

A new elementary proof of the Prime Number Theorem

Florian K. Richter

Abstract

We give a new elementary proof of the Prime Number Theorem by comparing averages of the Möbius function dilated by primes to those dilated by almost primes.

1. Introduction

One of the most fundamental results in mathematics is the Prime Number Theorem, which describes the asymptotic law of the distribution of prime numbers in the integers.

Prime Number Theorem. *Let $\pi(N)$ denote the number of primes smaller or equal to a positive integer N . Then*

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\pi(N)}{N/\log N} = 1. \quad (1.1)$$

The Prime Number Theorem was conjectured independently by Gauß and Legendre towards the end of the 18th century and was proved independently by Hadamard and de la Vallée Poussin in the year 1896. Their proofs are similar and rely on sophisticated analytic machinery involving complex analysis, which was developed throughout the 19th century by the combined effort of many great mathematicians of this era, including Euler, Chebyshev, and Riemann (to name a few). Historically, this method became known as *analytic*. We refer the reader to [Apo00; Gol73a; Gol73b] for more details on the history behind the analytic proof of the Prime Number Theorem, and to [New80] for an abridged version of it (see also [Zag97]).

Even though it was believed for a long time not to be possible, more than 50 years after the analytic proof of the Prime Number Theorem was discovered, an elementary proof was found by Erdős and Selberg [Erd49; Sel49]. In this context, *elementary* refers to methods that avoid using complex analysis and instead rely only on rudimentary facts from calculus and basic arithmetic identities and inequalities. Their approach was based on Selberg’s famous “fundamental formula”:

$$\sum_{p \leq x} \log^2(p) + \sum_{pq \leq x} \log(p) \log(q) = 2x \log(x) + O(x). \quad (1.2)$$

We refer to [Gol04] and [SG09] for the history behind the Erdős-Selberg proof, and to [Lev69] for a streamlined exposition thereof. See also [Sha50] for a short proof of (1.2), and [Dia82] and [Gra10] for more general surveys on this topic. A new and dynamically inspired way of deriving the Prime Number Theorem from (1.2), which bears many similarities to the proof we give in this paper, was recently discovered by McNamara [McN20].

A different elementary proof of the Prime Number Theorem was found by Daboussi [Dab84], using what he called the “convolution method” (cf. [Dab89, p. 1]). We refer the reader to the book of Tenenbaum and Mendés France [TM00, Chapter 4] for a friendly rendition of Daboussi’s proof.

Finally, a third elementary proof, which is different from the proofs of Erdős-Selberg and Daboussi, was provided by Hildebrand [Hil86]. We remark that Hildebrand’s proof is not self-contained, as it relies on a non-trivial corollary of the large sieve ([Mon71, Corollary 3.2]) as a starting point.

In this paper we provide a new elementary proof of the Prime Number Theorem, using ideas inspired by recent developments surrounding Sarnak’s and Chowla’s conjecture. With the exception of Stirling’s approximation formula, which is used in Section 3 without giving a proof, our proof is self-contained.

2. The proof

Let us write $[N]$ to abbreviate the set $\{1, \dots, N\}$. Given a finite set $A \subset \mathbb{N}$ and a function $f: A \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$, define the *Cesàro average* of f over A and the *logarithmic average* of f over A respectively by

$$\mathbb{E}_{n \in A} f(n) := \frac{1}{|A|} \sum_{n \in A} f(n) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbb{E}_{n \in A}^{\log} f(n) := \frac{\sum_{n \in A} f(n)/n}{\sum_{n \in A} 1/n}.$$

The Prime Number Theorem possesses numerous well-known equivalent formulations. One of which asserts that

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}_{n \in [N]} \mu(n) = 0, \tag{2.1}$$

where $\mu: \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \{-1, 0, 1\}$ is the classical *Möbius function*. Expression (2.1) was already known to von Mangoldt [Man97, pp. 849–851] and the equivalence between (2.1) and (1.1) is classical and dates back to Landau (see [Lan99, §4] and [Lan11]).¹ Many proofs of the Prime Number Theorem establish (2.1) in place of (1.1); we pursue the same strategy here.

Let \mathbb{P} denote the set of prime numbers. As was already observed by Daboussi [Dab75, Lemma 1] and Kátai [Kát86, Eq. (3.1)], it follows from the Turán-Kubilius inequality that for every $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists s_0 such that for all $s \geq s_0$ one has

$$\limsup_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}_{n \in [N]} \left| \mathbb{E}_{p \in \mathbb{P} \cap [s]}^{\log} (1 - p1_{p|n}) \right| \leq \varepsilon, \tag{2.2}$$

where $1_{p|n}$ denotes the function that is 1 if p divides n and 0 otherwise. One way of interpreting (2.2) is to say that for “large” s and “almost all” $n \in \mathbb{N}$ the number of primes smaller or equal to s dividing n is approximately equal to $\sum_{p \in \mathbb{P} \cap [s]} 1/p$. Even though (2.2) is commonly viewed as a corollary of the Turán-Kubilius inequality, we remark that its proof is significantly shorter and easier (it follows by choosing $B = \mathbb{P} \cap [s]$ in Proposition 2.1 below).

An important role in our proof of the Prime Number Theorem will be played by a variant of (2.2), asserting that

$$\limsup_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}_{n \in [N]} \left| \mathbb{E}_{m \in B}^{\log} (1 - m1_{m|n}) \right| \leq \varepsilon, \tag{2.3}$$

for some special types of finite and non-empty subsets $B \subset \mathbb{N}$. To clarify which choices of B work, besides $B = \mathbb{P} \cap [s]$ for large s as in (2.2), we provide an easy to check criterion. In layman’s terms, our criterion says that B is good for (2.3) if two integers n and m chosen at random from B have a “high likelihood” of being coprime. The precise statement is as follows.

Proposition 2.1. *Let $B \subset \mathbb{N}$ be finite and non-empty. Then*

$$\limsup_{N \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}_{n \in [N]} \left| \mathbb{E}_{m \in B}^{\log} (1 - m1_{m|n}) \right| \leq \left(\mathbb{E}_{m \in B}^{\log} \mathbb{E}_{n \in B}^{\log} \Phi(n, m) \right)^{1/2}, \tag{2.4}$$

where $\Phi: \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$ is the function $\Phi(m, n) := \gcd(m, n) - 1$.

Proof. Using the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and expanding the square gives

$$\left| \mathbb{E}_{n \in [N]} \mathbb{E}_{m \in B}^{\log} (1 - m1_{m|n}) \right|^2 \leq \mathbb{E}_{n \in [N]} \left| \mathbb{E}_{m \in B}^{\log} (1 - m1_{m|n}) \right|^2 = S_1 - 2S_2 + 1, \tag{2.5}$$

where $S_1 := \mathbb{E}_{n \in [N]} \mathbb{E}_{l, m \in B}^{\log} (l1_{l|n})(m1_{m|n})$ and $S_2 := \mathbb{E}_{n \in [N]} \mathbb{E}_{m \in B}^{\log} m1_{m|n}$. Since every m -th number is divisible by m , we have $\mathbb{E}_{n \in [N]} m1_{m|n} = 1 + O(1/N)$. This implies $S_2 = 1 + O(1/N)$. Similarly, one can verify that $\mathbb{E}_{n \in [N]} lm1_{l|n}1_{m|n} = \gcd(l, m) + O(1/N)$, which gives

$$S_1 = \mathbb{E}_{l \in B}^{\log} \mathbb{E}_{m \in B}^{\log} \gcd(l, m) + O\left(\frac{1}{N}\right) = 1 + \mathbb{E}_{l \in B}^{\log} \mathbb{E}_{m \in B}^{\log} \Phi(l, m) + O\left(\frac{1}{N}\right).$$

¹A proof of this equivalence can also be found in most textbooks on number theory, see for example [IK04, p. 32], [TM00, §4.4], or [Apo76, §4.9].

Substituting $S_2 = 1 + O(1/N)$ and $S_1 = 1 + \mathbb{E}_{l \in B}^{\log} \mathbb{E}_{m \in B}^{\log} \Phi(l, m) + O(1/N)$ into (2.5) finishes the proof of (2.4). \square

This next proposition guarantees the existence of two finite sets B_1 and B_2 with a number of useful properties. With the help of this technical result we will be able to finish the proof of the Prime Number Theorem rather quickly.

Proposition 2.2. *For all $\eta > 0$ there exist $\rho \in (1, 1 + \eta]$ and $k_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for all $k \geq k_0$ and all $l \geq 1$ there exist two finite, non-empty sets $B_1, B_2 \subset \mathbb{N}$ with the following properties:*

- (a) *all elements in B_1 are primes larger than l and all elements in B_2 are a product of k distinct primes larger than l ;*
- (b) *the sets B_1 and B_2 have the same cardinality when restricted to ρ -adic intervals, by which we mean $|B_1 \cap (\rho^j, \rho^{j+1}]| = |B_2 \cap (\rho^j, \rho^{j+1}]|$ for all $j \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$;*
- (c) *$\mathbb{E}_{m \in B_i}^{\log} \mathbb{E}_{n \in B_i}^{\log} \Phi(m, n) \leq \eta$ for $i = 1, 2$, where Φ is as in Proposition 2.1.*

Proof of the Prime Number Theorem assuming Proposition 2.2. Fix an arbitrary $\eta > 0$. Let $\rho \in (1, 1 + \eta]$ and $k_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ be as guaranteed by Proposition 2.2. Let k be an arbitrary even number bigger or equal to k_0 and let $l \in \mathbb{N}$ be any number which the reader should think of as being much larger than k . By Proposition 2.2, we can find two finite and non-empty sets $B_1, B_2 \subset \mathbb{N}$ satisfying properties (a) through (c). For $i \in \{1, 2\}$ we thus have

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \mathbb{E}_{n \in [N]} \mu(n) - \mathbb{E}_{m \in B_i}^{\log} \mathbb{E}_{n \in [N/m]} \mu(mn) \right| &= \left| \mathbb{E}_{n \in [N]} \mu(n) - \mathbb{E}_{m \in B_i}^{\log} \mathbb{E}_{n \in [N]} m 1_{m|n} \mu(n) \right| + O\left(\frac{1}{N}\right) \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}_{n \in [N]} \left| \mathbb{E}_{m \in B_i}^{\log} (1 - m 1_{m|n}) \right| + O\left(\frac{1}{N}\right) \\ &\leq \sqrt{\eta} + O\left(\frac{1}{N}\right), \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality follows from property (c) combined with (2.4). This implies

$$\mathbb{E}_{n \in [N]} \mu(n) = \mathbb{E}_{m \in B_i}^{\log} \mathbb{E}_{n \in [N/m]} \mu(mn) + O\left(\sqrt{\eta} + \frac{1}{N}\right), \quad i = 1, 2. \quad (2.6)$$

Since any element $m \in B_i$ has at most k prime factors, each of which is bigger than l , the asymptotic density of numbers that are not coprime to m is very small; in fact it is smaller than k/l . Combining this observation with the multiplicativity of the Möbius function, i.e. $\mu(mn) = \mu(n)\mu(m)$ whenever m and n are coprime, we deduce that $\mathbb{E}_{n \in [N/m]} \mu(mn) = \mathbb{E}_{n \in [N/m]} \mu(m)\mu(n) + O(k/l)$. Note that $\mu(m) = -1$ for all $m \in B_1$ because B_1 consists only of primes, whereas $\mu(m) = 1$ for all $m \in B_2$ because any element in B_2 is a product of k distinct primes and k is even. Thus, (2.6) becomes

$$\mathbb{E}_{n \in [N]} \mu(n) = -\mathbb{E}_{m \in B_1}^{\log} \mathbb{E}_{n \in [N/m]} \mu(n) + O\left(\sqrt{\eta} + \frac{k}{l} + \frac{1}{N}\right) \quad (2.7)$$

in the case $i = 1$, and

$$\mathbb{E}_{n \in [N]} \mu(n) = \mathbb{E}_{m \in B_2}^{\log} \mathbb{E}_{n \in [N/m]} \mu(n) + O\left(\sqrt{\eta} + \frac{k}{l} + \frac{1}{N}\right) \quad (2.8)$$

in the case $i = 2$. Finally, using that B_1 and B_2 have the same size within ρ -adic intervals and that ρ is very close to 1, we conclude that the expressions $\mathbb{E}_{m \in B_1} \mathbb{E}_{n \in [N/m]} \mu(n)$ and $\mathbb{E}_{m \in B_2} \mathbb{E}_{n \in [N/m]} \mu(n)$ are approximately the same; in fact,

$$\mathbb{E}_{m \in B_1}^{\log} \mathbb{E}_{n \in [N/m]} \mu(n) = \mathbb{E}_{m \in B_2}^{\log} \mathbb{E}_{n \in [N/m]} \mu(n) + O(\eta). \quad (2.9)$$

From (2.7), (2.8), and (2.9) it follows that $\mathbb{E}_{n \in [N]} \mu(n) = O\left(\sqrt{\eta} + \frac{k}{l} + \frac{1}{N}\right)$. Since η and k/l can be made arbitrarily small, this completes the proof of (2.1). \square

3. Proof of Proposition 2.2

The starting point for our proof of Proposition 2.2 are Chebyshev-type estimates on the number of primes in intervals. In particular, we derive a rough lower bound on the number of primes in $(8^x, 8^{x+1}]$, as well as a rough upper bound on the number of primes in $(8^x, 8^{x+\varepsilon}]$ for small ε .

Proposition 3.1. *There are $x_0 \geq 1$ and $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ such that*

- (i) $|\mathbb{P} \cap (8^x, 8^{x+1}]| \geq \frac{8^x}{x}$ for all $x \geq x_0$, and
- (ii) $|\mathbb{P} \cap (8^x, 8^{x+\varepsilon}]| \leq \frac{\sqrt{\varepsilon} 8^x}{x}$ for all $x \geq x_0$ and $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_0]$.

The ideas used in the proof of Proposition 3.1 are very much classical and date back to Chebyshev. We begin with the following lemma.

Lemma 3.2. *We have the asymptotic estimate*

$$|\mathbb{P} \cap [x]| \geq \frac{\log(2)x}{\log x} + O(1). \quad (3.1)$$

Proof. To obtain (3.1) for arbitrary positive reals x , it is enough to prove it for the special case when x is an even natural number, i.e., $x = 2n$. In this case, the key to proving (3.1) is to study the prime factorization of the binomial coefficient $\binom{2n}{n}$. Observe that there are $\lfloor m/p \rfloor$ many numbers in the interval $[m]$ that are divisible by p . Out of those, there are $\lfloor m/p^2 \rfloor$ many divisible by p^2 , and out of those there are $\lfloor m/p^3 \rfloor$ many divisible by p^3 , and so on. Therefore, if ν is the largest exponent for which $p^\nu \leq m$, the power of p in $m!$ is equal to $\lfloor m/p \rfloor + \lfloor m/p^2 \rfloor + \dots + \lfloor m/p^\nu \rfloor$. In light of this observation, we can calculate the multiplicity of a prime p in the prime factorization of $\binom{2n}{n} = \frac{(2n)!}{(n!)^2}$ using the formula

$$\sum_{1 \leq i \leq \nu_p} [2n/p^i] - 2[n/p^i], \quad (3.2)$$

where ν_p is the largest exponent for which $p^{\nu_p} \leq 2n$. Since $[2n/p^i] - 2[n/p^i] \leq 1$, we can estimate $\sum_{i=1}^{\nu_p} [2n/p^i] - 2[n/p^i] \leq \nu_p$. This yields

$$\binom{2n}{n} \leq \prod_{p \in \mathbb{P} \cap [2n]} p^{\nu_p} \leq (2n)^{|\mathbb{P} \cap [2n]|},$$

which, after taking logarithms, leaves us with

$$\log \binom{2n}{n} \leq |\mathbb{P} \cap [2n]| \log(2n). \quad (3.3)$$

Stirling's approximation formula implies that $\log(m!) = m \log(m) - m + O(\log m)$. This can now be used to finish the proof by approximating $\log \binom{2n}{n}$ with $2 \log(2)n + O(\log n)$ in (3.3). \square

Lemma 3.2 gives a reasonable lower bound on the asymptotic number of primes, which plays a crucial role in the proof for part (i) of Proposition 3.1. For the proof of part (ii) we need an upper bound.

Lemma 3.3. *Define $\beta(\sigma) := \sigma \log(\sigma) - (\sigma - 1) \log(\sigma - 1)$. Then for all $1 < \sigma \leq 16$,*

$$|\mathbb{P} \cap (x, \sigma x]| \leq \frac{\beta(\sigma)x}{\log x} + O(1). \quad (3.4)$$

Proof. For convenience, let us write $\binom{\sigma x}{x}$ for the quantity $\binom{\lfloor \sigma x \rfloor}{\lfloor x \rfloor}$. Observe that every prime number in the interval $(x, \sigma x]$ divides the number $\binom{\sigma x}{x}$. This implies that the number $\binom{\sigma x}{x}$ is greater or equal than $\prod_{p \in \mathbb{P} \cap (x, \sigma x]} p$. By bounding $\prod_{p \in \mathbb{P} \cap (x, \sigma x]} p$ from below by $x^{|\mathbb{P} \cap (x, \sigma x)]}$ and taking logarithms, we obtain

$$\log \binom{\sigma x}{x} \geq |\mathbb{P} \cap (x, \sigma x]| \log(x). \quad (3.5)$$

Similarly as in the proof of Lemma 3.2, we can now use Stirling's approximation formula, $\log(m!) = m \log(m) - m + O(\log m)$, to estimate that

$$\begin{aligned} \log \binom{\sigma x}{x} &= \lfloor \sigma x \rfloor \log(\lfloor \sigma x \rfloor) - \lfloor x \rfloor \log(\lfloor x \rfloor) - (\lfloor \sigma x \rfloor - \lfloor x \rfloor) \log(\lfloor \sigma x \rfloor - \lfloor x \rfloor) + O(\log x) \\ &= \sigma x \log(\sigma x) - x \log(x) - (\sigma - 1)x \log((\sigma - 1)x) + O(\log x) \\ &= \sigma x \log(\sigma) - (\sigma - 1)x \log(\sigma - 1) + O(\log x) \end{aligned}$$

Together with (3.5), this proves (3.4). \square

Proof of Proposition 3.1. The proof of part (ii) simply follows from Lemma 3.3 (applied with $\sigma = 8^\varepsilon$) and the fact that the order of magnitude of $\sqrt{\varepsilon}$ is much smaller than the order of magnitude of $\beta(8^\varepsilon)$ as ε tends to 0.

For the proof of part (i), we start by rewriting the interval $(8^x, 8^{x+1}]$ in the form $(8^x, 8^{x+1}] = [8^{x+1}] \setminus \bigcup_{0 \leq n \leq 3x} (\frac{8^x}{2^{n+1}}, \frac{8^x}{2^n}]$. Lemma 3.2 gives the estimate $|\mathbb{P} \cap [8^{x+1}]| \geq 8^{x+1}/3(x+1) + O(1)$, whereas Lemma 3.3 (applied with $\sigma = 2$) gives the estimate $|\mathbb{P} \cap (8^x/2^{n+1}, 8^x/2^n]| \leq 8^x/2^{n+1}x + O(1)$. Therefore

$$|\mathbb{P} \cap (8^x, 8^{x+1}]| \geq \frac{8^{x+1}}{3(x+1)} - \sum_{0 \leq n \leq 3x} \frac{8^x}{2^{n+1}x} + O(x) \geq \frac{8^{x+1}}{3(x+1)} - \frac{8^x}{x} + O(x).$$

This implies that if x_0 is sufficiently large then $|\mathbb{P} \cap (8^x, 8^{x+1}]| \geq \frac{8^x}{x}$ for all $x \geq x_0$. \square

Proposition 3.1 is the only number-theoretic component in our proof of Proposition 2.2. The rest of our argument is more combinatorial in nature. The way Proposition 3.1 is used in our proof of Proposition 2.2 is through the following corollary.

Corollary 3.4. *There are $x_0 \geq 1$ and $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ such that for all $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_0)$ and all $\delta \in (0, 1)$ there exists $D = D(\varepsilon, \delta) \in (0, 1)$ with the following property: For all $n \geq x_0$ there exist $x, y \in [n, n+1)$ with $\varepsilon^4 < y - x < \varepsilon$ such that*

$$|\mathbb{P} \cap (8^x, 8^{x+\delta}]| \geq D \frac{8^x}{x}, \quad \text{and} \quad |\mathbb{P} \cap (8^y, 8^{y+\delta}]| \geq D \frac{8^y}{y}.$$

Proof. As guaranteed by Proposition 3.1, the number of primes in $(8^n, 8^{n+1}]$ is at least $\frac{8^n}{n}$. Therefore, by the Pigeonhole Principle, for some $t \in [n, n+1)$ the number of primes in $(8^t, 8^{t+\varepsilon}]$ is at least $\varepsilon 8^n/2n$. We can then cover the interval $(8^t, 8^{t+\varepsilon}]$ by $K := \lceil \varepsilon^{-3} \rceil$ many smaller intervals in the following way:

$$(8^t, 8^{t+\varepsilon}] = (8^t, 8^{t+\varepsilon^4}] \cup (8^{t+\varepsilon^4}, 8^{t+2\varepsilon^4}] \cup \dots \cup (8^{t+(K-1)\varepsilon^4}, 8^{t+K\varepsilon^4}].$$

By Lemma 3.3, each of the intervals $(8^{t+i\varepsilon^4}, 8^{t+(i+1)\varepsilon^4}]$ contains at most $O(\varepsilon^2 8^n/n)$ many primes, whereas the whole interval $(8^t, 8^{t+\varepsilon}]$ contains at least $O(\varepsilon 8^n/n)$ many primes. It follows that if ε is chosen sufficiently small, say smaller than some threshold ε_0 , then we can find two non-consecutive $a, b \in \{0, 1, \dots, K-1\}$ such that the intervals $(8^{t+a\varepsilon^4}, 8^{t+(a+1)\varepsilon^4}]$ and $(8^{t+b\varepsilon^4}, 8^{t+(b+1)\varepsilon^4}]$ contain at least $O(\frac{\varepsilon^4 8^n}{n})$ many primes. Using the Pigeonhole Principle once more we can then find for every $\delta \in (0, 1)$ some $x \in [t + a\varepsilon^4, t + (a+1)\varepsilon^4)$ and some $y \in [t + b\varepsilon^4, t + (b+1)\varepsilon^4)$ such that the intervals $(8^x, 8^{x+\delta}]$ and $(8^y, 8^{y+\delta}]$ contain at least $O(\frac{\delta \varepsilon^4 8^n}{n})$ many primes. Since a and b are non-consecutive, we have $y - x > \varepsilon^4$, and since $x, y \in [t, t + \varepsilon)$ we have $y - x < \varepsilon$. \square

Lemma 3.5. *Let x_0 and ε_0 be as in Corollary 3.4. Let $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_0)$ be arbitrary, let $k \geq \lceil 4/\varepsilon^4 \rceil$ be arbitrary, and let $D = D(\varepsilon, \delta)$ be as in Corollary 3.4, where $\delta := \varepsilon/k$. Then for all $n_1, \dots, n_k \in \{n \in \mathbb{N} : n \geq x_0\}$, and all $x \geq x_0$ with $n_1 + \dots + n_k = \lfloor x \rfloor$ there exist $x_1, \dots, x_k \in \mathbb{R}$ such that*

- (I) $|\mathbb{P} \cap (8^{x_i}, 8^{x_i+\delta}]| \geq D 8^{x_i}/x_i$ for all $1 \leq i \leq k$;
- (II) $|x_i - n_i| \leq 1$ for all $1 \leq i \leq k$;
- (III) $x_1 + \dots + x_k \in [x, x + \varepsilon)$.

Proof. Suppose n_1, \dots, n_k are natural numbers bigger than x_0 with $n_1 + \dots + n_k = \lfloor x \rfloor$ for some x . In view of Corollary 3.4 there are $x_{i,1}, y_{i,1} \in [n_i - 1, n)$ and $x_{i,2}, y_{i,2} \in [n_i, n + 1)$ with $\varepsilon^4 < y_{i,1} - x_{i,1} < \varepsilon$ and $\varepsilon^4 < y_{i,2} - x_{i,2} < \varepsilon$, such that $|\mathbb{P} \cap (8^{x_{i,j}}, 8^{x_{i,j} + \delta})| \geq D8^{x_{i,j}}/x_{i,j}$ and $|\mathbb{P} \cap (8^{y_{i,j}}, 8^{y_{i,j} + \delta})| \geq D8^{y_{i,j}}/y_{i,j}$ for $j = 1, 2$. Therefore, if $x_i \in \{x_{i,1}, y_{i,1}, x_{i,2}, y_{i,2}\}$ then (I) and (II) are already satisfied. It remains to show that one can choose for every i and element $x_i \in \{x_{i,1}, y_{i,1}, x_{i,2}, y_{i,2}\}$ in a way such that the sequence x_1, \dots, x_k satisfies (III) too.

Set $x_1 := x_1^{(1)}$ and then inductively define $x_{i+1} := x_{i,2}$ if $x_1 + \dots + x_i \leq n_1 + \dots + n_i$ and $x_{i+1} := x_{i,1}$ otherwise. This results in a sequence x_1, \dots, x_k whose sum $x_1 + \dots + x_k$ lies between $n - 1$ and n . Note that for every choice of $x_{i,1}$ we could have also chosen $y_{i,1}$ instead, which would increase the sum $x_1 + \dots + x_k$ by a threshold between ε^4 and ε . Similarly, instead of $x_{i,2}$ we could have chosen $y_{i,2}$ which would also increase the sum by a number between ε^4 and ε . Therefore, by replacing a certain number of x_i this way, we can change the sum $x_1 + \dots + x_k$ and guarantee that it lies between x and $x + \varepsilon$. \square

Proof of Proposition 2.2. Let $\eta > 0$ be given. Choose $K \in \mathbb{N}$ sufficiently large such that $8^{1/K} < 1 + \eta$ and define $\rho := 8^{1/K}$. Let x_0 and ε_0 be as in Corollary 3.4, pick any $\varepsilon > 0$ with $\varepsilon < \min\{\varepsilon_0, \eta/2\}$, and set $k_0 := \lceil 4/\varepsilon^4 \rceil$. We claim that ρ and k_0 are as desired, meaning that for all $k \geq k_0$ and all $l \geq 1$ there exist two finite, non-empty sets $B_1, B_2 \subset \mathbb{N}$ satisfying properties (a), (b), and (c).

To verify this claim, let $k \geq k_0$ be arbitrary. By Proposition 3.1 there exists a constant $C \geq 1$ such that $8^n/n \leq |\mathbb{P} \cap (8^{n-1}, 8^{n+1})| \leq C8^n/n$ for all $n \geq x_0$. Set $\delta := \varepsilon/k$ and define $N := 384^k C^k K^k / D^k \eta$, where $D = D(\varepsilon, \delta)$ is as in Corollary 3.4. Choose any $s_1 \in \mathbb{N}$ with $s_1 \geq \max\{x_0, \log(l)/\log(8)\}$.

First we will construct the set B_2 . Let A_1 be a subset of $s_1\mathbb{N} = \{s_1 n : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ with $\sum_{n \in A_1} 1/n \geq N$. Then, assuming A_i has already been found, define $s_{i+1} := \max(A_1 + \dots + A_i)$ and let A_{i+1} be any subset of $s_{i+1}\mathbb{N}$ with $\sum_{n \in A_{i+1}} 1/n \geq N$. Following this procedure until $i = k$, we end up with a sequence of finite sets A_1, \dots, A_k with the convenient property that any element in $A_1 + \dots + A_k$ is unique in the sense that if $n_1, n'_1 \in A_1, \dots, n_k, n'_k \in A_k$ with $n_1 + \dots + n_k = n'_1 + \dots + n'_k$ then necessarily $n_1 = n'_1, \dots, n_k = n'_k$.

According to Proposition 3.1, for all $n \in A_1 + \dots + A_k$, the interval $(8^n, 8^{n+1}]$ contains at least $8^n/n$ many primes. Since $(8^n, 8^{n+1}]$ splits into exactly K many ρ -adic intervals $(\rho^i, \rho^{i+1}]$, namely $(8^n, 8^{n+1}] = (\rho^{Kn}, \rho^{Kn+1}] \cup \dots \cup (\rho^{Kn+K-1}, \rho^{Kn+K}]$, the Pigeonhole Principle implies that for at least one $i_n \in \{Kn, \dots, Kn+K-1\}$ the interval $(\rho^{i_n}, \rho^{i_n+1}] \subset (8^n, 8^{n+1}]$ contains at least $8^n/Kn$ many primes. Note that $\lfloor i_n/K \rfloor = n = n_1 + \dots + n_k$ for some $n_1 \in A_1, \dots, n_k \in A_k$. In view of Lemma 3.5 we can therefore find $x_1, \dots, x_k \in \mathbb{R}$ such that (I), (II), and (III) hold with $x = i_n/K$.

From Property (I) it follows that for every $i = 1, \dots, k$ there is a subset P_{n_i} of $\mathbb{P} \cap (8^{x_i}, 8^{x_i + \delta})$ of size $\lfloor D8^{x_i}/Kx_i \rfloor$. This allows us to define $B_{n,2} := P_{n_1} \dots P_{n_k}$, which has the useful property that $B_{n,2} \subset (8^{x_1 + \dots + x_k}, 8^{x_1 + \dots + x_k + k\delta}) \subset (8^{i_n}/K, 8^{i_n}/K + 2\varepsilon) \subset (\rho^{i_n}, \rho^{i_n+1}]$, because $k\delta \leq \varepsilon \leq \eta/2$. Let $B_{n,1}$ be any subset of $\mathbb{P} \cap (\rho^{i_n}, \rho^{i_n+1}]$ of size $|B_{n,2}|$, which exists because $|B_{n,2}| \leq \prod_{i=1}^k D8^{x_i}/Kx_i \leq 8^n/Kn$ and $|\mathbb{P} \cap (\rho^{i_n}, \rho^{i_n+1})| \geq 8^n/Kn$. Now define

$$B_1 := \bigcup_{n \in A_1 + \dots + A_k} B_{n,1} \quad \text{and} \quad B_2 := \bigcup_{n \in A_1 + \dots + A_k} B_{n,2}.$$

By construction, B_1 consists only of primes larger than l and B_2 only of numbers that are a product of exactly k distinct primes larger than l . Also by construction, they have the same cardinality when restricted to ρ -adic intervals. This means that properties (a) and (b) are satisfied. It remains to show that B_1 and B_2 also satisfy property (c). Define $Q_{n_i} := \mathbb{P} \cap (8^{n_i-1}, 8^{n_i+1}]$ for all $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ and all $n_i \in A_i$ and set $Q_i := \bigcup_{n_i \in A_i} Q_{n_i}$. Since $|Q_{n_i}| \leq C8^{n_i}/n_i$, we have

$$\sum_{m \in Q_1 \dots Q_k} \frac{1}{m} = \prod_{i=1}^k \left(\sum_{m \in Q_i} \frac{1}{m} \right) \leq \prod_{i=1}^k \left(\sum_{n_i \in A_i} \frac{|\mathbb{P} \cap (8^{n_i-1}, 8^{n_i+1})|}{8^{n_i-1}} \right) \leq 8^k C^k \prod_{i=1}^k \left(\sum_{n_i \in A_i} \frac{1}{n_i} \right).$$

Similarly, using $|P_{n_i}| \geq \lfloor D8^{x_i}/Kx_i \rfloor \geq D8^{n_i}/2Kn_i$, we see that

$$\sum_{m \in B_2} \frac{1}{m} = \sum_{n_1 \in A_1, \dots, n_k \in A_k} \left(\sum_{p_1 \in P_{n_1}, \dots, p_k \in P_{n_k}} \frac{1}{p_1 \cdot \dots \cdot p_k} \right) \geq \frac{D^k}{16^k K^k} \prod_{i=1}^k \left(\sum_{n_i \in A_i} \frac{1}{n_i} \right), \quad (3.6)$$

which proves $\sum_{m \in B_2} 1/m \geq E \sum_{m \in Q_1 \dots Q_k} 1/m$ for $E := D^k/128^k K^k C^k$. Since B_1 consists only of primes, a straightforward calculation shows that

$$\mathbb{E}_{m \in B_1}^{\log} \mathbb{E}_{n \in B_1}^{\log} \Phi(n, m) \leq \frac{1}{\sum_{m \in B_1} \frac{1}{m}}.$$

Moreover, since B_1 and B_2 satisfy property (b), we have $\sum_{m \in B_1} 1/m \geq \frac{1}{\rho} \sum_{m \in B_2} 1/m$, which together with (3.6), the fact that $\sum_{n_i \in A_i} 1/n_i \geq N$, and our choice of N proves that B_1 satisfies property (c), that is, $\mathbb{E}_{m \in B_1}^{\log} \mathbb{E}_{n \in B_1}^{\log} \Phi(m, n) \leq \eta$. Finally, to prove that B_2 also satisfies property (c), note that P_{n_i} is a subset of Q_{n_i} and hence B_2 is a subset of $Q_1 \dots Q_k$. Since also $\sum_{m \in B_2} 1/m \geq E \sum_{m \in Q_1 \dots Q_k} 1/m$, we conclude that $\mathbb{E}_{m \in B_2}^{\log} \mathbb{E}_{n \in B_2}^{\log} \Phi(m, n) \leq \frac{1}{E} \mathbb{E}_{m \in Q_1 \dots Q_k}^{\log} \mathbb{E}_{n \in Q_1 \dots Q_k}^{\log} \Phi(m, n)$. Now the key idea is to use the following observation: Whenever U and V are coprime sets (meaning that $\gcd(m, n) = 1$ for all $m \in U$ and $n \in V$) then $\mathbb{E}_{m \in UV}^{\log} \mathbb{E}_{n \in UV}^{\log} \Phi(n, m)$ is equal to

$$\left(\mathbb{E}_{m \in U}^{\log} \mathbb{E}_{n \in U}^{\log} \Phi(n, m) \right) \left(\mathbb{E}_{m \in V}^{\log} \mathbb{E}_{n \in V}^{\log} \Phi(n, m) \right) + \mathbb{E}_{m \in U}^{\log} \mathbb{E}_{n \in V}^{\log} \Phi(n, m) + \mathbb{E}_{m \in V}^{\log} \mathbb{E}_{n \in U}^{\log} \Phi(n, m).$$

From this observation it follows that if $\mathbb{E}_{m \in U}^{\log} \mathbb{E}_{n \in U}^{\log} \Phi(m, n)$ and $\mathbb{E}_{m \in V}^{\log} \mathbb{E}_{n \in V}^{\log} \Phi(m, n)$ are smaller than 1 then

$$\mathbb{E}_{m \in UV}^{\log} \mathbb{E}_{n \in UV}^{\log} \Phi(n, m) \leq 3 \max \left\{ \mathbb{E}_{m \in U}^{\log} \mathbb{E}_{n \in U}^{\log} \Phi(n, m), \mathbb{E}_{m \in V}^{\log} \mathbb{E}_{n \in V}^{\log} \Phi(n, m) \right\}. \quad (3.7)$$

Since Q_1, \dots, Q_k are pairwise coprime sets, we can iterating (3.7) to obtain

$$\mathbb{E}_{m \in Q_1 \dots Q_k}^{\log} \mathbb{E}_{n \in Q_1 \dots Q_k}^{\log} \Phi(n, m) \leq 3^k \max \left\{ \frac{1}{\sum_{m \in Q_i} \frac{1}{m}} : 1 \leq i \leq k \right\}.$$

Since $|Q_{n_i}| \geq 8^{n_i}/n_i$ we get $\sum_{m \in Q_i} 1/m \geq \frac{1}{8} \sum_{n_i \in A_i} 1/n_i \geq N/8$, which due to our choice of N implies $\mathbb{E}_{m \in B_2}^{\log} \mathbb{E}_{n \in B_2}^{\log} \Phi(m, n) \leq \eta$. \square

Acknowledgments: The author thanks Vitaly Bergelson and Redmond McNamara for helpful comments. This work is supported by the National Science Foundation under grant number DMS 1901453.

References

- [Apo00] T. M. Apostol. “A centennial history of the prime number theorem”. In: *Number theory*. Trends Math. Birkhäuser, Basel, 2000, pp. 1–14.
http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-3-0348-7023-8_1.
- [Apo76] T. M. Apostol. *Introduction to analytic number theory*. Undergraduate Texts in Mathematics. Springer-Verlag, New York-Heidelberg, 1976, pp. xii+338.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4757-5579-4>.
- [Dab75] H. Daboussi. “Fonctions multiplicatives presque périodiques B”. In: *Journées Arithmétiques de Bordeaux (Conf., Univ. Bordeaux, Bordeaux, 1974)*. Vol. tome 24–25. Soc. Math. France, Paris, 1975, pp. 321–324.
http://www.numdam.org/item/AST_1975__24-25__321_0.
- [Dab84] H. Daboussi. “Sur le théorème des nombres premiers”. In: *C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris Sér. I Math.* 298.8 (1984), pp. 161–164.

- [Dab89] H. Daboussi. “On the prime number theorem for arithmetic progressions”. In: *J. Number Theory* 31.3 (1989), pp. 243–254.
[http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0022-314X\(89\)90071-1](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0022-314X(89)90071-1).
- [Dia82] H. G. Diamond. “Elementary methods in the study of the distribution of prime numbers”. In: *Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. (N.S.)* 7.3 (1982), pp. 553–589.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1090/S0273-0979-1982-15057-1>.
- [Erd49] P. Erdős. “On a new method in elementary number theory which leads to an elementary proof of the prime number theorem”. In: *Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* 35 (1949), pp. 374–384.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1073/pnas.35.7.374>.
- [Gol04] D. Goldfeld. “The elementary proof of the prime number theorem: an historical perspective”. In: *Number theory (New York, 2003)*. Springer, New York, 2004, pp. 179–192.
http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4419-9060-0_10.
- [Gol73a] L. J. Goldstein. “A history of the prime number theorem”. In: *Amer. Math. Monthly* 80 (1973), pp. 599–615.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/2319162>.
- [Gol73b] L. J. Goldstein. “Correction to: “A history of the prime number theorem” (Amer. Math. Monthly 80 (1973), 599–615)”. In: *Amer. Math. Monthly* 80 (1973), p. 1115.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/2318546>.
- [Gra10] A. Granville. “Different approaches to the distribution of primes”. In: *Milan J. Math.* 78.1 (2010), pp. 65–84.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s00032-010-0122-7>.
- [Hil86] A. Hildebrand. “The prime number theorem via the large sieve”. In: *Mathematika* 33.1 (1986), pp. 23–30.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1112/S002557930001384X>.
- [IK04] H. Iwaniec and E. Kowalski. *Analytic number theory*. Vol. 53. American Mathematical Society Colloquium Publications. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2004, pp. xii+615. ISBN: 0-8218-3633-1.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1090/coll/053>.
- [Kát86] I. Kátai. “A remark on a theorem of H. Daboussi”. In: *Acta Math. Hungar.* 47.1-2 (1986), pp. 223–225.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/BF01949145>.
- [Lan11] E. Landau. “Über die Äquivalenz zweier Hauptsätze der analytischen Zahlentheorie”. In: *Sitzungsberichte der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien, Mathematisch-Naturwissenschaftliche Klasse* 120.2a (1911), pp. 1–16.
- [Lan99] E. Landau. “Neuer Beweis der Gleichung $\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{\mu(k)}{k}$ ”. PhD thesis. Friedrich-Wilhelms-Universität zu Berlin, 1899.
<http://resolver.sub.uni-goettingen.de/purl?PPN317979566>.
- [Lev69] N. Levinson. “A motivated account of an elementary proof of the prime number theorem”. In: *Amer. Math. Monthly* 76 (1969), pp. 225–245.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/2316361>.
- [Man97] H.C.F. von Mangoldt. “Beweis der Gleichung $\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{\mu(k)}{k} = 0$ ”. In: *Sitzungsberichte der Königlich Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin Zweiter Halbband – Juli bis December (1897)*, pp. 835–852.
<https://biodiversitylibrary.org/page/29982413>.

- [McN20] R. McNamara. “A dynamical proof of the prime number theorem”. In: *ArXiv e-prints* (2020).
- [Mon71] H. L. Montgomery. *Topics in multiplicative number theory*. Lecture Notes in Mathematics, Vol. 227. Springer-Verlag, Berlin-New York, 1971, pp. ix+178.
- [New80] D. J. Newman. “Simple analytic proof of the prime number theorem”. In: *Amer. Math. Monthly* 87.9 (1980), pp. 693–696.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/2321853>.
- [Sel49] Atle Selberg. “An elementary proof of the prime-number theorem”. In: *Ann. of Math. (2)* 50 (1949), pp. 305–313.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/1969455>.
- [SG09] J. Spencer and R. Graham. “The elementary proof of the prime number theorem”. In: *Math. Intelligencer* 31.3 (2009). With a note on the controversy by E. G. Straus and a postscript by Carl Pomerance, pp. 18–23.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s00283-009-9063-9>.
- [Sha50] H. N. Shapiro. “On a theorem of Selberg and generalizations”. In: *Ann. of Math. (2)* 51 (1950), pp. 485–497.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/1969336>.
- [TM00] G. Tenenbaum and M. Mendès France. *The prime numbers and their distribution*. Vol. 6. Student Mathematical Library. Translated from the 1997 French original by Philip G. Spain. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2000, pp. xx+115. ISBN: 0-8218-1647-0.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1090/stml/006>.
- [Zag97] D. Zagier. “Newman’s short proof of the prime number theorem”. In: *Amer. Math. Monthly* 104.8 (1997), pp. 705–708.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/2975232>.

Florian K. Richter
 NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY
fkr@northwestern.edu