

SUMS AND PRODUCTS WITH SMOOTH NUMBERS*

WILLIAM D. BANKS
Department of Mathematics
University of Missouri
Columbia, MO 65211 USA
BanksWD@missouri.edu

DAVID J. COVERT
Department of Mathematics
University of Missouri
Columbia, MO 65211 USA
CovertDJ@missouri.edu

November 12, 2018

Abstract

We estimate the sizes of the sumset $\mathcal{A} + \mathcal{A}$ and the productset $\mathcal{A} \cdot \mathcal{A}$ in the special case that $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{S}(x, y)$, the set of positive integers $n \leq x$ free of prime factors exceeding y .

*MSC Numbers: 11B75, 11N25

1 Background

For any nonempty subset \mathcal{A} of a ring, the *sumset* and *productset* of \mathcal{A} are defined as

$$\mathcal{A} + \mathcal{A} = \{a + a' : a, a' \in \mathcal{A}\} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{A} \cdot \mathcal{A} = \{a \cdot a' : a, a' \in \mathcal{A}\},$$

respectively. A famous problem of Erdős and Szemerédi [6] asks one to show that the sumset and productset of a finite set of integers cannot both be small.

Conjecture. (Erdős–Szemerédi) *For any fixed $\delta > 0$ the lower bound*

$$\max\{|\mathcal{A} + \mathcal{A}|, |\mathcal{A} \cdot \mathcal{A}|\} \gg_{\delta} |\mathcal{A}|^{2-\delta}$$

holds for all finite sets $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathbb{Z}$.

Erdős and Szemerédi [6] took the first step towards this conjecture by showing that for some $\epsilon > 0$, one has a lower bound of the form

$$\max\{|\mathcal{A} + \mathcal{A}|, |\mathcal{A} \cdot \mathcal{A}|\} \geq c(\epsilon) |\mathcal{A}|^{1+\epsilon} \tag{1}$$

for all finite sets $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathbb{Z}$. Nathanson [10] gave the first explicit bound by showing that one can take $\epsilon = \frac{1}{31}$ and $c(\epsilon) = 0.00028 \dots$ in this inequality, and later, Ford [8] showed that $\epsilon = \frac{1}{15}$ is acceptable. Establishing an important connection between the sum-product problem and geometric incidence theory, Elekes [3] showed that one can take $\epsilon = \frac{1}{4}$ via a clever application of the Szemerédi–Trotter incidence theorem (which counts incidences between points and lines in the plane); moreover, his argument readily extends to finite sets of real numbers. Further improvements, including the best known bound to date, have been given by Solymosi [12, 13]; he has shown that (1) holds with any $\epsilon < \frac{1}{3}$ for all finite sets $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathbb{R}$.

Although the Erdős–Szemerédi conjecture remains open, it is known that the productset must be large whenever the sumset is sufficiently small. In fact, Nathanson and Tenenbaum [11] have shown that

$$|\mathcal{A} \cdot \mathcal{A}| \geq \frac{c |\mathcal{A}|^2}{\log |\mathcal{A}|} \quad \text{if} \quad |\mathcal{A} + \mathcal{A}| \leq 3|\mathcal{A}| - 4. \tag{2}$$

The aforementioned best known bound to date, given by Solymosi [13], follows from his more general inequality

$$|\mathcal{A} + \mathcal{A}|^2 |\mathcal{A} \cdot \mathcal{A}| \geq \frac{|\mathcal{A}|^4}{4 \lceil \log |\mathcal{A}| \rceil}. \tag{3}$$

Note that (3) provides a quantitative generalization of the Nathanson–Tenenbaum result (2) (see also the results in [3, 4, 12]); it implies that $|\mathcal{A} \cdot \mathcal{A}| \geq |\mathcal{A}|^{2-\delta_\epsilon}$ whenever $|\mathcal{A} + \mathcal{A}| < |\mathcal{A}|^{1+\epsilon}$, where $\delta_\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$.

In the opposite direction, Chang [2] has shown that the sumset must be large whenever the productset is sufficiently small. More precisely, she has shown that

$$|\mathcal{A} + \mathcal{A}| > 36^{-\alpha} |\mathcal{A}|^2 \quad \text{if} \quad |\mathcal{A} \cdot \mathcal{A}| < \alpha |\mathcal{A}| \quad \text{for some constant } \alpha. \quad (4)$$

A great deal of attention has also been given to the sum-product problem in other rings, including (but not limited to) finite fields, polynomial rings, and matrix rings. For a thorough account of the subject, we refer the reader to [14] and the references contained therein.

2 Statement of results

Let Ω be any infinite collection of finite sets within a given ring. We shall say that Ω has the *Erdős–Szemerédi property* if

$$\max\{|\mathcal{A} + \mathcal{A}|, |\mathcal{A} \cdot \mathcal{A}|\} = |\mathcal{A}|^{2+o(1)} \quad \text{as} \quad |\mathcal{A}| \rightarrow \infty \text{ with } \mathcal{A} \in \Omega.$$

Then, the Erdős–Szemerédi conjecture is the assertion that the collection consisting of *all* finite sets of integers has the Erdős–Szemerédi property.

In this paper, we study the Erdős–Szemerédi property with collections of sets of *smooth numbers*, i.e., sets of the form

$$\mathcal{S}(x, y) = \{n \leq x : P^+(n) \leq y\} \quad (x \geq y \geq 2),$$

where $P^+(n)$ denotes the largest prime factor of an integer $n \geq 2$, and $P^+(1) = 1$. These sets are well known in analytic number theory; for a background on integers free of large prime factors, we refer the reader to [15, Chapter III.5] (see also the survey [9]).

Theorem 1. *There is an absolute constant $c > 0$ for which the collection*

$$\Omega = \{\mathcal{S}(x, y) : 2 \leq y \leq c \log x\}$$

has the Erdős–Szemerédi property.

REMARK. For smaller values of y of size $o(\log x)$ we show that the productset of $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{S}(x, y)$ has size $|\mathcal{A}|^{1+o(1)}$ (see Theorem 4), and thus only the sumset is large in this region.

Theorem 2. *Let f be an arbitrary real-valued function such that $f(x) \rightarrow \infty$ as $x \rightarrow \infty$. Then, the collection*

$$\Omega = \{\mathcal{S}(x, y) : f(x) \log x \leq y \leq x\}$$

has the Erdős–Szemerédi property.

REMARK. For slightly larger values of y exceeding $(\log x)^{f(x)}$ we show that the sumset of $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{S}(x, y)$ has size $|\mathcal{A}|^{1+o(1)}$ (see Theorem 5), and hence only the productset is large in this region.

Since each set $\mathcal{S}(x, y)$ is multiplicatively defined, it is quite difficult to estimate the size of the sumset $\mathcal{S}(x, y) + \mathcal{S}(x, y)$ for values of y close to $\log x$. It is reasonable to expect that for every fixed $\kappa > 0$ one has

$$|\mathcal{S}(x, y) + \mathcal{S}(x, y)| = |\mathcal{S}(x, y)|^{2+o(1)} \quad (x \rightarrow \infty, y = \kappa \log x).$$

In view of (12), the Erdős–Szemerédi conjecture implies that this is true. A partial result in this direction is provided by (13). We also expect that for any fixed $A > 1$ one has

$$|\mathcal{S}(x, y) + \mathcal{S}(x, y)| = |\mathcal{S}(x, y)|^{\beta_A+o(1)} \quad (x \rightarrow \infty, y = (\log x)^A)$$

for some constant β_A in the open interval $(1, 2)$. For $A > 2$, a partial result in this direction is provided by Theorem 8.

Acknowledgements. The authors would like to thank Derrick Hart, Alex Iosevich, and Igor Shparlinski for helpful conversations.

3 Preliminaries

As before, we write

$$\mathcal{S}(x, y) = \{n \leq x : P^+(n) \leq y\} \quad (x \geq y \geq 2),$$

and we now set

$$\Psi(x, y) = |\mathcal{S}(x, y)| \quad (x \geq y \geq 2).$$

We also put

$$G(t) = \log(1+t) + t \log(1+t^{-1}) \quad (t > 0).$$

From this definition we immediately derive the crude estimates

$$G(t) = \log t \left\{ 1 + O\left(\frac{1}{\log t}\right) \right\} \quad (t \geq 2) \quad (5)$$

and

$$G(t) = t \log t^{-1} \left\{ 1 + O\left(\frac{1}{\log t^{-1}}\right) \right\} \quad (0 < t \leq 1/2). \quad (6)$$

The following result is due to de Bruijn [1].

Lemma 1. *Uniformly for $x \geq y \geq 2$ we have*

$$\log \Psi(x, y) = \frac{\log x}{\log y} G\left(\frac{y}{\log x}\right) \left\{ 1 + O\left(\frac{1}{\log y} + \frac{1}{\log \log 2x}\right) \right\}.$$

For smaller values of y , we need the following result of Ennola [5].

Lemma 2. *Uniformly for $2 \leq y \leq \sqrt{\log x \log \log x}$ we have*

$$\Psi(x, y) = \frac{1}{\pi(y)!} \prod_{p \leq y} \frac{\log x}{\log p} \left\{ 1 + O\left(\frac{y^2}{\log x \log y}\right) \right\},$$

where $\pi(y) = |\{p \leq y\}|$.

For any finite set of primes S , let \mathcal{O}_S^* denote the group of S -units in \mathbb{Q}^* ; that is,

$$\mathcal{O}_S^* = \{a/b \in \mathbb{Q}^* : p \mid ab \Rightarrow p \in S\}.$$

The next statement is a special case of a more general result of Evertse on solutions to S -unit equations (see [7, Theorem 3]).

Lemma 3. *Given $a_1 \dots a_n \in \mathbb{Q}^*$ and a finite set of primes S of cardinality $|S| = s$, the S -unit equation*

$$a_1 u_1 + \dots + a_n u_n = 1 \quad (u_1, \dots, u_n \in \mathcal{O}_S^*)$$

has at most $(2^{35} n^2)^{n^3 s}$ solutions (u_1, \dots, u_n) with $\sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}} a_j u_j \neq 0$ for every nonempty subset $\mathcal{J} \subseteq \{1, \dots, n\}$.

To get a better handle on productsets of smooth numbers, we shall apply the following technical lemma.

Lemma 4. *We have*

$$\Psi(x^2/y, y) \leq |\mathcal{S}(x, y) \cdot \mathcal{S}(x, y)| \leq \Psi(x^2, y) \quad (x \geq y \geq 2).$$

Proof. It is easy to see that $\mathcal{S}(x, y) \cdot \mathcal{S}(x, y) \subseteq \mathcal{S}(x^2, y)$, which yields the second inequality. For the first inequality, it suffices to show that $\mathcal{S}(x^2/y, y)$ is contained in the productset $\mathcal{S}(x, y) \cdot \mathcal{S}(x, y)$. To this end, let $n \in \mathcal{S}(x^2/y, y)$, and let d be the largest divisor of n that does not exceed x . Note that $\max\{P^+(d), P^+(n/d)\} \leq y$. There are three possibilities for the number d :

- (i) $d > x/y$;
- (ii) $d = n \leq x/y$;
- (iii) $d \leq x/y$ and $d < n$.

In case (i) we have $n/d \leq x$, hence we can write $n = d \cdot (n/d)$ where d and n/d both lie in $\mathcal{S}(x, y)$; this shows that $n \in \mathcal{S}(x, y) \cdot \mathcal{S}(x, y)$ as required. In case (ii) the number n lies in the set $\mathcal{S}(x/y, y)$, which is a subset of $\mathcal{S}(x, y) \cdot \mathcal{S}(x, y)$. To finish the proof, we need only show that the case (iii) is not possible. Indeed, suppose $d \leq x/y$ and $d < n$, and let p be any prime factor of n/d ; then $p \leq P^+(n/d) \leq y$, $dp \mid n$, and $dp \leq x$, which contradicts the maximal property of d . \square

4 Small values of y

Theorem 3. *There is an absolute constant $c > 0$ such that the estimate*

$$|\mathcal{S}(x, y) + \mathcal{S}(x, y)| \sim \frac{1}{2} \Psi(x, y)^2 \quad (x \rightarrow \infty)$$

holds uniformly for $2 \leq y \leq c \log x$.

Proof. We have

$$\Psi(x, y)^2 = |\mathcal{S}(x, y)|^2 = \sum_{n \in \mathcal{S}(x, y) + \mathcal{S}(x, y)} \sum_{\substack{m_1, m_2 \in \mathcal{S}(x, y) \\ m_1 + m_2 = n}} 1.$$

Using the Cauchy inequality it follows that

$$\Psi(x, y)^4 \leq |\mathcal{S}(x, y) + \mathcal{S}(x, y)| \cdot |\mathcal{T}|,$$

where \mathcal{T} is the set of quadruples (m_1, m_2, m_3, m_4) with entries in $\mathcal{S}(x, y)$ such that $m_1 + m_2 = m_3 + m_4$. It is easy to see that there are precisely $2\Psi(x, y)^2 - \Psi(x, y)$ quadruples in \mathcal{T} for which $m_1 = m_3$ or $m_1 = m_4$. Let \mathcal{T}^* be the set of quadruples in \mathcal{T} with $m_1 \neq m_3$ and $m_1 \neq m_4$ (thus, $m_2 \neq m_3$ and $m_2 \neq m_4$ as well). If we put $a_1 = a_2 = 1$ and $a_3 = -1$, the equation $m_1 + m_2 = m_3 + m_4$ becomes

$$a_1 u_1 + a_2 u_2 + a_3 u_3 = 1, \quad (7)$$

where

$$u_1 = \frac{m_1}{m_4}, \quad u_2 = \frac{m_2}{m_4} \text{ and } u_3 = \frac{m_3}{m_4}. \quad (8)$$

Let S be the set of primes $p \leq y$, and let \mathcal{O}_S^* be the group of S -units in \mathbb{Q}^* . According to Lemma 3, there are at most $(2^{35} 9)^{27\pi(y)}$ solutions to the S -unit equation (7) with $u_j \in \mathcal{O}_S^*$, $j = 1, 2, 3$, and $\sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}} a_j u_j \neq 0$ for each nonempty subset $\mathcal{J} \subseteq \{1, 2, 3\}$. On the other hand, for every fixed solution (u_1, u_2, u_3) to (7) there are at most $\Psi(x, y)$ quadruples (m_1, m_2, m_3, m_4) in \mathcal{T}^* for which (8) holds (since each choice of $m_4 \in \mathcal{S}(x, y)$ determines m_1, m_2, m_3 uniquely). Putting everything together, it follows that the bound

$$\Psi(x, y)^4 \leq |\mathcal{S}(x, y) + \mathcal{S}(x, y)| \cdot (2\Psi(x, y)^2 - \Psi(x, y) + \exp(c_1 y / \log y) \Psi(x, y))$$

holds with some absolute constant $c_1 > 0$. Taking into account the trivial upper bound

$$|\mathcal{S}(x, y) + \mathcal{S}(x, y)| \leq \frac{1}{2} (\Psi(x, y)^2 + \Psi(x, y)),$$

it suffices to show that there is an absolute constant $c > 0$ such that for all sufficiently large x , we have

$$\exp(c_1 y / \log y) \leq \Psi(x, y)^{1/2} \quad (2 \leq y \leq c \log x). \quad (9)$$

For every sufficiently large integer N , Lemma 1 implies that:

$$\log \Psi(x, y) \geq \frac{1}{2} \frac{\log x}{\log y} G\left(\frac{y}{\log x}\right) \quad (x \geq y > N)$$

if x is sufficiently large. Let $N \geq 2$ be fixed with this property. For every sufficiently small constant $c > 0$ we also have by (6):

$$G(t) \geq \frac{1}{2} t \log t^{-1} \quad (0 < t \leq c).$$

Let $0 < c \leq e^{-8c_1}$ be fixed with this property. Combining the two bounds, we see that

$$\log \Psi(x, y) \geq \frac{\log(1/c)}{4} \frac{y}{\log y} \geq 2c_1 \frac{y}{\log y} \quad (N < y \leq c \log x)$$

if x is large enough; this implies (9) in the range $N < y \leq c \log x$. For the smaller values of y in the range $2 \leq y \leq N$, we simply observe that $\exp(c_1 y / \log y) = O(1)$, whereas

$$\Psi(x, y) \geq \Psi(x, 2) = 1 + \left\lfloor \frac{\log x}{\log 2} \right\rfloor \rightarrow \infty \quad \text{as } x \rightarrow \infty.$$

Hence, (9) also holds for these values of y if x is sufficiently large. This completes the proof. \square

Theorem 4. *Suppose that $y \geq 2$ and $y = o(\log x)$. Then*

$$|\mathcal{S}(x, y) \cdot \mathcal{S}(x, y)| = \Psi(x, y)^{1+o(1)}.$$

Proof. By Lemma 4 we have

$$\Psi(x, y) \leq \Psi(x^2/y, y) \leq |\mathcal{S}(x, y) \cdot \mathcal{S}(x, y)| \leq \Psi(x^2, y),$$

hence it suffices to show that $\Psi(x^2, y) = \Psi(x, y)^{1+o(1)}$ as $x \rightarrow \infty$.

First, suppose that $2 \leq y \leq \sqrt{\log x}$. By Lemma 2 we have

$$\Psi(x, y) \sim \frac{1}{\pi(y)!} \prod_{p \leq y} \frac{\log x}{\log p} \quad (x \rightarrow \infty)$$

and

$$\Psi(x^2, y) \sim \frac{1}{\pi(y)!} \prod_{p \leq y} \frac{\log x^2}{\log p} \sim 2^{\pi(y)} \Psi(x, y) \quad (x \rightarrow \infty).$$

Since the inequality $\pi(y)! \leq y^{\pi(y)}$ implies

$$\Psi(x, y) \geq (1 + o(1)) \left(\frac{\log x}{y \log y} \right)^{\pi(y)} \geq (1 + o(1)) \left(\frac{2\sqrt{\log x}}{\log \log x} \right)^{\pi(y)},$$

it follows that $2^{\pi(y)} = \Psi(x, y)^{o(1)}$; thus, $\Psi(x^2, y) = \Psi(x, y)^{1+o(1)}$ as required.

Next, suppose that $y > \sqrt{\log x}$ and $y = o(\log x)$ as $x \rightarrow \infty$. Using Lemma 1 together with (6) we see that the estimate

$$\log \Psi(z, y) = \frac{y}{\log y} \log \left(\frac{\log z}{y} \right) \left\{ 1 + O \left(\frac{1}{\log((\log x)/y)} \right) \right\}$$

holds uniformly for all z in the range $x \leq z \leq x^2$. Applying this estimate with $z = x$ and with $z = x^2$, we derive that $\Psi(x^2, y) = \Psi(x, y)^{1+o(1)}$ in this case as well. \square

5 Large values of y

For values of y exceeding any fixed power of $\log x$, we have:

Theorem 5. *Suppose that $(\log y)/\log \log x \rightarrow \infty$. Then,*

$$|\mathcal{S}(x, y) + \mathcal{S}(x, y)| = \Psi(x, y)^{1+o(1)} \quad (x \rightarrow \infty).$$

Proof. Using Lemma 1 and (5) we see that

$$\log \Psi(x, y) \sim \frac{\log x}{\log y} G\left(\frac{y}{\log x}\right) \sim \frac{\log x}{\log y} (\log y - \log \log x) \sim \log x \quad (x \rightarrow \infty),$$

since $(\log \log x)/\log y \rightarrow 0$; that is,

$$\Psi(x, y) = x^{1+o(1)} \quad (x \rightarrow \infty).$$

Using the trivial bounds

$$\Psi(x, y) \leq |\mathcal{S}(x, y) + \mathcal{S}(x, y)| \leq 2x$$

together with the previous estimate, we obtain the desired result. \square

Theorem 6. *Let $y/\log x \rightarrow \infty$. Then,*

$$|\mathcal{S}(x, y) \cdot \mathcal{S}(x, y)| = \Psi(x, y)^{2+o(1)} \quad (x \rightarrow \infty). \quad (10)$$

Proof. In the case that $(\log y)/\log \log x \rightarrow \infty$, we can apply Theorem 5 together with (3) to obtain (10) immediately. Thus, we can assume that $\log y \asymp \log \log x$. Since $y/\log x \rightarrow \infty$, we derive from Lemma 1 and (5) the estimate

$$\log \Psi(x, y) = \frac{\log x}{\log y} \log \left(\frac{y}{\log x} \right) \{1 + o(1)\}, \quad (11)$$

whereas both $\log \Psi(x^2/y, y)$ and $\log \Psi(x^2, y)$ are of the size

$$\frac{\log x}{\log y} \log \left(\frac{y}{\log x} \right) \{2 + o(1)\}.$$

Therefore,

$$\Psi(x^2/y, y) = \Psi(x, y)^{2+o(1)} \quad \text{and} \quad \Psi(x^2, y) = \Psi(x, y)^{2+o(1)},$$

and the result follows from Lemma 4. \square

6 Intermediate values of y

Theorem 7. *Suppose that $y = \kappa \log x$, where $\kappa > 0$ is fixed. Then,*

$$|\mathcal{S}(x, y) \cdot \mathcal{S}(x, y)| = \Psi(x, y)^{\alpha_\kappa + o(1)} \quad (12)$$

and

$$|\mathcal{S}(x, y) + \mathcal{S}(x, y)| \geq \Psi(x, y)^{(4-\alpha_\kappa)/2 + o(1)}, \quad (13)$$

where

$$\alpha_\kappa = \frac{2 \log(1 + \kappa/2) + \kappa \log(1 + 2/\kappa)}{\log(1 + \kappa) + \kappa \log(1 + 1/k)}.$$

REMARK. For every positive real number κ we have $1 < \alpha_\kappa < 2$. Also, $\alpha_\kappa \rightarrow 1$ as $\kappa \rightarrow 0^+$ and $\alpha_\kappa \rightarrow 2$ as $\kappa \rightarrow \infty$.

Proof. First note that (13) follows from combining (12) and (3). It remains to prove (12). By Lemma 1 we have

$$\log \Psi(x, y) = (G(\kappa) + o(1)) \frac{\log x}{\log \log x} \quad (x \rightarrow \infty)$$

and

$$\log \Psi(x^2, y) = (2G(\kappa/2) + o(1)) \frac{\log x}{\log \log x} \quad (x \rightarrow \infty),$$

where the functions implied by $o(1)$ depend only on κ . Since G is continuous it is also easy to see that

$$\log \Psi(x^2/y, y) = (2G(\kappa/2) + o(1)) \frac{\log x}{\log \log x} \quad (x \rightarrow \infty).$$

Using Lemma 4, the above estimates, and the fact that $\alpha_\kappa = 2G(\kappa/2)/G(\kappa)$, the result follows. \square

Theorem 8. *Suppose that $y \asymp (\log x)^A$, where $A > 2$ is fixed. Then,*

$$|\mathcal{S}(x, y) + \mathcal{S}(x, y)| \leq \Psi(x, y)^{\frac{A}{A-1} + o(1)} \quad (x \rightarrow \infty).$$

Proof. If $y \asymp (\log x)^A$ for some $A > 1$, then the estimate $\Psi(x, y) = x^{\frac{A-1}{A} + o(1)}$ follows immediately from (11). Taking into account the trivial bound $|\mathcal{S}(x, y) + \mathcal{S}(x, y)| \leq 2x$, we obtain the stated result (which is nontrivial in the range $A > 2$). \square

References

- [1] N. G. de Bruijn, ‘On the number of positive integers $\leq x$ and free of prime factors $> y$,’ *Nederl. Acad. Wetensch. Proc. Ser. A.* **54** (1951), 50–60.
- [2] M.-C. Chang, ‘The Erdős-Szemerédi problem on sum set and product set,’ *Annals of Math.* **157** (2003), 939–957
- [3] Gy. Elekes, ‘On the number of sums and products,’ *Acta Arith.* **81** (1997), 365–367.
- [4] Gy. Elekes and I. Ruzsa, ‘Few sums, many products,’ *Studia Sci. Math. Hungar.* **40** (2003), no. 3, 301–308.
- [5] V. Ennola, ‘On numbers with small prime divisors,’ *Ann. Acad. Sci. Fenn. Ser. A I* **440** (1969), 16 pp.
- [6] P. Erdős and E. Szemerédi, ‘On sums and products of integers,’ *Studies in pure mathematics*, 213–218, Birkhäuser, Basel, 1983.
- [7] J.-H. Evertse, ‘The number of solutions of decomposable form equations,’ *Invent. Math.* **122** (1995), no. 3, 559–601.
- [8] K. Ford, ‘Sums and products from a finite set of real numbers,’ *Ramanujan J.* **2** (1998), 59–66.
- [9] A. Granville, ‘Smooth numbers: computational number theory and beyond,’ in *Algorithmic number theory: lattices, number fields, curves and cryptography*, 267–323, Math. Sci. Res. Inst. Publ., **44**, Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 2008.
- [10] M. B. Nathanson, ‘On sums and products of integers,’ *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* **125** (1997), 9–16.
- [11] M. Nathanson and G. Tenenbaum, ‘Inverse theorems and the number of sums and products,’ *Structure theory of set addition*. Astérisque No. **258** (1999), xiii, 195–204.
- [12] J. Solymosi, ‘On the number of sums and products,’ *Bull. London Math. Soc.* **37** (2005), 491–494.
- [13] J. Solymosi, ‘Bounding multiplicative energy by the sumset’. *Advances in Mathematics*, Volume **222**, Issue 2, 2009, 402–408

- [14] T. Tao, ‘The sum-product phenomenon in arbitrary rings,’ *Contrib. Discrete Math.* **4** (2009), no. 2, 59–82.
- [15] G. Tenenbaum, *Introduction to analytic and probabilistic number theory*. Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics, **46**. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1995.