

# EXTREMAL PROPERTIES OF PRODUCT SETS

KEVIN FORD

*To Sergei Vladimirovich Konyagin on the occasion of his 60th birthday*

ABSTRACT. We find the nearly optimal size of a set  $A \subset [N] := \{1, \dots, N\}$  so that the product set  $AA$  satisfies either (i)  $|AA| \sim |A|^2/2$  or (ii)  $|AA| \sim |[N][N]$ . This settles problems recently posed in a paper of Cilleruelo, Ramana and Ramaré.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

For  $A, B \subset \mathbb{N}$  let  $AB$  denote the product set  $\{ab : a \in A, b \in B\}$ . In the special case  $[N] = \{1, 2, 3, \dots, N\}$ , denote by  $M_N = |[N][N]|$  the number of distinct products in an  $N$  by  $N$  multiplication table. In a recent paper [CRR17] of Cilleruelo, Ramana and Ramaré (see also Problems 15, 16 in [CRS18]), the following problems were posed:

- (1) [CRR17, Problem 1.2]. If  $A \subset [N]$  and  $|AA| \sim |A|^2/2$ , is  $|A| = o(N/\log^{1/2} N)$ ?
- (2) [CRR17, Problem 1.4]. If  $A \subset [N]$  and  $|AA| \sim M_N$ , is  $|A| \sim N$ ?

In this note, we answer both questions in the negative. Our results are based on a careful analysis of the structure of  $[N][N]$  developed in [For08a] and [For08b]. Let

$$(1.1) \quad \theta = \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1 + \log \log 2}{\log 4} = 1 - \frac{1 + \log \log 4}{\log 4} = 0.04303566 \dots$$

From [For08a], we have

$$(1.2) \quad M_N \asymp \frac{N^2}{(\log N)^{2\theta} (\log \log N)^{3/2}}.$$

In light of the elementary inequalities  $|AA| \leq \min(|A|^2, M_N)$ , it follows that if  $|AA| \sim \frac{1}{2}|A|^2$ , then  $|A|$  cannot be of order larger than  $M_N^{1/2}$ , and if  $|AA| \sim M_N$ , then  $|A|$  cannot have order of growth smaller than  $M_N^{1/2}$ . As we shall see,  $M_N^{1/2}$  turns out to be close to the threshold value of  $|A|$  for each of these properties to hold.

**Theorem 1.** *Let  $D > 7/2$ . For each  $N \geq 10$  there is a set  $A \subset [N]$  of size*

$$|A| \geq \frac{N}{(\log N)^\theta (\log \log N)^D},$$

for which  $|AA| \sim |A|^2/2$  as  $N \rightarrow \infty$ .

Consequently, the largest size  $T_N(\varepsilon)$  of a set  $A$  with  $|AA| \geq (1 - \varepsilon)|A|^2/2$  satisfies

$$\frac{N}{(\log N)^\theta (\log \log N)^{7/2+o(1)}} \ll T_N(\varepsilon) \ll \frac{N}{(\log N)^\theta (\log \log N)^{3/4}}.$$

---

<sup>1</sup>Research of the author supported in part by individual NSF grant DMS-1501982. Some of this work was carried out at MSRI, Berkeley during the Spring semester of 2017, partially supported by NSF grant DMS-1440140.

**Theorem 2.** *For each  $N \geq 10$  there is a set  $A \subset [N]$  of size*

$$|A| \leq \frac{N}{(\log N)^\theta} \exp \left\{ (2/3) \sqrt{\log \log N \log \log \log N} \right\},$$

for which  $|AA| \sim M_N$  as  $N \rightarrow \infty$ .

The construction of extremal sets satisfying the required properties in either Theorem 1 or 2 requires an analysis of the structure of integers in the “multiplication table”  $[N][N]$ , as worked out in [For08a]. From this work, we know that most elements of  $[N][N]$  have  $\frac{\log \log N}{\log 2} + O(1)$  prime factors, and moreover, these prime factors are not “compressed at the bottom”, meaning that for most  $n \in [N][N]$  we have

$$\#\{p|n : p \leq t\} \leq \frac{\log \log t}{\log 2} + O(1) \quad (3 \leq t \leq N).$$

Here the terms  $O(1)$  should be interpreted as being bounded by a sufficiently large constant  $C = C(\epsilon)$ , where  $\epsilon$  is the relative density of exceptional elements of  $[N][N]$ . This suggests that candidate extremal sets  $A$  should consist of integers with about half as many prime factors; that is,  $\omega(n) \approx \frac{\log \log N}{\log 4}$ .

In a sequel paper, we will refine the estimates in Theorems 1 and 2. In particular, we will show that the threshold size of  $A$  for the property  $|AA| \sim |A|^2/2$  is genuinely smaller than the threshold size of  $|A|$  for the property  $|AA| \sim M_N$ . More precisely, we will show that if  $|A| \leq \frac{N}{(\log N)^\theta} \exp\{O(\sqrt{\log \log N})\}$ , then  $|AA| \not\sim M_N$ . The proof requires a much more intricate analysis of the arguments in the papers [For08a] and [For08b].

**Acknowledgements.** The author is grateful to Sergei Konyagin for bringing the paper [CRR17] to his attention, and for helpful conversations. The author thanks Yuri Shteinikov for pointing out an error in the proof of Lemma 3.2 in an earlier version of the paper.

## 2. PRELIMINARIES

Here  $\omega(n)$  is the number of distinct prime factors of  $n$ ,  $\omega(n, t)$  is the number of prime factors  $p|n$  with  $p \leq t$ ,  $\Omega(n)$  is the number of prime power divisors of  $n$ ,  $\Omega(n, t)$  is the number of prime powers  $p^a|n$  with  $p \leq t$ . We analyze the distribution of these functions using a simple, but powerful technique known as the parametric method (or the “tilting method” in probability theory).

For brevity, we use the notation  $\log_k x$  for the  $k$ -th iterate of the logarithm of  $x$ .

**Lemma 2.1.** *Let  $f$  be a real valued multiplicative function such that  $0 \leq f(p^a) \leq 1.9^a$  for all primes  $p$  and positive integers  $a$ . Then, for all  $x > 1$  we have*

$$\sum_{n \leq x} f(n) \ll \frac{x}{\log x} \exp \left( \sum_{p \leq x} \frac{f(p)}{p} \right).$$

*Proof.* This is a corollary of a more general theorem of Halberstam and Richert; see Theorem 01 of [HT88] and the following remarks.  $\square$

In the special case  $f(n) = \lambda^{\Omega(n)}$ , where  $0 < \lambda \leq 1.9$ , we get by Mertens’ estimate the uniform bound

$$(2.1) \quad \sum_{n \leq x} \lambda^{\Omega(n,t)} \ll x(\log t)^{\lambda-1}.$$

This is useful for bounding the tails of the distribution of  $\Omega(n, t)$ .

### 3. PROOF OF THEOREM 1

Define

$$k = \left\lfloor \frac{\log_2 N}{\log 4} \right\rfloor$$

and let

$$B = \left\{ N/2 < m \leq N : m \text{ squarefree, } \omega(m) = k, \omega(m, t) \leq \frac{\log_2 t}{\log 4} + 2 \text{ (} 3 \leq t \leq N \text{)} \right\}.$$

Our proof of Theorem 1 has three parts:

- (i) establish a lower bound on the size of  $B$ , showing that the upper bound on  $\omega(n, t)$  affects the size of  $B$  only mildly;
- (ii) give an upper bound on the multiplicative energy  $E(B)$ , which shows that there are few nontrivial solutions of  $b_1 b_2 = b_3 b_4$ ; consequently, the product set  $BB$  is large; and
- (iii) select a thin random subset  $A$  of  $B$  that has the desired properties, an idea borrowed from Proposition 3.2 of [CRR17].

**Lemma 3.1.** *We have*

$$|B| \gg \frac{N}{(\log N)^\theta (\log_2 N)^{3/2}}.$$

**Lemma 3.2.** *Let  $E(B) = |\{(b_1, b_2, b_3, b_4) \in B^4 : b_1 b_2 = b_3 b_4\}|$  be the multiplicative energy of  $B$ . Then*

$$E(B) \ll |B|^2 (\log_2 N)^4.$$

**Lemma 3.3.** *Given  $B \subset [N]$  with  $E(B) \leq |B|^2 f(N)$  and  $f(N) \leq |B|^{1/2}$ , let  $A$  be a subset of  $B$  where the elements of  $A$  are chosen at random, each element  $b \in B$  chosen with probability  $\rho$  satisfying  $\rho^2 = o(1/f(N))$  and  $\rho |B|^2 \gg |N|^{1.1}$  as  $N \rightarrow \infty$ . Then with probability  $\rightarrow 1$  as  $N \rightarrow \infty$ , we have  $|A| \sim \rho |B|$  and  $|AA| \sim \frac{1}{2} |A|^2$ .*

Assuming these three lemmas, it is easy to prove Theorem 1. We apply Lemma 3.3 with  $f(N) = C(\log_2 N)^4$ , invoking the energy estimate from Lemma 3.2 and the size bound from Lemma 3.1. For any function  $g(N) \rightarrow \infty$  as  $N \rightarrow \infty$ , we take

$$\rho = \frac{1}{(\log_2 N)^2 g(N)}$$

and deduce that there is a set  $A \subset [N]$  of size

$$|A| \sim \rho |B| \gg \frac{N}{(\log N)^\theta (\log_2 N)^{7/2} g(N)},$$

such that  $|AA| \sim \frac{1}{2} |A|^2$ .

Now we prove the three lemmas.

*Proof of Lemma 3.1.* If  $p_j(m)$  denotes the  $j$ -th smallest (distinct) prime factor of  $m$ , for  $1 \leq j \leq \omega(m)$ , then the condition  $\omega(m, t) \leq \frac{\log_2 t}{\log 4} + 2$  ( $3 \leq t \leq N$ ) is implied by

$$\log_2 p_j(m) \geq (j-2) \log 4 \quad (1 \leq j \leq \omega(m)).$$

Indeed, the assertion is trivial if  $t < p_1(m)$  since in this case  $\omega(m, t) = 0$ . If  $p_1(m) \leq t \leq N$ , set  $j = \max\{i : t \geq p_i(m)\}$ . Then

$$\omega(m, t) = j \leq \frac{\log_2 p_j(m)}{\log 4} + 2 \leq \frac{\log_2 t}{\log 4} + 2.$$

Thus,

$$|B| \geq |\{N/2 < m \leq N : \omega(m) = k, m \text{ squarefree}, \log_2 p_j(m) \geq j \log 4 - 2 \log 4 \ (1 \leq j \leq \omega(m))\}|.$$

This is closely related to the quantity

$$N_k(x; \alpha, \beta) = |\{m \leq x : \omega(m) = k, \log_2 p_j(m) \geq \alpha j - \beta \ (1 \leq j \leq k)\}|,$$

as defined in [For07]. In fact, the lower bound in [For07, Theorem 1] for  $N_k(x; \alpha, \beta)$  is proved under the additional conditions that  $m$  is squarefree and lies in a dyadic range ([For07, §4]), although this is not stated explicitly. Thus, the proof of [For07, Theorem 1] applies to lower-bounding  $|B|$ . In the notation of [For07], we have

$$k = \left\lfloor \frac{\log_2 N}{\log 4} \right\rfloor, \quad A = \frac{1}{\log 4}, \quad \alpha = \log 4, \quad \beta = 2 \log 4, \quad u = 2, \quad v = \frac{\log_2 N}{\log 4}, \quad w = \frac{\log_2 N}{\log 4} - k + 3.$$

Taking  $\varepsilon = 0.1$ , one easily verifies the required conditions for [For07, Theorem 1]:

$$\alpha - \beta \leq A, \quad w \geq 1 + \varepsilon, \quad e^{\alpha(w-1)} - e^{\alpha(w-2)} \geq 1 + \varepsilon.$$

Hence, by the proof of the aforementioned theorem, we obtain

$$|B| \gg \frac{N(\log_2 N)^{k-2}}{(\log N)(k-1)!},$$

from which the conclusion follows by Stirling's formula.  $\square$

*Proof of Lemma 3.2.* In the equation  $b_1 b_2 = b_3 b_4$ , let  $c = (b_1, b_2)$ . Then  $c|b_i$  for all  $i$  and, setting  $b'_i = b_i/c$  for  $1 \leq i \leq 4$ , we have

$$(3.1) \quad b'_1 b'_2 = b'_3 b'_4 \quad (b'_1, b'_2) = (b'_3, b'_4) = 1.$$

Set  $M = N/c$ , and observe that for  $M < N^{1/2}$  the number of solutions of (3.1) is  $O(M^3)$ . Summing over  $c$  yields  $O(N^{3/2})$  solutions. From now on, assume that  $M \geq N^{1/2}$ , let

$$\beta_{13} = \gcd(b'_1, b'_3), \quad \beta_{14} = \gcd(b'_1, b'_4), \quad \beta_{23} = \gcd(b'_2, b'_3), \quad \beta_{24} = \gcd(b'_2, b'_4),$$

so that

$$b'_1 = \beta_{13} \beta_{14}, \quad b'_2 = \beta_{23} \beta_{24}, \quad b'_3 = \beta_{13} \beta_{23}, \quad b'_4 = \beta_{14} \beta_{24}.$$

Since  $1/2 \leq b_1/b_4 \leq 2$ , it follows that  $1/2 \leq \beta_{13}/\beta_{24} \leq 2$  and likewise that  $1/2 \leq \beta_{14}/\beta_{23} \leq 2$ . By reordering variables, we may assume without loss of generality that  $\min(\beta_{13}, \beta_{24}) \gg M^{1/2}$ . For some parameter  $T$ , which is a power of 2 and satisfies  $T = O(M^{1/2})$ , we have

$$(3.2) \quad T \leq \beta_{14} < 2T.$$

This implies that  $T/2 \leq \beta_{23} \leq 4T$  and  $M/8T \leq \beta_{13}, \beta_{24} \leq 2M/T$ . We also note that

$$(3.3) \quad \omega(b'_j, 4T) \leq \omega(b_j, 4T) = \Omega(b_j, 4T) \leq z_T \quad (1 \leq j \leq 4), \quad z_T = \frac{\log_2(4T)}{\log 4} + 2.$$

Let  $\lambda_1, \lambda_2 \in (0, 1)$  be two parameters to be chosen later. Let  $U_T(c)$  be the number of solutions of

$$b'_1 b'_2 = b'_3 b'_4 \quad (cb_j \in B, 1 \leq j \leq 4, (b'_1, b'_2) = (b'_3, b'_4) = 1)$$

also satisfying (3.2). Using (3.3), we see that

$$\begin{aligned} U_T(c) &\leq \sum_{\beta_{14}, \beta_{23} \leq 4T} \sum_{\beta_{24}, \beta_{13} \leq 2M/T} \prod_{j=1}^2 \lambda_1^{\Omega(\beta_{j3}, \beta_{j4}, 4T) - z_T} \lambda_2^{\Omega(\beta_{j3}, \beta_{j4}) - k} \prod_{j=3}^4 \lambda_1^{\Omega(\beta_{1j}, \beta_{2j}, 4T) - z_T} \lambda_2^{\Omega(\beta_{1j}, \beta_{2j}) - k} \\ &= \lambda_1^{-4z_T} \lambda_2^{-4k} \sum_{\beta_{14}, \beta_{23} \leq 4T} \sum_{\beta_{24}, \beta_{13} \leq 2M/T} \lambda_1^{2\Omega(\beta_{14}, \beta_{23}) + 2\Omega(\beta_{13}, \beta_{24}, 4T)} \lambda_2^{2\Omega(\beta_{13}, \beta_{14}, \beta_{23}, \beta_{24})} \\ &= \lambda_1^{-4z_T} \lambda_2^{-4k} \left( \sum_{\beta \leq 4T} (\lambda_1^2 \lambda_2^2)^{\Omega(\beta)} \right)^2 \left( \sum_{\beta \leq 2M/T} \lambda_1^{2\Omega(\beta, 4T)} \lambda_2^{2\Omega(\beta)} \right)^2. \end{aligned}$$

An application of Lemma 2.1 yields

$$\begin{aligned} U_T(c) &\ll \lambda_1^{-4z_T} \lambda_2^{-4k} \left( T(\log T)^{\lambda_1^2 \lambda_2^2 - 1} \right)^2 \left( \frac{M}{T} (\log M)^{\lambda_2^2 - 1} (\log T)^{\lambda_1^2 \lambda_2^2 - \lambda_2^2} \right)^2 \\ &= \lambda_1^{-4z_T} \lambda_2^{-4k} M^2 (\log M)^{2\lambda_2^2 - 2} (\log T)^{4\lambda_1^2 \lambda_2^2 - 2\lambda_2^2 - 2}. \end{aligned}$$

We optimize by taking  $\lambda_1^2 = \frac{1}{2}$  and  $\lambda_2^2 = \frac{1}{\log 4}$ , so that

$$U_T(c) \ll \frac{M^2}{(\log M)^{2\theta} (\log T)}.$$

Summing over  $T = 2^r \ll M^{1/2}$  and then over  $c$  yields

$$E(B) \ll \sum_c \frac{M^2 \log_2 N}{(\log M)^{2\theta}} \ll \frac{N^2 \log_2 N}{(\log N)^{2\theta}} \ll |B|^2 (\log_2 N)^4,$$

using Lemma 3.1. □

*Proof of Proposition 3.3.* This is similar to the proof of Proposition 3.2 of [CRR17]. First, if elements of  $A$  are chosen from  $B$  with probability  $\rho$ , then by easy first and second moment calculations,

$$\mathbf{E}|A| = \rho|B|, \quad \mathbf{E}(|A| - \rho|B|)^2 = O(\rho|B|),$$

where  $\mathbf{E}$  denotes expectation. By Chebyshev's inequality,  $|A| \sim \rho|B|$  with probability tending to 1 as  $N \rightarrow \infty$ . By the proof of Proposition 3.2 of [CRR17], we also have

$$\mathbf{E}|AA| = \sum_x \left( 1 - (1 - \rho^2)^{\tau_B(x)/2} \right) + O(\rho N),$$

where

$$\tau_B(x) = |\{x = b_1 b_2 : b_1, b_2 \in B\}|.$$

Now  $(1-z)^k = 1 - kz + O((kz)^2)$  uniformly for  $0 \leq z \leq 1$  and  $k \geq 1$ , and so

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{E}|AA| &= (\rho^2/2) \sum_x \tau_B(x) + O\left(\rho^4 \sum_x \tau_B^2(x)\right) + O(\rho N) \\ &= (\rho^2/2)|B|^2 + O(\rho^4 E(B) + \rho N) \\ &= \left(\frac{1}{2} + o(1)\right) (\rho|B|)^2. \end{aligned}$$

Since  $|A| \sim \rho|B|$  with probability tending to 1 as  $N \rightarrow \infty$ , and also  $|AA| \leq \frac{1}{2}|A|(|A| + 1)$  for all  $|A|$ , we conclude that  $|AA| \sim \frac{1}{2}|A|^2$  with probability tending to 1 as  $N \rightarrow \infty$ .  $\square$

#### 4. PROOF OF THEOREM 2

Again let

$$k = \left\lfloor \frac{\log_2 N}{\log 4} \right\rfloor.$$

Define

$$A = \{m \leq N : \Omega(m) \leq k + r\}, \quad r = 2\sqrt{\log_2 N \log_3 N}.$$

By (2.1), we have the size bound

$$|A| \leq \sum_{m \leq N} \left(\frac{1}{\log 4}\right)^{\Omega(m) - (k+r)} \ll \frac{N(\log 4)^r}{(\log N)^\theta} \ll \frac{N}{(\log N)^\theta} \exp\{(2/3)\sqrt{\log_2 N \log_3 N}\}$$

using (1.1). Next, we show that  $|AA| \sim M_N$ . Let  $B = [N] \setminus A$ . It suffices to show that

$$|B[N]| \leq |AB| + |BB| = o(M_N).$$

Let  $c = ab$ , where  $a \leq N$  and  $b \in B$ , and consider two cases: (i)  $\Omega(c) > 2k + h$ , where  $h = \lfloor 5 \log_3 N \rfloor$ , and (ii)  $\Omega(c) < 2k + h$ . We then have  $|B[N]| \leq D_1 + D_2$ , where  $D_1$  is the number of integers  $c \leq N^2$  with  $\Omega(c) > 2k + h$ , and  $D_2$  is the number of pairs  $(a, b) \in [N]^2$  with  $\Omega(ab) \leq 2k + h$  and  $\Omega(b) \geq k + r$ . We will show that each of these is small, essentially by exploiting the imbalance in prime factors of  $a$  and  $b$  implied in the conditions on  $D_2$ . By (2.1) and (1.1),

$$D_1 \leq \sum_{c \leq N^2} \left(\frac{1}{\log 2}\right)^{\Omega(c) - (2k+h)} \ll \frac{N^2}{(\log N)^{2\theta} (1/\log 2)^h} = o(M_N),$$

in light of estimate (1.2). Next, choose parameters  $0 < \lambda_2 < 1 < \lambda_1 < 1.9$ . Then

$$D_2 \leq \sum_{a, b \leq N} \lambda_2^{\Omega(ab) - (2k+h)} \lambda_1^{\Omega(b) - (k+r)} \ll \lambda_1^{-(k+r)} \lambda_2^{-(2k+h)} N^2 (\log N)^{\lambda_2 + \lambda_1 \lambda_2 - 2},$$

invoking (2.1) again. A near-optimal choice for the parameters is

$$\lambda_2 = \frac{1-x}{\log 4}, \quad \lambda_1 = \frac{1+x}{1-x}, \quad x = \frac{r \log 4}{\log_2 N}.$$

A little algebra reveals that the previous upper bound on  $D_2$  is bounded by

$$\ll N^2 (\log N)^{-2\theta - \frac{1}{\log 4}((1+x) \log(1+x) + (1-x) \log(1-x)) - \frac{h}{\log_2 N} \log \frac{1-x}{\log 4}}.$$

By Taylor's expansion,

$$(1+x)\log(1+x) + (1-x)\log(1-x) \geq x^2 \quad (|x| < 1)$$

and therefore the exponent of  $\log N$  is at most

$$-2\theta - \frac{x^2}{\log 4} + \frac{h \log \log(4 + o(1))}{\log_2 N} \leq -2\theta - 4 \log 4 \frac{\log_3 N}{\log_2 N} + 1.7 \frac{\log_3 N}{\log_2 N} \leq -2\theta - 3.8 \frac{\log_3 N}{\log_2 N}.$$

We get that  $D_2 \ll N^2(\log N)^{-2\theta}(\log_2 N)^{-3.8} = o(M_N)$  and Theorem 2 follows.

#### REFERENCES

- [CRR17] J. Cilleruelo, D. S. Ramana, and O. Ramaré. Quotient and product sets of thin subsets of the positive integers. *Tr. Mat. Inst. Steklova*, 296(Analiticheskaya i Kombinatornaya Teoriya Chisel):58–71, 2017.
- [CRS18] Pablo Candela, Juanjo Rué, and Oriol Serra. Memorial to Javier Cilleruelo: A problem list. *INTEGERS: The electronic journal of combinatorial number theory*, 18(A28):1–9, 2018.
- [For07] Kevin Ford. Generalized Smirnov statistics and the distribution of prime factors. *Funct. Approx. Comment. Math.*, 37(part 1):119–129, 2007.
- [For08a] K. Ford. The distribution of integers with a divisor in a given interval. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 168(2):367–433, 2008.
- [For08b] K. Ford. Integers with a divisor in  $(y, 2y]$ . In *Anatomy of integers*, volume 46 of *CRM Proc. Lecture Notes*, pages 65–80. Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2008.
- [HT88] Richard R. Hall and Gérald Tenenbaum. *Divisors*, volume 90 of *Cambridge Tracts in Mathematics*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1988.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, 1409 WEST GREEN STREET, UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT URBANA-CHAMPAIGN,  
URBANA, IL 61801, USA

*E-mail address:* ford@math.uiuc.edu