

EFFECTIVE ESTIMATES FOR SOME FUNCTIONS DEFINED OVER PRIMES

CHRISTIAN AXLER

ABSTRACT. In this paper we give effective estimates for some classical arithmetic functions defined over prime numbers. First we find the smallest real number x_0 so that some inequality involving Chebyshev's ϑ -function holds for every $x \geq x_0$. Then we give some new results concerning the existence of prime numbers in short intervals. Also we derive new upper and lower bounds for some functions defined over prime numbers, for instance the prime counting function $\pi(x)$, which improve current best estimates of similar shape.

1. INTRODUCTION

First, we consider Chebyshev's ϑ -function

$$\vartheta(x) = \sum_{p \leq x} \log p,$$

where p runs over all primes not exceeding x . Since there are infinitely many primes, we have $\vartheta(x) \rightarrow \infty$ as $x \rightarrow \infty$. Hadamard [28] and de la Vallée-Poussin [17] independently proved a result concerning the asymptotic behavior for $\vartheta(x)$, namely

$$(1.1) \quad \vartheta(x) \sim x \quad (x \rightarrow \infty),$$

which is known as the *Prime Number Theorem*. In a later paper [18], where the existence of a zero-free region for the Riemann zeta function to the left of the line $\operatorname{Re}(s) = 1$ was proved, de la Vallée-Poussin also estimated the error term in the Prime Number Theorem by showing that

$$(1.2) \quad \vartheta(x) = x + O(xe^{-c_0\sqrt{\log x}}) \quad (x \rightarrow \infty),$$

where c_0 is a positive absolute constant. The currently best explicit version of this result is due to Johnston and Yang [31, Corollary 1.2]. They found that

$$(1.3) \quad |\vartheta(x) - x| \leq 9.14x(\log x)^{1.515} \exp(-0.8274\sqrt{\log x})$$

for every $x \geq 2$. The work of Korobov [32] and Vinogradov [58] implies the currently asymptotically strongest error term in (1.1), namely

$$(1.4) \quad \vartheta(x) = x + O\left(x \exp\left(-c_1 \log^{3/5} x (\log \log x)^{-1/5}\right)\right) \quad (x \rightarrow \infty),$$

where c_1 is a positive absolute constant. An explicit version of (1.4) was recently given by Johnston and Yang [31, Theorem 1.4]. Now, (1.2)–(1.4) each imply that for every positive integer k and every positive real number η_k there is real number $x_1 = x_1(k, \eta_k) > 1$ so that

$$(1.5) \quad |\vartheta(x) - x| < \frac{\eta_k x}{\log^k x}$$

for every $x \geq x_1$. In the case where $k = 3$ and $\eta_3 = 0.024334$, Broadbent et al. [10, Table 15] found that

$$(1.6) \quad |\vartheta(x) - x| < \frac{0.024334x}{\log^3 x} \quad (x \geq e^{29}).$$

In our first result, we compute the smallest positive integer N so that (1.6) holds for every $x \geq N$.

Proposition 1.1. *The inequality (1.6) holds for every $x \geq 1,757,126,630,797 = p_{64,707,865,143}$.*

Estimates for $\vartheta(x)$ of the form (1.5) can be used to specify short intervals containing at least one prime number. As an application of the Proposition 1.1 and a recent result of Broadbent et al. [10], we find the following result concerning the existence of prime numbers in short intervals.

Date: June 30, 2022.

2010 Mathematics Subject Classification. 11N56 (Primary), 11N05, 11A41 (Secondary).

Key words and phrases. Chebyshev's ϑ -function, prime counting function, primes in short intervals.

Theorem 1.2. *For every $x \geq x_0$ there is a prime number p such that*

$$x < p \leq x \left(1 + \frac{k}{\log^n x} \right),$$

where

n	3	4	5
k	$0.048668 + 8.22 \times 10^{-11}$	$114.368 + 2.145 \times 10^{-10}$	$268,820 + 5.0363 \times 10^{-7}$
x_0	17,051,708	2	2

Let $\pi(x)$ denote the number of primes not exceeding x . Chebyshev's ϑ -function and the prime counting function $\pi(x)$ are connected by the identity

$$(1.7) \quad \pi(x) = \frac{\vartheta(x)}{\log x} + \int_2^x \frac{\vartheta(t)}{t \log^2 t} dt,$$

which holds for every $x \geq 2$ (see [2, Theorem 4.3]). If we combine (1.3) and (1.7), we see that

$$(1.8) \quad \pi(x) = \text{li}(x) + O(xe^{-c_2\sqrt{\log x}}) \quad (x \rightarrow \infty),$$

where c_2 is a positive absolute constant. Here, the *integral logarithm* $\text{li}(x)$ is defined for every $x \geq 0$ as

$$\text{li}(x) = \int_0^x \frac{dt}{\log t} = \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0+} \left\{ \int_0^{1-\varepsilon} \frac{dt}{\log t} + \int_{1+\varepsilon}^x \frac{dt}{\log t} \right\}$$

and plays an important role in this paper. The current best explicit version of (1.8) is due to Johnston and Yang [31, Corollary 1.3]. Again, the work of Korobov [32] and Vinogradov [58] implies the current asymptotically strongest error term for the difference $\pi(x) - \text{li}(x)$, namely

$$(1.9) \quad \pi(x) = \text{li}(x) + O\left(x \exp\left(-c_3(\log x)^{3/5}(\log \log x)^{-1/5}\right)\right) \quad (x \rightarrow \infty),$$

where c_3 is a positive absolute constant. Ford [27, p. 2] has found that the constant c_3 in (1.9) can be chosen to be equal to 0.2098. Johnston and Yang [31, Theorem 1.4] used explicit zero-free regions and zero-density estimates for the Riemann zeta-function to show that the inequality

$$(1.10) \quad |\pi(x) - \text{li}(x)| \leq 0.028x(\log x)^{0.801} \exp\left(-0.1853(\log x)^{3/5}(\log \log x)^{-1/5}\right)$$

holds for every $x \geq 71$. Panaitopol [42, p. 55] gave another completely different asymptotic formula for the prime counting function by showing that for every positive integer m , one has

$$(1.11) \quad \pi(x) = \frac{x}{\log x - 1 - \frac{k_1}{\log x} - \frac{k_2}{\log^2 x} - \dots - \frac{k_m}{\log^m x}} + O\left(\frac{x}{\log^{m+2} x}\right) \quad (x \rightarrow \infty),$$

where the positive integers $k_1, \dots, k_m$ are defined by the recurrence formula

$$k_m + 1!k_{m-1} + 2!k_{m-2} + \dots + (m-1)!k_1 = m \cdot m!.$$

For instance, we have $k_1 = 1$, $k_2 = 3$, $k_3 = 13$, $k_4 = 71$, $k_5 = 461$, and $k_6 = 3441$. The computation of the prime counting function $\pi(x)$ for large values of x is a difficult problem (the latest record is due to Baugh and Walisch and was $\pi(10^{28}) = 157,589,269,275,973,410,412,739,598$). Also the asymptotic formula (1.8) (or (1.11)) is not very meaningful with regard to the computation of $\pi(x)$ for some fixed x . Hence we are interested in finding new effective estimates for the prime counting function $\pi(x)$ which correspond to the first terms of (1.11). For instance, those estimates for the prime counting function are used to get effective estimates for $1/\pi(x)$ (see [8]) or the n th prime number (see [5]). In this paper, we use Proposition 1.1 to establish the following upper bound for $\pi(x)$ which corresponds to the first terms of the asymptotic formula (1.11).

Theorem 1.3. *For every $x \geq 48$, we have*

$$(1.12) \quad \pi(x) < \frac{x}{\log x - 1 - \frac{1}{\log x} - \frac{3.024334}{\log^2 x} - \frac{12.975666}{\log^3 x} - \frac{71.048668}{\log^4 x} - \frac{461.364417856444}{\log^5 x} - \frac{4331.1}{\log^6 x}}.$$

For all sufficiently large values of x , Theorem 1.3 is a consequence of (1.10). On the other hand, we get the following lower bound for the $\pi(x)$ which corresponds to the first terms of (1.11).

Theorem 1.4. *For every $x \geq 1,751,189,194,177 = p_{64,497,259,289}$, we have*

$$(1.13) \quad \pi(x) > \frac{x}{\log x - 1 - \frac{1}{\log x} - \frac{2.975666}{\log^2 x} - \frac{13.024334}{\log^3 x} - \frac{70.951332}{\log^4 x} - \frac{460.634397856444}{\log^5 x} - \frac{3444.031844143556}{\log^6 x}}.$$

Again, for all sufficiently large values of x , Theorem 1.4 follows directly from (1.10). Our next goal is to establish new explicit estimates for the functions

$$\sum_{p \leq x} \frac{1}{p} \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{p \leq x} \frac{\log p}{p},$$

where p runs over primes not exceeding x , respectively. Euler [24] proved that the sum of the reciprocals of all prime numbers diverges. Mertens [39, p. 52] found that $\log \log x$ is the right order of magnitude for this sum by showing

$$(1.14) \quad \sum_{p \leq x} \frac{1}{p} = \log \log x + B + O\left(\frac{1}{\log x}\right).$$

Here B denotes *the Mertens' constant* and is defined by

$$(1.15) \quad B = \gamma + \sum_p \left(\log \left(1 - \frac{1}{p} \right) + \frac{1}{p} \right) = 0.26149 \dots,$$

where $\gamma = 0.577215 \dots$ denotes the Euler-Mascheroni constant. In Section 6, we apply Proposition 1.1 to some identity obtained by Rosser and Schoenfeld [50] and derive the following result which improves all other results of this form.

Theorem 1.5. *For every $x \geq 1,757,126,630,797$, we have*

$$(1.16) \quad \left| \sum_{p \leq x} \frac{1}{p} - \log \log x - B \right| \leq \frac{0.024334}{3 \log^3 x} \left(1 + \frac{15}{4 \log x} \right).$$

In 1874, Mertens [39] showed that

$$(1.17) \quad \sum_{p \leq x} \frac{\log p}{p} = \log x + O(1).$$

Landau [35, §55] improved (1.17) by finding

$$\sum_{p \leq x} \frac{\log p}{p} = \log x + E + O(\exp(-\sqrt[14]{\log x})),$$

where E is a constant defined by

$$(1.18) \quad E = -\gamma - \sum_p \frac{\log p}{p(p-1)} = -1.3325 \dots$$

Similar to Theorem 1.5, we establish the following explicit estimates for $\sum_{p \leq x} \log(p)/p$ which improve [3, Proposition 8].

Theorem 1.6. *For every $x \geq 1,757,126,630,797$, we have*

$$\left| \sum_{p \leq x} \frac{\log p}{p} - \log x - E \right| \leq \frac{0.024334}{2 \log^2 x} \left(1 + \frac{2}{\log x} \right).$$

2. PROOF OF PROPOSITION 1.1

In the following proof of Proposition 1.1, we first utilize an identity investigated by Rosser and Schoenfeld [50] to express Chebyshev's ϑ -function in terms of the difference $\pi(x) - \text{li}(x)$. Then we apply Walisch's *primecount* C++ code [61] to find a lower bound for $\pi(x) - \text{li}(x)$ in a certain restricted interval.

Proof of Proposition 1.1. By (1.6) and [10, Corollary 11.1], it suffices to check that the inequality

$$(2.1) \quad \vartheta(x) > x - \frac{0.024334x}{\log^3 x}$$

holds for every x satisfying $1,757,126,630,797 \leq x \leq e^{29}$. Using [50, (2.26)] with $f(x) = \log x$, we get

$$(2.2) \quad \vartheta(x) = x - 2 + \text{li}(2) \log 2 + (\pi(x) - \text{li}(x)) \log x - \int_2^x \frac{\pi(t) - \text{li}(t)}{t} dt$$

for every $x \geq 2$. Now we can use [43, Corollary 1] to see that

$$(2.3) \quad -2 + \text{li}(2) \log 2 - \int_2^x \frac{\pi(t) - \text{li}(t)}{t} dt \geq -2 + \text{li}(2) \log 2 - \int_2^9 \frac{\pi(t) - \text{li}(t)}{t} dt \geq 0.129$$

for every x with $9 \leq x \leq e^{29}$. Applying (2.4) to (2.2), we get

$$(2.4) \quad \vartheta(x) > x + (\pi(x) - \text{li}(x)) \log x$$

for every x so that $9 \leq x \leq e^{29}$. Now we use Walisch's *primecount* C++ code [61] to get

$$(2.5) \quad \pi(x) - \text{li}(x) \geq -\frac{0.024334x}{\log^4 x}$$

for every x with $1,760,505,892,241 \leq x \leq 2,342,911,050,819$ and every x with $2,346,094,807,193 \leq x \leq 4 \times 10^{12}$. If we combine (2.5) with (2.4), we get (2.1) for every x satisfying $1,760,505,892,241 \leq x \leq 2,342,911,050,819$ and every x with $2,346,094,807,193 \leq x \leq e^{29} \leq 4 \times 10^{12}$. In order to verify the required inequality (2.1) in the case where x satisfies $1,757,126,630,797 \leq x < 1,760,505,892,241$, we can check with a computer that $\vartheta(p_n) > g(p_{n+1})$ for every integer n such that $\pi(1,757,126,630,797) \leq n \leq \pi(1,760,505,892,241)$. Finally, a direct computer check shows that the inequality (2.1) also holds for every x such that $2,342,911,050,819 \leq x \leq 2,346,094,807,193$. $\square$

Remark. To find other explicit estimates for $\vartheta(x)$ in the restricted interval $[2, 10^{20}]$, one can also apply the method used by Dusart in [23]. Let

$$\pi_0(x) = \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{\pi(x - \varepsilon) + \pi(x + \varepsilon)}{2} = \begin{cases} \pi(x) - 1/2, & \text{if } x \text{ is prime,} \\ \pi(x), & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Riemann [47] published the formula

$$(2.6) \quad \pi_0(x) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{\mu(n)}{n} f(x^{1/n}),$$

where $\mu(n)$ is the Möbius function, and $f(x)$ is the Riemann prime counting function

$$f(x) = \text{li}(x) - \sum_{\rho} \text{li}(x^{\rho}) + \int_x^{\infty} \frac{dt}{t(t^2 - 1) \log t} - \log 2.$$

Here the sum means $\lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{|\rho| \leq T} \text{li}(x^{\rho})$, and the ρ 's are the nontrivial zeros of the Riemann zeta function. A first proof of (2.6) was given by von Mangoldt [60] in 1895. Now let

$$(2.7) \quad R(x) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{\mu(n)}{n} \text{li}(x^{1/n}) = 1 + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{\log^k x}{k! k \zeta(k+1)}.$$

The latter series for it is known as Gram series. Since $\log x < x$ for every real $x > 0$, this series converges for all positive x by comparison with the series for e^x . In [48], Riesel and Göhl showed that the function

$$g(x) = R(x) - \frac{1}{\log x} + \frac{1}{\pi} \arctan \frac{\pi}{\log x}$$

is a quite good approximation to $\pi_0(x)$. The difference between $g(x)$ and $\pi_0(x)$ heuristically oscillates with an amplitude of about $\sqrt{x}/\log x$. So we define

$$(2.8) \quad \Delta(x) = \left(\pi_0(x) - R(x) + \frac{1}{\log x} - \frac{1}{\pi} \arctan \frac{\pi}{\log x} \right) \frac{\log x}{\sqrt{x}},$$

the function which represents the fluctuations of the distribution of primes. We can use (2.7) and (2.8) to get

$$(2.9) \quad \pi(x) - \text{li}(x) \leq \frac{1}{2} + f_2(x) + \frac{\sqrt{x}}{\log x} \times \Delta(x) - \frac{1}{\log x} + \frac{1}{\pi} \arctan \frac{\pi}{\log x},$$

where

$$f_k(x) = \sum_{n=k}^{\infty} \frac{\mu(n)}{n} \text{li}(x^{1/n}).$$

Since $\mu(4) = 0$ and $f_5(x)$ is strictly decreasing on $(1, \infty)$, the inequality (2.9) implies that

$$(2.10) \quad \pi(x) - \text{li}(x) \leq -\frac{\text{li}(\sqrt{x})}{2} - \frac{\text{li}(x^{1/3})}{3} + \frac{\sqrt{x}}{\log x} \times \Delta(x)$$

for every $x \geq 2,000$. Similarly, we see that

$$(2.11) \quad \pi(x) - \text{li}(x) \geq \sum_{n=2}^5 \frac{\mu(n)}{n} \text{li}(x^{1/n}) + \frac{\sqrt{x}}{\log x} \times \Delta(x)$$

for every $x \geq 10,326$. Applying (2.10) and (2.11) to (2.2), we get

$$\vartheta(x) > x + (\Delta(x) - 1)\sqrt{x} - \max_{2000 \leq t \leq x} \Delta(t) \times \text{li}(\sqrt{x}) - \sqrt[3]{x} - \frac{\text{li}(\sqrt[5]{x}) \log x}{5} + c_1$$

for every $x \geq 10,326$, where c_1 is a constant. Analogously, we see that the inequality

$$\vartheta(x) < x + (\Delta(x) - 1)\sqrt{x} - \min_{10,236 \leq t \leq x} \Delta(t) \times \text{li}(\sqrt{x}) - \sqrt[3]{x} + \frac{\text{li}(\sqrt[5]{x}) \log x}{5} - \sqrt[5]{x} + c_2$$

holds for every $x \geq 10,326$, where c_2 is a constant. Now one can use the extensive table of the minimum and maximum values of $\Delta(x)$ in [34] to obtain explicit estimates for $\vartheta(x)$ in the restricted interval $[2, 10^{20}]$.

Remark. Under the assumption that the Riemann hypothesis is true, von Koch [59] deduced the asymptotic formula $\vartheta(x) = x + O(\sqrt{x} \log^2 x)$. An explicit version was given by Schoenfeld [53, Theorem 10]. Under the assumption that the Riemann hypothesis is true, Schoenfeld has found that

$$(2.12) \quad |\vartheta(x) - x| < \frac{\sqrt{x}}{8\pi} \log^2 x$$

for every $x \geq 599$. Recently, Schoenfeld's result was slightly improved by Dusart [23, Proposition 2.5]. In 2016, Büthe [12, Theorem 2] investigated a method to show that the inequality (2.12) holds unconditionally for every x such that $599 \leq x \leq 1.4 \times 10^{25}$. Büthe's result was improved by Platt and Trudgian [44, Corollary 1]. They proved that the inequality (2.12) holds unconditionally for every x satisfying $599 \leq x \leq 2.169 \times 10^{25}$. Recently, Johnston [30, Corollary 3.3] extended the last result by showing that the inequality (2.12) holds unconditionally for every x with $599 \leq x \leq 1.101 \times 10^{26}$.

3. PROOF OF THEOREM 1.2

Bertrand's postulate states that for each positive integer n there is a prime number p with $n < p \leq 2n$. It was proved, for instance, by Chebyshev [16]. In the following, we note some improvements of Bertrand's postulate. The first result is due to Trudgian [57, Corollary 2]. He proved that for every $x \geq 2,898,242$ there exists a prime number p with

$$(3.1) \quad x < p \leq x \left(1 + \frac{1}{111 \log^2 x} \right).$$

Dusart [22, Corollary 5.5] improved Trudgian's result by showing that for every $x \geq 468,991,632$ there exists a prime number p such that

$$(3.2) \quad x < p \leq x \left(1 + \frac{1}{5,000 \log^2 x} \right).$$

In [3, Theorem 4], it is shown that for every $x \geq 6,034,256$ there exists a prime number p such that

$$(3.3) \quad x < p \leq x \left(1 + \frac{0.087}{\log^3 x} \right).$$

Further, the present author [3, Theorem 4] found that for every $x > 1$ there is a prime number p with

$$(3.4) \quad x < p \leq x \left(1 + \frac{198.2}{\log^4 x} \right).$$

In Theorem 1.2, we give improvements of (3.3) and (3.4) by decreasing the coefficient of the term $1/\log^n x$ and on the other hand by increasing the exponent of the $\log x$ term. In order to prove the first part of this theorem, we use Proposition 1.1. For the second and third part, we need the following effective estimates for the Chebyshev ϑ -function.

Lemma 3.1. *For every $x \geq 1,091,159$, one has*

$$(3.5) \quad |\vartheta(x) - x| \leq \frac{57.184x}{\log^4 x},$$

and for every $x > 1$, one has

$$(3.6) \quad |\vartheta(x) - x| \leq \frac{134,410x}{\log^5 x}.$$

Proof. Using [10, Table 15], we see that the inequality (3.5) holds for every $x \geq 5 \times 10^6$. For smaller values of x , we use a computer. The inequality (3.6) has already been proven in [10, Table 15]. $\square$

Now we give a prove of Theorem 1.2.

Proof of Theorem 1.2. For a better readability, we set $f_{k,n}(x) = kx/\log^n x$, $a = 0.048668 + 8.22 \times 10^{-11}$, $b = 114.368 + 2.145 \times 10^{-10}$, and $c = 268,820 + 5.0363 \times 10^{-7}$. Using Proposition 1.1, we get

$$\vartheta(x + f_{a,3}(x)) - \vartheta(x) > \frac{x}{\log^3 x} \left(8.22 \times 10^{-11} - \frac{0.024334a}{\log^3 x} \right) \geq 0$$

for every $x \geq e^{243.3297}$, which implies that for every $x \geq e^{243.329}$ there is a prime number p satisfying $x < p \leq x + ax/\log^3 x$. From (3.2), it is clear that the claim follows for every x with $468,991,632 \leq x < e^{243.34}$. To deal with the cases where $17,051,887 \leq x < 468,991,632$, we check with a computer that the inequality $p_n(1 + a/\log^3 p_n) > p_{n+1}$ holds for every integer n such that $\pi(17,051,887) \leq n \leq \pi(468,991,632) + 1$. Finally, we notice that $\pi(x(1 + a/\log^3 x)) > \pi(x)$ for every x such that $17,051,708 \leq x < 17,051,887$.

In order to prove the second part, we use (3.5) to obtain the inequality

$$\vartheta(x + f_{b,4}(x)) - \vartheta(x) > \frac{x}{\log^4 x} \left(2.145 \times 10^{-10} - \frac{57.184b}{\log^4 x} \right) \geq 0$$

for every $x \geq e^{2349.839}$. Obviously, the first part yields that there is a prime number p satisfying $x < p \leq x + bx/\log^4 x$ for every $17,051,708 \leq x \leq e^{2349.963}$. Analogously to the proof of the first part, we check with a computer that for every x with $2 \leq x < 17,051,708$ there is a prime p so that $x < p \leq x + bx/\log^4 x$.

Finally, we verify the third part. By (3.6), we have

$$\vartheta(x + f_{c,5}(x)) - \vartheta(x) > \frac{x}{\log^5 x} \left(5.0363 \times 10^{-7} - \frac{134410c}{\log^5 x} \right) \geq 0$$

for every $x \geq e^{2350.479}$. Now it suffices to observe that the second part implies the third part for every x satisfying $2 \leq x \leq e^{2350.482}$. $\square$

Remark. Beginning with Hoheisel [29], many authors have found shorter intervals of the form $[x - x^\delta, x]$ that must contain a prime number for all sufficiently large values of x . The most recent result is due to Baker, Harman, and Pintz [6]. They found the value $\delta = 0.525$. Under the assumption that the Riemann hypothesis is true, much better results are known. For more details, see, for instance, Ramaré and Saouter [46], Dudek [20], Dudek, Grenié, and Molteni [21], and Carneiro, Milinovich, and Soundararajan [14].

4. PROOF OF THEOREM 1.3

First, we note some well known estimates for the prime counting function $\pi(x)$. A classic method of finding explicit estimates for $\pi(x)$ is the following. Let k be a positive integer and η_k a positive real number. By (1.5), there is a real number $x_1 = x_1(k, \eta_k) > 1$ so that

$$|\vartheta(x) - x| < \frac{\eta_k x}{\log^k x}$$

for every $x \geq x_1$. In order to prove Theorem 1.3, we define the auxiliary function

$$(4.1) \quad J_{k;\eta_k;x_1}(x) = \pi(x_1) - \frac{\vartheta(x_1)}{\log x_1} + \frac{x}{\log x} + \frac{\eta_k x}{\log^{k+1} x} + \int_{x_1}^x \left(\frac{1}{\log^2 t} + \frac{\eta_k}{\log^{k+2} t} \right) dt$$

and note the following both inequalities involving the prime counting function $\pi(x)$.

Lemma 4.1. *For every $x \geq x_1$, we have*

$$J_{k;-\eta_k;x_1}(x) \leq \pi(x) \leq J_{k;\eta_k;x_1}(x).$$

Proof. The claim follows directly from (1.7) and (1.5). $\square$

One of the first estimates for $\pi(x)$ is due to Gauss. In 1793, he computed that

$$(4.2) \quad \pi(x) \leq \text{li}(x)$$

holds for every x with $2 \leq x \leq 3,000,000$ and conjectured that the inequality (4.2) holds for every $x \geq 2$. This conjecture was disproven by Littlewood [38]. More precisely, he proved that the function $\pi(x) - \text{li}(x)$ changes the sign infinitely many times. Unfortunately, Littlewood's proof is nonconstructive and there is still no example of x such that $\pi(x) > \text{li}(x)$. Skewes [54] proved the existence of a number x_0 with $x_0 < \exp(\exp(\exp(\exp(7.705))))$ such that $\pi(x_0) > \text{li}(x_0)$. Lehman [37] improved this last upper bound considerably by showing that exists a number x_0 with $x_0 < 1.65 \times 10^{1165}$ such that $\pi(x_0) > \text{li}(x_0)$. After some further improvements (see, for instance, te Riele [56], Bays and Hudson [7], Chao and Plymen [15], Saouter and Demichel [52], Stoll and Demichel [55] and Saouter, Trudgian, and Demichel [51]), the current best upper bound was found by Platt and Trudgian [43]. They proved that there exists a number x_0 with $x_0 < e^{727.951332668}$ such that $\pi(x_0) > \text{li}(x_0)$. All these upper bounds have been proved by using

computer calculations of zeros of the Riemann zeta function. The first lower bound for a number x_0 with $\pi(x_0) > \text{li}(x_0)$ was given by the calculation of Gauss, namely $x_0 > 3,000,000$. This lower bound was improved in a series of papers. For details, see Rosser and Schoenfeld [50], Brent [9], Kotnik [33], Platt and Trudgian [43], and Stoll and Demichel [55]. For our further investigation, we use the following improvement.

Lemma 4.2 (Büthe [13]). *For every x with $2 \leq x \leq 10^{19}$, we have $\pi(x) \leq \text{li}(x)$.*

Remark. Recently, Dusart [23, Lemma 2.2] showed that $\pi(x) \leq \text{li}(x)$ for every x with $2 \leq x \leq 10^{20}$.

Now we use Proposition 1.1 and the Lemmata 4.1 and (4.2) to give a proof of Theorem 1.3.

Proof of Theorem 1.3. First, we combine Lemma 4.1 with Proposition 1.1 to see that

$$(4.3) \quad J_{3,-0.024334;x_1}(x) \leq \pi(x) \leq J_{3,0.024334;x_1}(x)$$

for every $x \geq x_1$, where $x_1 \geq 1,757,126,630,797$. Now, let $x_2 = 10^{18}$ and let $f(x)$ be given by the right-hand side of (1.12). We consider the function $g(x) = f(x) - J_{3,0.024334;x_2}(x)$. By [19], we have $\vartheta(x_2) \geq 999,999,999,144,115,634$. Further, $\pi(x_2) = 24,739,954,287,740,860$ and so we compute $g(x_2) \geq 2 \times 10^8$. Since the derivative of g is positive for every $x \geq x_2$, we get $f(x) - J_{3,0.024334;x_2}(x) > 0$ for every $x \geq x_1$, and we conclude from (4.3) that the inequality (1.12) holds for every $x \geq x_1$. Comparing $f(x)$ with the integral logarithm $\text{li}(x)$, we see that $f(x) > \text{li}(x)$ for every $x \geq 121,141,948$. Now we can utilize Lemma 4.2 to see that the desired inequality also holds for every x such that $121,141,948 \leq x < 10^{18}$. A computer check for smaller values of x completes the proof. $\square$

Under the assumption that the Riemann hypothesis is true, von Koch [59] deduced that $\pi(x) = \text{li}(x) + O(\sqrt{x} \log x)$ as $x \rightarrow \infty$. Actually, one can show that the asymptotic formula $\pi(x) = \text{li}(x) + O(\sqrt{x} \log x)$ as $x \rightarrow \infty$ is even a sufficient criterion for the truth of the Riemann hypothesis. An explicit version of von Koch's result is due to Schoenfeld [53, Corollary 1]. Under the assumption that the Riemann hypothesis is true, Schoenfeld found that the inequality

$$(4.4) \quad |\pi(x) - \text{li}(x)| < \frac{1}{8\pi} \sqrt{x} \log x$$

holds for every $x \geq 2,657$. In 2014, Büthe [12, p. 2,495] proved that the inequality (4.4) holds unconditionally for every x such that $2,657 \leq x \leq 1.4 \times 10^{25}$. Platt and Trudgian [44, Corollary 1] improved Büthe's result by showing that the inequality (4.4) holds unconditionally for every x satisfying $2,657 \leq x \leq 2.169 \times 10^{25}$. Johnston [30, Corollary 3.3] extended the last result by showing the following

Lemma 4.3 (Johnston). *The inequality (4.4) holds unconditionally for every x satisfying $2,657 \leq x \leq 1.101 \times 10^{26}$.*

Now we can use Theorem 1.3 and the Lemmata 4.2 and (4.3) to find the following weaker but more compact upper bounds for the prime counting function $\pi(x)$ of the form

$$(4.5) \quad \pi(x) < \frac{x}{\log x - a_0 - \frac{a_1}{\log x} - \dots - \frac{a_m}{\log^m x}} \quad (x \geq x_0),$$

where m is a integer with $0 \leq m \leq 5$ and $a_0, \dots, a_m$ are suitable positive real numbers.

Corollary 4.4. *We have*

$$\pi(x) < \frac{x}{\log x - a_0 - \frac{a_1}{\log x} - \frac{a_2}{\log^2 x}}$$

for every $x \geq x_0$, where

a_0	1.0343	1	1
a_1	0	1.109	1
a_2	0	0	3.48
x_0	106,640,139,304,611	81,250,795,096,339	145,413,088,724,077

and we have

$$\pi(x) < \frac{x}{\log x - 1 - \frac{1}{\log x} - \frac{3.024334}{\log^2 x} - \frac{a_3}{\log^3 x} - \frac{a_4}{\log^4 x} - \frac{a_5}{\log^5 x}}$$

for every $x \geq x_0$, where

a_3	14.893	12.975666	12.975666
a_4	0	79.962	71.048668
a_5	0	0	533.594
x_0	142, 464, 507, 937, 911	22	32

Proof. Theorem 1.3 implies that the inequality

$$(4.6) \quad \pi(x) < \frac{x}{\log x - 1.0343}$$

holds for every $x \geq 108, 943, 258, 198, 427$. If we compare the right-hand side of (4.6) with $\text{li}(x)$, we can use Lemma 4.2 to see that the required inequality (4.6) holds for every x with $106, 910, 668, 441, 596 \leq x \leq 108, 943, 258, 198, 427$. Finally, we use Walisch's *primecount* program [61] to obtain that the inequality (4.6) is also valid for every x satisfying $106, 640, 139, 304, 611 \leq x \leq 106, 910, 668, 441, 596$. The proof of each of the next three inequalities is similar to the proof of (4.6) and we leave the details to the reader. Next, we show that the inequality

$$(4.7) \quad \pi(x) < \frac{x}{\log x - 1 - \frac{1}{\log x} - \frac{3.024334}{\log^2 x} - \frac{12.975666}{\log^3 x} - \frac{79.962}{\log^4 x}}$$

holds for every $x \geq 22$. First, we can use Theorem 1.3 to obtain that the inequality (4.7) holds for every $x \geq 1.101 \times 10^{26}$. Let $f(x)$ denote the right-hand side of (4.6). We get that $f(x) \geq \text{li}(x) + \sqrt{x} \log(x)/(8\pi)$ for every x with $22, 066, 689, 219, 741, 110 \leq x \leq 1.101 \times 10^{26}$. Now we can apply Lemma 4.3 to see that the required inequality (4.7) also holds for every x satisfying $22, 066, 689, 219, 741, 110 \leq x \leq 1.101 \times 10^{26}$. A comparison with $\text{li}(x)$ shows that $f(x) > \text{li}(x)$ for every $x \geq 259, 576, 712, 645$ and Lemma 4.2 yields the desired inequality (4.7) for every x with $259, 576, 712, 645 \leq x \leq 22, 066, 689, 219, 741, 110$. Finally, it suffices to apply Walisch's *primecount* program [61] to see that the inequality (4.7) also holds for every x satisfying $22 \leq x \leq 259, 576, 712, 645$. Again, the proof of the remaining inequality is similar to the proof of (4.7) and we leave the details to the reader. $\square$

Remark. In Section 7, we give lots of other weaker upper bounds in the case where $m \in \{0, 1, 2\}$.

Using Lemma 3.1, we get the following upper bound for the prime counting function which improves the inequality (1.12) for all sufficiently large values of x .

Proposition 4.5. *For every $x \geq 29.53$, we have*

$$\pi(x) < \frac{x}{\log x - 1 - \frac{1}{\log x} - \frac{3}{\log^2 x} - \frac{70.935}{\log^3 x}}.$$

Proof. We combine Lemma 4.1 with (3.5) to see that $\pi(x) \leq J_{4,57.184,x_1}(x)$ for every $x \geq 10^{18}$ and proceed as in the proof of Theorem 1.3. We leave the details to the reader. $\square$

Integration by parts in (1.8) implies that for every positive integer m , one has

$$(4.8) \quad \pi(x) = \frac{x}{\log x} + \frac{x}{\log^2 x} + \frac{2x}{\log^3 x} + \frac{6x}{\log^4 x} + \frac{24x}{\log^5 x} + \dots + \frac{(m-1)!x}{\log^m x} + O\left(\frac{x}{\log^{m+1} x}\right)$$

as $x \rightarrow \infty$. In this direction, we get the following upper bound for $\pi(x)$.

Proposition 4.6. *For every $x > 1$, we have*

$$\pi(x) < \frac{x}{\log x} + \frac{x}{\log^2 x} + \frac{2x}{\log^3 x} + \frac{6.024334x}{\log^4 x} + \frac{24.024334x}{\log^5 x} + \frac{120.12167x}{\log^6 x} + \frac{720.73002x}{\log^7 x} + \frac{6098x}{\log^8 x}.$$

Proof. We set $x_1 = 10^{18}$. Further, let $f(x)$ be the right-hand side of the required inequality. We have $f(x) > J_{3,0.024334,x_1}(x)$ for every $x \geq x_1$. So, we can use (4.3) to get $f(x) > \pi(x)$ for every $x \geq x_1$. Since $f(x) > \text{li}(x)$ for every $x \geq 204, 182, 829$, we can apply Lemma 4.2 to obtain $f(x) > \pi(x)$ for every x such that $204, 182, 829 \leq x \leq x_1$. A direct computation for smaller values of x completes the proof. $\square$

Proposition 4.6 yields the following weaker but more compact upper bounds for the prime counting function $\pi(x)$.

Corollary 4.7. *For every $x \geq x_0$, we have*

$$\pi(x) < \frac{x}{\log x} + \frac{x}{\log^2 x} + \frac{(2+\varepsilon)x}{\log^3 x},$$

where

ε	0.21	0.215	0.22	0.225
x_0	160, 930, 932, 942, 272	83, 016, 503, 500, 865	43, 999, 690, 220, 699	23, 824, 649, 646, 672
ε	0.23	0.24	0.25	0.26
x_0	13, 279, 102, 022, 111	4, 511, 700, 549, 332	1, 615, 202, 653, 795	643, 809, 266, 445
ε	0.265 ¹	0.27	0.28	0.29
x_0	406, 742, 886, 708	265, 248, 130, 170	117, 997, 473, 286	57, 720, 805, 589

Proof. Let $x_0 = 160, 930, 932, 942, 272$ and $f(x) = x/\log x + x/\log^2 x + 2.21x/\log^3 x$. Proposition 4.6 implies that $\pi(x) < f(x)$ for every $x \geq 180, 250, 881, 352, 396$. If we compare $f(x)$ with the integral logarithm $\text{li}(x)$, we get by Lemma 4.2 that $\pi(x) < f(x)$ for every $x \geq 162, 791, 795, 110, 834$. Next, we use a computer to verify the inequality $\pi(x) < f(x)$ for every x with $x_0 \leq x \leq 162, 791, 795, 110, 834$. The remaining inequalities can be proved in the same way. $\square$

5. PROOF OF THEOREM 1.4

In order to give a proof of Theorem 1.4, we use (4.3) and a numerical calculation that verifies the desired inequality for smaller values of x .

Proof of Theorem 1.4. Let $x_1 = 1, 757, 126, 630, 797$. Further, let $g(x)$ be the right-hand side of (1.13). We can compute that $J_{3,-0.024334,x_1}(x_1) - g(x_1) > 6 \times 10^3$. In addition we have $J'_{3,-0.024334,x_1}(x) > g'(x)$ for every $x \geq 44.42$. Therefore, we get $J_{3,-0.024334,x_1}(x) > g(x)$ for every $x \geq x_1$. Using (4.3), we get the required inequality for every $x \geq x_1$. For smaller values of x we use a computer. $\square$

Remark. Let $x_1 = 1, 751, 189, 194, 177$. Then the inequality (1.13) does not hold for $x = x_1 - 0.1$.

Remark. Theorem 1.4 improves the lower bound for $\pi(x)$ obtained in [3, Theorem 3].

In the next corollary, we establish some weaker lower bounds for the prime counting function.

Corollary 5.1. *We have*

$$\pi(x) > \frac{x}{\log x - 1 - \frac{1}{\log x} - \frac{a_2}{\log^2 x} - \frac{a_3}{\log^3 x} - \frac{a_4}{\log^4 x} - \frac{a_5}{\log^5 x}}$$

for every $x \geq x_0$, where

a_2	2.975666	2.975666	2.975666	2.975666
a_3	13.024334	13.024334	13.024334	0
a_4	70.951332	70.951332	0	0
a_5	460.634397856444	0	0	0
x_0	1, 035, 745, 443, 241	153, 887, 581, 621	7, 713, 187, 213	54, 941, 209

Proof. From Theorem 1.4, it follows that each required inequality holds for every $x \geq 1, 751, 189, 194, 177$. For smaller values of x we use a computer. $\square$

Further, we give the following result which refines Theorem 1.4 for all sufficiently large values of x .

Proposition 5.2. *For every $x \geq 467, 497 = p_{39,021}$, we have*

$$(5.1) \quad \pi(x) > \frac{x}{\log x - 1 - \frac{1}{\log x} - \frac{3}{\log^2 x} + \frac{44.184}{\log^3 x}}.$$

Proof. Let $x_1 = 10^7$ and let $f(x)$ denote the right-hand side of (5.1). A comparison with $J_{4,-57.184,x_1}(x)$ gives that $J_{4,-57.184,x_1}(x) > f(x)$ for every $x \geq x_1$. Now we can use (3.5) and Lemma 4.1 to see that $\pi(x) > f(x)$ for every $x \geq x_1$. We may conclude with a direct computation. $\square$

The asymptotic expansion (1.11) implies that the slightly sharper inequality

$$(5.2) \quad \pi(x) > \frac{x}{\log x - 1 - \frac{1}{\log x} - \frac{3}{\log^2 x}}$$

holds for all sufficiently large values of x . Under the assumption that the Riemann hypothesis is true, the present author [4, Proposition 2] showed that the inequality (5.2) holds for every $x \geq 65, 405, 887$. Now we use Theorem 1.4 to obtain the following unconditionally result.

¹This inequality was already known to be true for every $x \geq 8 \times 10^{11}$ (see [40, Proposition 3.3]).

Proposition 5.3. *The inequality (5.2) holds unconditionally for every x such that $65,405,887 \leq x \leq e^{1697}$ and every $x \geq e^{2256}$.*

Proof. In [4, Theorem 1], the inequality was already proved for every x with $65,405,887 \leq x \leq 2.7358 \times 10^{40}$. If we utilize Theorem 1.4, it turns out that the inequality (5.2) holds unconditionally for every x such that $65,405,887 \leq x \leq e^{540}$.

Now, let $f(x)$ denote the right-hand side of (5.2). In order to verify the required inequality for every x with $e^{540} \leq x \leq e^{1680}$, we set $c_0 = 1 - 1.6341 \times 10^{-12}$. By [25, Table 3], we have $\vartheta(x) \geq c_0 x$ for every $x > e^{500}$. Applying this inequality to (1.7), we get

$$(5.3) \quad \pi(x) > g_0(x)$$

for every $x \geq e^{500}$, where $g_0(x) = c_0(\text{li}(x) - \text{li}(e^{500}) + e^{500}/500)$. If we show that $g_0(x) > f(x)$ for every x satisfying $e^{540} \leq x \leq e^{1680}$, we can use (5.3) to see that the required inequality (5.2) holds for every x with $e^{540} \leq x \leq e^{1680}$. Since $g'_0(x) > f'(x)$ for every x so that $9 \leq x \leq e^{1680}$, it remains to show that $g_0(x_0) > f(x_0)$, where $x_0 = e^{540}$. First, we note that

$$(5.4) \quad \sum_{k=1}^6 \frac{(k-1)!}{\log^k t} < \frac{\text{li}(t)}{t} < \frac{1.003}{\log t},$$

where the left-hand side inequality holds for every $t \geq 565$ and the right-hand side inequality is valid for every $t \geq e^{500}$. Therefore,

$$\frac{g_0(x_0) - f(x_0)}{x_0} > c_0 \sum_{k=1}^6 \frac{(k-1)!}{540^k} - \frac{0.003c_0}{e^{40}} - \frac{f(x_0)}{x_0}.$$

Since the right-hand side of the last inequality is positive and we conclude that the required inequality holds for every x with $x_0 \leq x \leq e^{1680}$.

Next, we check the inequality (5.2) for every x satisfying $e^{1680} \leq x \leq e^{1697}$. Here, we set $c_1 = 1 - 1.5733 \times 10^{-12}$ and $d_1 = 1 - 1.5907 \times 10^{-12}$. According to Fiori, Kadiri, and Swidinsky [25, Table 3], we have

$$(5.5) \quad \vartheta(x) \geq c_1 x \quad (x \geq e^{1680}),$$

$$(5.6) \quad \vartheta(x) \geq d_1 x \quad (x \geq e^{1000}).$$

If we substitute the inequalities (5.5) and (5.6) into (1.7), we get that

$$(5.7) \quad \pi(x) > g_{1680}(x)$$

for every $x \geq e^{1680}$, where

$$(5.8) \quad g_a(x) = c_1 \left(\text{li}(x) - \text{li}(e^a) + \frac{e^a}{a} \right) + d_1 \left(\text{li}(e^a) - \frac{e^a}{a} - \text{li}(e^{1000}) + \frac{e^{1000}}{1000} \right).$$

Again it suffices to show that $g_{1680}(x) \geq f(x)$ for every x satisfying $e^{1680} \leq x \leq e^{1697}$. We can use the left-hand side inequality of (5.4) and the inequality $\text{li}(t) < 1.0006t/\log t$, which holds for every $t \geq e^{1680}$, to see that

$$(5.9) \quad \frac{g_{1680}(e^{1680}) - f(e^{1680})}{e^{1680}} > \frac{c_1}{1680} + d_1 \sum_{k=2}^6 \frac{(k-1)!}{1680^k} - \frac{0.0006d_1}{1000e^{680}} - \frac{f(e^{1680})}{e^{1680}} > 0.$$

Together with $g'_{1680}(t) \geq f'(t)$ for every t with $e^{1680} \leq t \leq t_1$, where $t_1 = 1696.0578605\dots$, it turns out that $\pi(x) > g_{1680}(x) > f(x)$ for every x with $e^{1680} \leq x \leq t_1$. Similar to (5.9), we compute that $g_{1680}(e^{1697}) > f(e^{1697})$. Since $g'_{1680}(t) \leq f'(t)$ for every t with $t \geq t_1$, we see that $\pi(x) > g_{1680}(x) > f(x)$ for every x with $t_1 \leq x \leq e^{1697}$.

Now, we deal with the case where x satisfies $e^{2256} \leq x \leq e^{2259}$. Here, let $c_2 = 1 - 5.0057 \times 10^{-13}$. By [26, Table 3], we have $\vartheta(x) \geq c_2 x$ for every $x \geq e^{2256}$. Similar to (5.7), we get that $\pi(x) > g_{2256}(x)$ for every $x \geq e^{2256}$, where $g_a(x)$ is defined as in (5.8). Analogous to the proof that $\pi(x) > g_{1680}(x) > f(x)$ for every x with $e^{1680} \leq x \leq t_1$, we see that $\pi(x) > g_{2256}(x) > f(x)$ for every x satisfying $e^{2256} \leq x \leq e^{2258}$.

The cases where

- x satisfies $e^{2258} \leq x \leq e^{2265}$,
- x satisfies $e^{2265} \leq x \leq e^{2289}$,
- x satisfies $e^{2289} \leq x \leq e^{2377}$,
- x satisfies $e^{2377} \leq x \leq e^{4677}$

can be treated as the case where x satisfies $e^{2256} \leq x \leq e^{2258}$ and we leave the details to the reader.

The final step of the proof consists in the verification of the required inequality for every $x \geq x_1$, where $x_1 = e^{4677}$. By [10, Table 15], we have $\vartheta(x) > x(1 - 0.037436/\log^4 x)$ for every $x \geq x_1$. Now we can utilize Lemma 4.1 to get $\pi(x) \geq J_{4,-0.037436,x_1}(x)$ for every $x \geq x_1$. We want to show that $J_{4,-0.037436,x_1}(x) > f(x)$ for every $x \geq x_1$. Since $J'_{4,-0.037436,x_1}(x) > f'(x)$ for every $x \geq x_1$, it remains to show that $J_{4,-0.037436,x_1}(x_1) > f(x_1)$. For a better readability, we set $J(x) = J_{4,-0.037436,x_1}(x)$. By [26, Table 3], we have $\vartheta(x) > c_3 x$ for every $x \geq e^{2000}$, where $c_3 = 1 - 1.5692 \times 10^{-12}$. Applying this inequality to (1.7), we see that

$$\pi(x_1) - \frac{\vartheta(x_1)}{\log x_1} \geq c_3 \left(\text{li}(x_1) - \frac{x_1}{\log x_1} - \text{li}(e^{2000}) + \frac{e^{2000}}{2000} \right).$$

If we substitute this into (4.1), we get

$$\frac{J(x_1) - f(x_1)}{x_1} > \frac{c_3}{x_1} \left(\text{li}(x_1) - \text{li}(e^{2000}) + \frac{e^{2000}}{2000} \right) + \frac{1.5692 \times 10^{-12}}{4677} - \frac{0.037436}{4677^5} - \frac{f(x_1)}{x_1}.$$

Finally, we use (5.4) to see that

$$\frac{J(x_1) - f(x_1)}{x_1} > \frac{1}{4677} + c_3 \sum_{k=2}^6 \frac{(k-1)!}{4677^k} - \frac{c_3}{e^{2677}} + \frac{c_3}{2000e^{2677}} - \frac{0.037436}{4677^5} - \frac{f(x_1)}{x_1}.$$

Since the right-hand side of the last inequality is positive, we obtain that the required inequality (5.2) holds for every $x \geq e^{4677}$, and we arrive at the end of the proof. $\square$

Remark. By (1.11), the even sharper inequality

$$\pi(x) > \frac{x}{\log x - 1 - \frac{1}{\log x} - \frac{3}{\log^2 x} - \frac{13}{\log^3 x}}$$

holds for all sufficiently large values of x . Similar to the proof of Proposition 5.3, we get that this inequality holds for every x satisfying $11,471,757,461 \leq x \leq e^{57.820987}$ and every $x \geq e^{5000}$.

Let n be a positive integer. Then (4.8) yields the inequality

$$(5.10) \quad \pi(x) > \frac{x}{\log x} + \frac{x}{\log^2 x} + \frac{2x}{\log^3 x} + \frac{6x}{\log^4 x} + \frac{24x}{\log^5 x} + \dots + \frac{(n-1)!x}{\log^n x}$$

for all sufficiently large values of x . In the following proposition, we describe a method to find lower bounds for $\pi(x)$ in the direction of (5.10) by using lower bounds for $\pi(x)$ in the direction of (1.11).

Proposition 5.4. *Let n be a positive integer and let $a_0 > 0$ and $a_1, \dots, a_n$ be negative real numbers. Suppose that there is a positive real number x_0 such that the inequalities*

$$(5.11) \quad a_0 \log x + a_1 + \frac{a_2}{\log x} + \dots + \frac{a_n}{\log^{n-1} x} > 0$$

and

$$(5.12) \quad \pi(x) > \frac{x}{a_0 \log x + a_1 + \frac{a_2}{\log x} + \dots + \frac{a_n}{\log^{n-1} x}}$$

hold simultaneously for every $x \geq x_0$. Then we have

$$\pi(x) > \frac{b_0 x}{\log x} + \frac{b_1 x}{\log^2 x} + \dots + \frac{b_n x}{\log^{n+1} x}$$

for every $x \geq x_0$, where $b_0, \dots, b_n$ are real numbers recursively defined by

$$(5.13) \quad b_0 = 1/a_0, \quad \text{and} \quad b_k = -\frac{1}{a_0} \sum_{i=1}^k a_i b_{k-i} \quad (1 \leq k \leq n).$$

Proof. For $y > 0$, we define $R(y) = \sum_{k=0}^n a_k/y^k$ and $S(y) = \sum_{i=0}^n b_i/y^i$. For $i \in \{1, \dots, 2n\}$, we set

$$a'_i = \begin{cases} a_i, & \text{if } i \in \{1, \dots, n\}, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad \text{and} \quad b'_i = \begin{cases} b_i, & \text{if } i \in \{1, \dots, n\}, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Using (5.13) together with $b'_{n+1} = 0$, we can see that

$$R(y)S(y) = 1 + \sum_{k=n+1}^{2n} \sum_{i=1}^k \frac{a'_i b'_{k-i}}{y^k}.$$

Since $a'_i b'_{k-i} \leq 0$ for every i with $1 \leq i \leq 2n$ and every k satisfying $n+1 \leq k \leq 2n$, we get $R(y)S(y) \leq 1$. By (5.11), we have $R(\log x) > 0$ for every $x \geq x_0$. Now we can use (5.12) to get $\pi(x) > x/(R(x) \log x) \geq xS(\log x)/\log x$ for every $x \geq x_0$ and we arrive at the end of the proof. $\square$

The best explicit result in the direction of (5.3) was found in [3, Proposition 5]. The following refinements of it are a consequence of Proposition 5.4, Theorem 1.4, and Corollary 5.1.

Corollary 5.5. *We have*

$$\pi(x) > \frac{x}{\log x} + \frac{x}{\log^2 x} + \frac{2x}{\log^3 x} + \frac{b_4 x}{\log^4 x} + \frac{b_5 x}{\log^5 x} + \frac{b_6 x}{\log^6 x} + \frac{b_7 x}{\log^7 x} + \frac{b_8 x}{\log^8 x}$$

for every $x \geq x_0$, where

b_4	5.975666	5.975666	5.975666	5.975666	5.975666
b_5	23.975666	23.975666	23.975666	23.975666	0
b_6	119.87833	119.87833	119.87833	0	0
b_7	719.26998	719.26998	0	0	0
b_7	5034.88986	0	0	0	0
x_0	1, 681, 111, 802, 141	721, 733, 241, 667	110, 838, 719, 141	1, 331, 691, 853	10, 383, 799

Proof. In order to prove the first inequality, we combine Proposition 5.4 and Theorem 1.4 to see that this inequality holds for every $x \geq 1, 751, 189, 194, 177$. For smaller values of x , we use a computer. Further, we use Proposition 5.4, Corollary 5.1, and a direct computation for smaller values of x to verify the remaining inequalities. $\square$

Remark. By (5.10), we see that the inequality

$$(5.14) \quad \pi(x) > \frac{x}{\log x} + \frac{x}{\log^2 x} + \frac{2x}{\log^3 x} + \frac{6x}{\log^4 x}$$

holds for all sufficiently large values of x . If we combine Proposition 5.4, Proposition 5.3, and [4, Theorem 2], it turns out that the inequality (5.14) holds for every x such that $10, 384, 261 \leq x \leq e^{1697}$ and every $x \geq e^{2256}$.

6. PROOF OF THEOREM 1.5

In this section, we want to find unrestricted effective estimates for the sum

$$\sum_{p \leq x} \frac{1}{p}$$

where p runs over primes not exceeding x . For this purpose, we use the method investigated by Rosser and Schoenfeld [50, p. 74]. They derived a remarkable identity which connects the sum of the reciprocals of all prime numbers not exceeding x with Chebyshev's ϑ -function by showing that

$$(6.1) \quad A_1(x) = \frac{\vartheta(x) - x}{x \log x} - \int_x^\infty \frac{(\vartheta(y) - y)(1 + \log y)}{y^2 \log^2 y} dy,$$

where

$$(6.2) \quad A_1(x) = \sum_{p \leq x} \frac{1}{p} - \log \log x - B.$$

Here, the constant B is defined as in (1.15). Applying (1.2) to (6.1), Rosser and Schoenfeld [50, p. 68] refined the error term in Mertens' result (1.14) by giving $A_1(x) = O(\exp(-a\sqrt{\log x}))$ as $x \rightarrow \infty$, where a is an absolute positive constant. Then [50, Theorem 5] they used explicit estimates for Chebyshev's ϑ -function to show that

$$(6.3) \quad -\frac{1}{2 \log^2 x} < A_1(x) < \frac{1}{2 \log^2 x},$$

where the left-hand side inequality is valid for every $x > 1$ and the right-hand side inequality holds for every $x \geq 286$. Meanwhile there are several improvements of (6.3) (see, for instance, [22, Theorem 5.6] and [3, Proposition 7]). In Theorem 1.5, we give the current best unconditionally effective estimates for $A_1(x)$. The proof is now rather simple.

Proof of Theorem 1.5. It suffices to combine (6.1) with Proposition 1.1. $\square$

Remark. Note that the positive integer $N_0 = 1,757,126,630,797$ might not be the smallest positive integer N so that the inequality given in Theorem 1.5 holds for every $x \geq N$.

Remark. Rosser and Schoenfeld [50, Theorem 20] used the calculation in [1] to see that $A_1(x) > 0$ for every $1 < x \leq 10^8$ and raised the question whether this inequality hold for every $x > 1$. Robin [49, Théorème 2] proved that the function $A_1(x)$ changes the sign infinitely often, which leads to a negative answer to the above question. By adapting a method for bounding Skewes' number, Büthe [11, Theorem 1.1] found that there exists an $x_0 \in [\exp(495.702833109), \exp(495.702833165)]$ such that $A_1(x)$ is negative for every $x \in [x_0 - \exp(239.046541), x_0]$.

Remark. Under the assumption that the Riemann hypothesis is true, Schoenfeld [53, Corollary 2] found some better estimate for the sum of the reciprocals of all prime numbers not exceeding x . This result was recently improved by Dusart [23, Theorem 4.1].

Using the definition (1.15) of B , we get

$$(6.4) \quad e^\gamma \log x \prod_{p \leq x} \left(1 - \frac{1}{p}\right) = e^{-S(x) - A_1(x)},$$

where

$$(6.5) \quad S(x) = \sum_{p > x} \left(\log \left(1 - \frac{1}{p}\right) + \frac{1}{p} \right) = - \sum_{n=2}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{p > x} \frac{1}{p^n}.$$

By Rosser and Schoenfeld [50, p. 87], we have

$$(6.6) \quad -\frac{1.02}{(x-1) \log x} < S(x) < 0$$

for every $x > 1$. Hence, the asymptotic formula (1.14) gives $A_2(x) = O(1/\log^2 x)$ as $x \rightarrow \infty$, where

$$A_2(x) = \frac{e^{-\gamma}}{\log x} - \prod_{p \leq x} \left(1 - \frac{1}{p}\right).$$

In [50, Theorem 7], Rosser and Schoenfeld found that

$$\frac{e^{-\gamma}}{\log x} \left(1 - \frac{1}{2 \log^2 x}\right) < \prod_{p \leq x} \left(1 - \frac{1}{p}\right) < \frac{e^{-\gamma}}{\log x} \left(1 + \frac{1}{2 \log^2 x}\right),$$

where the left-hand side inequality is valid for every $x \geq 285$ and the right-hand side inequality holds for every $x > 1$. We use (6.4) combined with Theorem 1.5 to obtain the following refinement of [3, Proposition 9].

Proposition 6.1. *For every $x \geq 1,757,126,630,797$, we have*

$$\frac{e^{-\gamma}}{\log x} \exp(-f(x)) < \prod_{p \leq x} \left(1 - \frac{1}{p}\right) < \frac{e^{-\gamma}}{\log x} \exp\left(f(x) + \frac{1.02}{(x-1) \log x}\right),$$

where $f(x)$ denotes the right-hand side of (1.16).

Proof. First, we apply the left-hand side inequality of Theorem 1.5 to (6.4) and see that

$$(6.7) \quad \prod_{p \leq x} \left(1 - \frac{1}{p}\right) < \frac{e^{-\gamma}}{\log x} \exp(-S(x) + f(x))$$

for every $x > 1,757,126,630,797$. Now it suffices to apply the right-hand side inequality of (6.6) to (6.7) and we get the required right-hand side inequality. On the other hand, we have $S(x) < 0$ by (6.6). Applying this and the right-hand side inequality of Theorem 1.5 to (6.4), we arrive at the end of the proof. $\square$

Remark. Note that the positive integer $N_0 = 1,757,126,630,797$ in Proposition 6.1 might not be the smallest positive integer N so that the inequality given holds for every $x \geq N$.

Remark. Under the assumption that the Riemann hypothesis is true, Schoenfeld [53, Corollary 3] found that the inequality

$$|A_2(x)| < \frac{3 \log x + 5}{8\pi e^\gamma \sqrt{x} \log x}$$

holds for every $x \geq 8$. This was slightly improved by Dusart [23, Theorem 4.4] in 2018.

Remark. Rosser and Schoenfeld [50, Theorem 23] found that $A_2(x) > 0$ for every $0 < x \leq 10^8$ and stated [50, p. 73] the question whether this inequality also hold for every $x > 10^8$. In [49, Proposition 1], Robin answered this by showing that the function $A_2(x)$ changes the sign infinitely often.

Now we can use Proposition 6.1 to derive the following effective estimates for

$$\prod_{p \leq x} \left(1 + \frac{1}{p}\right),$$

where p runs over primes not exceeding x .

Corollary 6.2. *For every $x \geq 1,757,126,630,797$, one has*

$$\frac{6e^\gamma}{\pi^2} \exp\left(-f(x) - \frac{1.02}{(x-1)\log x}\right) \log x < \prod_{p \leq x} \left(1 + \frac{1}{p}\right) < \frac{6e^\gamma}{\pi^2} \left(1 + \frac{1}{x}\right) \exp(f(x)) \log x,$$

where $f(x)$ denotes the right-hand side of (1.16).

Proof. Since $1 + 1/p = (1 - 1/p^2)/(1 - 1/p)$, we can use Proposition 6.1 and [23, Lemma 4.3] to get that

$$\frac{e^\gamma}{\zeta(2)} \exp\left(-f(x) - \frac{1.02}{(x-1)\log x}\right) \log x < \prod_{p \leq x} \left(1 + \frac{1}{p}\right) < \frac{e^\gamma}{\zeta(2)} \left(1 + \frac{1}{x}\right) \exp(f(x)) \log x$$

for every $x \geq 1,757,126,630,797$. Finally, it suffices to apply the well known identity $\zeta(2) = \pi^2/6$. $\square$

Remark. Note that the positive integer $N_0 = 1,757,126,630,797$ might not be the smallest positive integer N so that the inequality given in Corollary 6.2 holds for every $x \geq N$.

Let us briefly study $S(x)$, defined as in (6.5), in more detail. In the proof of the left-hand side inequality in (6.6), Rosser and Schoenfeld used the inequality $\vartheta(x) < 1.02x$ which is valid for every $x > 0$ (see [50, Theorem 9]). If we use approximations for $\vartheta(x)$ of the form (1.5), we get the following result.

Proposition 6.3. *Let k be a positive integer and let η_k and $x_0 = x_0(k)$ be positive real numbers with $x_0 > 1$ so that $|\vartheta(x) - x| < \eta_k x / \log^k x$ for every $x \geq x_0$. Then, we have*

$$\left| S(x) - \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{\text{li}(x^{-n})}{n+1} \right| < \frac{\eta_k}{\log^{k+1} x} \left((x+1) \log \left(\frac{x}{x-1} \right) - 1 \right)$$

for every $x \geq x_0$.

In order to prove this proposition, we first establish the following lemma.

Lemma 6.4. *Let n be a positive integer with $n \geq 2$. Under the assumptions of Proposition 6.3, we have*

$$\left| \text{li}(x^{1-n}) + \sum_{p > x} \frac{1}{p^n} \right| < \frac{\eta_k}{x^{n-1} \log^{k+1} x} \left(1 + \frac{n}{n-1} \right)$$

for every $x \geq x_0$.

Proof. By [50, p. 87], we have

$$(6.8) \quad \sum_{p > x} \frac{1}{p^n} = -\frac{\vartheta(x)}{x^n \log x} + \int_x^\infty \frac{(1+n \log y) \vartheta(y)}{y^{n+1} \log^2 y} dy.$$

Since we have assumed that $|\vartheta(x) - x| < \eta_k x / \log^k x$ for every $x \geq x_0$, we see that

$$(6.9) \quad \sum_{p > x} \frac{1}{p^n} \leq -\text{li}(x^{1-n}) + \frac{\eta_k}{x^{n-1} \log^{k+1} x} + \eta_k \int_x^\infty \frac{1+n \log y}{y^n \log^{k+2} y} dy$$

for every $x \geq x_0$. Analogous to [50, Lemma 9], we get that

$$\int_x^\infty \frac{1+n \log y}{y^n \log^{k+2} y} dy \leq \frac{n}{(n-1)x^{n-1} \log^{k+1} x}.$$

Applying this inequality to (6.9), we see that the required upper bound holds for every $x \geq x_0$. The proof of the required lower bound is quite similar and we leave the details to the reader. $\square$

Now we can combine the definition (6.5) with Lemma 6.4 to get the following proof of Proposition 6.3.

Proof of Proposition 6.3. If we apply Lemma 6.4 to (6.5), it turns out that

$$-\frac{\eta_k}{\log^{k+1} x} \sum_{n=2}^{\infty} \left(1 + \frac{n}{n-1}\right) \frac{1}{nx^{n-1}} < S(x) - \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{\text{li}(x^{-n})}{n+1} < \frac{\eta_k}{\log^{k+1} x} \sum_{n=2}^{\infty} \left(1 + \frac{n}{n-1}\right) \frac{1}{nx^{n-1}}$$

for every $x \geq x_0$. Now, it suffices to apply the identity

$$\sum_{n=2}^{\infty} \left(1 + \frac{n}{n-1}\right) \frac{1}{nx^{n-1}} = (x+1) \log \left(\frac{x}{x-1}\right) - 1$$

to complete the proof. $\square$

If we combine (2.12) and (6.8), we find the following new necessary condition for the Riemann hypothesis including the sum in Lemma 6.4.

Proposition 6.5. *Let n be a positive integer with $n \geq 2$. Under the assumption that the Riemann hypothesis is true, we have*

$$\left| \text{li}(x^{1-n}) + \sum_{p>x} \frac{1}{p^n} \right| < \frac{1}{8\pi x^{n-1/2}} \left(1 + \frac{2n}{2n-1}\right) \left(\log x + \frac{2}{2n-1}\right)$$

for every $x \geq 599$.

Proof. Instead of the assumption (1.5), we now use (2.12) in the proof of Lemma 6.4. $\square$

7. PROOF OF THEOREM 1.6

Here we give the following proof of Theorem 1.6.

Proof of Theorem 1.6. Let the constant E be defined as in (1.18) and let

$$(7.1) \quad A_3(x) = \sum_{p \leq x} \frac{\log p}{p} - \log x - E.$$

By Rosser and Schoenfeld [50, p. 74], we have

$$(7.2) \quad A_3(x) = \frac{\vartheta(x) - x}{x} - \int_x^{\infty} \frac{\vartheta(y) - y}{y^2} dy.$$

Similarly to the proof of Theorem 1.5, we may combine (7.2) and Proposition 1.1 to conclude that the desired both inequalities hold for every $x \geq 1,757,126,630,797$. $\square$

Remark. Note that the positive integer $N_0 = 1,757,126,630,797$ in Theorem 1.6 might not be the smallest positive integer N so that the inequality given in Theorem 1.6 holds for every $x \geq N$.

Remark. Under the assumption that the Riemann hypothesis is true, Schoenfeld [53, Corollary 2] found a better upper bound for $|A_3(x)|$. This result was later improved by Dusart [23, Theorem 4.2].

Remark. Rosser and Schoenfeld [50, Theorem 21] also found that $A_3(x) > 0$ for every $0 < x \leq 10^8$. Again, they asked whether this inequality also holds for every $x > 10^8$. Robin [49, Proposition 1] showed that the function $A_3(x)$ changes the sign infinitely often, which leads again to a negative answer to the above question. Unfortunately, until today no x_0 is known so that $A_3(x_0) < 0$.

8. APPENDIX

In this section we use Corollary 4.4 and Walisch's *primecount* program [61] to note more weaker upper bounds for the prime counting function $\pi(x)$ of the form (4.5), where m is an integer with $0 \leq m \leq 2$ and $a_0, \dots, a_m$ are suitable positive real numbers. We start with the case where $m = 0$.

Corollary 8.1. *One has*

$$\pi(x) < \frac{x}{\log x - a_0}$$

for every $x \geq x_0$, where

a_0	1.0344	1.0345	1.0346	1.0347
x_0	98,011,218,006,714	90,093,726,828,053	82,972,765,680,514	76,292,362,570,940
a_0	1.0348	1.0349	1.035	1.036
x_0	70,363,470,737,452	64,716,191,738,353	59,667,044,596,151	27,086,141,056,455
a_0	1.037	1.038	1.039	1.04
x_0	12,806,615,320,917	6,317,261,904,937	3,231,501,496,562	1,697,021,254,855
a_0	1.041	1.042	1.043	1.044
x_0	924,640,658,874	519,205,451,664	296,735,291,225	175,758,684,156
a_0	1.045	1.046	1.047	1.048
x_0	105,640,136,371	65,431,161,562	41,022,022,044	25,724,702,310
a_0	1.049	1.05	1.051	1.052
x_0	17,231,171,472	11,207,440,881	7,538,561,672	5,047,295,951
a_0	1.053	1.054	1.055	1.056
x_0	3,745,835,388	2,605,443,747	1,810,796,757	1,220,594,340
a_0	1.057	1.058	1.059	1.06
x_0	876,542,559	673,828,570	501,155,566	383,446,375
a_0	1.061	1.062	1.063	1.064
x_0	269,585,283	196,894,353	180,220,137	116,749,925
a_0	1.065	1.066	1.067	1.068
x_0	110,166,540	76,223,058	53,431,171	46,097,944
a_0	1.069	1.07	1.071	1.072
x_0	39,706,453	31,027,247	22,078,017	18,339,738
a_0	1.073	1.074	1.075	1.076
x_0	13,026,859	12,895,928	8,832,927	7,299,254
a_0	1.077	1.078	1.079	1.08
x_0	7,117,256	5,465,656	4,994,010	3,462,478
a_0	1.081	1.082	1.083	1.08366
x_0	3,455,648	2,279,177	1,529,630	1,526,671
a_0	1.084	1.085	1.086	1.087
x_0	1,525,432	1,515,074	1,200,014	1,195,296
a_0	1.088	1.089	1.09	1.091
x_0	624,878	618,726	618,058	445,112
a_0	1.092	1.093	1.094	1.095
x_0	359,804	356,203	355,990	355,177
a_0	1.096	1.097	1.098	1.099
x_0	155,935	155,907	60,297	60,224

Proof. Corollary 4.4 implies that the inequality

$$(8.1) \quad \pi(x) < \frac{x}{\log x - 1.0344}$$

holds for every $x \geq 106,640,139,304,611$. If we compare the right-hand side of (8.1) with the integral logarithm $\text{li}(x)$, we can use Lemma 4.2 to see that the required inequality (8.1) also holds for every x with $98,269,667,551,459 \leq x \leq 106,640,139,304,611$. We conclude by direct computation. $\square$

Remark. The real number $a_0 = 1.08366$ in Corollary 8.1 is mostly only of historical value. On the basis of his study of a limited table of primes, Legendre stated 1808 (see [36, p. 394]) that

$$\pi(x) = \frac{x}{\log x - A(x)},$$

where $\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} A(x) = 1.08366$. Clearly Legendre's conjecture is equivalent to (1.8). However, from (1.11), it follows that the best value of $\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} A(x)$ is 1. At this point it should be mentioned that Panaitopol [41] claimed to have proved the inequality

$$(8.2) \quad \pi(x) < \frac{x}{\log x - 1.08366}$$

for every $x > 10^6$. In Corollary 8.1, it could be shown that $N = 1,526,671$ is the smallest possible positive integer so that the inequality (8.2) holds for every $x \geq N$.

Next, we consider the case where $m = 1$. Here we obtain the following effective estimates for $\pi(x)$.

Corollary 8.2. *We have*

$$\pi(x) < \frac{x}{\log x - 1 - \frac{a_1}{\log x}}$$

for every $x \geq x_1$, where

a_1	1.11	1.111	1.112	1.113
x_1	62,998,850,942,976	49,246,036,992,716	38,472,138,880,411	30,658,643,813,468
a_1	1.114	1.115	1.116	1.117
x_1	23,767,640,743,883	19,278,513,358,342	15,142,627,022,527	12,279,648,138,508
a_1	1.118	1.119	1.12	1.121
x_1	9,684,114,630,824	7,981,446,192,206	6,323,967,140,812	5,273,225,700,761
a_1	1.122	1.123	1.124	1.125
x_1	4,170,462,893,841	3,458,549,136,539	2,825,539,807,244	2,292,448,124,593
a_1	1.126	1.127	1.128	1.129
x_1	1,903,596,231,542	1,573,767,234,188	1,290,096,268,844	1,073,403,839,693
a_1	1.13	1.131	1.132	1.133
x_1	889,377,392,161	782,989,678,664	608,408,258,090	540,050,850,157
a_1	1.134	1.135	1.136	1.137
x_1	452,875,824,702	373,479,021,700	335,562,521,091	263,728,502,964
a_1	1.138	1.139	1.14	1.141
x_1	242,118,904,367	201,924,836,111	161,054,192,492	149,061,190,565
a_1	1.142	1.143	1.144	1.145
x_1	125,233,112,846	105,053,836,224	86,061,321,374	77,278,924,451
a_1	1.146	1.147	1.148	1.149
x_1	61,344,524,412	57,720,831,343	46,039,922,948	42,575,222,481

Proof. The proof is quite similar to the proof of Corollary 8.1 and we leave the details to the reader. $\square$

Finally, we consider the case where $m = 2$ and find the following explicit estimates for $\pi(x)$.

Corollary 8.3. *We have*

$$\pi(x) < \frac{x}{\log x - 1 - \frac{1}{\log x} - \frac{a_2}{\log^2 x}}$$

for every $x \geq x_2$, where

a_2	3.49	3.5	3.51	3.52
x_2	83, 027, 761, 686, 134	50, 794, 512, 296, 846	30, 594, 003, 254, 258	17, 348, 455, 129, 950
a_2	3.53	3.54	3.55	3.56
x_2	11, 655, 963, 556, 138	5, 539, 984, 798, 515	4, 489, 052, 430, 063	2, 180, 930, 569, 481
a_2	3.57	3.58	3.59	3.6
x_2	1, 464, 200, 206, 021	882, 055, 689, 961	584, 256, 118, 105	437, 882, 804, 654
a_2	3.61	3.62	3.63	3.64
x_2	332, 203, 763, 508	201, 890, 631, 296	148, 632, 348, 138	102, 965, 110, 268
a_2	3.65	3.66	3.67	3.68
x_2	55, 102, 251, 180	38, 278, 086, 931	24, 178, 954, 639	21, 729, 109, 565

Proof. Similar to Corollary 8.1. □

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I would like to express my great appreciation to Kim Walisch and Thomas Lessmann for the support in writing the C++ codes used in this paper. Furthermore I thank Samuel Broadbent, Habiba Kadiri, Allysa Lumley, Nathan Ng, and Kirsten Wilk, whose paper has motivated me to deal with the present topic again. Moreover, I would also like to thank the two beautiful souls R. and O. for the never ending inspiration.

REFERENCES

- [1] K. I. Appel and J. B. Rosser, *Tables for estimating functions of primes*, Comm. Res. Div. Tech. Rep. **4** (1961).
- [2] T. Apostol, *Introduction to Analytic Number Theory*, Springer-Verlag, New York-Heidelberg, 1976.
- [3] C. Axler, *New estimates for some functions defined over primes*, Integers **18** (2018), Paper No. A52, 21 pp.
- [4] ———, *Estimates for $\pi(x)$ for large values of x and Ramanujan's prime counting inequality*, Integers **18** (2018), Paper No. A61, 14 pp.
- [5] ———, *New estimates for the n th prime number*, J. Integer Seq. **22** (2019), no. 4, Art. 19.4.2, 30 pp.
- [6] R. C. Baker, G. Harman, and J. Pintz, *The difference between consecutive primes II*, Proc. Lond. Math. Soc. **83** (2001), 532–562.
- [7] C. Bays and R. H. Hudson, *A new bound for the smallest x with $\pi(x) > \text{li}(x)$* , Math. Comp. **69** (2000), no. 231, 1285–1296.
- [8] D. Berkane and P. Dusart, *On a constant related to the prime counting function*, Mediterr. J. Math. **13** (2016), no. 3, 929–938.
- [9] R. P. Brent, *Irregularities in the distribution of primes and twin primes*, Math. Comp. **29** (1975), 43–56.
- [10] S. Broadbent, H. Kadiri, A. Lumley, N. Ng, and K. Wilk, *Sharper bounds for the Chebyshev function $\theta(x)$* , Math. Comp. **90** (2021), no. 331, 2281–2315.
- [11] J. Büthe, *On the first sign change in Mertens' theorem*, Acta Arith. **171** (2015), no. 2, 183–195.
- [12] ———, *Estimating $\pi(x)$ and related functions under partial RH assumptions*, Math. Comp. **85** (2016), no. 301, 2483–2498.
- [13] ———, *An analytic method for bounding $\psi(x)$* , Math. Comp. **87** (2018), no. 312, 1991–2009.
- [14] E. Carneiro, M. B. Milinovich, and K. Soundararajan, *Fourier optimization and prime gaps*, Comment. Math. Helv. **94** (2019), no. 3, 533–568.
- [15] K. F. Chao and R. Plymen, *A new bound for the smallest x with $\pi(x) > \text{li}(x)$* , Int. J. Number Theory **6** (2010), no. 3, 681–690.
- [16] P. L. Chebyshev, *Mémoire sur les nombres premiers*, Mémoires des savants étrangers de l'Acad. Sci. St. Pétersbourg **7** (1850), 17–33. [Also in J. math. pures appl. **17** (1852), 366–390.]
- [17] C.-J. de la Vallée Poussin, *Recherches analytiques la théorie des nombres premiers*, Ann. Soc. scient. Bruxelles **20** (1896), 183–256.
- [18] ———, *Sur la fonction $\zeta(s)$ de Riemann et le nombre des nombres premiers inférieurs à une limite donnée*, Mem. Couronnés de l'Acad. Roy. Sci. Bruxelles **59** (1899), 1–74.
- [19] M. Deléglise, *Valeurs de la fonction Theta de Chebychev*, <http://math.univ-lyon1.fr/~deleglis/calculs.html>.
- [20] A. W. Dudek, *On the Riemann hypothesis and the difference between primes*, Int. J. Number Theory **11** (2015), no. 3, 771–778.
- [21] A. W. Dudek, L. Grenié, and G. Molteni, *Primes in explicit short intervals on RH*, Int. J. Number Theory **12** (2016), no. 5, 1391–1407.
- [22] P. Dusart, *Explicit estimates of some functions over primes*, Ramanujan J. **45** (2018), no. 1, 227–251.
- [23] ———, *Estimates of the k th prime under the Riemann hypothesis*, Ramanujan J. **47** (2018), no. 1, 141–154.
- [24] L. Euler, *Variae observationes circa series infinitas*, Comment. Acad. Sci. Petropol. **9** (1744), 160–188.
- [25] A. Fiori, H. Kadiri, and J. Swidinsky, *Sharper bounds for the error term in the Prime Number Theorem*, preprint, 2022. Available at arxiv.org/abs/2206.12557.

- [26] ———, Detailed Tables of Explicit Bounds for Prime Counting Functions. Available as an auxiliary file on arXiv, pp. 167. Also available at cs.uleth.ca/~fiori/Docs/PrimeCountingTables.pdf.
- [27] K. Ford, *Vinogradov's integral and bounds for the Riemann zeta function*, Proc. London Math. Soc. **85** (2002), no. 3, 565–633.
- [28] J. Hadamard, *Sur la distribution des zéros de la fonction $\zeta(s)$ et ses conséquences arithmétiques*, Bull. Soc. Math. France **24** (1896), 199–220.
- [29] G. Hoheisel, *Primzahlprobleme in der Analysis*, Sitz. Preuss. Akad. Wiss. **2** (1930) 1–13.
- [30] D. R. Johnston, *Improving bounds on prime counting functions by partial verification of the Riemann hypothesis*, preprint, 2021. Available at arxiv.org/abs/2109.02249.
- [31] D. R. Johnston and A. Yang, *Some explicit estimates for the error term in the prime number theorem*, preprint, 2022. Available at arxiv.org/abs/2204.01980.
- [32] N. M. Korobov, *Estimates of trigonometric sums and their applications*, Uspehi Mat. Nauk **13** (1958), no. 4 (82), 185–192.
- [33] T. Kotnik, *The prime-counting function and its analytic approximations: $\pi(x)$ and its approximations*, Adv. Comput. Math. **29** (2008), no. 1, 55–70.
- [34] A. V. Kulsha, *Values of $\pi(x)$ and $\Delta(x)$ for various x 's*, <http://www.primefan.ru/stuff/primes/table.html> (2016).
- [35] E. Landau, *Handbuch der Lehre von der Verteilung der Primzahlen*, 2 vols., Leipzig, Teubner, 1909. Reprinted in 1953 by Chelsea Publishing Co., New York.
- [36] A.-M. Legendre, *Essai sur la théorie des nombres*, Paris, Courcier 1808.
- [37] R. S. Lehman, *On the difference $\pi(x) - \text{li}(x)$* , Acta Arith. **11** (1966), 397–410.
- [38] J. E. Littlewood, *Sur la distribution des nombres premiers*, Comptes Rendues **158** (1914), 1869–1872.
- [39] F. Mertens, *Ein Beitrag zur analytischen Zahlentheorie*, J. Reine Angew. Math. **78** (1874), 42–62.
- [40] S. Nazardonyavi, *Improved explicit bounds for some functions of prime numbers*, Funct. Approx. Comment. Math. **58** (2018), no. 1, 7–22.
- [41] L. Panaitopol, *Several approximations of $\pi(x)$* , Math. Inequal. Appl. **2** (1999), no. 3, 317–324.
- [42] ———, *A formula for $\pi(x)$ applied to a result of Koninck-Ivić*, Nieuw Arch. Wiskd. **1** (2000), no. 1, 55–56.
- [43] D. J. Platt and T. S. Trudgian, *On the first sign change of $\theta(x) - x$* , Math. Comp. **85** (2016), no. 299, 1539–1547.
- [44] ———, *The Riemann hypothesis is true up to $3 \cdot 10^{12}$* , Bull. Lond. Math. Soc. **53** (2021), no. 3, 792–797.
- [45] K. Prachar, *Primzahlverteilung*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1957.
- [46] O. Ramaré and Y. Saouter, *Short effective intervals containing primes*, J. Number Theory **98** (2003), no. 1, 10–33.
- [47] B. Riemann, *Über die Anzahl der Primzahlen unter einer gegebenen Grösse*. Monats. Preuss. Akad. Wiss. (1859), 671–680.
- [48] H. Riesel and G. Göhl, *Some calculations related to Riemann's prime number formula*, Math. Comp. **24** (1970), 969–983.
- [49] G. Robin, *Sur l'ordre maximum de la fonction somme des diviseurs*, Seminar on number theory, Paris 1981–82, Progr. Math., vol. 38, Birkhäuser Boston, Boston, MA, 1983, pp. 233–244.
- [50] J. B. Rosser and L. Schoenfeld, *Approximate formulas for some functions of prime numbers*, Illinois J. Math. **6** (1962), 64–94.
- [51] Y. Saouter, T. S. Trudgian, and P. Demichel, *A still sharper region where $\pi(x) - \text{li}(x)$ is positive*, Math. Comp. **84** (2015), no. 295, 2433–2446.
- [52] Y. Saouter and P. Yannick, *A sharp region where $\pi(x) - \text{li}(x)$ is positive*, Math. Comp. **79** (2010), no. 272, 2395–2405.
- [53] L. Schoenfeld, *Sharper bounds for the Chebyshev functions $\theta(x)$ and $\psi(x)$ II*, Math. Comp. **30** (1976), no. 134, 337–360.
- [54] S. Skewes, *On the difference $\pi(x) - \text{li}(x)$ (II)*, Proc. London Math. Soc. (3) **5** (1955), 48–70.
- [55] D. A. Stoll and P. Demichel, *The impact of $\zeta(s)$ complex zeros on $\pi(x)$ for $x < 10^{10^{13}}$* , Math. Comp. **80** (2011), no. 276, 2381–2394.
- [56] H. J. J. te Riele, *On the sign of the difference $\pi(x) - \text{li}(x)$* , Math. Comp. **48** (1987), no. 177, 323–328.
- [57] T. S. Trudgian, *Updating the error term in the prime number theorem*, Ramanujan J. **39** (2016), no. 2, 225–234.
- [58] I. M. Vinogradov, *A new estimate of the function $\zeta(1 + it)$* , Izv. Akad. Nauk SSSR. Ser. Mat. **22** (1958), 161–164.
- [59] H. von Koch, *Sur la distribution des nombres premiers*, Acta Math. **24** (1901), no. 1, 159–182.
- [60] H. von Mangoldt, *Zu Riemanns Abhandlung "Ueber die Anzahl der Primzahlen unter einer gegebenen Grösse"*, J. Reine Angew. Math. **114** (1895), 255–305.
- [61] K. Walisch, *primecount*, version 7.2. Available at github.com/kimwalisch/primecount.