

## LECTURE 8: SUMMARY

Last time we discussed the Prime Number Theorem, which asserts that

$$\pi(x) \sim \frac{x}{\log x}.$$

(We also discussed the Riemann Hypothesis, which is a more precise form of this.) We won't be able to prove this theorem in this course, since the proof requires a background in complex analysis. Instead, we devote the next couple of lectures to proving a somewhat weaker version of this theorem, due to Chebyshev in the 1850s:

**Theorem 1.** *There exist positive constants  $a$  and  $b$  such that*

$$\frac{ax}{\log x} < \pi(x) < \frac{bx}{\log x}$$

for all  $x \geq 2$ .

We started by reviewing the symbol  $\binom{n}{k}$ , read ' $n$  choose  $k$ '. It represents the number of ways of choosing  $k$  objects out of a set of  $n$  objects. For example,  $\binom{4}{2} = 6$ . There's an explicit formula for this quantity:

$$\binom{n}{k} = \frac{n!}{k!(n-k)!}.$$

Perhaps the most famous appearance of this is in the binomial theorem:

$$(a+b)^n = \sum_{k=0}^n \binom{n}{k} a^k b^{n-k}.$$

Having review all this, we are now ready to begin proving Chebyshev's theorem. We begin by proving an upper bound on  $\pi(x)$ . Our approach is due to Ramanujan, who significantly simplified Chebyshev's original method.

Consider the binomial coefficient  $\binom{2n}{n}$ . We will bound it from above and below; comparing the two bounds will give us Chebyshev's upper bound. We have

$$\binom{2n}{n} < \sum_{k=0}^{2n} \binom{2n}{k} = (1+1)^{2n} = 2^{2n}. \quad (\dagger)$$

On the other hand, observe that if a prime  $p \leq 2n$ , then  $p \mid (2n)!$ . If moreover  $p > n$ , the  $p \nmid n!$ . This (combined with problem 1.9 from your homework) shows that

$$\left( \prod_{p \in (n, 2n]} p \right) \mid \binom{2n}{n}.$$

We deduce that

$$\binom{2n}{n} \geq \prod_{p \in (n, 2n]} p > \prod_{p \in (n, 2n]} n = n^{\pi(2n) - \pi(n)}. \quad (\ddagger)$$

Combining equations  $(\dagger)$  and  $(\ddagger)$ , taking logs, and simplifying, we find

$$\pi(2n) - \pi(n) < \frac{(2 \log 2)n}{\log n}.$$

This already looks quite promising; next lecture we'll conclude the proof of Chebyshev's upper bound with relative ease, and move on to the lower bound.