

# AN EXPOSITORY REVIEW OF THE CHEBYSHEV-SYLVESTER METHOD IN PRIME NUMBER THEORY

TSOGTGEREL GANTUMUR

**ABSTRACT.** This paper provides a detailed expository and computational account of the elementary methods developed by P. L. Chebyshev and J. J. Sylvester to establish explicit bounds on the prime counting function. The core of the method involves replacing the Möbius function with a finitely supported arithmetic function in the convolution identities, relating the Chebyshev function  $\psi(x)$  to the summatory logarithm function  $T(x) = \log([x]!)$ . We present a comprehensive analysis of the various schemes proposed by Chebyshev and Sylvester, with a central focus on Sylvester's innovative iterative refinement procedure. By implementing this procedure computationally, we replicate, verify, and optimize the historical results, providing a self-contained pedagogical resource for this pivotal technique in analytic number theory.

## CONTENTS

1. Introduction	1
2. Arithmetic functions and prime counting	2
3. Chebyshev's basic framework	4
4. Sylvester's new schemes	6
5. Sylvester's iterative refinement	9
6. Computational optimization	12
7. Sylvester's gigantic schemes	16
8. Conclusion	18
Acknowledgements	20
References	20

## 1. INTRODUCTION

The distribution of prime numbers has been a central object of study in number theory for centuries. Before the proof of the Prime Number Theorem using complex analysis, mathematicians developed "elementary" methods to establish rigorous bounds on the prime-counting function,  $\pi(x)$ . In the 1850s, P. L. Chebyshev made the first significant breakthrough by proving that the ratio  $\pi(x)/(x/\log x)$  is bounded between two positive constants [1, 2]. His method involved relating the prime-counting function to the more analytically tractable logarithm of the factorial function.

Decades later, J. J. Sylvester expanded on this work by introducing a variety of new auxiliary functions and, most importantly, developing a powerful iterative procedure to systematically refine the bounds obtained from any given function [3, 4]. This "bootstrapping" method represented the high water mark of elementary techniques prior to the proof of the Prime Number Theorem.

This paper provides a self-contained exposition of the Chebyshev-Sylvester method. We begin by introducing the necessary concepts from the theory of arithmetic functions. We then detail the main

---

<sup>1</sup>MCGILL UNIVERSITY

<sup>2</sup>NATIONAL UNIVERSITY OF MONGOLIA

<sup>3</sup>INSTITUTE OF MATHEMATICS AND DIGITAL TECHNOLOGY, MONGOLIAN ACADEMY OF SCIENCES

*Date:* December 3, 2025.

framework, analyze the schemes of Chebyshev and Sylvester, and explain the iterative refinement procedure. A unique feature of this work is the use of modern computational tools to implement and optimize Sylvester's procedure, thereby finding the best possible bounds attainable for each of the historical schemes. All computations were carried out in Python using the Jupyter notebooks in the repository [5].

## 2. ARITHMETIC FUNCTIONS AND PRIME COUNTING

To make the paper self-contained, we first introduce the essential concepts from the theory of arithmetic functions, which form the language of our exposition.

An *arithmetic function* is a function  $f : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$  defined on the set of positive integers. A key operation between two arithmetic functions  $f$  and  $g$  is the *Dirichlet convolution*, denoted by  $f * g$ , which is defined as:

$$(f * g)(n) = \sum_{d|n} f(d)g(n/d) = \sum_{ab=n} f(a)g(b). \quad (1)$$

This operation is commutative and associative. The identity element for convolution is the function  $\delta$ , defined as  $\delta(1) = 1$  and  $\delta(n) = 0$  for  $n > 1$ .

The fundamental theorem of arithmetic can be written in additive form as

$$\ln n = \sum_{d|n} \Lambda(d), \quad (2)$$

where  $\Lambda(n)$  is the *von Mangoldt function*

$$\Lambda(n) = \begin{cases} \ln p & \text{if } n = p^k \text{ for some prime } p \text{ and integer } k \geq 1, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (3)$$

Introducing the *unit function*,  $1(n) = 1$  for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , (2) becomes  $\ln = 1 * \Lambda$ . Thus if we can invert  $1$  under convolution, we can express  $\Lambda$  in terms of  $\ln$ . The *Möbius function*, defined as

$$\mu(n) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } n = 1, \\ (-1)^k & \text{if } n \text{ is a product of } k \text{ distinct primes,} \\ 0 & \text{if } n \text{ has a squared prime factor,} \end{cases} \quad (4)$$

does exactly what we need:

$$(\mu * 1)(n) = \sum_{d|n} \mu(d) = \delta(n). \quad (5)$$

By convolving  $\ln = 1 * \Lambda$  with  $\mu$ , we get

$$\mu * \ln = \mu * (1 * \Lambda) = (\mu * 1) * \Lambda = \delta * \Lambda = \Lambda. \quad (6)$$

Let us display the important identities for later use.

**Lemma 2.1.** We have  $\ln = 1 * \Lambda$  and  $\Lambda = \mu * \ln$ .

The central object of study in prime number theory is the *prime counting function*

$$\pi(x) = \sum_{p \leq x} 1, \quad (7)$$

where the notation  $p \leq x$  means that the sum is over all primes not exceeding  $x$ . The *prime number theorem* (PNT), which was a conjecture at the time of Chebyshev-Sylvester work, posits that

$$\pi(x) \cdot \frac{\ln x}{x} \rightarrow 1 \quad \text{as } x \rightarrow \infty. \quad (8)$$

In the Chebyshev-Sylvester framework (and in fact in all standard approaches to PNT), we access  $\pi(x)$  through the following more analytically friendly function:

$$\psi(x) = \sum_{p^m \leq x} \ln p = \sum_{n \leq x} \Lambda(n), \quad (9)$$

where the notation  $p^m \leq x$  means that the sum is over all primes  $p$  and all positive integers  $m$  satisfying  $p^m \leq x$ . This was the second of two functions introduced by Chebyshev. An interesting side observation is

$$e^{\psi(x)} = \prod_{p^m \leq x} p = \text{lcd}\{n : n \leq x\}. \quad (10)$$

**Lemma 2.2.** For all  $0 < \alpha < 1$  and  $x > 1$ , we have

$$\psi(x) \leq \pi(x) \ln x \leq \frac{\psi(x)}{\alpha} + x^\alpha \ln x, \quad (11)$$

and hence the prime number theorem is equivalent to the statement  $\psi(x) \sim x$ .

*Proof.* For any  $p$ , the highest power with  $p^m \leq x$  is  $m = \lfloor \frac{\ln x}{\ln p} \rfloor$ , and so

$$\psi(x) = \sum_{p^m \leq x} \ln p = \sum_{p \leq x} \left\lfloor \frac{\ln x}{\ln p} \right\rfloor \ln p \leq \sum_{p \leq x} \frac{\ln x}{\ln p} \ln p = \ln x \sum_{p \leq x} 1 = \pi(x) \ln x. \quad (12)$$

On the other hand, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \psi(x) &\geq \sum_{x^\alpha < p \leq x} \ln p \geq \sum_{x^\alpha < p \leq x} \ln x^\alpha = \alpha \ln x \sum_{x^\alpha < p \leq x} 1 \\ &= \alpha \ln x \cdot (\pi(x) - \pi(x^\alpha)) \geq \alpha \ln x \cdot (\pi(x) - x^\alpha). \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

The proof is complete.  $\square$

Chebyshev's idea was to relate  $\psi(x) = \sum_{n \leq x} \Lambda(n)$  to the more approachable function

$$T(x) = \sum_{n \leq x} \ln n = \ln(\lfloor x \rfloor!) = x \ln x - x + O(\ln x), \quad (14)$$

through  $\ln = 1 * \Lambda$ . To this end, we need the following result.

**Lemma 2.3.** We have

$$\sum_{n \leq x} (f * g)(n) = \sum_{k \leq x} f(k) \sum_{d \leq x/k} g(d). \quad (15)$$

*Proof.* We proceed as

$$\sum_{n \leq x} (f * g)(n) = \sum_{n \leq x} \sum_{d|n} f(n/d) g(d) = \sum_{k \geq 1} \sum_{kd \leq x} f(k) g(d) = \sum_{k \geq 1} f(k) \sum_{d \leq x/k} g(d), \quad (16)$$

and note that the outer sum is restricted by  $k \leq x$ , since for  $k > x$  the inner sum is empty.  $\square$

Applying this to  $\ln = 1 * \Lambda$ , we get

$$T(x) = \sum_{k \leq x} \psi(x/k), \quad (17)$$

and to  $\Lambda = \mu * \ln$ , we get

$$\psi(x) = \sum_{k \leq x} \mu(k) T(x/k). \quad (18)$$

This is the starting point of Chebyshev's method.

## 3. CHEBYSHEV'S BASIC FRAMEWORK

In principle, (18) expresses  $\psi(x)$  in terms of  $T(x)$ , but it involves the Möbius function, which is quite unwieldy. So suppose that we have a surrogate  $\nu$  of  $\mu$ , and convolve it with the identity  $1 * \Lambda = \ln$ , to get

$$\nu * 1 * \Lambda = \nu * \ln. \quad (19)$$

Then summation of the right hand side via Lemma 2.3 yields

$$V(x) = \sum_{n \leq x} (\nu * 1 * \Lambda)(n) = \sum_{n \leq x} (\nu * \ln)(n) = \sum_{k \leq x} \nu(k) T(x/k). \quad (20)$$

Note that the first expression is the definition of  $V(x)$ , which we expect to be an imitation of  $\psi$ , if  $\nu$  imitates  $\mu$  well. The sense in which  $\nu$  should “imitate”  $\mu$  is part of what need to figure out as we develop the theory.

Now let us apply our summation formula (15) to the splitting  $(\nu * 1) * \Lambda$ , to get

$$V(x) = \sum_{n \leq x} (\nu * 1 * \Lambda)(n) = \sum_{k \leq x} E(x/k) \Lambda(k), \quad (21)$$

where we have introduced

$$E(x) = \sum_{n \leq x} (\nu * 1)(n) = \sum_{k \leq x} \left\lfloor \frac{x}{k} \right\rfloor \nu(k). \quad (22)$$

Chebyshev's original choice for  $V$  is

$$V(x) = T(x) - T(x/2) - T(x/3) - T(x/5) + T(x/30), \quad (23)$$

which corresponds to  $\nu$  that is given by

$$\nu_* = \delta_1 - \delta_2 - \delta_3 - \delta_5 + \delta_{30}. \quad (24)$$

Here  $\delta_m(n) = \delta_{m,n}$ , that is,  $\delta_m(n) = 1$  for  $n = m$ , and  $\delta_m(n) = 0$  otherwise.

What conditions does  $\nu$  need to satisfy in order to give us a good estimate on  $\psi(x)$  through the relations (20)-(21)? The following conditions suggest themselves naturally.

- Supposing that  $V(x) \approx \psi(x)$  in some sense, since  $T(x) = x \ln x + O(x)$ , the right hand side of (20) can be  $O(x)$  only if  $\sum_n \nu(n)/n = 0$ . Chebyshev's scheme satisfies this condition.
- In order for  $V(x) \approx \psi(x)$  to hold, in view of (21), it is necessary that  $E(x) \approx 1$  at least for small values of  $x$ . Chebyshev's scheme satisfies  $E(x) = 1$  for  $1 \leq x < 6$ .
- Finally, for practicality, we require that  $\nu(n) \neq 0$  for only finitely many  $n$ .

**Theorem 3.1.** (a) *If the cancellation condition*

$$\sum_n \frac{\nu(n)}{n} = 0, \quad (25)$$

*is satisfied, then we have*

$$V(x) = A(\nu)x + O(\ln x), \quad (26)$$

*where*

$$A(\nu) = - \sum_n \frac{\nu(n) \ln n}{n}. \quad (27)$$

(b) *If  $E(x) \leq 1$  for  $x \geq 1$ , then  $V(x) \leq \psi(x)$ .*

(c) *If  $E(x) \geq 1$  for  $1 \leq x < N$ , then  $V(x) \geq \psi(x) - \psi(x/N)$ . In addition, if we assume (25), then*

$$\psi(x) \leq \frac{N}{N-1} A(\nu)x + O(\ln^2 x). \quad (28)$$

*Proof.* (a) Using Stirling's approximation  $T(x) = x \ln x - x + O(\ln x)$  in (20), and taking into account the cancellation condition, we derive

$$V(x) = \sum_{n \leq x} \nu(n) T(x/n) = - \left( \sum_n \frac{\nu(n) \ln n}{n} \right) x + O(\ln x) = A(\nu)x + O(\ln x). \quad (29)$$

(b) It is immediate from (21) that

$$V(x) = \sum_{k \leq x} E(x/k) \Lambda(k) \leq \sum_{k \leq x} \Lambda(k) = \psi(x). \quad (30)$$

(c) First, we have

$$V(x) = \sum_{k \leq x} E(x/k) \Lambda(k) \geq \sum_{x/N < k \leq x} \Lambda(k) = \psi(x) - \psi(x/N). \quad (31)$$

Then noting that

$$\begin{aligned} \psi(x) - \psi(x/N) &\leq V(x) = A(\nu)x + O(\ln x), \\ \psi(x/N) - \psi(x/N^2) &\leq V(x/N) = A(\nu)x/N + O(\ln x), \\ \psi(x/N^2) - \psi(x/N^3) &\leq V(x/N^2) = A(\nu)x/N^2 + O(\ln x), \\ &\dots \end{aligned} \quad (32)$$

and summing over these  $\lfloor \frac{\ln x}{\ln N} \rfloor$  lines gives us the upper bound

$$\psi(x) \leq (1 + N^{-1} + N^{-2} + \dots) A(\nu)x + O(\ln^2 x) = \frac{N}{N-1} A(\nu)x + O(\ln^2 x). \quad (33)$$

□

**Example 3.2.** For Chebyshev's scheme, we have

$$A_* = A(\nu_*) = \frac{\ln 2}{2} + \frac{\ln 3}{3} + \frac{\ln 5}{5} - \frac{\ln 30}{30} = 0.92129\dots \quad (34)$$

In particular,  $E(x)$  has period 30, and  $0 \leq E(x) \leq 1$  for all  $x$ . Moreover, since  $E(x) = 1$  for  $x < 6$ , we have  $N = 6$ . Applying the preceding theorem then yields the familiar bounds

$$A_*x + O(\ln x) \leq \psi(x) \leq \frac{6}{5}A_*x + O(\ln^2 x). \quad (35)$$

Figure 1 shows  $E(x)$  corresponding to Chebyshev's scheme.




FIGURE 1.  $E(x)$  for Chebyshev's scheme.


*Remark 3.3.* Note that as (21) means

$$V(x) = \sum_{n \leq x} E(x/n) \Lambda(n) = \sum_{n \leq x} (E(n) - E(n-1)) \psi(x/n), \quad (36)$$

we can read off from the graph of  $E(x)$  the coefficients of the expansion of  $V(x)$  in terms of  $\psi(x/n)$ . For example, in Chebyshev's case we have

$$V(x) = \psi(x) - \psi(x/6) + \psi(x/7) - \psi(x/10) + \psi(x/11) - \psi(x/12) + \dots, \quad (37)$$

see Figure 2.

FIGURE 2. Expanding  $V(x)$  in terms of  $\psi(x/n)$ .

*Remark 3.4.* On Figure 2, in light of the nondecreasing property of  $\psi(x)$ , it is easy to see

$$\begin{aligned}
 V(x) &= \psi(x) - \underbrace{\psi(x/6) + \psi(x/7) - \psi(x/10) + \psi(x/11) - \psi(x/12) + \dots}_{\leq 0} \leq \psi(x), \\
 V(x) &= \psi(x) - \psi(x/6) + \underbrace{\psi(x/7) - \psi(x/10) + \psi(x/11) - \psi(x/12) + \dots}_{\geq 0} \\
 &\geq \psi(x) - \psi(x/6).
 \end{aligned} \tag{38}$$

We illustrate this process in Figure 3, where the dashed red lines show the pairs that were canceled due to the nondecreasing property of  $\psi(x)$ .




FIGURE 3. Derivation of the estimates (38).

#### 4. SYLVESTER'S NEW SCHEMES

It had passed 30–40 years since Chebyshev's work, when the following schemes were found by James Sylvester and his assistant James Hammond<sup>1</sup>:

$$\begin{aligned}
 \nu_1 &= \delta_1 - 2\delta_2, \\
 \nu_2 &= \delta_1 - \delta_2 - 2\delta_3 + \delta_6, \\
 \nu_3 &= \delta_1 - \delta_2 - \delta_3 - \delta_4 + \delta_{12},
 \end{aligned} \tag{39}$$

which are written in Sylvester's own notation as

$$\nu_1 = [1; 2, 2], \quad \nu_2 = [1, 6; 2, 3, 3], \quad \nu_3 = [1, 12; 2, 3, 4]. \tag{40}$$

In this notation, Chebyshev's scheme is

$$\nu_* = [1, 30; 2, 3, 5]. \tag{41}$$

These new schemes satisfy (25), and  $0 \leq E(x) \leq 1$  for all  $x$ . Moreover, we have the following.

- For  $\nu_1$ , the period of  $E(x)$  is 2, and  $E(x) = 1$  for  $x < 2$ .
- For  $\nu_2$ , the period of  $E(x)$  is 6, and  $E(x) = 1$  for  $x < 3$ .

<sup>1</sup>Sylvester gives the credit of discovering  $\nu_3$  to James Hammond.

- For  $\nu_3$ , the period of  $E(x)$  is 12, and  $E(x) = 1$  for  $x < 4$ .

The corresponding functions  $E(x)$  are shown in Figure 4.




FIGURE 4. The  $E$ -functions for  $\nu_1$ ,  $\nu_2$ , and  $\nu_3$ .

The constants  $A(\nu)$  and  $B(\nu) = \frac{N}{N-1}A(\nu)$  from Theorem 3.1, for each new scheme, are as follows.

$$\begin{aligned} A(\nu_1) &= 0.6931\dots, & B(\nu_1) &= 2A(\nu_1) = 1.3862\dots, \\ A(\nu_2) &= 0.7803\dots, & B(\nu_2) &= \frac{3}{2}A(\nu_2) = 1.1705\dots, \\ A(\nu_3) &= 0.8522\dots, & B(\nu_3) &= \frac{4}{3}A(\nu_3) = 1.1363\dots \end{aligned} \quad (42)$$

Although all of these pairs are inferior to Chebyshev's

$$A(\nu_*) = 0.9212\dots, \quad B(\nu_*) = \frac{6}{5}A(\nu_*) = 1.1055\dots, \quad (43)$$

each scheme is able to give  $\psi(x) = O(x)$  and  $\frac{1}{\psi(x)} = O(x)$  without much effort, and so might be of interest in some situations. For instance, already the scheme  $\nu_2$  is strong enough to imply Bertrand's postulate.

In fact, there is no known scheme satisfying  $0 \leq E(x) \leq 1$  except the aforementioned 4. In order to improve upon Chebyshev's constants, Sylvester considered more general schemes, including

$$\begin{aligned} \nu_4 &= \delta_1 - \delta_2 - \delta_3 - \delta_6, \\ \nu_5 &= \delta_1 + \delta_{15} - \delta_2 - \delta_3 - \delta_5 - \delta_{30}, \\ \nu_6 &= \delta_1 + \delta_6 + \delta_{70} - \delta_2 - \delta_3 - \delta_5 - \delta_7 - \delta_{210}, \end{aligned} \quad (44)$$

or written in Sylvester's notation

$$\nu_4 = [1, 6; 2, 3], \quad \nu_5 = [1, 15; 2, 3, 5, 30], \quad \nu_6 = [1, 6, 70; 2, 3, 5, 7, 210]. \quad (45)$$



They all satisfy (25), and  $0 \leq E(x) \leq 2$  for all  $x$ . Moreover, we have the following.

- For  $\nu_4$ , the period of  $E(x)$  is 6,  $E(x) = 1$  for  $x < 5$ , and  $N = 6$ .
- For  $\nu_5$ , the period of  $E(x)$  is 30,  $E(x) = 1$  for  $x < 6$ , and  $N = 6$ .
- For  $\nu_6$ , the period of  $E(x)$  is 210,  $E(x) = 1$  for  $x < 10$ , and  $N = 10$ .

The corresponding functions  $E(x)$  are shown in Figure 5. For  $\nu_6$ , the period of  $E(x)$  is 210, and hence Figure 5 does not contain a whole period. This is remedied in Figure 6.

The most striking feature of these schemes is that the condition  $E \leq 1$  is now violated, and hence Theorem 3.1(b) cannot be applied. However, (a) and (c) of that theorem are still valid, meaning that we have

$$V(x) = A(\nu)x + O(\ln x), \quad (46)$$

FIGURE 5. The  $E$ -functions for  $\nu_4$ ,  $\nu_5$ , and  $\nu_6$ .FIGURE 6. A complete period of the  $E$ -function for  $\nu_6$ .

and

$$\psi(x) \leq \frac{N}{N-1} A(\nu)x + O(\ln^2 x). \quad (47)$$

The constants  $A(\nu)$  corresponding to these schemes are

$$A(\nu_4) = 1.0114\dots, \quad A(\nu_5) = 0.9675\dots, \quad A(\nu_6) = 0.9787\dots \quad (48)$$

For a lower bound on  $\psi$ , we need to update Theorem 3.1(b).

**Theorem 4.1.** *Assume the cancellation condition  $\sum_n \nu(n)/n = 0$ , and assume  $E(x) \geq 1$  for  $1 \leq x < N$ . In addition, let  $E \leq 2$  and let  $E(x) \leq 1$  for  $1 \leq x < M$ . Then we have*

$$\psi(x) \geq \left(1 - \frac{N}{M(N-1)}\right) A(\nu)x + O(\ln^2 x). \quad (49)$$

*Proof.* The additional condition can be written as

$$E(x) \leq \chi(x) + \chi(x/M), \quad (50)$$

where

$$\chi(x) = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{for } x \geq 1, \\ 0, & \text{for } x < 1. \end{cases} \quad (51)$$

Thus we have

$$V(x) = \sum_{k \leq x} E(x/k) \Lambda(k) \leq \sum_{k \leq x} \left(1 + \chi\left(\frac{x}{Mk}\right)\right) \Lambda(k) = \psi(x) + \psi(x/M), \quad (52)$$

and by invoking (47) to estimate  $\psi(x/M)$ , we get

$$\psi(x) \geq V(x) - \psi(x/M) \geq \left(1 - \frac{N}{M(N-1)}\right) A(\nu)x + O(\ln^2 x). \quad (53)$$

□



**Example 4.2.** For the schemes  $\nu_4$ ,  $\nu_5$ , and  $\nu_6$ , respectively, we have  $M = 5$ ,  $M = 17$ , and  $M = 13$ . The bound for  $\psi$  is now

$$A'(\nu)x + O(\ln^2 x) \leq \psi(x) \leq B(\nu)x + O(\ln^2 x), \quad (54)$$

with  $A'(\nu) = (1 - \frac{N}{M(N-1)})A(\nu)$  and  $B(\nu) = \frac{N}{N-1}A(\nu)$ , and the numerical values for the aforementioned schemes are computed as

$$\begin{aligned} A'(\nu_4) &= \frac{19}{25}A(\nu_4) = 0.7686\dots, & B(\nu_4) &= \frac{6}{5}A(\nu_4) = 1.2136\dots, \\ A'(\nu_5) &= \frac{79}{85}A(\nu_5) = 0.8992\dots, & B(\nu_5) &= \frac{6}{5}A(\nu_5) = 1.1610\dots, \\ A'(\nu_6) &= \frac{107}{117}A(\nu_6) = 0.8951\dots, & B(\nu_6) &= \frac{10}{9}A(\nu_6) = 1.0875\dots \end{aligned} \quad (55)$$

Among these  $B(\nu_6)$  is found to be better than Chebyshev's  $B(\nu_*) = 1.1055\dots$ , indicating that our work was not in vain. However, the improvement is rather mild. Sylvester's iterative procedure, described next, is designed precisely to extract more improvement from such schemes.

*Remark 4.3.* To continue the theme of Remarks 3.3-3.4, the bound (52) has a nice graphical interpretation. As an example, Figure 7 illustrates how to derive the inequalities  $V(x) \leq \psi(x) + \psi(x/17)$  and  $V(x) \geq \psi(x) - \psi(x/6)$  from (the  $E$ -function of) the scheme  $\nu_5$ .




FIGURE 7. Deriving estimates of  $\psi$  from  $\nu_5$ .

## 5. SYLVESTER'S ITERATIVE REFINEMENT

Sylvester's main contribution to Chebyshev's theory is that he devised a way to iteratively improve the constants of any given scheme. We explain the procedure for  $\nu_4$ . For this scheme, we have

$$a_0x + O(\ln^2 x) \leq \psi(x) \leq b_0x + O(\ln^2 x), \quad (56)$$

where we have introduced the notations  $a_0 = A'(\nu_4)$  and  $b_0 = B(\nu_4)$ . To derive these estimates, we used the bounds

$$\begin{aligned} V(x) &= \psi(x) - \psi(x/6) + \underbrace{\psi(x/5) - \psi(x/6)}_{\geq 0} + \underbrace{\psi(x/7) + \psi(x/11) - 2\psi(x/12)}_{\geq 0} + \dots \\ &\geq \psi(x) - \psi(x/6) \end{aligned} \quad (57)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} V(x) &= \psi(x) + \psi(x/5) - \underbrace{2\psi(x/6) + \psi(x/7) + \psi(x/11)}_{\leq 0} - \underbrace{2\psi(x/12) + \psi(x/13) + \psi(x/17)}_{\leq 0} + \dots \\ &\leq \psi(x) + \psi(x/5). \end{aligned} \quad (58)$$

To improve these bounds, we replace the first by

$$\begin{aligned} V(x) &= \psi(x) - \psi(x/6) + \underbrace{\psi(x/5) - \psi(x/6)}_{\geq 0} + \psi(x/7) - \psi(x/12) + \underbrace{\psi(x/11) - \psi(x/12)}_{\geq 0} + \dots \\ &\geq \psi(x) - \psi(x/6) + \psi(x/7) - \psi(x/12) \end{aligned} \quad (59)$$

and the second by

$$\begin{aligned} V(x) &= \psi(x) + \psi(x/5) - \psi(x/6) + \psi(x/11) - \underbrace{\psi(x/6) + \psi(x/7)}_{\leq 0} - \underbrace{2\psi(x/12)}_{\leq 0} + \dots \\ &\leq \psi(x) + \psi(x/5) - \psi(x/6) + \psi(x/11). \end{aligned} \quad (60)$$

The idea is that, for example, in the first estimate, instead of invoking  $\psi(x/7) - \psi(x/12) \geq 0$  and simply omitting the term  $\psi(x/7) - \psi(x/12)$ , it might be beneficial to use the bounds (56) to extract some “positivity” from  $\psi(x/7) - \psi(x/12)$ . The process is depicted in Figure 8.




FIGURE 8. Green dots indicate the new terms in (59)-(60).

On the graph, the blue dots indicate the terms that existed before, and the green dots indicate the newly added terms into the estimate. In what follows, we will call the terms corresponding to the blue dots the *leading terms*. Thus, by using (56), we get

$$\begin{aligned} \psi(x) - \psi(x/6) &\leq V(x) - \psi(x/7) + \psi(x/12) \leq V(x) - \left(\frac{a_0}{7} - \frac{b_0}{12}\right)x + O(\ln^2 x), \\ \psi(x) &\geq V(x) - \psi(x/5) + \psi(x/6) - \psi(x/11) \geq V(x) + \left(\frac{a_0}{6} - \frac{b_0}{11} - \frac{b_0}{5}\right)x + O(\ln^2 x), \end{aligned}$$

which leads to

$$\left(A + \frac{a_0}{6} - \frac{b_0}{11} - \frac{b_0}{5}\right)x + O(\ln^2 x) \leq \psi(x) \leq \frac{6}{5}\left(A - \frac{a_0}{7} + \frac{b_0}{12}\right)x + O(\ln^2 x), \quad (61)$$

where  $A = A(\nu_4)$ . Hence, with the sequences  $\{a_i\}$  and  $\{b_i\}$  defined by the recurrence

$$\begin{cases} a_{i+1} &= A + \frac{a_i}{6} - \frac{b_i}{11} - \frac{b_i}{5}, \\ b_{i+1} &= \frac{6}{5}\left(A - \frac{a_i}{7} + \frac{b_i}{12}\right), \end{cases} \quad (62)$$

we have the bounds

$$a_i x + O(\ln^2 x) \leq \psi(x) \leq b_i x + O(\ln^2 x). \quad (63)$$

Now, assuming that  $a_i \rightarrow a = \alpha A$  and  $b_i \rightarrow b = \beta A$  as  $i \rightarrow \infty$ , in the limit, the aforementioned recurrence becomes

$$\begin{cases} \alpha &= 1 + \frac{\alpha}{6} - \frac{\beta}{11} - \frac{\beta}{5}, \\ \beta &= \frac{6}{5}\left(1 - \frac{\alpha}{7} + \frac{\beta}{12}\right), \end{cases} \quad (64)$$

yielding

$$\alpha = \frac{4242}{5391} = 0.7868\dots, \quad \beta = \frac{6380}{5391} = 1.18345\dots \quad (65)$$

So if our assumption

$$a_i \rightarrow a = \alpha A = 0.7958\dots, \quad b_i \rightarrow b = \beta A = 1.1969\dots \quad (66)$$

holds, then for any  $\varepsilon > 0$ , we have

$$(a - \varepsilon)x + O(\ln^2 x) \leq \psi(x) \leq (b + \varepsilon)x + O(\ln^2 x), \quad (67)$$

meaning that the constants  $a$  and  $b$  obtained by the recurrence are an improvement on the original constants

$$A'(\nu_4) = 0.7686\dots, \quad B(\nu_4) = 1.2136\dots \quad (68)$$

To verify the assumption, we let  $a_i = (\alpha + \Delta\alpha_i)A$  and  $b_i = (\beta + \Delta\beta_i)A$ , and write the recurrence as

$$\begin{cases} \Delta\alpha_{i+1} &= \frac{\Delta\alpha_i}{6} - \frac{\Delta\beta_i}{11} - \frac{\Delta\beta_i}{5} = \frac{\Delta\alpha_i}{6} - \frac{16}{55}\Delta\beta_i \\ \Delta\beta_{i+1} &= \frac{6}{5}\left(-\frac{\Delta\alpha_i}{7} + \frac{\Delta\beta_i}{12}\right) = -\frac{6}{35}\Delta\alpha_i + \frac{1}{10}\Delta\beta_i \end{cases} \quad (69)$$

or

$$\begin{pmatrix} \Delta\alpha_{i+1} \\ \Delta\beta_{i+1} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{6} & -\frac{16}{55} \\ -\frac{6}{35} & \frac{1}{10} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \Delta\alpha_i \\ \Delta\beta_i \end{pmatrix}. \quad (70)$$

The eigenvalues of the involved matrix are

$$\lambda_1 = -0.0924\dots, \quad \lambda_2 = 0.3591\dots, \quad (71)$$

and therefore regardless of the values of  $C_1, \dots, C_4$ , the sequences

$$\Delta\alpha_i = C_1\lambda_1^i + C_2\lambda_2^i, \quad \Delta\beta_i = C_3\lambda_1^i + C_4\lambda_2^i, \quad (72)$$

both converge to 0 as  $i \rightarrow \infty$ . Moreover, the outcome of the procedure, the constants  $a$  and  $b$  do not depend on the initial values  $a_0$  and  $b_0$ , and depends only on the coefficients of the recurrence (62). Indeed, the preceding argument is valid even when  $a_0 = 0$  or  $a_0 < 0$ . Sylvester's procedure gives better and better bounds as it iterates, starting with, say,  $a_0 = 0$  and  $b_0 = 100$ . In Figure 9, we depict the iterations corresponding to two initial value pairs  $a_0 = 0.1, b_0 = 3$  and  $a_0 = 0, b_0 = 6$ .




FIGURE 9. Sequences  $a_i$  (red) and  $b_i$  (blue).

## 6. COMPUTATIONAL OPTIMIZATION

Before applying Sylvester's procedure to other schemes, let us consider the question of how one could choose the terms of the expansion of  $V(x)$  to keep in the inequalities that lead to the recurrence relation. In the  $i$ -th step of the iteration, we would have the bounds

$$a_i x + O(\ln^2 x) \leq \psi(x) \leq b_i x + O(\ln^2 x). \quad (73)$$

In the next step, suppose that we include the term  $\psi(x/m) - \psi(x/n)$ . Since

$$V(x) = \psi(x) + \dots + \psi(x/m) - \psi(x/n) + \dots \geq \psi(x) + \dots + \left(\frac{a_i}{m} - \frac{b_i}{n}\right)x + \dots, \quad (74)$$

the upper bound would improve if  $\frac{a_i}{m} - \frac{b_i}{n} > 0$  or

$$\frac{n}{m} > \frac{b_i}{a_i}, \quad (75)$$

and the upper bound would get worse if

$$\frac{n}{m} < \frac{b_i}{a_i}. \quad (76)$$

In other words, we shouldn't include pairs whose indices are too close together. Obviously, the same applies to lower bounds as well.

Thus, in order to automate the process, we fix a constant  $\rho > 1$ , and apart from the leading terms, let us include

- the pairs  $\psi(x/m) - \psi(x/n)$  satisfying  $\frac{n}{m} > \rho$  into the upper bound of  $V(x)$ ,
- and the pairs  $-\psi(x/m) + \psi(x/n)$  satisfying  $\frac{n}{m} > \rho$  into the lower bound of  $V(x)$ .

As an example, Figure 10 shows the new terms in green for the scheme  $\nu_4$ , when  $\rho = 1.3$ .




FIGURE 10. With  $\rho = 1.3$ , we get one additional pair in each bound, cf. Figure 8.

Compared to the previous example (59)-(60), each bound has now one additional pair. Namely, we get the bounds

$$\begin{aligned} V(x) &\geq \psi(x) - \psi(x/6) + \psi(x/7) - \psi(x/12) + \psi(x/13) - \psi(x/18) \\ V(x) &\leq \psi(x) + \psi(x/5) - \psi(x/6) + \psi(x/11) - \psi(x/12) + \psi(x/17) \end{aligned} \quad (77)$$

leading to the iteration

$$\begin{cases} a_{i+1} &= A + \left(\frac{1}{6} + \frac{1}{12}\right)a_i - \left(\frac{1}{5} + \frac{1}{11} + \frac{1}{17}\right)b_i \\ b_{i+1} &= \frac{6}{5}A - \left(\frac{1}{7} + \frac{1}{13}\right) \cdot \frac{6}{5}a_i + \left(\frac{1}{12} + \frac{1}{18}\right) \cdot \frac{6}{5}b_i \end{cases} \quad (78)$$

whose limit behaviour is

$$a_i \rightarrow a = 0.7852 \dots, \quad b_i \rightarrow b = 1.5381 \dots \quad (79)$$

This is weaker than the values  $a = 0.7958\dots$  and  $b = 1.1969\dots$  that we found earlier in (66), meaning that we have added too many new terms into the bounds. The additional terms we have added were  $\psi(x/13) - \psi(x/18)$  and  $-\psi(x/12) + \psi(x/17)$ . The index ratios of these pairs, respectively, are

$$\frac{18}{13} = 1.3846\dots < \frac{b}{a} = 1.5381\dots, \quad \frac{17}{12} = 1.4166\dots < \frac{b}{a}, \quad (80)$$

which, in light of (76), indicate that towards the end of the iteration, those pairs were in fact harming the ratio  $\frac{b}{a}$ , rather than helping. To conclude

- If the index ratio  $\frac{n}{m}$  of a given pair  $\pm\psi(x/m) \mp \psi(x/n)$  is less than the final ratio  $\frac{b}{a}$ , then by removing the pair from the procedure, the final ratio will be improved.
- Hence we should try to choose  $\rho$  so that  $\rho \approx \frac{b}{a}$ .

In Figure 11, we illustrate how the outcome of Sylvester's procedure for  $\nu_4$  depends on the parameter  $\rho$ . The first graph shows the constants  $a$  and  $b$ , the second graph the eigenvalues of the iteration matrix, and the third graph the number of terms included into the upper and lower bounds of  $V(x)$ . The plots suggest that near  $\rho = 1.5$  the values of  $a$  and  $b$  are essentially optimal within this one parameter family. Near this value, the upper and lower bounds of  $V(x)$  each has 4 terms. At  $\rho = 1.5$ , we have  $a = 0.7958\dots$  and  $b = 1.1969\dots$ , which we found earlier in (66).





FIGURE 11.  $\nu_4$ .

Now, let us apply Sylvester's procedure to Chebyshev's scheme. Taking  $\rho = 1.2$ , we get

$$\begin{aligned}
 V(x) &= \psi(x) - \psi(x/6) + \psi(x/7) - \psi(x/10) + \underbrace{\psi(x/11) - \psi(x/12) + \dots}_{\geq 0} \\
 &\geq \psi(x) - \psi(x/6) + \psi(x/7) - \psi(x/10), \\
 V(x) &= \psi(x) - \underbrace{\psi(x/6) + \psi(x/7) - \dots + \psi(x/23)}_{\leq 0} - \psi(x/24) + \psi(x/29) - \underbrace{\psi(x/30) + \dots}_{\leq 0} \\
 &\leq \psi(x) - \psi(x/24) + \psi(x/29),
 \end{aligned} \quad (81)$$

cf. Figure 12.

FIGURE 12. Chebyshev's scheme, with  $\rho = 1.2$ .

The corresponding iteration is

$$\begin{cases} a_{i+1} &= A + \frac{a_i}{24} - \frac{b_i}{29} \\ b_{i+1} &= \frac{6}{5} \left( A - \frac{a_i}{7} + \frac{b_i}{10} \right) \end{cases} \quad (82)$$

where  $A = A(\nu_*) = 0.9212\dots$ . Proceeding as before, we set  $a_i = \alpha_i A$  and  $b_i = \beta_i A$ , and write the iteration as

$$\begin{pmatrix} \alpha_{i+1} \\ \beta_{i+1} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ \frac{6}{5} \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{24} & -\frac{1}{29} \\ \frac{6}{5} & -\frac{6}{50} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \alpha_i \\ \beta_i \end{pmatrix}. \quad (83)$$

Since the eigenvalues of the matrix are

$$\lambda_1 = -0.0054\dots, \quad \lambda_2 = 0.1671\dots, \quad (84)$$

we conclude that no matter the values of the constants  $C_1, \dots, C_4$ , the sequences

$$\alpha_i = \alpha + C_1 \lambda_1^i + C_2 \lambda_2^i, \quad \beta_i = \beta + C_3 \lambda_1^i + C_4 \lambda_2^i \quad (85)$$

converge to  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  respectively, as  $i \rightarrow \infty$ . Those limits can easily be found by putting  $\alpha_i = \alpha$  and  $\beta_i = \beta$  into the iteration, as

$$\alpha = \frac{51072}{50999}, \quad \beta = \frac{59595}{50999}, \quad (86)$$

which implies that the inequalities

$$a_i x + O(\ln^2 x) \leq \psi(x) \leq b_i x + O(\ln^2 x) \quad (87)$$

are true, with

$$a_i \rightarrow \alpha A = 0.9226\dots, \quad b_i \rightarrow \beta A = 1.0765\dots \quad (88)$$

This is a significant improvement over Chebyshev's original

$$A(\nu_*) = A = 0.9212\dots, \quad B(\nu_*) = \frac{6}{5} A = 1.1055\dots \quad (89)$$


In fact, the values in (88) are essentially optimal for Chebyshev's scheme, cf. Figure 13.

The values in (88) are obtained by Sylvester in his 1881 work. In the same work, the schemes  $\nu_1$  and  $\nu_4$  appeared for the first time. Sylvester published another paper on the subject in 1892, where he presents, apart from  $\nu_2, \nu_3, \nu_5$ , and  $\nu_6$ , the following gigantic schemes

$$\begin{aligned} \nu_7 &= [1, 6, 10, 210, 231, 1155; 2, 3, 5, 7, 11, 105], \\ \nu_8 &= [1, 6, 10, 14, 105; 2, 3, 5, 7, 11, 13, 385, 1001]. \end{aligned} \quad (90)$$

By applying Sylvester's procedure to  $\nu_5$  with  $\rho = 1.2$ , we get the bounds


$$\begin{aligned} V(x) &\leq \psi(x) + \psi(x/17) - \psi(x/24) + \psi(x/29) \\ &\quad - \psi(x/30) + \psi(x/47) - \psi(x/60) + \psi(x/77), \\ V(x) &\geq \psi(x) - \psi(x/6) + \psi(x/7) - \psi(x/10) + \psi(x/13) - \psi(x/30) \\ &\quad + \psi(x/43) - \psi(x/60) + \psi(x/73) - \psi(x/90), \end{aligned} \quad (91)$$

FIGURE 13. Chebyshev's scheme, with varying  $\rho$ .

leading to the iteration

$$\begin{cases} a_{i+1} &= A + \left(\frac{1}{24} + \frac{1}{30} + \frac{1}{60}\right)a_i - \left(\frac{1}{17} + \frac{1}{29} + \frac{1}{47} + \frac{1}{77}\right)b_i, \\ b_{i+1} &= \frac{6}{5}A - \left(\frac{1}{7} + \frac{1}{13} + \frac{1}{43} + \frac{1}{73}\right) \cdot \frac{6}{5}a_i + \left(\frac{1}{10} + \frac{1}{30} + \frac{1}{60} + \frac{1}{90}\right) \cdot \frac{6}{5}b_i, \end{cases} \quad (92)$$


cf. Figure 14.

FIGURE 14. Scheme  $\nu_5$  with  $\rho = 1.2$ .

The limit of the iteration is found to be

$$a_i \rightarrow a = 0.9119\dots, \quad b_i \rightarrow b = 1.0909\dots, \quad (93)$$

whose ratio is  $\frac{b}{a} = 1.1963\dots$ . These values are virtually optimal for  $\nu_5$ , cf. Figure 15.

FIGURE 15. Scheme  $\nu_5$  with varying  $\rho$ .

Next, for  $\nu_6$ , we take  $\rho = 1.1$ , and get the bounds

$$\begin{aligned}
 V(x) &\leq \psi(x) + \psi(x/13) - \psi(x/10) + \psi(x/11) - \psi(x/15) + \psi(x/17) \\
 &\quad - \psi(x/14) + \psi(x/19) - \psi(x/20) + \psi(x/73) - \psi(x/230) + \psi(x/283) \\
 &\quad - \psi(x/440) + \psi(x/493) - \psi(x/110) + \psi(x/139), \\
 V(x) &\geq \psi(x) - \psi(x/10) + \psi(x/11) - \psi(x/15) + \psi(x/17) - \psi(x/21) \\
 &\quad + \psi(x/23) - \psi(x/28) + \psi(x/31) - \psi(x/35) + \psi(x/71) - \psi(x/100) \\
 &\quad + \psi(x/281) - \psi(x/310) + \psi(x/137) - \psi(x/190) + \psi(x/347) - \psi(x/400).
 \end{aligned} \tag{94}$$

Sylvester himself took  $\rho = 1.1$ , but omitted (for some reason) the terms  $-\psi(x/440) + \psi(x/493)$  and  $\psi(x/281) - \psi(x/310)$  respectively, from the afore-displayed bounds, to get

$$a = 0.941854\dots, \quad b = 1.056726\dots \tag{95}$$

If we include the omitted terms, we get

$$a = 0.941806\dots, \quad b = 1.056825\dots, \tag{96}$$

suggesting that perhaps Sylvester intentionally omitted those terms. In any case, none of the aforementioned values are optimal for  $\nu_6$ , as the choice  $\rho = 1.105$  gives



$$a = 0.944462\dots, \quad b = 1.055800\dots \tag{97}$$

Figure 16 suggests that these values are the best possible.

## 7. SYLVESTER'S GIGANTIC SCHEMES

Finally, let us consider the two gigantic schemes. For  $\nu_7$ , the period of  $E(x)$  is 2310, and we have  $-2 \leq E(x) \leq 2$  for all  $x$ . Moreover, we have  $E(x) \geq 1$  for  $x < 15$ , and the first occurrence of  $E(x) = 2$  is at  $x = 13$ . The first occurrence of  $E(x) = -1$  is at  $x = 105$ , and first occurrence of  $E(x) = -2$  is at  $x = 616$ , cf. Figure 17.



FIGURE 16. Scheme  $\nu_6$  with varying  $\rho$ .FIGURE 17.  $E(x)$  for  $\nu_7$ .

Since especially the lower bound of  $V(x)$  is quite difficult to manage, Sylvester took the upper bound generated by  $\nu_7$  with  $\rho = 1.1$ , and combined it with the lower bound coming from  $\nu_6$ , to obtain

$$a = 0.946197\dots, \quad b = 1.055185\dots \quad (98)$$

After this, he applied the lower bound coming from  $\nu_7$ , but only including the terms up to  $\psi(x/616)$ , which improved  $b$  to

$$b = 1.054239\dots \quad (99)$$

Since we have computer at our disposal, we easily find that  $\rho = 1.113$  is essentially the optimal parameter for  $\nu_7$ , for which

$$a = 0.946585\dots, \quad b = 1.054309\dots, \quad (100)$$

cf. Figure 18. Note that by hybridizing  $\nu_7$  with  $\nu_6$ , Sylvester made the value of  $b$  better than that yielded by  $\nu_7$  alone.




FIGURE 18. Scheme  $\nu_7$  with varying  $\rho$ .

It is now time to look at our absolute champion  $\nu_8$ . For this scheme, the period of  $E(x)$  is 30030, and we have  $-1 \leq E(x) \leq 4$  for all  $x$ . Furthermore, we have  $E(x) \geq 1$  for  $x < 15$ . The first occurrence of  $E(x) = 2$  is at  $x = 19$ , the first occurrence of  $E(x) = -1$  is at  $x = 66$ , the first occurrence of  $E(x) = 3$  is at  $x = 229$ , and the first occurrence of  $E(x) = 4$  is at  $x = 1891$ .

Sylvester used  $\nu_8$  to obtain his personal record

$$a = 0.95695\dots, \quad b = 1.04423\dots \quad (101)$$

Nevertheless, we find that the value  $\rho = 1.09$  is closer to optimality, yielding



$$a = 0.957600\dots, \quad b = 1.043521\dots, \quad (102)$$

cf. Figure 20.

## 8. CONCLUSION

The Chebyshev-Sylvester method is a powerful example of elementary reasoning in number theory. It begins with a fundamental identity relating the summatory logarithm function  $T(x)$  to the Chebyshev function  $\psi(x)$ . By replacing the Möbius function with a finitely-supported proxy  $\nu$ , one can derive initial, explicit bounds on  $\psi(x)$ . Sylvester's main contribution was an iterative procedure that uses these initial bounds to bootstrap a sequence of progressively better bounds, converging to the optimal values achievable for a given scheme  $\nu$ .

While superseded by complex-analytic methods for proving the Prime Number Theorem, the method remains of great pedagogical value. It provides a concrete case study in the techniques of elementary analytic number theory, including convolution identities, summatory functions, and

FIGURE 19. Scheme  $\nu_8$ .FIGURE 20. Scheme  $\nu_8$  with varying  $\rho$ .

bootstrapping arguments. The computational optimization presented here makes this classical theory accessible and demonstrates the full power of Sylvester's ingenious machinery.

It may be helpful to place the present work in the context of some standard references. Davenport's multiplicative number theory text [7] presents the Chebyshev functions and the von Mangoldt

function primarily as entry points to analytic methods via the Dirichlet series

$$-\frac{\zeta'(s)}{\zeta(s)} = \sum_{n \geq 1} \frac{\Lambda(n)}{n^s}.$$

Diamond’s survey [6] collects a wide range of elementary arguments in prime number theory, including Chebyshev’s original inequalities, Erdős–Selberg’s elementary proof of the prime number theorem, and related refinements. In contrast, we have concentrated here on a single elementary mechanism — the use of finitely supported schemes  $\nu$ , the associated function  $E(x)$ , and the Sylvester iteration — and have made this framework fully explicit and computational, without calling on complex analysis or the more global themes.

#### ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author would like to thank Jonah Saks for reading an early draft of these notes, offering valuable feedback, and independently verifying the computer programs during his undergraduate research internship. This work was supported by NSERC Discovery Grants Program.

#### REFERENCES

- [1] P. L. Chebyshev, (1852). Sur la totalité des nombres premiers inférieurs à une limite donnée. *Journal de Mathématiques Pures et Appliquées, 1re série*, 17, 341–365. (Presented in 1848).
- [2] P. L. Chebyshev, (1852). Mémoire sur les nombres premiers. *Journal de Mathématiques Pures et Appliquées, 1re série*, 17, 366–390. (Presented in 1850).
- [3] J. J. Sylvester, (1881). On Tchebycheff’s Theory of the Totality of the Prime Numbers Comprised within Given Limits. *American Journal of Mathematics*, 4(3), 230–247.
- [4] J. J. Sylvester, (1892). On arithmetical series. *Messenger of Mathematics*, 21, 1–19, 87–120.
- [5] T. Gantumur, *numbers: Python notebooks for Chebyshev–Sylvester schemes*, GitHub repository, <https://github.com/gantumur/numbers/>, accessed 10 December 2025.
- [6] H. G. Diamond, (1982). Elementary methods in the study of the distribution of prime numbers. *Bulletin of the American Mathematical Society*, 7(3), 553–589.
- [7] H. Davenport, *Multiplicative Number Theory*, 3rd ed., revised by H. L. Montgomery, Graduate Texts in Mathematics, Vol. 74, Springer-Verlag, New York, 2000.