

Article

Not peer-reviewed version

---

# On the Piatetski–Shapiro Prime Number Theorem

---

[Runbo Li](#) \*

Posted Date: 15 April 2025

doi: 10.20944/preprints202504.1190.v1

Keywords: prime; sieve methods; Piatetski--Shapiro sequences



Preprints.org is a free multidisciplinary platform providing preprint service that is dedicated to making early versions of research outputs permanently available and citable. Preprints posted at Preprints.org appear in Web of Science, Crossref, Google Scholar, Scilit, Europe PMC.

Copyright: This open access article is published under a Creative Commons CC BY 4.0 license, which permit the free download, distribution, and reuse, provided that the author and preprint are cited in any reuse.

Disclaimer/Publisher's Note: The statements, opinions, and data contained in all publications are solely those of the individual author(s) and contributor(s) and not of MDPI and/or the editor(s). MDPI and/or the editor(s) disclaim responsibility for any injury to people or property resulting from any ideas, methods, instructions, or products referred to in the content.

Article

# On the Piatetski–Shapiro Prime Number Theorem

Runbo Li

International Curriculum Center, The High School Affiliated to Renmin University of China, Beijing, China;  
runbo.li.carey@gmail.com

**Abstract:** The author sharpens a result of Rivat and Wu (2000), showing that for sufficiently large  $n$ , there are infinitely many primes of the form  $[n^c]$  for  $1 < c < \frac{211}{178}$ .

**Keywords:** prime; sieve methods; Piatetski–Shapiro sequences

**2020 Mathematics Subject Classification:** 11N35; 11N36

## Contents

1. Introduction	1
2. Sieve Asymptotic Formulas	2
3. The Final Decomposition	3
4. Application: Piatetski–Shapiro–Vinogradov Theorem	6
5. References	6

## 1. Introduction

The Euler’s conjecture, which states that there are infinitely many primes of the form  $n^2 + 1$ , is one of Landau’s problems on prime numbers. There are several ways to attack this conjecture. One way is to relax the number of prime factors of  $f(n)$ , and the best result in this way is due to Iwaniec [1]. Building on the previous work of Richert [2], he showed that for any irreducible polynomial  $f(n) = an^2 + bn + c$  with  $a > 0$  and  $c \equiv 1 \pmod{2}$ , there are infinitely many  $x$  such that  $f(x)$  has at most 2 prime factors.

Another possible way is to consider the degree of the polynomial. In 1953, Piatetski–Shapiro [3] has proposed to investigate the prime numbers of the form  $[n^c]$ , where  $c > 1$  and  $[n^c]$  denotes the integer part of  $n^c$ . Clearly  $[n^c]$  can be regarded as "polynomials of degree  $c$ ". Define

$$\pi_c(x) := |\{n \leq x : [n^c] \text{ is a prime number}\}|,$$

then he has shown that  $\pi_c(x) \sim x(c \log x)^{-1}$  holds for any  $1 < c < \frac{12}{11} \approx 1.0909$  as  $x \rightarrow \infty$ . This range has been improved by many authors, and the best record now is due to Rivat and Sargos [4], where they proved the above asymptotic formula holds for any  $1 < c < \frac{2817}{2426} \approx 1.1612$ .

In 1992, Rivat [5] first introduced a sieve method into this problem. He established a lower bound with correct order (instead of an asymptotic formula) with  $1 < c < \frac{7}{6} \approx 1.1616$ . After this, many improvements were made and the range of  $c$  was enlarged successively to

$$1 < c < \frac{20}{17} \approx 1.1765, \quad 1 < c < \frac{13}{11} \approx 1.1818, \quad 1 < c < \frac{45}{38} \approx 1.1842 \text{ and } 1 < c < \frac{243}{205} \approx 1.18536$$

by Jia [6] (and Baker, Harman and Rivat [7]), Jia [8], Kumchev [9] and Rivat and Wu [10] respectively. In this paper, we obtain the following result.

**Theorem 1.1.** For sufficiently large  $x$  and  $1 < c < \frac{211}{178} \approx 1.18539$ , we have  $\pi_c(x) \gg x(c \log x)^{-1}$ .

Throughout this paper, we always suppose that  $x$  is a sufficiently large integer,  $\gamma$  and  $\theta_0$ – $\theta_6$  are positive numbers which will be fixed later. Let  $\frac{37}{44} < \gamma < \frac{28}{33}$  and  $c = \frac{1}{\gamma}$ . The letter  $p$ , with or without subscript, is reserved for prime numbers. We define the sets  $\mathcal{A}$  and  $\mathcal{B}$  as

$$\mathcal{A} = \{m : m = [n^c], x \leq n^c < 2x\}, \quad \mathcal{B} = \{n : x \leq n < 2x\},$$

and we put

$$\mathcal{A}_d = \{a : ad \in \mathcal{A}\}, \quad \mathcal{B}_d = \{b : bd \in \mathcal{A}\}, \quad P(z) = \prod_{p < z} p, \quad S(\mathcal{A}, z) = \sum_{\substack{a \in \mathcal{A} \\ (a, P(z))=1}} 1, \quad S(\mathcal{B}, z) = \sum_{\substack{b \in \mathcal{B} \\ (b, P(z))=1}} 1.$$

Then we only need to show that  $S(\mathcal{A}, (2x)^{\frac{1}{2}}) > 0$ . Our aim is to show that the sparser set  $\mathcal{A}$  contains the expected proportion of primes compared to the bigger set  $\mathcal{B}$ , which requires us to decompose  $S(\mathcal{A}, (2x)^{\frac{1}{2}})$  and prove asymptotic formulas of the form

$$S(\mathcal{A}, z) = (1 + o(1))x^{\gamma-1}(2^\gamma - 1)S(\mathcal{B}, z) \quad (1)$$

for some parts of it, and drop the other positive parts. The asymptotic formulas will be given in the next section. We define the boolean function as

$$\text{Bool}[X] = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } X \text{ is true,} \\ 0 & \text{if } X \text{ is false.} \end{cases}$$

## 2. Sieve Asymptotic Formulas

In this section we provide some asymptotic formulas for sieve functions. Let  $\omega(u)$  denote the Buchstab function determined by the following differential–difference equation

$$\begin{cases} \omega(u) = \frac{1}{u}, & 1 \leq u \leq 2, \\ (u\omega(u))' = \omega(u-1), & u \geq 2. \end{cases}$$

Following [10] directly, we set  $\gamma = \frac{178}{211}$ ,  $\theta_0 = 6\gamma - 5$ ,  $\theta_1 = 1 - \gamma$ ,  $\theta_2 = \frac{61\gamma - 49}{11}$ ,  $\theta_3 = 3 - 3\gamma$ ,  $\theta_4 = 3\gamma - 2$ ,  $\theta_5 = \frac{60 - 61\gamma}{11}$ ,  $\theta_6 = \gamma$  and let  $p_j = x^{t_j}$ . We define the asymptotic region  $I$  as

$$I(m, n) := \{\theta_1 \leq m < \theta_2 \text{ or } \theta_3 \leq m < \theta_4 \text{ or } \theta_5 \leq m < \theta_6 \text{ or} \\ \theta_1 \leq m + n < \theta_2 \text{ or } \theta_3 \leq m + n < \theta_4 \text{ or } \theta_5 \leq m + n < \theta_6\}.$$

**Lemma 2.1.** We can give an asymptotic formula for

$$\sum_{t_1 \cdots t_n} S(\mathcal{A}_{p_1 \cdots p_n}, x^{\theta_0})$$

if we have  $t_1 + \dots + t_n < \theta_4$ .

**Lemma 2.2.** We can give an asymptotic formula for

$$\sum_{t_1 \cdots t_n} S(\mathcal{A}_{p_1 \cdots p_n}, p_n)$$

if we can group  $(t_1, \dots, t_n)$  into  $(m, n) \in I$ .

### 3. The Final Decomposition

Before decomposing, we define non-overlapping regions  $U_1$ – $U_3$  as

$$\begin{aligned} U_1(m, n) &:= \{(m, n) \notin I, m + 2n < \theta_4\} \\ U_2(m, n) &:= \left\{ (m, n) \notin I, m + 2n \geq \theta_4, \frac{1 - m - n}{n} < 2 \right\}, \\ U_3(m, n) &:= \left\{ (m, n) \notin I, m + 2n \geq \theta_4, \frac{1 - m - n}{n} \geq 2 \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

We shall apply different techniques to the different regions above. By Buchstab's identity, we have

$$\begin{aligned} S\left(\mathcal{A}, (2x)^{\frac{1}{2}}\right) &= S\left(\mathcal{A}, x^{\theta_0}\right) - \sum_{\theta_0 \leq t_1 < \frac{1}{2}} S\left(\mathcal{A}_{p_1}, x^{\theta_0}\right) + \sum_{\substack{\theta_0 \leq t_1 < \frac{1}{2} \\ \theta_0 \leq t_2 < \min\left(t_1, \frac{1}{2}(1-t_1)\right)}} S\left(\mathcal{A}_{p_1 p_2}, p_2\right) \\ &= S\left(\mathcal{A}, x^{\theta_0}\right) - \sum_{\theta_0 \leq t_1 < \frac{1}{2}} S\left(\mathcal{A}_{p_1}, x^{\theta_0}\right) + \sum_{\substack{\theta_0 \leq t_1 < \frac{1}{2} \\ \theta_0 \leq t_2 < \min\left(t_1, \frac{1}{2}(1-t_1)\right) \\ (t_1, t_2) \in I}} S\left(\mathcal{A}_{p_1 p_2}, p_2\right) \\ &\quad + \sum_{\substack{\theta_0 \leq t_1 < \frac{1}{2} \\ \theta_0 \leq t_2 < \min\left(t_1, \frac{1}{2}(1-t_1)\right) \\ (t_1, t_2) \in U_1}} S\left(\mathcal{A}_{p_1 p_2}, p_2\right) + \sum_{\substack{\theta_0 \leq t_1 < \frac{1}{2} \\ \theta_0 \leq t_2 < \min\left(t_1, \frac{1}{2}(1-t_1)\right) \\ (t_1, t_2) \in U_2}} S\left(\mathcal{A}_{p_1 p_2}, p_2\right) \\ &\quad + \sum_{\substack{\theta_0 \leq t_1 < \frac{1}{2} \\ \theta_0 \leq t_2 < \min\left(t_1, \frac{1}{2}(1-t_1)\right) \\ (t_1, t_2) \in U_3}} S\left(\mathcal{A}_{p_1 p_2}, p_2\right) \\ &= S_1 - S_2 + S_I + S_{U1} + S_{U2} + S_{U3}. \end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

By Lemma 2.1 and Lemma 2.2, we can give asymptotic formulas for  $S_1$ ,  $S_2$  and  $S_I$ . For  $S_{U1}$ , we can use Buchstab's identity twice more to get

$$\begin{aligned}
 S_{U1} &= \sum_{\substack{\theta_0 \leq t_1 < \frac{1}{2} \\ \theta_0 \leq t_2 < \min(t_1, \frac{1}{2}(1-t_1)) \\ (t_1, t_2) \in U_1}} S(\mathcal{A}_{p_1 p_2}, p_2) = \sum_{\substack{\theta_0 \leq t_1 < \frac{1}{2} \\ \theta_0 \leq t_2 < \min(t_1, \frac{1}{2}(1-t_1)) \\ (t_1, t_2) \in U_1}} S(\mathcal{A}_{p_1 p_2}, x^{\theta_0}) \\
 &\quad - \sum_{\substack{\theta_0 \leq t_1 < \frac{1}{2} \\ \theta_0 \leq t_2 < \min(t_1, \frac{1}{2}(1-t_1)) \\ (t_1, t_2) \in U_1 \\ \theta_0 \leq t_3 < \min(t_2, \frac{1}{2}(1-t_1-t_2)) \\ (t_1, t_2, t_3) \text{ can be partitioned into } (m, n) \in I}} S(\mathcal{A}_{p_1 p_2 p_3}, p_3) \\
 &\quad - \sum_{\substack{\theta_0 \leq t_1 < \frac{1}{2} \\ \theta_0 \leq t_2 < \min(t_1, \frac{1}{2}(1-t_1)) \\ (t_1, t_2) \in U_1 \\ \theta_0 \leq t_3 < \min(t_2, \frac{1}{2}(1-t_1-t_2)) \\ (t_1, t_2, t_3) \text{ cannot be partitioned into } (m, n) \in I}} S(\mathcal{A}_{p_1 p_2 p_3}, x^{\theta_0}) \\
 &\quad + \sum_{\substack{\theta_0 \leq t_1 < \frac{1}{2} \\ \theta_0 \leq t_2 < \min(t_1, \frac{1}{2}(1-t_1)) \\ (t_1, t_2) \in U_1 \\ \theta_0 \leq t_3 < \min(t_2, \frac{1}{2}(1-t_1-t_2)) \\ (t_1, t_2, t_3) \text{ cannot be partitioned into } (m, n) \in I \\ \theta_0 \leq t_4 < \min(t_3, \frac{1}{2}(1-t_1-t_2-t_3)) \\ (t_1, t_2, t_3, t_4) \text{ can be partitioned into } (m, n) \in I}} S(\mathcal{A}_{p_1 p_2 p_3 p_4}, p_4) \\
 &\quad + \sum_{\substack{\theta_0 \leq t_1 < \frac{1}{2} \\ \theta_0 \leq t_2 < \min(t_1, \frac{1}{2}(1-t_1)) \\ (t_1, t_2) \in U_1 \\ \theta_0 \leq t_3 < \min(t_2, \frac{1}{2}(1-t_1-t_2)) \\ (t_1, t_2, t_3) \text{ cannot be partitioned into } (m, n) \in I \\ \theta_0 \leq t_4 < \min(t_3, \frac{1}{2}(1-t_1-t_2-t_3)) \\ (t_1, t_2, t_3, t_4) \text{ cannot be partitioned into } (m, n) \in I}} S(\mathcal{A}_{p_1 p_2 p_3 p_4}, p_4) \\
 &= S_{U11} - S_{U12} - S_{U13} + S_{U14} + S_{U15}. \tag{3}
 \end{aligned}$$

We can give asymptotic formulas for  $S_{U11}-S_{U14}$ . For  $S_{U15}$  we can perform Buchstab's identity more times to make savings, but we choose to discard all of it for the sake of simplicity. Combining the above cases, we get a loss from  $S_{U1}$  of

$$\begin{aligned}
 &\int_{\theta_0}^{\frac{1}{2}} \int_{\theta_0}^{\min(t_1, \frac{1-t_1}{2})} \int_{\theta_0}^{\min(t_2, \frac{1-t_1-t_2}{2})} \int_{\theta_0}^{\min(t_3, \frac{1-t_1-t_2-t_3}{2})} \\
 &\quad \text{Bool}e[(t_1, t_2, t_3, t_4) \in U_{15}] \frac{\omega\left(\frac{1-t_1-t_2-t_3-t_4}{t_4}\right)}{t_1 t_2 t_3 t_4^2} dt_4 dt_3 dt_2 dt_1 \\
 &< 0.001624 \tag{4}
 \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
 U_{15}(t_1, t_2, t_3, t_4) &:= \left\{ (t_1, t_2) \in U_1, \theta_0 \leq t_3 < \min\left(t_2, \frac{1}{2}(1-t_1-t_2)\right), \right. \\
 &\quad (t_1, t_2, t_3) \text{ cannot be partitioned into } (m, n) \in I, \\
 &\quad \theta_0 \leq t_4 < \min\left(t_3, \frac{1}{2}(1-t_1-t_2-t_3)\right), \\
 &\quad \left. (t_1, t_2, t_3, t_4) \text{ cannot be partitioned into } (m, n) \in I \right\}.
 \end{aligned}$$

For  $S_{U2}$ , we cannot decompose further but have to discard the whole region giving the loss

$$\int_{\theta_0}^{\frac{1}{2}} \int_{\theta_0}^{\min(t_1, \frac{1-t_1}{2})} \text{Bool}[(t_1, t_2) \in U_2] \frac{\omega\left(\frac{1-t_1-t_2}{t_2}\right)}{t_1 t_2^2} dt_2 dt_1 < 0.412666. \quad (5)$$

For  $S_{U3}$  we cannot use Buchstab's identity in a straightforward manner, but we can use Buchstab's identity in reverse to make almost-primes visible. The details of using Buchstab's identity in reverse are similar to those in [11] and [12]. By using Buchstab's identity in reverse twice, we have

$$\begin{aligned} S_{U3} &= \sum_{\substack{\theta_0 \leq t_1 < \frac{1}{2} \\ \theta_0 \leq t_2 < \min(t_1, \frac{1}{2}(1-t_1)) \\ (t_1, t_2) \in U_3}} S(\mathcal{A}_{p_1 p_2}, p_2) \\ &= \sum_{\substack{\theta_0 \leq t_1 < \frac{1}{2} \\ \theta_0 \leq t_2 < \min(t_1, \frac{1}{2}(1-t_1)) \\ (t_1, t_2) \in U_3}} S\left(\mathcal{A}_{p_1 p_2}, \left(\frac{2x}{p_1 p_2}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}\right) \\ &+ \sum_{\substack{\theta_0 \leq t_1 < \frac{1}{2} \\ \theta_0 \leq t_2 < \min(t_1, \frac{1}{2}(1-t_1)) \\ (t_1, t_2) \in U_3 \\ t_2 < t_3 < \frac{1}{2}(1-t_1-t_2)}} S(\mathcal{A}_{p_1 p_2 p_3}, p_3) \\ &= \sum_{\substack{\theta_0 \leq t_1 < \frac{1}{2} \\ \theta_0 \leq t_2 < \min(t_1, \frac{1}{2}(1-t_1)) \\ (t_1, t_2) \in U_3}} S\left(\mathcal{A}_{p_1 p_2}, \left(\frac{2x}{p_1 p_2}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}\right) \\ &+ \sum_{\substack{\theta_0 \leq t_1 < \frac{1}{2} \\ \theta_0 \leq t_2 < \min(t_1, \frac{1}{2}(1-t_1)) \\ (t_1, t_2) \in U_3 \\ t_2 < t_3 < \frac{1}{2}(1-t_1-t_2) \\ (t_1, t_2, t_3) \text{ can be partitioned into } (m, n) \in I}} S(\mathcal{A}_{p_1 p_2 p_3}, p_3) \\ &+ \sum_{\substack{\theta_0 \leq t_1 < \frac{1}{2} \\ \theta_0 \leq t_2 < \min(t_1, \frac{1}{2}(1-t_1)) \\ (t_1, t_2) \in U_3 \\ t_2 < t_3 < \frac{1}{2}(1-t_1-t_2) \\ (t_1, t_2, t_3) \text{ cannot be partitioned into } (m, n) \in I}} S\left(\mathcal{A}_{p_1 p_2 p_3}, \left(\frac{2x}{p_1 p_2 p_3}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}\right) \\ &+ \sum_{\substack{\theta_0 \leq t_1 < \frac{1}{2} \\ \theta_0 \leq t_2 < \min(t_1, \frac{1}{2}(1-t_1)) \\ (t_1, t_2) \in U_3 \\ t_2 < t_3 < \frac{1}{2}(1-t_1-t_2) \\ (t_1, t_2, t_3) \text{ cannot be partitioned into } (m, n) \in I \\ t_3 < t_4 < \frac{1}{2}(1-t_1-t_2-t_3) \\ (t_1, t_2, t_3, t_4) \text{ can be partitioned into } (m, n) \in I}} S(\mathcal{A}_{p_1 p_2 p_3 p_4}, p_4) \\ &+ \sum_{\substack{\theta_0 \leq t_1 < \frac{1}{2} \\ \theta_0 \leq t_2 < \min(t_1, \frac{1}{2}(1-t_1)) \\ (t_1, t_2) \in U_3 \\ t_2 < t_3 < \frac{1}{2}(1-t_1-t_2) \\ (t_1, t_2, t_3) \text{ cannot be partitioned into } (m, n) \in I \\ t_3 < t_4 < \frac{1}{2}(1-t_1-t_2-t_3) \\ (t_1, t_2, t_3, t_4) \text{ cannot be partitioned into } (m, n) \in I}} S(\mathcal{A}_{p_1 p_2 p_3 p_4}, p_4) \\ &= S_{U31} + S_{U32} + S_{U33} + S_{U34} + S_{U35}. \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

We can give asymptotic formulas for  $S_{U_{32}}$  and  $S_{U_{34}}$ , hence we can subtract them from the loss. In this way we obtain a loss from  $S_{U_3}$  of

$$\begin{aligned} & \left( \int_{\theta_0}^{\frac{1}{2}} \int_{\theta_0}^{\min(t_1, \frac{1-t_1}{2})} \text{Bool}e[(t_1, t_2) \in U_3] \frac{\omega\left(\frac{1-t_1-t_2}{t_2}\right)}{t_1 t_2^2} dt_2 dt_1 \right) \\ & - \left( \int_{\theta_0}^{\frac{1}{2}} \int_{\theta_0}^{\min(t_1, \frac{1-t_1}{2})} \int_{t_2}^{\frac{1-t_1-t_2}{2}} \text{Bool}e[(t_1, t_2, t_3) \in U_{32}] \frac{\omega\left(\frac{1-t_1-t_2-t_3}{t_3}\right)}{t_1 t_2 t_3^2} dt_3 dt_2 dt_1 \right) \\ & - \left( \int_{\theta_0}^{\frac{1}{2}} \int_{\theta_0}^{\min(t_1, \frac{1-t_1}{2})} \int_{t_2}^{\frac{1-t_1-t_2}{2}} \int_{t_3}^{\frac{1-t_1-t_2-t_3}{2}} \text{Bool}e[(t_1, t_2, t_3, t_4) \in U_{34}] \frac{\omega\left(\frac{1-t_1-t_2-t_3-t_4}{t_4}\right)}{t_1 t_2 t_3 t_4^2} dt_4 dt_3 dt_2 dt_1 \right) \\ & < (0.98983 - 0.390798 - 0.020403) = 0.578629 \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} U_{32}(t_1, t_2, t_3) &:= \left\{ (t_1, t_2) \in U_3, t_2 < t_3 < \frac{1}{2}(1 - t_1 - t_2), \right. \\ &\quad \left. (t_1, t_2, t_3) \text{ can be partitioned into } (m, n) \in I \right\}, \\ U_{34}(t_1, t_2, t_3, t_4) &:= \left\{ (t_1, t_2) \in U_3, t_2 < t_3 < \frac{1}{2}(1 - t_1 - t_2), \right. \\ &\quad \left. (t_1, t_2, t_3) \text{ cannot be partitioned into } (m, n) \in I, \right. \\ &\quad \left. t_3 < t_4 < \frac{1}{2}(1 - t_1 - t_2 - t_3), \right. \\ &\quad \left. (t_1, t_2, t_3, t_4) \text{ can be partitioned into } (m, n) \in I \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Finally, by (2)–(7), the total loss is less than

$$0.001624 + 0.412666 + 0.578629 < 0.993 < 1$$

and the proof of Theorem 1.1 is completed.

#### 4. Application: Piatetski–Shapiro–Vinogradov Theorem

In 1992, Balog and Friedlander [13] considered a hybrid of the Three Primes Theorem and the Piatetski–Shapiro prime number theorem. They proved that every sufficiently large odd integer can be written as the sum of three primes of the form  $[n^{c_0}]$  for any fixed  $1 < c_0 < \frac{21}{20}$ , and every sufficiently large odd integer can be written as the sum of two normal primes and another prime of the form  $[n^{c_1}]$  for any fixed  $1 < c_1 < \frac{9}{8}$ . Their result has been improved by many authors. Now the best range of  $c_1$  is due to Cai [14], where he proved the above statement of  $c_1$  holds for any fixed  $1 < c_1 < \frac{243}{205}$ . Using the same method but with our Theorem 1.1 instead of Rivat and Wu's result, we can easily deduce the following.

**Theorem 4.1.** Every sufficiently large odd integer can be written as the sum of two normal primes and another prime of the form  $[n^{c_1}]$  for any fixed  $1 < c_1 < \frac{211}{178}$ .

We shall consider the range of  $c_0$  in another paper.

**Acknowledgments:** The author would like to thank Professor Jie Wu for his encouragement and some helpful discussions.

#### References

1. Iwaniec, H. Almost-primes represented by quadratic polynomials. *Invent. Math.* **1978**, *47*, 171–188.
2. Richert, H.E. Selberg's sieve with weights. *Mathematika* **1969**, *16*, 1–22.

3. Piatetski-Shapiro, I.I. On the distribution of prime numbers in sequences of the form  $[f(n)]$ . *Mat. Sb.* **1953**, *33*, 559–566.
4. Rivat, J.; Sargos, P. Nombres premiers de la forme  $[n^c]$ . *Canad. J. Math. Vol.* **2001**, *53*, 414–433.
5. Rivat, J. Autour d'un théorème de Piatetski-Shapiro (Nombres premiers dans la suite  $[n^c]$ ). *Thèse de Doctorat* **1992**, Université de Paris-Sud.
6. Jia, C. On Piatetski-Shapiro prime number theorem I. *Chinese Ann. Math. Ser. B.* **1994**, *15*, 9–22.
7. Baker, R.C.; Harman, G.; Rivat, J. Primes of the form  $[n^c]$ . *J. Number Theory* **1995**, *50*, 261–277.
8. Jia, C. On Piatetski-Shapiro prime number theorem II. *Science in China* **1993**, *36*, 913–926.
9. Kumchev, A. On the distribution of prime numbers of the form  $[n^c]$ . *Glasgow Math. J.* **1999**, *41*, 85–102.
10. Rivat, J.; Wu, J. Prime numbers of the form  $[n^c]$ . *Glasgow Math. J.* **2001**, *43*, 237–254.
11. Li, R. Primes in almost all short intervals. *arXiv e-prints* **2024**, p. arXiv:2407.05651v5, [arXiv:math.NT/2407.05651]. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2407.05651>.
12. Li, R. The number of primes in short intervals and numerical calculations for Harman's sieve. *arXiv e-prints* **2025**, p. arXiv:2308.04458v6, [arXiv:math.NT/2308.04458]. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2308.04458>.
13. Balog, A.; Friedlander, J. A hybrid of theorems of Vinogradov and Piatetski-Shapiro. *Pacific J. Math.* **1992**, *156*, 45–62.
14. Cai, Y. A remark on the Piatetski-Shapiro-Vinogradov theorem. *Acta Arith.* **2003**, *110*, 73–75.

**Disclaimer/Publisher's Note:** The statements, opinions and data contained in all publications are solely those of the individual author(s) and contributor(s) and not of MDPI and/or the editor(s). MDPI and/or the editor(s) disclaim responsibility for any injury to people or property resulting from any ideas, methods, instructions or products referred to in the content.