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#### Abstract

The $n$th Ramanujan prime is the smallest positive integer $R_{n}$ such that for all $x \geq R_{n}$ the interval $(x / 2, x]$ contains at least $n$ primes. In this paper we undertake a study of the sequence $\left(\pi\left(R_{n}\right)\right)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$, which tells us where the $n$th Ramanujan prime appears in the sequence of all primes. In the first part we establish new explicit upper and lower bounds for the number of primes up to the $n$th Ramanujan prime, which imply an asymptotic formula for $\pi\left(R_{n}\right)$ conjectured by Yang and Togbé. In the second part of this paper, we use these explicit estimates to derive a result concerning an inequality involving $\pi\left(R_{n}\right)$ conjectured by of Sondow, Nicholson and Noe.


## 1. Introduction

Let $\pi(x)$ denotes the number of primes not exceeding $x$. In 1896, Hadamard [6] and de la ValléePoussin [15] proved, independently, the asymptotic formula $\pi(x) \sim x / \log x$ as $x \rightarrow \infty$, which is known as the Prime Number Theorem. Here, $\log x$ is the natural logarithm of $x$. In his later paper [16], where he proved the existence of a zero-free region for the Riemann zeta-function $\zeta(s)$ to the left of the line $\operatorname{Re}(s)=1$, de la Vallée-Poussin also estimated the error term in the Prime Number Theorem by showing

$$
\begin{equation*}
\pi(x)=\frac{x}{\log x}+O\left(\frac{x}{\log ^{2} x}\right) . \tag{1.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

The prime counting function and the asymptotic formula (1.1) play an important role in the definition of Ramanujan primes, which have their origin in Bertrand's postulate.

Bertrand's Postulate. For each $n \in \mathbb{N}$ there is a prime number $p$ with $n<p \leq 2 n$.
In terms of the prime counting function, Bertrand's postulate states that $\pi(2 n)-\pi(n) \geq 1$ for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Bertrand's postulate was first proved by Chebyshev [4] in 1850. In 1919, Ramanujan [8] proved an extension of Bertrand's postulate by investigating inequalities of the form $\pi(x)-\pi(x / 2) \geq n$ for $n \in \mathbb{N}$. In particular, he found that

$$
\pi(x)-\pi\left(\frac{x}{2}\right) \geq 1 \quad(\text { respectively } 2,3,4,5, \ldots)
$$

for every

$$
\begin{equation*}
x \geq 2 \quad(\text { respectively } 11,17,29,41, \ldots) . \tag{1.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

Using the fact that $\pi(x)-\pi(x / 2) \rightarrow \infty$ as $x \rightarrow \infty$, which follows from (1.1), Sondow [10] introduced the notation $R_{n}$ to represent the smallest positive integer for which the inequality $\pi(x)-\pi(x / 2) \geq n$ holds for every $x \geq R_{n}$. In (1.2), Ramanujan calculated the numbers $R_{1}=2, R_{2}=11, R_{3}=17, R_{4}=29$, and $R_{5}=41$. All these numbers are prime, and it can easily be shown that $R_{n}$ is actually prime for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$. In honor of Ramanujan's proof, Sondow [10] called the number $R_{n}$ the $n$th Ramanujan prime. A legitimate question is, where the $n$th Ramanujan prime appears in the sequence of all primes. Letting $p_{k}$ denotes the $k$ th prime number, we have $R_{n}=p_{\pi\left(R_{n}\right)}$, and it seems natural to study the sequence $\left(\pi\left(R_{n}\right)\right)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$. The first few values of $\pi\left(R_{n}\right)$ for $n=1,2,3, \ldots$ are

$$
\pi\left(R_{n}\right)=1,5,7,10,13,15,17,19,20,25,26,28,31,35,36,39,41,42,49,50,51,52,53, \ldots
$$

For further values of $\pi\left(R_{n}\right)$, see 9 . Since both $R_{n}$ for large $n$ and $\pi(x)$ for large $x$ are hard to compute, we are interested in explicit upper and lower bounds for $\pi\left(R_{n}\right)$. Sondow [10, Theorem 2] found a first lower bound for $\pi\left(R_{n}\right)$ by showing that the inequality

$$
\begin{equation*}
\pi\left(R_{n}\right)>2 n \tag{1.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

[^0]holds for every positive integer $n \geq 2$. Combined with [10, Theorem 3] and the Prime Number Theorem, we get the asymptotic relation
\[

$$
\begin{equation*}
\pi\left(R_{n}\right) \sim 2 n \quad(n \rightarrow \infty) \tag{1.4}
\end{equation*}
$$

\]

This, together with (1.3), means, roughly speaking, that the probability of a randomly chosen prime being a Ramanujan prime is slight less than $1 / 2$. The first upper bound for $\pi\left(R_{n}\right)$ is also due to Sondow [10, Theorem 2]. He found that the upper bound $\pi\left(R_{n}\right)<4 n$ holds for every positive integer $n$, and conjectured [10, Conjecture 1] that the inequality $\pi\left(R_{n}\right)<3 n$ holds for every positive integer $n$. This conjecture was proved by Laishram [7. Theorem 2] in 2010. Applying Theorem 4 from the paper of Sondow, Nicholson and Noe [11], we get a refined upper bound for the number of primes less or equal to $\pi\left(R_{n}\right)$, namely that the inequality $\pi\left(R_{n}\right) \leq \pi\left(41 p_{3 n} / 47\right)$ holds for every positive integer $n$ with equality at $n=5$. Srinivasan [12, Theorem 1.1] proved that for every $\varepsilon>0$ there exists a positive integer $N=N(\varepsilon)$ such that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\pi\left(R_{n}\right)<\lfloor 2 n(1+\varepsilon)\rfloor \tag{1.5}
\end{equation*}
$$

for every positive integer $n \geq N$ and conclude [12, Corollary 2.1] that $\pi\left(R_{n}\right) \leq 2.6 n$ for every positive integer $n$. The present author [1, Theorem 3.22] showed independently that for each $\varepsilon>0$ there is a computable positive integer $N=N(\varepsilon)$ so that $\pi\left(R_{n}\right) \leq\lceil 2 n(1+\varepsilon)\rceil$ for every positive integer $n \geq N$ and conclude that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\pi\left(R_{n}\right) \leq\lceil t n\rceil \tag{1.6}
\end{equation*}
$$

for every positive integer $n$, where $t$ is a arbitrary real number satisfying $t>48 / 19$. The inequality (1.5) was improved by Srinivasan and Nicholson [14, Theorem 1]. They proved that

$$
\pi\left(R_{n}\right) \leq 2 n\left(1+\frac{3}{\log n+\log \log n-4}\right)
$$

for every positive integer $n \geq 242$. Later, Srinivasan and Arés [13, Theorem 1.1] found a more precise result by showing that for every $\varepsilon>0$ there exists a positive integer $N=N(\varepsilon)$ such that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\pi\left(R_{n}\right)<2 n\left(1+\frac{\log 2+\varepsilon}{\log n+j(n)}\right) \tag{1.7}
\end{equation*}
$$

for every positive integer $n \geq N$, where $j$ is any positive function satisfying $j(n) \rightarrow \infty$ and $n j^{\prime}(n) \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Setting $\varepsilon=0.5$ and $j(n)=\log \log n-\log 2-0.5$, they found [13, Corollary] that the inequality (1.7) holds for every positive integer $n \geq 44$. In 2016, Yang and Togbé [17, Theorem 1.2] established the following current best upper and lower bound for $\pi\left(R_{n}\right)$ when $n$ satisfies $n>10^{300}$.
Proposition 1.1 (Yang, Togbé). Let $n$ be a positive integer with $n>10^{300}$. Then

$$
\beta<\pi\left(R_{n}\right)<\alpha
$$

where

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \alpha=2 n\left(1+\frac{\log 2}{\log n}-\frac{\log 2 \log \log n-\log ^{2} 2-\log 2-0.13}{\log ^{2} n}\right) \\
& \beta=2 n\left(1+\frac{\log 2}{\log n}-\frac{\log 2 \log \log n-\log ^{2} 2-\log 2+0.11}{\log ^{2} n}\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

The proof of Proposition 1.1 is based on explicit estimates for the $k$ th prime number $p_{k}$ obtained by Dusart [5, Proposition 6.6 and Proposition 6.7] and on Srinivasan's lemma [12, Lemma 2.1] concerning Ramanujan primes. Instead of using Dusart's estimates, we use the estimates obtained in 3, Corollary 1.2 and Corollary 1.4] to get the following improved upper bound for $\pi\left(R_{n}\right)$.

Theorem 1.2. Let $n$ be a positive integer satisfying $n \geq 5225$ and let

$$
\begin{equation*}
U(x)=\frac{\log 2 \log x(\log \log x)^{2}-c_{1} \log x \log \log x+c_{2} \log x-\log ^{2} 2 \log \log x+\log ^{3} 2+\log ^{2} 2}{\log ^{4} x+\log ^{3} x \log \log x-\log ^{3} x \log 2-\log ^{2} x \log 2} \tag{1.8}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $c_{1}=2 \log ^{2} 2+\log 2$ and $c_{2}=\log ^{3} 2+2 \log ^{2} 2+0.565$. Then

$$
\pi\left(R_{n}\right)<2 n\left(1+\frac{\log 2}{\log n}-\frac{\log 2 \log \log n-\log ^{2} 2-\log 2}{\log ^{2} n}+U(n)\right)
$$

With the same method, we used for the proof of Theorem 1.2, we get the following more precised lower bound for the number of primes not exceeding the $n$th Ramanujan prime.

Theorem 1.3. Let $n$ be a positive integer satisfying $n \geq 1245$ and let

$$
\begin{equation*}
L(x)=\frac{\log 2 \log x(\log \log x)^{2}-d_{1} \log x \log \log x+d_{2} \log x-\log ^{2} 2 \log \log x+\log ^{3} 2+\log ^{2} 2}{\log ^{4} x+\log ^{3} x \log \log x-\log ^{3} x \log 2-\log ^{2} x \log 2} \tag{1.9}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $d_{1}=2 \log ^{2} 2+\log 2+1.472$ and $d_{2}=\log ^{3} 2+2 \log ^{2} 2-2.51$. Then

$$
\pi\left(R_{n}\right)>2 n\left(1+\frac{\log 2}{\log n}-\frac{\log 2 \log \log n-\log ^{2} 2-\log 2}{\log ^{2} n}+L(n)\right)
$$

A direct consequence of Theorem 1.2 and Theorem 1.3 is the following result, which implies the correctness of a conjecture stated by Yang and Togbé [17, Conjecture 5.1] in 2015.

Corollary 1.4. Let $n \geq 2$ be a positive integer. Then

$$
\pi\left(R_{n}\right)=2 n\left(1+\frac{\log 2}{\log n}-\frac{\log 2 \log \log n-\log ^{2} 2-\log 2}{\log ^{2} n}+\frac{\log 2(\log \log n)^{2}}{\log ^{3} n}+O\left(\frac{\log \log n}{\log ^{3} n}\right)\right)
$$

The initial motivation for writing this paper, was the following conjecture stated by Sondow, Nicholson and Noe [11, Conjecture 1] involving $\pi\left(R_{n}\right)$.

Conjecture 1.5 (Sondow, Nicholson, Noe). For $m=1,2,3, \ldots$, let $N(m)$ be given by the following table:

| $m$ | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | $7,8, \ldots, 19$ | $20,21, \ldots$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $N(m)$ | 1 | 1245 | 189 | 189 | 85 | 85 | 10 | 2 |

Then we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
\pi\left(R_{m n}\right) \leq m \pi\left(R_{n}\right) \quad \forall n \geq N(m) \tag{1.10}
\end{equation*}
$$

Note that the inequality (1.10) clearly holds for $m=1$ and every positive integer $n$. In the cases $m=2,3, \ldots, 20$, the inequality (1.10) has been verified for every positive integer $n$ with $R_{m n}<10^{9}$. For any fixed positive integer $m$, we have, by (1.4), $\pi\left(R_{m n}\right) \sim 2 m n \sim m \pi\left(R_{n}\right)$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. A first result in the direction of Conjecture 1.5 is due to Yang and Togbé [17, Theorem 1.3]. They used Proposition 1.1 to find the following result, which proves Conjecture 1.5 when $n$ satisfies $n>10^{300}$.

Proposition 1.6 (Yang, Togbé). For $m=1,2,3, \ldots$, and $n>10^{300}$, we have

$$
\pi\left(R_{m n}\right) \leq m \pi\left(R_{n}\right)
$$

Using the same method, we apply Theorem 1.2 and Theorem 1.3 to get the following result.
Theorem 1.7. The Conjecture 1.5 of Sondow, Nicholson and Noe holds except for $(m, n)=(38,9)$.

## 2. Preliminaries

Let $n$ be a positive integer. For the proof of Theorem 1.2 and Theorem 1.3 we need sharp estimates for the $n$th prime number. The current best upper and lower bound for the $n$th prime number were obtained in [3, Corollary 1.2 and Corollary 1.4] and are given as follows.

Lemma 2.1. For every positive integers $n \geq 46254381$, we have

$$
p_{n}<n\left(\log n+\log \log n-1+\frac{\log \log n-2}{\log n}-\frac{(\log \log n)^{2}-6 \log \log n+10.667}{2 \log ^{2} n}\right) .
$$

Lemma 2.2. For every positive integer $n \geq 2$, we have

$$
p_{n}>n\left(\log n+\log \log n-1+\frac{\log \log n-2}{\log n}-\frac{(\log \log n)^{2}-6 \log \log n+11.508}{2 \log ^{2} n}\right) .
$$

## 3. Proof of Theorem 1.2

To prove Theorem 1.2, we use the method investigated by Yang and Togbé [17] for the proof of the upper bound for $\pi\left(R_{n}\right)$ given in Proposition 1.1 First, we note following result, which was obtained by Srinivasan [12, Lemma 2.1]. Although it is a direct consequence of the definition of a Ramanujan prime, it plays an important role in the proof of the upper bound for $\pi\left(R_{n}\right)$ in Proposition 1.1

Lemma 3.1 (Srinivasan). Let $R_{n}=p_{s}$ be the nth Ramanujan prime. Then we have $2 p_{s-n}<p_{s}$ for every positive integer $n \geq 2$.

Now, let $n$ be a positive integer. We define for each real $x$ with $2 n<x<2.6 n$ the functions

$$
\begin{equation*}
G(x)=x\left(\log x+\log \log x-1+\frac{\log \log x-2}{\log x}-\frac{(\log \log x)^{2}-6 \log \log x+10.667}{2 \log ^{2} x}\right) \tag{3.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

and

$$
\begin{equation*}
H(x)=x\left(\log x+\log \log x-1+\frac{\log \log x-2}{\log x}-\frac{(\log \log x)^{2}-6 \log \log x+11.508}{2 \log ^{2} x}\right), \tag{3.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

and consider the function $F_{1}:(2 n, 2.6 n) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ defined by

$$
\begin{equation*}
F_{1}(x)=G(x)-2 H(x-n) . \tag{3.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

In the following proposition, we note a first property of the function $F_{1}(x)$ concerning its derivative.
Proposition 3.2. Let $n$ be a positive integer with $n \geq 16$. Then $F_{1}(x)$ is a strictly decreasing function on the interval $(2 n, 2.6 n)$.

Proof. Setting

$$
q_{1}(x)=\frac{\log \log x-2}{\log x}-\frac{(\log \log x)^{2}-4 \log \log x+4.667}{2 \log ^{2} x}+\frac{(\log \log x)^{2}-7 \log \log x+13.667}{\log ^{3} x}
$$

and

$$
\begin{aligned}
r_{1}(x)=- & \frac{2(\log \log (x-n)-1)}{\log (x-n)}+\frac{(\log \log (x-n))^{2}-4 \log \log (x-n)+5.508}{2 \log ^{2}(x-n)} \\
& -\frac{2(\log \log (x-n))^{2}-14 \log \log (x-n)+29.016}{\log ^{3}(x-n)}
\end{aligned}
$$

a straightforward calculation shows that the derivative of $F_{1}(x)$ is given by

$$
F_{1}^{\prime}(x)=\log x-2 \log (x-n)+\log \log x-2 \log \log (x-n)+\frac{1}{\log x}+q_{1}(x)+r_{1}(x)
$$

Note that $\log \log (x-n) \geq 1, t^{2}-4 t+4.667>0$ and $2 t^{2}-14 t+29.016>0$ for every $t \in \mathbb{R}$. Hence

$$
\begin{aligned}
& F_{1}^{\prime}(x)<\log x-2 \log (x-n)+\log \log x-2 \log \log (x-n)+\frac{1}{\log x}+\frac{\log \log x-2}{\log x} \\
&+\frac{(\log \log x)^{2}-7 \log \log x+13.667}{\log ^{3} x}+\frac{(\log \log (x-n))^{2}-4 \log \log (x-n)+5.508}{\log ^{2}(x-n)} .
\end{aligned}
$$

The function $t \mapsto(\log \log t-2) / \log t$ has a global maximum at $t=\exp (\exp (3))$. Together with $32 \leq$ $2 n<x<2.6 n$, and the fact that the functions $t \mapsto\left((\log \log t)^{2}-7 \log \log t+13.667\right) / \log ^{3} t$ and $t \mapsto$ $\left((\log \log t)^{2}-4 \log \log t+5.508\right) / \log ^{3} t$ are monotonic decreasing for every $t>1$, we obtain that

$$
F_{1}^{\prime}(x)<1.772-\log n+\log \log (2.6 n)-\log \left(\log ^{2} n\right)
$$

Finally, we use the fact that $t \log ^{2} t>e^{1.772} \log (2.6 t)$ for every $t \geq 6$ to get $F_{1}^{\prime}(x)<0$ for every $x \in$ $(2 n, 2.6 n)$, which means that $F_{1}(x)$ is a strictly decreasing function on the interval $(2 n, 2.6 n)$.

Next, we define the function $\gamma: \mathbb{R}_{\geq 4} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by

$$
\begin{equation*}
\gamma(x)=\frac{\log 2+\log 2 / \log x+0.565 / \log ^{2} x}{\log x+\log \log x-\log 2-\log 2 / \log x} \tag{3.4}
\end{equation*}
$$

A simple calculation shows that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\gamma(x)=\frac{\log 2}{\log x}-\frac{\log 2 \log \log x-\log ^{2} 2-\log 2}{\log ^{2} x}+U(x) \tag{3.5}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $U(x)$ is defined as in (1.8). In the following lemma, we note some useful properties of $\gamma(x)$.
Lemma 3.3. Let $\gamma(x)$ be defined as in (3.4). Then the following hold:
(a) $\gamma(x)>0$ for every $x \geq 8$,
(b) $\gamma(x)<\log 2 / \log x$ for every $x \geq 10734$,
(c) $\gamma(x)<1 / 4$ for every $x \geq 10734$.

Proof. The statement in (a) is clear. To prove (b), we first note that $U(x)<\log 2(\log \log x)^{2} / \log ^{3} x$ for every $x \geq 230 \geq \exp (\exp (1+\log 2))$. Now we use (3.5) and the fact that $(\log \log x-\log 2-1) \log x \geq$ $(\log \log x)^{2}$ for every $x \geq 10734$, to conclude (b). Finally, (c) is a direct consequence of (b).

Now, we give a proof of Theorem 1.2 ,
Proof of Theorem 1.2. First, we consider the case where $n$ is a positive integer with $n \geq 528491312 \geq$ $\exp (\exp (3))$. By (1.3) and (1.6), we have $2 n<\pi\left(R_{n}\right)<2.6 n$. Hence $\pi\left(R_{n}\right) \geq 2 n \geq 1056982624$ and $\pi\left(R_{n}\right)-n \geq 528491312$. Now we apply Lemma 2.1 and Lemma 2.2 to get that $F_{1}\left(\pi\left(R_{n}\right)\right)>$ $p_{\pi\left(R_{n}\right)}-2 p_{\pi\left(R_{n}\right)-n}$, where $F_{1}$ is defined as in (3.3). Since $R_{n}=p_{\pi\left(R_{n}\right)}$, Srinivasan's Lemma 3.1 yields

$$
\begin{equation*}
F_{1}\left(\pi\left(R_{n}\right)\right)>0 \tag{3.6}
\end{equation*}
$$

For convenience, we write in the following $\gamma=\gamma(n)$ and $\alpha=2 n(1+\gamma)$. Now, by (3.5), we need to show that $\pi\left(R_{n}\right)<\alpha$. For this, we first show that $F_{1}(\alpha)<0$. By Lemma 3.3, we have $2 n<\alpha<2.6 n$. Further,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{F_{1}(\alpha)}{2 n}=(1+\gamma) \log 2-\gamma \log n+\gamma+A_{1}+B_{1}+C_{1}+D_{1}+(1+2 \gamma) \frac{0.841}{2 \log ^{2}(n+2 n \gamma)} \tag{3.7}
\end{equation*}
$$

where

$$
\begin{aligned}
A_{1}= & (1+\gamma) \log (1+\gamma)-(1+2 \gamma) \log (1+2 \gamma) \\
B_{1}= & (1+\gamma) \log \log (2 n+2 n \gamma)-(1+2 \gamma) \log \log (n+2 n \gamma) \\
C_{1}= & (1+\gamma) \frac{\log \log (2 n+2 n \gamma)-2}{\log (2 n+2 n \gamma)}-(1+2 \gamma) \frac{\log \log (n+2 n \gamma)-2}{\log (n+2 n \gamma)} \\
D_{1}= & -(1+\gamma) \frac{(\log \log (2 n+2 n \gamma))^{2}-6 \log \log (2 n+2 n \gamma)+10.667}{2 \log ^{2}(2 n+2 n \gamma)} \\
& +(1+2 \gamma) \frac{(\log \log (n+2 n \gamma))^{2}-6 \log \log (n+2 n \gamma)+10.667}{2 \log ^{2}(n+2 n \gamma)}
\end{aligned}
$$

In the following, we give upper bounds for the quantities $A_{1}, B_{1}, C_{1}$ and $D_{1}$. We start with $A_{1}$. We use the inequalities

$$
\begin{equation*}
t-\frac{t^{2}}{2}<\log (1+t)<t \tag{3.8}
\end{equation*}
$$

which hold for every real $t>0$, and Lemma 3.3(c) to get

$$
\begin{equation*}
A_{1}<(1+\gamma) \gamma-(1+2 \gamma)\left(2 \gamma-2 \gamma^{2}\right)=-\gamma-\gamma^{2}+4 \gamma^{3}<-\gamma \tag{3.9}
\end{equation*}
$$

Next, we estimate $B_{1}$. Using the right-hand side inequality of (3.8), we easily get

$$
\begin{equation*}
B_{1}<\frac{(1+\gamma) \log 2}{\log n}-\gamma \log \log n \tag{3.10}
\end{equation*}
$$

To find an upper bound for $C_{1}$, we note that $t \mapsto(\log \log t-2) / \log t$ is a decreasing function on the interval $(\exp (\exp (3)), \infty)$. Together with Lemma 3.3(a), we obtain that the inequality

$$
\begin{equation*}
C_{1}<0 \tag{3.11}
\end{equation*}
$$

holds. Finally, we estimate $D_{1}$. For this purpose, we consider the function $f:(1, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ defined by

$$
f(x)=\frac{(\log \log x)^{2}-6 \log \log x+10.667}{2 \log ^{2} x}
$$

By the mean value theorem, there exists a real number $\xi \in(n+2 n \gamma, 2 n+2 n \gamma)$ such that $f(2 n+2 n \gamma)-$ $f(n+2 n \gamma)=n f^{\prime}(\xi)$. Since $f^{\prime \prime}(x) \geq 0$ for every $x>1$, we get $f^{\prime}(\xi) \geq f^{\prime}(n+2 n \gamma) \geq f^{\prime}(n)$. Hence we get

$$
f(n+2 n \gamma)-f(2 n+2 n \gamma)=-n f^{\prime}(\xi) \leq-n f^{\prime}(n)=\frac{(\log \log n)^{2}-7 \log \log n+13.667}{\log ^{3} n}
$$

Therefore

$$
D_{1}<(1+\gamma) \frac{(\log \log n)^{2}-7 \log \log n+13.667}{\log ^{3} n}+\gamma f(n+2 n \gamma)
$$

Since $f(x)$ is a strictly decreasing function on the interval $(1, \infty)$, it follows that the inequality

$$
\begin{equation*}
D_{1}<(1+\gamma) \frac{(\log \log n)^{2}-7 \log \log n+13.667}{\log ^{3} n}+\gamma \frac{(\log \log n)^{2}-6 \log \log n+10.667}{2 \log ^{2} n} \tag{3.12}
\end{equation*}
$$

holds. Combining (3.7) with (3.9)-(3.12), we get

$$
\begin{aligned}
\frac{F_{1}(\alpha)}{2 n}<(1 & +\gamma) \log 2-\gamma \log n+\frac{(1+\gamma) \log 2}{\log n}-\gamma \log \log n+(1+\gamma) \frac{r_{1}(\log \log n)}{\log ^{3} n} \\
& +\gamma \frac{r_{2}(\log \log n)}{2 \log ^{2} n}+(1+2 \gamma) \frac{0.841}{2 \log ^{2} n}
\end{aligned}
$$

where $r_{1}(t)=t^{2}-7 t+13.667$ and $r_{2}(t)=t^{2}-6 t+10.667$. The functions $t \mapsto r_{1}(\log \log t) / \log t, t \mapsto$ $r_{1}(\log \log t) / \log ^{2} t$ and $t \mapsto r_{2}(\log \log t) / \log t$ are decreasing on the interval $(1, \infty)$. Hence $r_{1}(\log \log n) \leq$ $r_{1}(3)$ and $r_{2}(\log \log n) \leq r_{2}(3)$. Together with Lemma 3.3(a), Lemma 3.3(b) and $n \geq \exp (\exp (3))$, we obtain that

$$
\frac{F_{1}(\alpha)}{2 n}<(1+\gamma) \log 2-\gamma \log n+\frac{(1+\gamma) \log 2}{\log n}-\gamma \log \log n+\frac{0.565}{\log ^{2} n}
$$

Now we use (3.4) to get that the right-hand side of the last inequality is equal to 0 . Hence $F_{1}(\alpha)<0$. Together with $2 n<\pi\left(R_{n}\right), \alpha<2.6 n$, the inequality (3.6) and Proposition 3.2, we get $\pi\left(R_{n}\right)<\alpha$. We conclude by direct computation.

We get the following weaker but more compact upper bounds for the parameter $s$.
Corollary 3.4. For every positive integer $n \geq 2$, we have

$$
\pi\left(R_{n}\right)<2 n\left(1+\frac{\log 2}{\log n}-\frac{\log 2 \log \log n-\log ^{2} 2-\log 2}{\log ^{2} n}+\frac{\log 2(\log \log n)^{2}}{\log ^{3} n}\right)
$$

Proof. If $n \geq 5225$, the corollary follows directly from Theorem 1.2, since $U(x) \leq \log 2(\log \log x)^{2} / \log ^{3} x$ for every $x \geq 230$. For the remaining cases of $n$, we use a computer.

In the next corollary, we reduce the number $10^{300}$ in Proposition 1.1 as follows.
Corollary 3.5. For every positive integer $n$ satisfying $n \geq 4842763560306$, we have

$$
\pi\left(R_{n}\right)<2 n\left(1+\frac{\log 2}{\log n}-\frac{\log 2 \log \log n-\log ^{2} 2-\log 2-0.13}{\log ^{2} n}\right)
$$

Proof. Note that $U(x) \leq 0.13 / \log ^{2} x$ for every $x \geq 4842763560306$. Now we can use Theorem 1.2,
Corollary 3.6. Let $n$ be a positive integer satisfying $n \geq 640$. Then

$$
\pi\left(R_{n}\right)<2 n\left(1+\frac{\log 2}{\log n}\right)
$$

Proof. For every positive integer $n \geq 10734$, we have

$$
\frac{\log 2 \log \log n-\log ^{2} 2-\log 2}{\log ^{2} n}-\frac{\log 2(\log \log n)^{2}}{\log ^{3} n}>0
$$

an it suffices to apply Corollary 3.4. We conclude by direct computation.

## 4. Proof of Theorem 1.3

Using a simalar argument as in the proof of Lemma 3.1, Yang and Togbé [17, p. 248] derived the following result.

Lemma 4.1 (Yang, Togbé). Let $R_{n}=p_{s}$ be the nth Ramanujan prime. Then we have $p_{s}<2 p_{s-n+1}$ for every positive integer $n$.

Next, we define for each positive integer $n$ the function $F_{2}:(2 n, 2.6 n) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by

$$
\begin{equation*}
F_{2}(x)=H(x)-2 G(x-n+1) \tag{4.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

where the functions $G(x)$ and $H(x)$ are given by (3.1) and (3.2), respectively. In Proposition 3.2 we showed that for every positive integer $n \geq 16$, the function $F_{1}(x)$ is decreasing on the interval $(2 n, 2.6 n)$. In the following proposition, we get a similar result for the function $F_{2}(x)$.
Proposition 4.2. Let $n$ be a positive integer with $n \geq 15$. Then $F_{2}(x)$ is a strictly decreasing function on the interval $(2 n, 2.6 n)$.

Proof. A straightforward calculation shows that the derivative of $F_{2}(x)$ is given by

$$
\begin{aligned}
F_{2}^{\prime}(x)= & \log x-2 \log (x-n+1)+\log \log x-2 \log \log (x-n+1)+\frac{1}{\log x}+\frac{\log \log x-2}{\log x} \\
& -\frac{(\log \log x)^{2}-4 \log \log x+5.508}{2 \log ^{2} x}+\frac{(\log \log x)^{2}-7 \log \log x+14.508}{\log ^{3} x} \\
& -\frac{2(\log \log (x-n+1)-1)}{\log (x-n+1)}+\frac{(\log \log (x-n+1))^{2}-4 \log \log (x-n+1)+4.667}{2 \log ^{2}(x-n+1)} \\
& -\frac{2(\log \log (x-n+1))^{2}-14 \log \log (x-n+1)+27.334}{\log ^{3}(x-n+1)} .
\end{aligned}
$$

Now we argue as in the proof of Proposition 3.2 to obtain that the inequality

$$
F_{2}^{\prime}(x)<1.717-\log n+\log \log (2.6 n)-\log \left(\log ^{2} n\right)
$$

holds for every real $x$ such that $2 n<x<2.6 n$. Since $t \log ^{2} t>e^{1.717} \log (2.6 t)$ for every $t \geq 6$, we get that $F_{2}(x)$ is a strictly decreasing function on the interval ( $2 n, 2.6 n$ ).

Now, we define the function $\delta: \mathbb{R}_{\geq 4} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by

$$
\begin{equation*}
\delta(x)=\frac{\log 2+\log 2 / \log x-(1.472 \log \log x+2.51) / \log ^{2} x}{\log x+\log \log x-\log 2-\log 2 / \log x} . \tag{4.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

A simple calculation shows that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\delta(x)=\frac{\log 2}{\log x}-\frac{\log 2 \log \log x-\log ^{2} 2-\log 2}{\log ^{2} x}+L(x), \tag{4.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $L(x)$ is given by (1.9). In the following lemma, we note two properties of the function $\delta(x)$, which will be useful in the proof of Theorem 1.3 .

Lemma 4.3. Let $\delta(x)$ be defined as in (4.2). Then the following two inequalities hold:
(a) $\delta(x)>0.638 / \log x$ for every $x \geq \exp (\exp (3))$,
(b) $\delta(x)<\log 2 / \log x$ for every $x \geq 230$.

Proof. Since $0.055 \log x+0.812>0.638 \log \log x$ for every $x \geq 4.71 \cdot 10^{8}$, it follows that the inequality

$$
(\log 2-0.638) \log x+(1+0.638) \log 2-\frac{1.472 \cdot 3+2.51-0.638 \log 2}{e^{3}}>0.638 \log \log x
$$

holds for every $x \geq 4.71 \cdot 10^{8}$. The function $t \mapsto \log \log t / \log t$ is decreasing for $x \geq e^{e}$. Hence

$$
(\log 2-0.638) \log x+(1+0.638) \log 2-\frac{1.472 \log \log x+2.51-0.638 \log 2}{\log x}>0.638 \log \log x
$$

for every $x \geq \exp (\exp (3))$. Now it suffices to note that the last inequality is equivalent to $\delta(x)>$ $0.638 / \log x$. This proves (a). Next, we prove (b). Since $\log 2 \log \log x>\log 2+\log ^{2} 2$ for every $x \geq 230 \geq$ $\exp (\exp (1+\log 2))$, we obtain that the inequality

$$
\log 2+\log ^{2} 2<\log 2 \log \log x+\frac{1.472+2.51-\log ^{2} 2}{\log x}
$$

holds for $x \geq 230$. Again, it suffices to note that the last inequality is equivalent to $\delta(x)<\log 2 / \log x$.
Finally, we give the proof of Theorem 1.3 ,
Proof of Theorem 1.3. First, we consider the case where $n$ is a positive integer with $n \geq 528491312 \geq$ $\exp (\exp (3))$. By (1.3) and (1.6), we have $2 n<\pi\left(R_{n}\right)<2.6 n$. Further, $\pi\left(R_{n}\right)>2 n \geq 1056982624$ and $\pi\left(R_{n}\right)-n>528491312$. Applying Lemma 2.1 and Lemma 2.2, we get $F_{2}\left(\pi\left(R_{n}\right)\right)<p_{\pi}\left(R_{n}\right)-$ $2 p_{\pi\left(R_{n}\right)-n+1}$, where $F_{2}$ is defined as in (4.1). Note that $R_{n}=p_{\pi\left(R_{n}\right)}$. Hence, by Lemma 4.1 we get

$$
\begin{equation*}
F_{2}\left(\pi\left(R_{n}\right)\right)<p_{\pi\left(R_{n}\right)}-2 p_{\pi\left(R_{n}\right)-n+1}<0 \tag{4.4}
\end{equation*}
$$

In the following, we use, for convenience, the notation $\delta=\delta(n)$ and write $\beta=2 n(1+\delta)$. So, by (4.3), we need to prove that $\beta<\pi\left(R_{n}\right)$. For this purpose, we first show that $F_{2}(\beta)>0$. From Lemma 4.3, it follows that $2 n<\beta<2.6 n$. Furthermore, we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{F_{2}(\beta)}{2 n}=(1+\delta) \log 2-\delta \log n-\frac{\log n}{n}+\delta+\frac{1}{n}+A_{2}+B_{2}+C_{2}+D_{2}-\frac{0.841(1+\delta)}{2 \log ^{2}(2 n+2 n \delta)} \tag{4.5}
\end{equation*}
$$

where the quantities $A_{2}, B_{2}, C_{2}$ and $D_{2}$ are given by

$$
\begin{aligned}
A_{2}= & (1+\delta) \log (1+\delta)-\left(1+2 \delta+\frac{1}{n}\right) \log \left(1+2 \delta+\frac{1}{n}\right) \\
B_{2}= & (1+\delta) \log \log (2 n+2 n \delta)-\left(1+2 \delta+\frac{1}{n}\right) \log \log (n+2 n \delta+1) \\
C_{2}= & (1+\delta) \frac{\log \log (2 n+2 n \delta)-2}{\log (2 n+2 n \delta)}-\left(1+2 \delta+\frac{1}{n}\right) \frac{\log \log (n+2 n \delta+1)-2}{\log (n+2 n \delta+1)} \\
D_{2}= & -(1+\delta) \frac{(\log \log (2 n+2 n \delta))^{2}-6 \log \log (2 n+2 n \delta)+10.667}{2 \log ^{2}(2 n+2 n \delta)} \\
& +\left(1+2 \delta+\frac{1}{n}\right) \frac{(\log \log (n+2 n \delta+1))^{2}-6 \log \log (n+2 n \delta+1)+10.667}{2 \log ^{2}(n+2 n \delta+1)}
\end{aligned}
$$

To show that $F_{2}(\beta)>0$, we give in the following some lower bounds for the quantities $A_{2}, B_{2}, C_{2}$ and $D_{2}$. To find a lower bound for $A_{2}$, we consider the function $f:(0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ defined by $f(x)=x \log x$. Then $A_{2}=f(1+\delta)-f(1+2 \delta+1 / n)$. By the mean value theorem, there exists $\xi \in(1+\delta, 1+2 \delta+1 / n)$, so that $A_{2}=-(\delta+1 / n)(\log \xi+1)$. Since $\log \xi \leq \log (1+2 \delta+1 / n) \leq 2 \delta+1 / n$, we get

$$
A_{2} \geq-\delta-2 \delta^{2}-\frac{1}{n}\left(1+3 \delta+\frac{1}{n}\right)
$$

Applying Lemma 4.3(b) to the last inequality, we obtain that

$$
\begin{equation*}
A_{2} \geq-\delta-\frac{2 \log ^{2} 2}{\log ^{2} n}-\frac{1}{\log ^{2} n} \frac{(1+3 \delta+1 / n) \log ^{2} n}{n} \geq-\delta-\frac{0.961}{\log ^{2} n} \tag{4.6}
\end{equation*}
$$

Our next goal is to estimate $B_{2}$. For this purpose, we use the right-hand side inequality of (3.8), Lemma 4.3 (b) and the inequality $1 /(x \log x)<0.0037 / \log ^{2} x$, which holds for every $x \geq 2036$, to get

$$
\begin{equation*}
\log \log (n+2 n \delta+1)<\log \log n+\frac{2 \log 2}{\log ^{2} n}+\frac{1}{n \log n}<\log \log n+\frac{1.39}{\log ^{2} n} \tag{4.7}
\end{equation*}
$$

On the other hand, we have

$$
\log \log (2 n+2 n \delta)=\log \log n+\log \left(1+\frac{\log 2+\log (1+\delta)}{\log n}\right)
$$

Applying the left-hand side inequality of (3.8), we obtain that

$$
\log \log (2 n+2 n \delta) \geq \log \log n+\frac{\log 2}{\log n}+\frac{\log (1+\delta)}{\log n}-\frac{(\log 2+\log (1+\delta))^{2}}{2 \log ^{2} n}
$$

Combined with

$$
(\log 2+\log (1+\delta))^{2} \leq(\log 2+\delta)^{2} \leq\left(\log 2+\frac{\log 2}{\log n}\right)^{2} \leq 0.53
$$

it follows that the inequality

$$
\log \log (2 n+2 n \delta) \geq \log \log n+\frac{\log 2}{\log n}+\frac{\log (1+\delta)}{\log n}-\frac{0.265}{\log ^{2} n}
$$

holds. Again, we use the left-hand side inequality of (3.8) to establish

$$
\log \log (2 n+2 n \delta) \geq \log \log n+\frac{\log 2}{\log n}+\frac{\delta-\delta^{2} / 2}{\log n}-\frac{0.265}{\log ^{2} n}
$$

Now we apply Lemma 4.3(a) and Lemma 4.3(b) to obtain that

$$
\log \log (2 n+2 n \delta) \geq \log \log n+\frac{\log 2}{\log n}+\frac{0.361}{\log ^{2} n}
$$

Together with the definition of $B_{2}$ and (4.6), we get

$$
B_{2} \geq-\delta \log \log n+\frac{(1+\delta) \log 2}{\log n}-\frac{\log \log n}{n}-\frac{1.029+2.419 \delta}{\log ^{2} n}-\frac{1.39}{n \log ^{2} n}
$$

Finally, we use a computer and Lemma 4.3(b) to get

$$
\begin{equation*}
B_{2} \geq-\delta \log \log n+\frac{(1+\delta) \log 2}{\log n}-\frac{1.113}{\log ^{2} n} \tag{4.8}
\end{equation*}
$$

Next, we find an lower bound for $C_{2}$. For this, we apply the inequality

$$
\frac{2(1+2 \delta+1 / n)}{\log (n+2 n \delta+1)} \geq \frac{2(1+\delta)}{\log (2 n+2 n \delta)}
$$

to the definition of $C_{2}$ to get

$$
C_{2} \geq(1+\delta) \frac{\log \log (2 n+2 n \delta)}{\log (2 n+2 n \delta)}-\left(1+2 \delta+\frac{1}{n}\right) \frac{\log \log (n+2 n \delta+1)}{\log (n+2 n \delta+1)}
$$

We use $2 n+2 n \delta \geq n+2 n \delta+1 \geq n$ to obtain that the inequality

$$
C_{2} \geq-\log \log (n+2 n \delta+1) \frac{(\delta+1 / n) \log n+(1+2 \delta+1 / n)(\log 2+\log (1+\delta))}{\log (2 n+2 n \delta) \log (n+2 n \delta+1)}
$$

holds. Applying the right-hand side inequality of (3.8) and Lemma 4.3(b) to the last inequality, we get

$$
C_{2} \geq-\log \log (n+2 n \delta+1) \frac{(\log 2 / \log n+1 / n) \log n+(1+2 \log 2 / \log n+1 / n)(\log 2+\log 2 / \log n)}{\log (2 n+2 n \delta) \log (n+2 n \delta+1)}
$$

A computation shows that

$$
\left(1+\frac{2 \log 2}{\log n}+\frac{1}{n}\right)\left(\log 2+\frac{\log 2}{\log n}\right) \leq 0.778 .
$$

Hence

$$
C_{2} \geq-\frac{(\log 2+0.778) \log \log (n+2 n \delta+1)}{\log (2 n+2 n \delta) \log (n+2 n \delta+1)}-\frac{\log n \log \log (n+2 n \delta+1)}{n \log (2 n+2 n \delta) \log (n+2 n \delta+1)} .
$$

Note that the function $t \mapsto \log \log t / \log t$ is a decreasing function for every $t>e^{e}$, we obtain that

$$
\begin{equation*}
C_{2} \geq-\frac{(\log 2+0.778) \log \log n}{\log ^{2} n}-\frac{\log \log n}{n \log n} \geq-\frac{1.472 \log \log n}{\log ^{2} n} . \tag{4.9}
\end{equation*}
$$

Finally, we estimate $D_{2}$. For this purpose, we consider the function $f:(1, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ defined by

$$
f(x)=\frac{(\log \log x)^{2}-6 \log \log x+10.667}{2 \log ^{2} x} .
$$

Note that $f(x)$ is a strictly decreasing function on the interval $(1, \infty)$ and the numerator of $f(x)$ is positive for every real $x>1$. Together with $2 n+2 n \delta \geq n+2 n \delta+1 \geq n$, we get

$$
\begin{equation*}
D_{2} \geq\left(\delta+\frac{1}{n}\right) \frac{(\log \log n)^{2}-6 \log \log n+10.667}{2 \log ^{2} n}>0 \tag{4.10}
\end{equation*}
$$

Finally, we combine (4.5) with (4.6) and (4.8)-(4.10) to get that the inequality

$$
\begin{aligned}
\frac{F_{2}(\beta)}{2 n} & >(1+\delta)\left(\log 2+\frac{\log 2}{\log n}\right)-\delta \log n-\frac{\log n-1}{n}-\frac{1.472 \log \log n+2.4945}{\log ^{2} n}-\delta \log \log n-\frac{0.841 \delta}{2 \log ^{2} n} \\
& \geq \delta(-\log n-\log \log n+\log 2+\log 2 / \log n)+\log 2-\frac{1.472 \log \log n+2.51}{\log ^{2} n}+\frac{\log 2}{\log n}
\end{aligned}
$$

holds. Now it suffices to use (4.2) to get that the right-hand side of the last inequality is equal to 0 and it follows that $F_{2}(\beta)>0$. Together with $2 n<\pi\left(R_{n}\right), \beta<2.6 n$, the inequality (4.4) and Proposition4.2, we obtain that $\pi\left(R_{n}\right)>\beta$ for every positive integer $n \geq 528491312$. We conclude by direct computation.

Since $L(x) \geq 0$ for every $x \geq 10^{57}$, we use Theorem 1.3 to get the following weaker but more compact lower bound for $\pi\left(R_{n}\right)$.

Corollary 4.4. Let $n$ be a positive integer satisfying $n \geq 10^{57}$. Then

$$
\pi\left(R_{n}\right)>2 n\left(1+\frac{\log 2}{\log n}-\frac{\log 2 \log \log n-\log ^{2} 2-\log 2}{\log ^{2} n}\right)
$$

In the next corollary, we use Theorem 1.3 to find that the lower bound for $\pi\left(R_{n}\right)$ given in Proposition 1.1 also holds for every positive integer $n$ satisfying $51396214158824 \leq n \leq 10^{300}$.

Corollary 4.5. Let $n$ be a positive integer satisfying $n \geq 51396214158824$. Then

$$
\pi\left(R_{n}\right)>2 n\left(1+\frac{\log 2}{\log n}-\frac{\log 2 \log \log n-\log ^{2} 2-\log 2+0.11}{\log ^{2} n}\right)
$$

Proof. The claim follows directly by Theorem 1.3 and the fact that $L(x) \geq-0.11 / \log ^{2} x$ for every $x \geq 51396214158824$.

Finally, we give the following result concerning a lower bound for $\pi\left(R_{n}\right)$.
Corollary 4.6. Let $n$ be a positive integer satisfying $n \geq 85$. Then

$$
\pi\left(R_{n}\right)>2 n\left(1+\frac{\log 2}{\log n}-\frac{\log 2 \log \log n}{\log ^{2} n}\right)
$$

Proof. Since $L(x)+\left(\log ^{2} 2+\log 2\right) / \log ^{2} x \geq 0$ for every $x \geq 20$, we apply Theorem 1.3 to get the correctness of the corollary for every positive integer $n \geq 1245$. We conclude by direct computation.

## 5. Proof of Theorem 1.7

In this section we give a proof of Theorem 1.7 by using Theorem 3.22 of [1]. For this, we need to introduce the following notations. By [2, Corollary 3.4 and Corollary 3.5], we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{x}{\log x-1-\frac{1}{\log x}}<\pi(x)<\frac{x}{\log x-1-\frac{1.17}{\log x}} \tag{5.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

where the left-hand side inequality is valid for every $x \geq 468049$ and the right-hand side inequality holds for every $x \geq 5.43$. Using the right-hand side inequality of (5.1), we get $p_{n}>n\left(\log p_{n}-1-1.17 / \log p_{n}\right)$ for every positive integer $n$. In addition, we set $\varepsilon>0$ and $\lambda=\varepsilon / 2$. Let $S=S(\varepsilon)$ be defined by

$$
S=\exp \left(\sqrt{1.17+\frac{2(1+\varepsilon)}{\varepsilon}\left(0.17+\frac{\log 2}{\log (2 \cdot 5.43)}\right)+\left(\frac{1}{2}+\frac{(1+\varepsilon) \log 2}{\varepsilon}\right)^{2}}+\frac{1}{2}+\frac{(1+\varepsilon) \log 2}{\varepsilon}\right)
$$

and let $T=T(\varepsilon)$ be defined by $T=\exp (1 / 2+\sqrt{1.17+0.17 / \lambda+1 / 4})$. By setting $X_{9}=X_{9}(\varepsilon)=$ $\max \{468049,2 S, T\}$, we get the following result.

Lemma 5.1. Let $\varepsilon>0$. For every positive integer $n$ satisfying $n \geq\left(\pi\left(X_{9}\right)+1\right) /(2(1+\varepsilon))$, we have

$$
R_{n} \leq p_{\lceil 2(1+\varepsilon) n\rceil}
$$

Proof. This follows from Theorem 3.22 and Lemma 3.23 of 1 .
The following proof of Theorem 1.7 consists of three steps. In the first step, we apply Theorem 1.2 and Theorem 1.3 to derive a lower bound for the quantity $m \pi\left(R_{n}\right)-\pi\left(R_{m n}\right)$, which holds for every positive integers $m$ and $n$ satisfying $m \geq 2$ and $n \geq \max \{\lceil 5225 / m\rceil, 1245\}$. Then, in the second step, we use this lower bound and a computer to establish Theorem 1.7 for the cases $m=2$ and $m \in\{3,4, \ldots, 19\}$. Finally, we consider the case where $m \geq 20$. In this case, we first show that the inequality $\pi\left(R_{m n}\right) \leq m \pi\left(R_{n}\right)$ holds for every positive integer $n \geq 1245$. So it suffices to show that the required inequality also holds for every positive integers $m$ and $n$ with $m \geq 20$ and $N(m) \leq n \leq 1244$, where $N(m)$ is defined as in Theorem 1.7, with the only exception $(m, n)=(38,9)$. For this purpose, note that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\pi\left(R_{m n}\right) \leq m \pi\left(R_{n}\right) \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad R_{m n} \leq p_{m \pi\left(R_{n}\right)} \tag{5.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

Now, for each $n \in\{2, \ldots, 1244\}$ we use (5.2) and Lemma 5.1 with $\varepsilon=\pi\left(R_{n}\right) / 2 n-1$ (note that $\varepsilon>0$ by (1.3)) to find a positive integer $M(n)$, so that $R_{m n} \leq p_{m \pi\left(R_{n}\right)}$ for every positive integer $m \geq M(n)$. Finally we check with a computer for which $m<M(n)$ the inequality $R_{m n} \leq p_{m \pi\left(R_{n}\right)}$ holds.

Proof of Theorem 1.7. First, we note that the inequality (1.10) holds for $m=1$. So, we can assume that $m \geq 2$. Let $n$ be a positive integer with $n \geq \max \{\lceil 5225 / m\rceil, 1245\}$. By (3.4), (3.5) and Theorem (1.2, we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
\pi\left(R_{m n}\right)<2 m n\left(1+\frac{\log 2+\log 2 / \log (m n)+0.565 / \log ^{2}(m n)}{\log (m n)+\log \log (m n)-\log 2-\log 2 / \log (m n)}\right) \tag{5.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

and, by (4.2), (4.3) and Theorem 1.3) we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
\pi\left(R_{n}\right)>2 n\left(1+\frac{\log 2+\log 2 / \log n-(1.472 \log \log n+2.51) / \log ^{2} n}{\log n+\log \log n-\log 2-\log 2 / \log n}\right) \tag{5.4}
\end{equation*}
$$

We set $\lambda(x)=\log x+\log \log x-\log 2-\log 2 / \log x$ and $\phi(x)=1.472 \log \log x+2.51$. Then, by (5.3) and (5.4), we get

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{m \pi\left(R_{n}\right)-\pi\left(R_{m n}\right)}{2 m n}>\frac{W_{m}(n)}{\lambda(n) \lambda(m n)} \tag{5.5}
\end{equation*}
$$

where

$$
\begin{gathered}
W_{m}(n)=\log 2 \log m+\log 2(\log \log (m n)-\log \log n)+\log 2\left(\frac{\log (m n)}{\log n}-\frac{\log n}{\log (m n)}\right) \\
+ \\
+\log 2\left(\frac{\log \log (m n)}{\log n}-\frac{\log \log n}{\log (m n)}\right)-\frac{\phi(n) \lambda(m n)}{\log ^{2} n}-\frac{0.565 \lambda(n)}{\log ^{2}(m n)} .
\end{gathered}
$$

Clearly, it suffices to show that $W_{m}(n) \geq 0$. Setting $g(x)=\log \log x$, we get, by the mean value theorem, that there exists a real number $\xi \in(n, m n)$ such that $g(m n)-g(n)=(m-1) n g^{\prime}(\xi)$. Hence

$$
\begin{equation*}
\log \log (m n)-\log \log n=\frac{(m-1) n}{\xi \log \xi} \geq \frac{m-1}{m \log (m n)} \geq \frac{1}{2 \log (m n)} \tag{5.6}
\end{equation*}
$$

Further, we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{\log (m n)}{\log n}-\frac{\log n}{\log (m n)}=\frac{\log m}{\log n}+\frac{\log m}{\log (m n)} \tag{5.7}
\end{equation*}
$$

as well as

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{\log \log (m n)}{\log n}-\frac{\log \log n}{\log (m n)}>\frac{\log m \log \log n}{\log ^{2}(m n)} \tag{5.8}
\end{equation*}
$$

Combining (5.6)-(5.8) with the definition of $W_{m}(n)$, we obtain that the inequality

$$
W_{m}(n)>\log m\left(\log 2+\frac{\log 2}{\log n}\right)+\log 2\left(\frac{\log m+1 / 2}{\log (m n)}+\frac{\log m \log \log n}{\log ^{2}(m n)}\right)-\frac{\phi(n) \lambda(m n)}{\log ^{2} n}-\frac{0.565 \lambda(n)}{\log ^{2}(m n)}
$$

Since $\lambda(x)<\log x+\log \log x-\log 2<\log x+\log \log x$, we get

$$
\begin{aligned}
W_{m}(n)> & \log m\left(\log 2+\frac{\log 2}{\log n}-\frac{\phi(n)}{\log ^{2} n}\right)+\log 2\left(\frac{\log m+1 / 2}{\log (m n)}+\frac{\log m \log \log n}{\log ^{2}(m n)}\right) \\
& -\frac{\phi(n)}{\log n}-\frac{\phi(n) \log \log (m n)}{\log ^{2} n}+\frac{\phi(n) \log 2}{\log ^{2} n}-\frac{0.565 \log n}{\log ^{2}(m n)}-\frac{0.565 \log \log n}{\log ^{2}(m n)} .
\end{aligned}
$$

Now, we use the right-hand side inequality of (3.8) to get $\log \log (m n) \leq \log \log n+\log m / \log n$. Finally, we have

$$
\begin{gather*}
W_{m}(n)>\log m\left(\log 2+\frac{\log 2}{\log n}-\frac{\phi(n)}{\log ^{2} n}-\frac{\phi(n)}{\log ^{3} n}\right)-\frac{\phi(n)}{\log n}-\frac{\phi(n)(\log \log n-\log 2)}{\log ^{2} n}  \tag{5.9}\\
+\frac{(\log m+1 / 2) \log 2-0.565}{\log (m n)}+\frac{(\log m \log 2-0.565) \log \log n}{\log ^{2}(m n)}
\end{gather*}
$$

for every positive integers $m$ and $n$ satisfying $m \geq 2$ and $n \geq \max \{\lceil 5225 / m\rceil, 1245\}$. Next, we use this inequality to prove the theorem. For this purpose, we consider the following three cases:
(i) Case 1: $m=2$.

First, let $n \geq 4903689$. In this case, we have $(\log m+1 / 2) \log 2-0.565 \geq 0.262$ and $\log m \log 2-$ $0.565>-0.085$. Hence

$$
\frac{(\log m+1 / 2) \log 2-0.565}{\log (m n)}+\frac{(\log m \log 2-0.565) \log \log n}{\log ^{2}(m n)}>0
$$

Applying this inequality to (5.9), we get

$$
W_{2}(n)>\log 2\left(\log 2+\frac{\log 2}{\log n}-\frac{\phi(n)}{\log ^{2} n}-\frac{\phi(n)}{\log ^{3} n}\right)-\frac{\phi(n)}{\log n}-\frac{\phi(n)(\log \log n-\log 2)}{\log ^{2} n} .
$$

Since $\log 2-\phi(x) / \log x-\phi(x) / \log ^{2} x>0$ for every real $x \geq 10377$, we get

$$
W_{2}(n)>\log ^{2} 2-\frac{\phi(n)}{\log n}-\frac{\phi(n)(\log \log n-\log 2)}{\log ^{2} n} .
$$

Note that the right-hand side of the last inequality is positive. Combined with (5.5), we get that $\pi\left(R_{2 n}\right) \leq 2 \pi\left(R_{n}\right)$ holds for every positive integer $n \geq 4903689$. A direct computation shows that the inequality $\pi\left(R_{2 n}\right) \leq 2 \pi\left(R_{n}\right)$ also holds for every positive integer $n$ so that $1245 \leq n \leq$ 4903689 .
(ii) Case 2: $m \in\{3,4, \ldots, 19\}$.

First, we consider the case where $n \geq 6675$. By (5.9), we have

$$
W_{m}(n)>\log m\left(\log 2+\frac{\log 2}{\log n}-\frac{\phi(n)}{\log ^{2} n}-\frac{\phi(n)}{\log ^{3} n}\right)-\frac{\phi(n)}{\log n}-\frac{\phi(n)(\log \log n-\log 2)}{\log ^{2} n} .
$$

We set $\delta_{2}=0.003314$ to obtain that the inequality

$$
\delta_{2}+\frac{\log 2}{\log x}-\frac{\phi(x)}{\log ^{2} x}-\frac{\phi(x)}{\log ^{3} x}>0
$$

holds for every real $x \geq 6675$. So we see that

$$
W_{m}(n)>\left(\log 2-\delta_{2}\right) \log 3-\frac{\phi(n)}{\log n}-\frac{\phi(n)(\log \log n-\log 2)}{\log ^{2} n}
$$

and since the right-hand side of the last inequality is positive, we use (5.5) to conclude that $\pi\left(R_{m n}\right) \leq m \pi\left(R_{n}\right)$ holds for each $m \in\{3,4, \ldots, 19\}$ and every positive integer $n \geq 6675$. For $m \in\{3,4\}$, we verify with a direct computation that the inequality $\pi\left(R_{m n}\right) \leq m \pi\left(R_{n}\right)$ also holds for every positive integer $n$ so that $189 \leq n \leq 6674$. For $m \in\{5,6\}$, we use a computer to check that the inequality $\pi\left(R_{m n}\right) \leq m \pi\left(R_{n}\right)$ is also valid for every positive integer $n$ satisfying $85 \leq n \leq 6674$. Finally, if $m \in\{7,8, \ldots, 19\}$, a computer check shows that the required inequality also holds for every positive integer $n$ with $10 \leq n \leq 6674$.
(iii) Case 3: $m \geq 20$.

First, let $n \geq 1245$. Setting $\delta_{3}=0.03$, we obtain, similar to Case 2, that

$$
W_{m}(n)>\left(\log 2-\delta_{3}\right) \log 20-\frac{\phi(n)}{\log n}-\frac{\phi(n)(\log \log n-\log 2)}{\log ^{2} n}
$$

Note that the right-hand side of the last inequality is positive. Together with (5.5), we get that $\pi\left(R_{m n}\right) \leq m \pi\left(R_{n}\right)$ holds for all positive integers $m$ and $n$ satisfying $m \geq 20$ and $n \geq 1245$. Now, for each $n \in\{2, \ldots, 1244\}$, we use (5.2), Lemma 5.1 with $\varepsilon=\pi\left(R_{n}\right) / 2 n-1$ and a C ++ version of the following MAPLE code to find positive integer $M(n) \geq 20$, so that $R_{m n} \leq p_{m \pi\left(R_{n}\right)}$ for every positive integer $m \geq M(n)$ and then we check for which $m$ with $20 \leq m<M(n)$ the inequality $R_{m n} \leq p_{m \pi\left(R_{n}\right)}$ holds:

```
> restart: with(numtheory): Digits := 100:
>for n from 1244 by -1 to 2 do
    ep := pi(R[n])/(2*n)-1: # R[n] denotes the nth Ramanujan prime
    lambda := ep/2:
    S := ceil(evalf(exp(sqrt(1.17+2*(1+ep)/ep*(0.17+log(2)/log(2*5.43))+
            (1/2+(1+ep)*log(2)/ep) 2)+1/2+(1+ep)*log(2)/ep):
    T := ceil(evalf(exp(sqrt(1.17+0.17/lambda+1/4)+1/2))):
    X9 := max(468049,2*S,T): M := ceil((1+pi(X9))/(2*(1+ep))):
    # Hence pi(R[mn]) <= m*pi(R[n]) for all m >= M by Lemma 5.1
    while M*pi(R[n]) - pi(R[n*M]) >= 0 and M >= 20 do
            M := M-1:
    end do:
    L[n] := M+1:
end do:
```

Since $L[i]=20$ for every $i \in\{2, \ldots, 1244\} \backslash\{9\}$ and $L[9]=39$, we get that $\pi\left(R_{m n}\right) \leq m \pi\left(R_{n}\right)$ for every positive integers $n$, $m$ with $n \in\{2, \ldots, 1244\} \backslash\{9\}$ and $m \geq 20$ and for every positive integers $n, m$ with $n=9$ and $m \geq 39$. A direct computation shows that the inequality $\pi\left(R_{9 m}\right) \leq m \pi\left(R_{9}\right)$ holds for every $m$ with $20 \leq m \leq 37$ as well and that $38 \pi\left(R_{9}\right)-\pi\left(R_{9.38}\right)=-2$.
So, we showed that the inequality $\pi\left(R_{m n}\right) \leq m \pi\left(R_{n}\right)$ holds for every $m \in \mathbb{N}$ and every positive integer $n \geq N(m)$ with the only exception $(m, n)=(38,9)$, as desired.

We use Theorem 1.7 and a computer to get the following remark.

Remark. The inequality $\pi\left(R_{m n}\right) \leq m \pi\left(R_{n}\right)$ fails if and only if $(m, n) \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 2} \times\{1\}$ (see (1.3)) or

$$
\begin{aligned}
(m, n) \in\{ & (2,3),(2,7),(2,8),(2,9),(2,22),(2,23),(2,25),(2,37),(2,38),(2,49),(2,53),(2,54), \\
& (2,55),(2,66),(2,82),(2,83),(2,84),(2,85),(2,86),(2,87),(2,101),(2,102),(2,113), \\
& (2,114),(2,115),(2,160),(2,161),(2,162),(2,179),(2,180),(2,184),(2,185),(2,186), \\
& (2,232),(2,240),(2,241),(2,246),(2,247),(2,376),(2,377),(2,378),(2,379),(2,380), \\
& (2,381),(2,386),(2,387),(2,388),(2,412),(2,531),(2,532),(2,537),(2,538),(2,547), \\
& (2,548),(2,549),(2,550),(2,551),(2,552),(2,553),(2,554),(2,555),(2,556),(2,557), \\
& (2,558),(2,792),(2,793),(2,794),(2,795),(2,796),(2,797),(2,798),(2,799),(2,800), \\
& (2,801),(2,802),(2,803),(2,804),(2,1140),(2,1141),(2,1142),(2,1146),(2,1147), \\
& (2,1202),(2,1241),(2,1242),(2,1243),(2,1244),(3,9),(3,11),(3,23),(3,25),(3,49), \\
& (3,54),(3,55),(3,56),(3,57),(3,66),(3,67),(3,83),(3,84),(3,114),(3,115),(3,160), \\
& (3,187),(3,188),(4,9),(4,11),(4,37),(4,38),(4,42),(4,54),(4,55),(4,82),(4,83), \\
& (4,84),(4,114),(4,115),(4,188),(5,3),(5,9),(5,84),(6,28),(6,54),(6,55),(6,84), \\
& (7,3),(7,9),(8,9),(9,9),(10,9),(11,3),(11,9),(12,9),(13,9),(14,9),(15,3),(15,9), \\
& (16,9),(17,9),(18,9),(19,9),(38,9)\} .
\end{aligned}
$$
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