arXiv:1103.0296v1 [math.NT] 1 Mar 2011

DISTRIBUTION OF ELEMENTS OF COSETS OF SMALL SUBGROUPS AND APPLICATIONS

JEAN BOURGAIN, SERGEI KONYAGIN, AND IGOR SHPARLINSKI

Abstract. We obtain a series of estimates on the number of small integers and small order Farey fractions which belong to a given coset of a subgroup of order t of the group of units of the residue ring modulo a prime p, in the case when t is small compared to p. We give two applications of these results: to the simultaneous distribution of two high degree monomials x^{k_1} and x^{k_2} modulo p and to a question of J. Holden and P. Moree on fixed points of the discrete logarithm.

1. Introduction

1.1. **Estimates for the number of elements of small height in a coset of a small subgroup.** We fix a prime number $p > 2$. By $\mathbb{F}_p$ we denote the field of residues modulo p. For any element $x \in \mathbb{F}_p$ we define its integer height

$$|x| = \min\{|a| \ : \ a \in \mathbb{Z}, \ a \equiv x \pmod p\}$$

and its rational height

$$\|x\| = \min\{\max(|a|, b) \ : \ a \in \mathbb{Z}, b \in \mathbb{N}, a \equiv bx \pmod p\}.$$

Note that by pigeonhole principle,

$$|x| \le p/2, \quad \|x\| \le \sqrt{p}.$$

Moreover, if $\|x\| \le \sqrt{p/2}$ then the numbers $a \in \mathbb{Z}$, $b \in \mathbb{N}$ with $|a| \le \|x\|, b \le \|x\|$, $a \equiv bx \pmod p$ are uniquely defined. Also, the rational height is defined for a rational number x as

$$\|x\| = \min\{\max(|a|, b) \ : \ a \in \mathbb{Z}, b \in \mathbb{N}, x = a/b\}.$$

As usual, we use $\mathbb{F}_p^* = \mathbb{F}_p \setminus \{0\}$ to denote the multiplicative group of $\mathbb{F}_p$.

Date: February 4, 2014.

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 11A15; Secondary 11L07, 11N25.

Key words and phrases. congruence, multiplicative group of residues, smooth number, discrete logarithm.

If $t \mid p-1$ then there is a unique multiplicative subgroup $G \subseteq \mathbb{F}_p^*$. For $a \in \mathbb{F}_p$ we denote

$$aG = \{ag \ : \ g \in G\}.$$

Our aim is to estimate the cardinality of the sets

$$U(k,t,a) = \{x \ : \ x \in aG, |x| \le k\},$$

$$V(k,t,a) = \{x \ : \ x \in aG, \|x\| \le k\}.$$

These quantities are important for estimates of exponential sums in $\mathbb{F}_p$ and for analysis of distribution of cosets of G in $\mathbb{F}_p$. Estimates for $\#U(k,t,a)$ and for $\#V(k,t,a)$ have been obtained in [17] and [5] where the case of "large" t and k, that is, for $\log k \asymp \log t \asymp \log p$ (where $A \asymp B$ means that $A = O(B)$ and $B = O(A)$) has been studied. In this paper our main interest is related to the case of small G ($\log t = o(\log p)$; in particular, $\log t \asymp \log\log p$). It is proved in [3] that in a very general situation with rather small t and rather large k we have $\#U(k,t,a) = o(t)$. For smaller k (say, $k \le p^{0.1}$) the problem is easier. In this paper we prove some explicit estimates of $\#U(k,t,a)$ and for $\#V(k,t,a)$ for such k and small G and apply these results to the problem of simultaneous distribution of two powers in $\mathbb{F}_p$ (see [1]). If both parameters t and k are very small we establish some upper bounds for $\#U(k,t,a)$ and for $\#V(k,t,a)$, usually much better than the trivial estimates

$$\#U(k,t,a) \le \min\{2k, t\} \qquad \text{and} \qquad \#V(k,t,a) \le \min\{2k^2, t\}.$$

These results are applied to estimation of fixed points of the discrete logarithms.

We also noted that in the case when k and t are of about the same size one can estimate $\#U(k,t,a)$ by using the results and techniques of [7], based on [4, Theorem 1.1] that gives an explicit version of the sum-product theorem and of [8] which is based on estimates of [9] on the number of divisors in a short interval of an integer n

To formulate our results, we need some notation.

Let $x, y > 0$. A positive integer n is called y-smooth if it is composed of prime numbers up to y. The $\Psi(x,y)$ function is defined as the number of y-smooth positive integers that are up to x.

As usual, we use (a,b) to denote the greatest common divisor of integers a and b (with $a^2 + b^2 > 0$).

Finally, we also use p_k to denote the kth prime.

We fix a prime number $p > 2$. For any positive integer $1 < k < p/2$ we define the quantity

$$r_0(k) = \left\lfloor \frac{\log(p/2)}{\log k} \right\rfloor \tag{1.1}$$

Furthermore, let $t \in \mathbb{N}$ be another parameter, then we define

$$s_0(k,t) = \max\left\{ s \ : \ \binom{r_0(k)+s}{s} \le t \right\}. \tag{1.2}$$

We observe that $r_0(k)$ decreases and $s_0(k,t)$ increases as k and t increase.

Theorem 1. *For any $a \in \mathbb{F}_p^*$ we have*

$$\#\{|x| \ : \ x \in U(k,t,a)\} \le \Psi(k, p_{s+1})$$

where $s = s_0(k,t)$.

Theorem 2. *Let $a \in \mathbb{F}_p^*$ and $x_0 \in U(k,t,a)$*

$$\#\{|x| \ : \ x \in U(k,t,a), \ (x,x_0) = 1\} \le \Psi(k, p_s)$$

where $s = s_0(k,t)$.

If the coset is G itself then we can take $x_0 = 1$. Thus, we have the following estimate for the number of small elements in a subgroup.

Corollary 3. *We have*

$$\#\{|x| \ : \ x \in U(k,t,1)\} \le \Psi(k, p_s)$$

where $s = s_0(k,t)$.

Remark 1. If we are interested in counting the number of x such that $x \in U(k,t,a)$ and $1 \le x \le k$ then sometimes it is possible to estimate this number slightly better than in Theorem 1 by replacing $r_0(k)$ in the definition of $s_0(k,t)$ with

$$\widetilde{r_0}(k) = \left\lfloor \frac{\log p}{\log k} \right\rfloor.$$

A similar improvement can be made for Theorem 2 as well.

To study elements of small rational height in cosets of subgroups, we also define

$$r_1(k) = \lfloor r_0(k)/2 \rfloor = \left\lfloor \frac{\log(p/2)}{2\log k} \right\rfloor.$$

If $r_1(k) \ge 1$ (that is, $k \le (p/2)^{1/2}$) we also define

$$s_1(k,t) = \max\left\{ s \ : \ \binom{r_1(k)+s}{s} \le t \right\}.$$

Next, we denote for $s \in \mathbb{N}$

$$\tilde{\Phi}(k,s) = \sum_{i=0}^{s} \binom{s}{i} \Psi(k,p_i)\Psi(k,p_{s-i}).$$

Also, we consider that $\tilde{\Phi}(k,0) = 1$.

Theorem 4. *For any $a \in \mathbb{F}_p^*$ we have*

$$\#\{|x| \ : \ x \in V(k,t,a)\} \le \tilde{\Phi}(k,s+1)$$

where $s = s_1(k,t)$.

Theorem 5. *We have*

$$\#\{|x| \ : \ x \in V(k,t,1)\} \le \tilde{\Phi}(k,s)$$

where $s = s_1(k,t)$.

Theorems 1–5 can be useful only for very small k. For example, if $k \gg p^\delta$ with a fixed $\delta > 0$ then the estimates given by these theorems are trivial. However, using ideas of their proofs we can estimate $\#V(k,t,a)$ non-trivially for very small subgroups G and and not too small k. In particular, if $\delta \in (0,1/10)$ is fixed and $k \asymp p^\delta$ then the following theorem is nontrivial for a certain range of t. Denote

$$r_2(k) = \left\lfloor \frac{\log(p/2)}{8\log k} - \frac{1}{4} \right\rfloor.$$

Theorem 6. *Let $s \in \mathbb{N}$. For any $a \in \mathbb{F}_p^*$ we have*

$$\#V(k,t,a) \le \max\left(2\tilde{\Phi}(k^2,s-1), \binom{r+s}{s}^{-1} t\right)$$

where $r = r_2(k)$.

We also have:

Theorem 7. *Let $s \in \mathbb{N}$. We have*

$$\#V(k,t,1) \le \max\left(2\tilde{\Phi}(k,s-1), \binom{r+s}{s}^{-1} t\right)$$

where $r = r_2(k)$.

We do not prove analogs of Theorem 6 and 7 for integer heights. However, notice that some estimates for $\#U(k,t,a)$ can be deduced using the trivial inequality $\#U(k,t,a) \le \#V(k,t,a)$.

1.2. **On solutions of systems of congruences.** A general problem is to estimate , for given r, a_i, k_i, l_i $(i = 1, \dots, r)$, the number of solutions of a system of congruences

$$a_i x^{k_i} \equiv l_i + y_i \pmod{p} \tag{1.3}$$

in the box

$$(x, y_1, \dots, y_r) \in {\mathbb{F}_p}^* \times \prod_{i=1}^{r} [1, N_i]. \tag{1.4}$$

For integers $1 \le k_1 < \ldots < k_r < p-1$ which satisfy the conditions

$$(k_i, p-1) < p^{1-\varepsilon}, \qquad 1 \le i \le r, \tag{1.5}$$

and

$$(k_i - k_j, p-1) < p^{1-\varepsilon}, \qquad 1 \le j < i \le r, \tag{1.6}$$

J. Bourgain [2] has established the following result.

Lemma 8. *Given $r \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\varepsilon > 0$, there is $\delta > 0$ depending only on r and ε, such that for a sufficiently large prime p and $1 \le k_1 < \ldots < k_r < p-1$ satisfying* (1.5) *and* (1.6)*, for $(a_1, \dots, a_r) \in {\mathbb{F}_p}^r \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}$ the bound holds*

$$\max_{(a_1,\dots,a_r) \in {\mathbb{F}_p}^r \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}} \left| \sum_{x \in \mathbb{F}_p} \exp\left(\frac{2\pi i}{p} \left(a_1 x^{k_1} + \ldots + a_r x^{k_r} \right) \right) \right| < p^{1-\delta}.$$

Remark 2. The condition (1.6) is essential, as for instance the example $x - x^{(p+1)/2}$ shows.

Using standard arguments, one can deduce from Lemma 8 the following.

Corollary 9. *Given $r \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\varepsilon > 0$, there are $\delta > 0$ and C, depending only on r and ε, with the following property. If $p > C$ is a prime and $1 \le k_1 < \ldots < k_r < p-1$ satisfy* (1.5) *and* (1.6) *then for $(a_1, \dots, a_r) \in {\mathbb{F}_p}^r \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}$, $l_1, \dots, l_r \in \mathbb{F}_p$, and $N_1, \dots, N_r \in \mathbb{N}$, $N_1, \dots, N_r \le p$, the number N of solutions of the system of congruences* (1.3) *satisfies the inequalities*

$$|N - N_1 \cdots N_r / p^{r-1}| < p^{1-\delta}.$$

In particular, we have nontrivial solutions if

$$N_1 \dots N_r > p^{r-\delta}.$$

In [1, Theorem 17] the existence of solutions is proved under weaker restrictions on differences $k_i - k_j$, namely

$$(k_i - k_j, p-1) < \frac{p}{B} \qquad (1 \le j < i \le r)$$

instead of (1.6), where B depends only on r and ε, which however are not enough for getting an upper estimate on the number of solutions of the same order $N_1 \cdots N_r/p^{r-1}$.

Furthermore, the estimates for the number of solutions of two congruences are given in [1, Theorem 19] in a more precise form under the conditions

$$(k_i, p-1) < p^{1-\varepsilon} \quad (i = 1, 2) \qquad \text{and} \qquad (k_1 - k_2, p-1) < \frac{p-1}{2}. \tag{1.7}$$

More precisely, for

$$a_1, a_2 \in \mathbb{F}_p^*, \quad l_1, l_2 \in \mathbb{F}_p, \quad N_1, N_2 \in \mathbb{N}, \tag{1.8}$$

we define

$$I = \left\{ x \in \mathbb{F}_p^* \ : \ \begin{array}{l} \exists (n_1, n_2) \in [1, N_1] \times [1, N_2], \\ a_j x^{k_j} \equiv l_j + n_j \pmod p \, (j = 1, 2) \end{array} \right\}.$$

Then by [1, Theorem 19], for every $\varepsilon > 0$ there is $\eta > 0$, such that the following holds. If k_1, k_2 satisfy (1.7) then for $1 \le N_1, N_2 \le p$ and any $\delta \in (0, \eta)$ we have

$$\#I \ge \left(\frac{N_1 N_2}{p} - C p^{1-\delta} \right) \left(1 - \max \left(\frac{2(k_1 - k_2, p-1)}{p-1}, 5\delta \right) \right), \tag{1.9}$$

where $C > 0$ is an absolute constant.

Remark 3. The estimate is nontrivial if $\delta < 1/5$ and $N_1 N_2 > C p^{2-\delta}$.

Thus, the bound (1.9) gives a nontrivial estimate for the number of solutions under very weak assumptions on $k_1 - k_2$. If $(k_1 - k_2, p-1)$ is essentially smaller than p then we can get a better lower estimate.

Theorem 10. *There exists an absolute constant $C > 0$, and for every $\varepsilon > 0$ there is $\eta > 0$, such that the following holds. If $\Delta \in \mathbb{N}$, k_1, k_2, η, satisfy* (1.7) *as well as*

$$1 \le N_1, N_2 \le p, \quad \Delta \le p^{\eta},$$

then

$$\#I \ge \left(\frac{N_1 N_2}{p} - C p \Delta^{-1} \right) \left(1 - t^{-1} \max_{a \in \mathbb{F}_p^*} \#V(\Delta, t, a) \right), \tag{1.10}$$

where

$$t = \frac{p-1}{(k_1 - k_2, p-1)},$$

Using Theorem 10 and Theorem 6 one can estimate the number of solutions of a system of two congruences from below. We give some related examples.

1.3. **Fixed points of the discrete logarithms.** We consider some exponential congruences which are related to studying fixed points of the discrete logarithms in finite fields, see [6, 10, 14, 15, 16, 21]. For a prime p we denote by $F(p)$ the number of solutions of the congruence

$$g^h \equiv h \pmod p, \quad 1 \le g, h \le p-1, \tag{1.11}$$

with arbitrary integers g and h. J. Holden and P. Moree [16] have conjectured that

$$F(p) = (1+o(1))p. \tag{1.12}$$

It has been shown in [5] that $F(p) = p + O(p^{4/5+\varepsilon})$ for a set of primes of relative density 1.

It is noted in [5, Bound (33)] that

$$F(p) \le (p-1)\tau(p-1),$$

where $\tau(n)$ is the number of divisors of $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Therefore

$$F(p) \le p \exp\left(\frac{(\log 2 + o(1))\log p}{\log\log p}\right). \tag{1.13}$$

We note that in (1.13) and everywhere else in the paper, the argument of iterated logarithms is always assumed to be large enough so that the function is well-defined.

Towards the conjecture (1.12), here we prove the following upper estimate for $F(p)$.

Theorem 11. *We have*

$$F(p) = O(p).$$

We remark that though obtaining an asymptotic formula for $F(p)$ seems to be difficult, rather elementary arguments imply the lower bound

$$F(p) \ge p + O(p^{3/4+o(1)}). \tag{1.14}$$

It is likely that the arguments of [5] can be used to get a better remainder term in (1.14); we do not try to optimise it in this paper.

1.4. **Notation.** We recall that $U = O(V)$, $U \ll V$ and $V \gg U$ are all equivalent to the statement that the inequality $|U| \le cV$ holds with some constant $c > 0$. Sometimes we write $U = O_\lambda(V)$, $U \ll_\lambda V$ and $V \gg_\lambda U$ to emphasise that the implied constant may depend on a certain parameter λ. We also write $U \asymp V$ if $U \ll V \ll U$.

2. Distribution of Elements of Cosets of Small Subgroups

2.1. **Proof of Theorem 1.** Take a maximal possible set

$$\{x_0, x_1, \ldots, x_\ell\} \subseteq \mathbb{Z}$$

of multiplicatively independent elements of $U(k,t,a)$. We claim that

$$\ell \le s. \tag{2.1}$$

Indeed, let

$$Y = \{x_0^{u_0} x_1^{u_1} \ldots x_\ell^{u_\ell} \in \mathbb{Z} \ : \ u_0, \ldots, u_\ell \ge 0, \ u_0 + \ldots + u_\ell = r\}$$

where $r = r_0(k)$.

For any $y \in Y$ the exponents $u_0, \ldots, u_\ell$ are uniquely defined due to multiplicative independence of $x_0, \ldots, x_\ell$. Therefore,

$$\#Y = \binom{r+\ell}{\ell}. \tag{2.2}$$

Next, for any $y \in Y$ we have $|y| \le k^r < p/2$. Thus, different elements of $y \in \mathbb{Z}$ are different as elements of $\mathbb{F}_p$ as well. Finally, $Y \subseteq a^{\ell+1}G$. Hence, $\#Y \le t$. Comparing this inequality with (2.2) and recalling the definition (1.2) of $s_0(k,t)$ we get (2.1).

Take the largest possible n so that $p_n \le k$ and define the matrix

$$A = (\alpha_{i,j})_{0 \le i \le \ell}^{1 \le j \le n}$$

of exponents in the prime number factoizations

$$|x_i| = \prod_{j=1}^{n} p_j^{\alpha_{i,j}}, \quad 0 \le i \le \ell.$$

By the choice of $x_0, \ldots, x_s$, the matrix A is of full rank $\ell + 1$ and for any element

$$x = \pm \prod_{j=1}^{n} p_j^{\alpha_j} \in U(k,t,a)$$

the vector $(\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_n)$ is a linear combination of rows of the matrix A with rational coefficients. We take a non-singular $(\ell+1) \times (\ell+1)$ submatrix B of A. Let the columns of B correspond to prime numbers $q_1 < \ldots < q_{\ell+1}$.

For any $x \in U(k,t,a)$ we define $\mathbf{b}(x) = (\beta_1, \ldots, \beta_{\ell+1})$ by

$$q_j^{\beta_j} \mid x \qquad \text{and} \qquad q_j^{\beta_j+1} \nmid x, \qquad 1 \le j \le \ell+1.$$

We denote the rows of B by

$$\mathbf{b}_i = (\beta_{i,1}, \ldots, \beta_{i,\ell+1}), \qquad 0 \le i \le \ell.$$

So,

$$B = (\beta_{i,j})_{0\le i\le \ell}^{1\le j\le \ell+1}.$$

We see that $\mathbf{b}_i = \mathbf{b}(x_i)$.

We claim that different elements $|x|$ with $x \in U(k,t,a)$ define different vectors $\mathbf{b}(x)$. Indeed, the vector $\mathbf{b}(x)$ determines rational numbers $u_0, \dots, u_\ell$ so that

$$\mathbf{b}(x) = \sum_{i=0}^{\ell} u_i \mathbf{b}_i.$$

Then

$$|x| = \prod_{i=0}^{\ell} |x_i|^{u_i}$$

is also uniquely determined by $\mathbf{b}(x)$.

It suffices to estimate the number of possible vectors $\mathbf{b}(x)$ with $x \in U(k,t,a)$. We note that

$$\prod_{j=1}^{s+1} p_j^{\beta_j(x)} \le \prod_{j=1}^{s+1} q_j^{\beta_j(x)} \le |x| \le k$$

We now see that different elements $|x|$ with $x \in U(k,t,a)$ define different $p_{\ell+1}$-smooth numbers, thus

$$\#U(k,t,a) \le \Psi(k, p_{\ell+1}).$$

Using (2.1) completes the proof.

2.2. **Proof of Theorem 2.** Now we take a maximal possible set

$$\{x_1, \dots, x_\ell\} \subseteq \mathbb{Z}$$

of multiplicatively independent elements of $U(k,t,a)$ with $(x_0, x_j) = 1$ for $j = 1, \dots, \ell$. The inequality (2.1) can be proved in a similar way. If $y = x_0^{u_0} x_1^{u_1} \dots x_s^{u_s}$ then the number $|x_0|^{u_0}$ is determined as the largest power of $|x_0|$ dividing y. The exponents $u_1, \dots, u_\ell$ are uniquely defined due to multiplicative independence of $x_1, \dots, x_\ell$ and the equality

$$x_1^{u_1} \dots x_\ell^{u_\ell} = \pm y x_0^{-u_0}.$$

The matrix

$$A = (\alpha_{i,j})_{1\le i\le \ell}^{1\le j\le n}$$

is defined by the equalities

$$|x_i| = \prod_j p_j^{\alpha_{i,j}}, \quad 1 \le i \le \ell.$$

The rest of the proof is the same as in Theorem 1.

2.3. **Proof of Theorem 4.** Similarly to the proof of Theorem 1 we take a maximal possible set

$$\{x_0, x_1, \ldots, x_\ell\} \in \mathbb{Q}$$

of multiplicatively independent elements of $V(k,t,a)$. Now we have to verify that

$$\ell \le s = s_1(k,t). \tag{2.3}$$

To do so, we define

$$Y = \{x_0^{u_0} x_1^{u_1} \ldots x_\ell^{u_\ell} \in \mathbb{Q} \ : \ u_0, \ldots, u_\ell \ge 0, \ u_0 + \ldots + u_s = r\}$$

where $r = r_1(k)$. The proof of (2.3) follows the proof of (2.1). The distinction is that now for any $y \in Y$ we have $\|y\| \le k^r < \sqrt{p/2}$, and thus different rational values of y with this condition get reduced to different elements of $\mathbb{F}_p$.

We also choose prime numbers $q_1 < \ldots < q_{\ell+1}$ as in the proof of Theorem 1. Now we have to estimate the number of rational numbers of the form

$$m = \prod_{j=1}^{s+1} q_j^{\beta_j} \in \mathbb{Q} \ : \ \|m\| \le k.$$

Denote

$$J_+ = \{j \ : \ \beta_j \ge 0\}, \quad m_+ = \prod_{j \in J_+} q_j^{\beta_j} \in \mathbb{N},$$

$$J_- = \{j \ : \ \beta_j < 0\}, \quad m_- = \prod_{j \in J_+} q_j^{-\beta_j} \in \mathbb{N}.$$

So, $m = m_+/m_-$, $m_+ \le k$, $m_- \le k$. For a fixed $i = \#J_+$ there are $\binom{\ell+1}{i}$ ways to select $J_+ \subseteq 1, \ldots, \ell+1$. As J_+ and J_- have been chosen, there are at most $\Psi(k, p_i)$ possible values for m_+ and at most $\Psi(k, p_{\ell-i+1})$ possible values for m_-. Combining these estimates we complete the proof.

2.4. **Proof of Theorem 5.** We follow the proof of Theorem 4. Now we take a maximal possible set $\{x_1, \ldots, x_s\}$ of multiplicatively independent elements of $V(k,t,1)$ and define

$$Y = \left\{x_1^{u_1} \ldots x_\ell^{u_\ell} \in \mathbb{Q} \ : \ u_1, \ldots, u_\ell \ge 0, \ u_1 + \ldots + u_\ell \le r\right\}.$$

2.5. **Proof of Theorems 6 and 7.** We prove Theorems 6 and 7 simultaneously.

We take a maximal possible set $\{x_1, \ldots, x_\ell\}$ of multiplicatively independent elements of $V(k,t,1)$. We consider separately two cases.

Case of $\ell < s$. Assume that $V(k,t,a) \neq \emptyset$ and fix $y_0 \in V(k,t,a)$. Then for any $y \in V(k,t,a)$ we have $y = xy_0$ for some $x \in V(k^2,t,1)$. By the arguments from the proof of Theorem 6 the number of elements x satisfying these conditions is at most $2\tilde{\Phi}(k^2,\ell) \le 2\tilde{\Phi}(k^2,s-1)$ as desired for Theorem 6. If $a = 1$ we take $y_0 = 1$ and we have $x = y \in V(k,t,1)$. This gives the bound $\#V(k,t,1) \le 2\tilde{\Phi}(k,s-1)$ as desired for Theorem 7.

Case of $\ell \ge s$. Take the largest possible n so that $p_n \le k$. Define the matrix

$$A = (\alpha_{i,j})_{1 \le i \le \ell}^{1 \le j \le n}$$

by equalities

$$|x_i| = \prod_{j=1}^{n} p_j^{\alpha_{i,j}}, \quad 1 \le i \le \ell.$$

By the choice of $x_1, \ldots, x_s$, the matrix A has rank ℓ and for any element

$$x = \pm \prod_{j=1}^{n} p_j^{\alpha_j} \in V(k,t,1)$$

the vector $\mathbf{a}(x) = (\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_n)$ is a rational linear combination of rows of the matrix A. Equivalently, the vector $(\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_n)$ belongs to the linear subspace Y over $\mathbb{Q}$ generated by $\mathbf{a}(x_j)$, $j = 1, \ldots, \ell$. We now assume that the elements $x_1, \ldots, x_n$ are chosen so that the parallelepiped $\mathscr{P}(x_1, \ldots, x_\ell)$ with edges $\mathbf{a}(x_j)$, $j = 1, \ldots, \ell$ has a maximal volume.

We claim that for any integer vector $(u_1, \ldots, u_\ell) \neq 0$ we have

$$\|x\| > k^{1/2}, \quad x = \prod_{j=1}^{\ell} x_j^{u_j} \in \mathbb{Q}. \tag{2.4}$$

Indeed, assume that (2.4) does not hold. Without loss of generality, we can assume that $|u_1| \neq 0$. We consider a new system of multiplicatively independent elements of $V(k,t,1)$ obtained by replacing a number x_1 in the system $(x_1, \ldots, x_\ell)$ by x^2. Then the volume of $\mathscr{P}(x^2, x_2, \ldots, x_\ell)$ is the volume of $\mathscr{P}(x_1, \ldots, x_\ell)$ multiplied by $2|u_1| > 1$. This does not agree with the choice of $(x_1, \ldots, x_\ell)$. So, (2.4) holds.

Now we consider the set

$$Y = \left\{ \prod_{j=1}^{\ell} x_j^{4u_j} y \ : \ u_0, \ldots, u_\ell \ge 0, \right.$$
$$\left. u_0 + \ldots + u_\ell \le r, \ y \in V(k,t,1) \right\} \subseteq \mathbb{Q},$$

where $r = r_2(k)$. Using (2.4) and the inequality $\|y_1/y_2\| \le k^2$ for $y_1, y_2 \in V(k,t,1)$, we deduce that different vectors $(u_1, \ldots, u_\ell, y)$ define different elements of y. Therefore,

$$\#Y = \binom{r_2+\ell}{\ell} \#V(k,t,1). \tag{2.5}$$

Next, for any $y \in Y$ we have $\|y\| \le k^{4r_0+1} < \sqrt{p/2}$. Thus, different rational values of y with this condition get reduced to different elements of $\mathbb{F}_p$. Finally, $Y \subseteq aG$. Hence, $\#Y \le t$. Comparing this inequality with (2.5) we get

$$t \ge \binom{r_2+\ell}{\ell} \#V(k,t,1) \ge \binom{r_2+s}{s} \#V(k,t,1).$$

This completes the proof.

3. Estimates for sets of smooth numbers

We need several estimates for $\Psi(x,y)$.

If y is small, we use the following result, see [13, Theorem 1.4]:

Lemma 12. *Uniformly for $x \ge y \ge 2$, we have*

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

where

$$Z = \frac{\log x}{\log y} \log\left(1 + \frac{y}{\log x}\right) + \frac{y}{\log y} \log\left(1 + \frac{\log x}{y}\right).$$

In particular, we have, see [13, Equation (1.14)]:

Corollary 13. *For any $\alpha > 1$ we have*

$$\Psi(x, (\log x)^\alpha) = x^{1-1/\alpha+o(1)} \quad (x \to \infty).$$

Moreover, for very small y the asymptotic formula for $\Psi(x,y)$ is known, see [13, Theorem 1.5]:

Lemma 14. *Uniformly for $2 \le y \le (\log x)^{1/2}$, we have*

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

Therefore:

Corollary 15. *For any $s \in \mathbb{N}$ and $x \ge \exp(p_s^2)$ we have*

$$\Psi(x, p_s) \ll (\log x)^s.$$

For large y we know the following estimate for $\Psi(x,y)$, see [13, Corollary 1.3]:

Lemma 16. *Let $x \ge y \ge 2$ and $u = (\log x)/\log y$. For any fixed $\varepsilon > 0$ we have*

$$\Psi(x,y) = xu^{-(1+o(1))u},$$

as y and u tend to infinity, uniformly in the range $y \ge (\log x)^{1+\varepsilon}$.

Moreover, in a smaller range an asymptotic formula for $\Psi(x,y)$ is known, see [13, Theorem 1.1 and Corollary 2.3].

Lemma 17. *Let $x \ge y \ge 2$ and $u = (\log x)/\log y$. For any fixed $\varepsilon > 0$ we have*

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

uniformly in the range

$$y \ge \exp\left((\log\log x)^{(5/3)+\varepsilon}\right),$$

where

$$\rho(u) = \exp(-u(\log u + \log\log(u+2)) + O(1)).$$

is the Dickman function.

4. On solutions of systems of congruences

4.1. **Discrepancy and exponential sums.** We recall the notion of *discrepancy* which for a sequence of H points

$$\Gamma = (\gamma_{1,x}, \dots, \gamma_{m,x})_{x=1}^{H} \tag{4.1}$$

in the m-dimensional unit cube, is defined as

$$\Delta_\Gamma = \sup_{B \subseteq [0,1)^m} \left| \frac{T_\Gamma(B)}{H} - |B| \right|,$$

where $T_\Gamma(B)$ is the number of points of the sequence Γ in the box

$$B = [\alpha_1, \beta_1) \times \ldots \times [\alpha_m, \beta_m) \subseteq [0,1)^m$$

of volume $|B|$ and the supremum is taken over all such boxes.

A link between the discrepancy and exponential sums has been established independently by Koksma [18] and Szüsz [20], see also [11, Theorem 1.21].

Lemma 18. *For any integer $L > 1$ and sequence Γ of H points (4.1) the following bound holds*

$$\Delta_\Gamma \ll_m \frac{1}{L} + \frac{1}{H} \sum_{\substack{\lambda_1,\ldots\lambda_m \in \mathbb{Z} \\ 0 < |\lambda_1| + \ldots + |\lambda_m| \le L}} \prod_{j=1}^{m} \frac{1}{|\lambda_j| + 1} \left| \sum_{x=1}^{H} \exp\left(2\pi i \sum_{j=1}^{m} \lambda_j \gamma_{j,x}\right) \right|.$$

4.2. **The proof of Theorem 10.** Let

$$d = (k_1 - k_2, p-1) \qquad \text{and} \qquad t = (p-1)/d.$$

If $(k_1 - k_2, p-1) < p^{1-\varepsilon/2}$ then the result follows from Corollary 9. So we assume that

$$d \ge p^{1-\varepsilon/2}.$$

Write $x = y^t z$. For any $z \in \mathbb{F}_p^*$ we denote

$$I_z = \{y \in \mathbb{F}_p^* : y^t z \in I\}.$$

Then

$$\#I = \frac{1}{p-1} \sum_{z \in \mathbb{F}_p^*} \#I_z. \tag{4.2}$$

Fix z. Since $y^{k_1 t} \equiv y^{k_2 t} \pmod p$, the condition $x \in I$ can be written as

$$a_j y^{k_1 t} z^{k_j} \equiv l_j + n_j \pmod p,\ n_j \in [1, N_j],\ j = 1, 2. \tag{4.3}$$

Now we denote

$$\mathcal{Z} = \{z \in {\mathbb{F}_p}^* \ : \ \|a_2 z^{k_2 - k_1}/a_1\| > \Delta\}.$$

To get a lower estimate for $\#I$ we take a sum over only $z \in Z$.

First we estimate $\#\mathcal{Z}$. The multiset $\{z^{k_1 - k_2}\}$ is the subgroup G of ${\mathbb{F}_p}^*$ of order t, and each element of G has multiplicity d. Therefore,

$$\#\mathcal{Z} = \left(1 - t^{-1} |V(\Delta, t, a_2/a_1)|\right)(p-1). \tag{4.4}$$

Next, we estimate $\#I_z$ for $z \in \mathcal{Z}$. We note that the condition $z \in Z$ implies that

$$\lambda_1 a_1 + \lambda_2 a_2 z^{k_2 - k_1} \not\equiv 0 \pmod p$$

for $0 < \max(|\lambda_1|, |\lambda_2|) \le \Delta$. By Lemma 8 we have

$$\left| \sum_{y \in {\mathbb{F}_p}^*} \exp\left(\frac{2\pi i}{p} (y^{k_1 t} z^{k_1} (\lambda_1 a_1 + \lambda_2 a_2 z^{k_2 - k_1})\right) \right| \le p^{1-\delta}$$

for some $\delta > 0$ that depends only on ε. Thus by Lemma 18, applied with $m = 2$ and $L = \Delta$, we obtain

$$\#I_z = \frac{N_1 N_2}{p} + O\left(p/\Delta + p^{1-\delta} (\log \Delta)^2\right).$$

We observe that for $\eta \le \delta/2$ and $\Delta \le p^\eta$ we have

$$p^{1-\delta} (\log \Delta)^2 \ll p/\Delta.$$

Recalling (4.2) and the bound (4.4) we complete the proof.

4.3. **Applications of Theorem 10: some examples.** We consider the cases when N_1, N_2 are comparable to p. In our examples we use notation from the statement of Theorem 10 .

Corollary 19. *For any $A_1 > 0$, $A_2 > 0$ there exists some B such that if*

$$N_1 \ge A_1 p, \qquad N_2 \ge A_1 p, \qquad t \le \frac{A_2 \log p}{\log\log p}$$

then

$$\#I \ge \frac{N_1 N_2}{p}\left(1 - \frac{B}{t}\right).$$

Indeed, we assume that p is large enough. We take $\Delta = [(\log p)^2]$. To estimate $\#V(\Delta, t, a)$ we apply Theorem 6 with $s = 1$.

Corollary 20. *For any $l \in \mathbb{N}$, $A_1 > 0$, $A_2 > 0$ there exists some B such that if*

$$N_1 \ge A_1 p, \qquad N_2 \ge A_1 p, \qquad t \ge \frac{A_2 (\log p)^l}{\log\log p}$$

then

$$\#I \ge \frac{N_1 N_2}{p}\left(1 - \frac{B(\log\log p)^l}{(\log p)^l}\right).$$

Indeed, we assume that p is large enough. We take $\Delta = [(\log p)^{l+1}]$. To estimate $\#V(\Delta, t, a)$ we apply Theorem 6 with $s = l$ observing that, due to Corollary 15, we have $\tilde{\Phi}(x, s-1) \ll_s (\log x)^{s-1}$ for $x \ge 2$.

If t is large one can use the following estimate.

Corollary 21. *For any $\eta \in (0, 1/2]$, $\varepsilon > 0$, $A_1 > 0$, $A_2 > 0$ there exists some B such that if $t \le p^\eta$ and*

$$N_1 \ge A_1 p, \quad N_2 \ge A_1 p$$

then

$$\#I \ge \frac{N_1 N_2}{p}\left(1 - B\frac{\log p + t^{(1+\varepsilon)/l}}{t}\right)$$

where $l = \lfloor 1/(2\eta) \rfloor$.

Proof. Again, we assume that p is large enough. We take $\Delta = [t/2]$ and denote

$$\mathscr{A} = \{(u/v) \ : \ u \in \mathbb{Z},\ v \in \mathbb{N},\ |u| \le \Delta,\ v \le \Delta, \\ \exists x \in aG\ vx \equiv u \pmod p\}.$$

By the definition of $V(\Delta, t, a)$, we can associate with any element $x \in V(\Delta, t, a)$ a rational number $u/v \in \mathscr{A}$ such that $vx \equiv u \pmod p$. Thus,

$$\#\mathscr{A} \le \#V(\Delta, t, a). \tag{4.5}$$

Actually, the equality in (4.5) holds since $\Delta \le \sqrt{p/2}$.

Now consider the set

$$\mathscr{A}^{(l)} = \{a_1 \dots a_l \ : \ a_1 \dots, a_l \in \mathscr{A}\}.$$

By [5, Corollary 3] we have

$$\#\mathscr{A}^{(l)} \gg \#\mathscr{A}^{l-\varepsilon} \tag{4.6}$$

where the implied constant in $\gg$ depends on l and ε. On the other hand, any element of $\mathscr{A}^{(l)}$ has the form u/v, $u \in \mathbb{Z}$, $v \in \mathbb{N}$, $|u| \le \Delta^l$, $v \le \Delta^l$. Since $\Delta^l \le \sqrt{p/2}$, distinct element of $\mathscr{A}^{(l)}$ are distinct as elements of $\mathbb{F}_p$ as well. Considering $\mathscr{A}^{(l)}$ as a subset of $\mathbb{F}_p$ we see that $\mathscr{A}^{(l)} \subseteq a^l G$. Therefore,

$$\#\mathscr{A}^{(l)} \le t. \tag{4.7}$$

Inequalities (4.5), (4.6) and (4.7) imply

$$\#V(\Delta, t, a) \ll t^{(1+\varepsilon)/l}.$$

The corollary follows from this estimate and Theorem 10. □

5. Fixed points of the discrete logarithms

5.1. **Preparations.** For any divisor d of $p-1$ and $k = (p-1)/d$ we define the sets

$$X^*(k,p) = \left\{x \ : \ 1 \le x \le k, \ (x,k) = 1, \ x^k \equiv (-k)^k \pmod p\right\},$$

$$X(k,p) = \left\{x \ : \ 1 \le x \le k, \ x^k \equiv (-k)^k \pmod p\right\},$$

Let

$$T(d,p) = \#X^*(k,p).$$

It is known that

$$F(p) = \sum_{d \mid p-1} dT(d,p), \tag{5.1}$$

see [16, Equation (5)].

Lemma 22. *We have*

$$\sum_{h \mid k} T((p-1)/h, p) \le \#X(k,p).$$

Proof. For $h \mid k$ we define the set

$$X(k,h,p) = \frac{k}{h} X^*(h,p).$$

Clearly,

$$\#X(k,h,p) = \#X^*(h,p) = T((p-1)/h, p). \tag{5.2}$$

For $x \in X^*(h,p)$ we have

$$\left(\frac{kx}{h}\right)^k = \left(\frac{k}{h}\right)^k \left(x^h\right)^{k/h} \equiv \left(\frac{k}{h}\right)^k \left((-h)^h\right)^{k/h} = (-k)^k \pmod p.$$

Therefore, the sets $X(k,h,p)$ are subsets of $X(k,p)$. Moreover, these sets are disjoint since for $x \in X(k,h,p)$ we have $(x,k) = h/k$. Applying (5.2) we complete the proof. □

We use the following estimate for $T(d,p)$, see [5, Bound (39)] with $\nu = 3$.

Lemma 23. *We have*

$$T(d,p) \le \left(d^{-4/3}p + (p/d)^{1/3}\right)(p/d)^{o(1)}.$$

Following [5] we denote

$$D = p \exp\left(-4\frac{\log p}{\log\log p}\right)$$

(we always assume that p is large enough). Then we have

$$\sum_{\substack{d \mid p-1,\\ d \le D}} dT(d,p) = p + o(p), \tag{5.3}$$

as $p \to \infty$, see [5, Section 5]. It is convenient for us to take a sum over k. The identity (5.1) can be rewritten as

$$F(p) = (p-1) \sum_{k \mid p-1} \frac{T((p-1)/k, p)}{k}. \tag{5.4}$$

We now define the sums

$$S_p(K,L) = \sum_{\substack{k \mid p-1,\\ K \ge k > L}} \frac{T((p-1)/k, p)}{k}.$$

and denote

$$K_1 = \exp\left(4\frac{\log p}{\log\log p}\right),$$
$$K_2 = \exp\left((\log p)^{0.4}\right),$$
$$K_3 = \exp\left((\log\log p)^7\right)$$

So we see from (5.4) that

$$F(p) = (p-1)(S_p(p-1,K_1)+S_p(K_1,K_2) + S_p(K_2,K_3) + S_p(K_3,0)). \tag{5.5}$$

Inequality (5.3) immediately implies

$$S_p(p-1,K_1) = 1 + o(1), \tag{5.6}$$

as $p \to \infty$. So, to prove Theorem 11 we have to estimate the sums $S_p(K_1,K_2)$, $S_p(K_2,K_3)$ and $S_p(K_3,0)$.

Our main tools are Theorem 2 and estimates for sets of smooth numbers. Besides, for the sum $S_p(K_3,0)$ we use some arguments which stem from functional analysis.

5.2. **Preliminary estimates.** We recall the definitions (1.1) and (1.2) of the functions $r_0(k)$ and $s_0(k,t)$. By Lemma 22, Theorem 2 in this case can be rewritten as follows:

Corollary 24. *We have*

$$\sum_{h|k} T((p-1)/h,p) \le \#X(k,p) \le \Psi(k,p_s)$$

where $s = s_0(k,k)$.

By the prime number theorem we have

$$\frac{p_j}{\log p_j} = j + O\left(\frac{j}{\log j}\right). \tag{5.7}$$

It is easy to estimate the number of small divisors of a positive integer in terms of the $\Psi(x,y)$ function. Moreover, we need to estimate the number of products of a small divisor of a fixed number by a small smooth number. For $m \in \mathbb{N}$, $m \ge 2$, $y > 0$, and $z > 0$ by $\tau(m,y,z)$ we denote the number of numbers $dl \le z$ where d is a divisor of m and l is an y-smooth number. Several estimates on $\tau(m,1,z)$ have recently been given in [12]. In particular our next estimate for $y = 1$ is essentially [12, Bound (7)].

Lemma 25. *We have $\tau(m, y, z) \le \Psi(z, q)$ where q is the largest prime number with*

$$\prod_{\substack{y<\ell\le q\\ \ell \text{ prime}}} \ell \le m.$$

Proof. Let D be the set of divisors d of m such that all prime divisors of d are greater than y. Thus, we have to estimate the number of numbers $dl \le z$ where $d \in D$ and l is an y-smooth number. Let $q_1 < q_2 < \cdots < q_J$ be the prime divisors of m that are greater than y, and let $\tilde{p}_1 < \tilde{p}_2 < \dots$ be the primes greater than y. We associate with any number dl where l is y-smooth, $d \in D$ and

$$d = \prod_{j=1}^{J} q_j^{\alpha_j}$$

the number

$$l \prod_{j=1}^{J} \tilde{p}_j^{\alpha_j} \le dl,$$

which is clearly q-smooth. Since this map is injection, the result now follows. □

Corollary 26. *We have $\tau(m, 1, z) \le \Psi(z, q)$ where q is the largest prime number with*

$$\prod_{\substack{\ell\le q\\ \ell \text{ prime}}} \ell \le m.$$

5.3. **Some tools from functional analysis.** Finally, we also need the following statement which is essentially based on linear algebra. Let $\mathcal{X}$ be a linear space of real sequences $\mathbf{x} = (x_q)_{q\in\mathcal{P}}$, finitely supported on the set of primes $\mathcal{P}$.

Define

$$\mathcal{H}(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{q\in\mathcal{P}} |x_q| \log q.$$

Also for a set $\mathcal{Q} \subseteq \mathcal{P}$ we use $\pi_{\mathcal{Q}}$ to denote the coordinate restriction on the sequences of $\mathcal{X}$, that is for $\mathbf{x} = (x_q)_{q\in\mathcal{P}} \in \mathcal{X}$ we have

$$\pi_{\mathcal{Q}}(\mathbf{x}) = (x_q)_{q\in\mathcal{Q}}.$$

We have the following:

Lemma 27. *Let $\mathcal{F} \subseteq \mathcal{X}$ be a finite whose elements have integer coordinates. Let a positive integers s, L, M be such that $L \ge M$;*

(i) *all elements of $\mathcal{F}$ generate a linear subspace $\langle\mathcal{F}\rangle$ of $\mathcal{X}$ of dimension $\dim\langle\mathcal{F}\rangle \le s$;*

(ii) $\mathcal{H}(\mathbf{x}) < L$ *for* $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{F}$*;*
(iii) *for any subset* $\mathcal{Q} \subseteq \mathcal{P}$ *with*

$$\sum_{q \in \mathcal{Q}} \log q < M \tag{5.8}$$

the sequences $\pi_{\mathcal{P} \setminus \mathcal{Q}}$ *is one-to-one on* $\mathcal{F}$*.*

Then

$$\#\mathcal{F} < (cL/M)^s$$

for some absolute constant c*.*

Proof. We take a sufficiently large prime q_0 and let $\mathcal{X}_0$ be (a finitely dimensional) space of all real sequences $\mathbf{x} = (x_q)_{q \in \mathcal{P}_0}$ where $\mathcal{P}_0 = \{q \in \mathcal{P}, q \le q_0\}$. We require that q_0 is so large that all elements of $\mathcal{F}$ are supported on $\mathcal{P}_0$. Thus, we can consider $\mathcal{F}$ as a subset of $\mathcal{X}_0$. Reduction the lemma to a finite dimensional subspace is caused by the using of the Hahn-Banach separation theorem which has a simpler form in the finite dimensional case.

Denote

$$\mathfrak{B} = \{\mathcal{B} \subseteq \mathcal{P}_0 \ : \ \#\mathcal{B} \le s, \ \pi_{\mathcal{B}} \text{ is one-to-one on } \mathcal{F}\}$$

We see from the condition (i) that $\mathfrak{B} \ne \emptyset$. Moreover if $\mathcal{Q} \subseteq \mathcal{P}$ satisfies (5.8) then there exists $\mathcal{B} \in \mathfrak{B}$ with $\mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{Q} = \emptyset$. Indeed, by (iii), $\pi_{\mathcal{P} \setminus \mathcal{Q}}$ is one-to-one map from $\mathcal{F}$ to $\mathcal{G} = \pi_{\mathcal{P} \setminus \mathcal{Q}}(\mathcal{F})$. Since by (i) the linear subspace $\langle \mathcal{G} \rangle = \pi_{\mathcal{P} \setminus \mathcal{Q}}(\langle \mathcal{F} \rangle)$ of $\mathcal{X}_0$ is of dimension at most s, there is $\mathcal{B} \subseteq \mathcal{P} \setminus \mathcal{Q}$ with $\#\mathcal{B} \le s$ and such that $\pi_{\mathcal{B}}$ is one-to-one on $\langle \mathcal{G} \rangle$. Hence $\pi_{\mathcal{B}}$ is one-to-one on $\mathcal{G}$ and $\mathcal{F}$.

Let $\operatorname{conv} \mathfrak{B}$ be the convex hull in $\mathcal{X}_0$ of characteristic functions of all possible sets treated as elements of $\mathcal{B} \in \mathfrak{B}$.

We claim that there exists an element $\beta = (\beta_q)_{q \in \mathcal{P}} \in \operatorname{conv} \mathfrak{B}$ such that

$$0 \le \beta_q < 2 \frac{s}{M} \log q, \quad q \in \mathcal{P}. \tag{5.9}$$

Indeed, assume that it is false. Define another convex subset of $\mathcal{X}_0$:

$$\mathcal{A} = \{(x_q)_{q \in \mathcal{P}, q \le q_0} \ : \ x_q < 2 \frac{s}{M} \log q\}.$$

By our assumption, the convex sets $\mathcal{A}$ and $\operatorname{conv} \mathfrak{B}$ are disjoint; also, $\mathcal{A}$ is an open set. Therefore, we can apply the Hahn-Banach separation theorem, see [19], and conclude the existence of a nonzero sequence $(\mu_q)_{q \in \mathcal{P}}$ such that

$$S = \sup_{(x_q) \in \mathcal{A}} \sum_{q \in \mathcal{P}} \mu_q x_q$$

satisfies

$$\sup_{(x_q)\in\mathcal{A}} \sum_{q\in\mathcal{P}} \mu_q x_q \le \inf_{(x_q)\in \operatorname{conv}\mathfrak{B}} \sum_{q\in\mathcal{P}} \mu_q x_q.$$

and in particular is finite. Furthermore, since S is finite we also see that $\mu_q \ge 0$ for all q. Hence

$$S = 2\frac{s}{M}\sum_{q\in\mathcal{P}} \mu_q \log q > 0.$$

Now we define a nonnegative sequence

$$(\lambda_q) = (\mu_q/S)_{q\in\mathcal{P}}\,.$$

Then we have

$$\sum_{q\in\mathcal{P}} \lambda_q \log q \le \frac{M}{2s} \tag{5.10}$$

and

$$\min_{\mathcal{B}\in\mathfrak{B}} \sum_{q\in\mathcal{B}} \lambda_q \ge 1. \tag{5.11}$$

We now take

$$\mathcal{Q} = \left\{ q\in\mathcal{P} \ : \ |\lambda_q| > \frac{1}{2s} \right\}$$

for which by (5.10) we have (5.8). Thus there exists $\mathcal{B}\in\mathfrak{B}$ with $\mathcal{B}\cap\mathcal{Q} = \emptyset$. We have

$$\sum_{q\in\mathcal{B}} |\lambda_q| \le \frac{1}{2s}\#\mathcal{B} \le \frac{1}{2}$$

contradicting (5.11). This proves the existence of $\beta = (\beta_q)_{q\in\mathcal{P}} \in \operatorname{conv}\mathfrak{B}$ satisfying (5.9).

It follows from the condition (ii) and the inequality (5.9) that

$$\sum_{q\in\mathcal{P}} |x_q|\beta_q < 2\frac{s}{M}\sum_{q\in\mathcal{P}} |x_q|\log q \le 2\frac{sL}{M}.$$

Therefore

$$\sum_{\mathbf{x}\in\mathcal{F}}\sum_{q\in\mathcal{P}} |x_q|\beta_q < 2\frac{sL}{M}\#\mathcal{F}.$$

Since $\beta\in\operatorname{conv}\mathfrak{B}$, by the convexity there is $\mathcal{B}\in\mathfrak{B}$ with

$$\sum_{\mathbf{x}\in\mathcal{F}}\sum_{q\in\mathcal{B}} |x_q| < 2\frac{sL}{M}\#\mathcal{F}.$$

Hence there is a set $\mathcal{F}_0 \subseteq \mathcal{F}$ such that

$$\#\mathcal{F}_0 \ge \frac{1}{2}\#\mathcal{F} \tag{5.12}$$

and for every $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{F}_0$ we have

$$\sum_{q \in \mathcal{P}} |x_q| \le \frac{4SL}{M}. \tag{5.13}$$

Since $\mathcal{B} \in \mathfrak{B}$, the map $\pi_{\mathcal{B}}$ is one-to-one on $\mathcal{F}_0$. Moreover, $x_q \in \mathbb{Z}$ for $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{F}$. Therefore, from (5.12) and (5.13) we derive

$$\#\mathcal{F} \le 2\#\mathcal{F}_0 = 2\pi_{\mathcal{B}}(\mathcal{F}_0) < 2\binom{\lceil 4sL/M \rceil + s}{s}$$

and the result follows. □

5.4. **Estimating $S_p(K_1, K_2)$.**

Lemma 28. *We have*

$$S_p(K_1, K_2) = o(1),$$

as $p \to \infty$

Proof. By Lemma 23, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\substack{k \mid p-1, \\ K_2 < k \le K_1}} \frac{T((p-1)/k, p)}{k} \\ \le \sum_{\substack{k \mid p-1, \\ K_2 < k \le K_1}} k^{1/3+o(1)} p^{-1/3} + \sum_{\substack{k \mid p-1, \\ K_2 < k \le K_1}} k^{-2/3+o(1)}. \end{aligned} \tag{5.14}$$

The first sum can be estimated trivially:

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\substack{k \mid p-1, \\ K_2 < k \le K_1}} k^{1/3+o(1)} p^{-1/3} &\le \sum_{K_2 < k \le K_1} k^{1/3+o(1)} p^{-1/3} \\ &\le K_1^{(4/3)+o(1)} p^{-1/3} = o(1). \end{aligned} \tag{5.15}$$

Next,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\substack{k \mid p-1, \\ K_2 < k \le K_1}} k^{-2/3+o(1)} &\ll \sum_{\substack{k \mid p-1, \\ K_2 < k \le K_1}} k^{-0.65} \\ &= \sum_{K_2 < k \le K_1} k^{-0.65} (\tau(p-1, k) - \tau(p-1, k-1)). \end{aligned}$$

By partial summation,

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{\substack{k\mid p-1,\\ K_2<k\le K_1}} k^{-2/3+o(1)} \\ \ll \sum_{K_2<k\le K_1} k^{-1.65}\tau(p-1,k) + K_1^{-0.65}\tau(p-1,K_1).\end{aligned} \tag{5.16}$$

Define q as the largest prime q so that

$$\prod_{\substack{\ell\le q\\ \ell \text{ prime}}} \ell \le p-1. \tag{5.17}$$

By (5.7) we have

$$q = \log p + o(\log p). \tag{5.18}$$

Therefore, $q \le (\log k)^{2.6}$ for $k > K_2$. Using Lemma 26 and Corollary 13 we get

$$\tau(p-1,k) \ll k^{0.62} \quad (k > K_2).$$

Plugging in this estimate to (5.16) we conclude that

$$\sum_{\substack{k\mid p-1,\\ K_2<k\le K_1}} k^{-2/3+o(1)} = o(1). \tag{5.19}$$

Now the result follows from (5.14), (5.15) and (5.19). □

5.5. **Estimating $S_p(K_2, K_3)$.**

Lemma 29. *We have*

$$S_p(K_2,K_3) = o(1),$$

as $p \to \infty$

Proof. For any integer $K \in (K_3, K_2]$ we estimate

$$S(K) = \sum_{\substack{k\mid p-1,\\ K/e<k\le K}} \frac{T((p-1)/k,p)}{k}. \tag{5.20}$$

By Corollaries 24 and 26, we have

$$S(K) \le 2\Psi(K,p_s)\Psi(K,q)/K. \tag{5.21}$$

where $r = r_0(K)$, $s = s_0(K,K)$ and the prime q is defined by (5.17). To estimate s we use a simple inequality

$$\binom{r+s}{s} \ge (r/s)^s. \tag{5.22}$$

For $K \le K_2$ we have $r \gg (\log p)^{0.6}$. Take $s_0 = \lfloor (\log p)^{0.4} \rfloor$. Then we have, by (5.22),

$$\binom{r+s_0}{s_0} \ge (\log p)^{0.2+o(1)(\log p)^{0.4}} > K.$$

Consequently, $s \le s_0 = o(r)$ and

$$\binom{r+s}{s} = (r/s)^{s+o(s)} \quad \text{and} \quad \binom{r+s+1}{s+1} = (r/s)^{s+o(s)} \tag{5.23}$$

Since $r/s_0 \le r_0/s \le r$ we have

$$\log(r/s) \asymp \log r \asymp \log((\log p)/\log K),$$

and thus we get the order for s

$$s \asymp \frac{\log K}{\log((\log p)/\log K)}$$

Thus, for $K \le K_2$ we have

$$\log(r/s) = \log r - \log s = (1+o(1))\left(\log\log p - 2\log\log K\right).$$

Hence, from (5.23) and the inequalities

$$\binom{r+s}{s} \le K < \binom{r+s+1}{s+1}$$

we obtain an asymptotic formula for s:

$$s = \frac{\log K}{\log\log p - 2\log\log K}(1+o(1)) + O(1) \quad \text{as} \quad K \le K_2. \tag{5.24}$$

(Note the term $O(1)$ is included to have a uniform estimate for $2 \le K \le K_2$, rather than only in the range $K_3 < K \le K_2$).

Using that $\log(1+\alpha) \le \alpha$ for any $\alpha > 0$, and that $s \to \infty$ for $K \ge K_3$, we now conclude from Lemma 12 that

$$\log \Psi(K, p_s) \le (1+o(1))\frac{p_s}{\log p_s}\left(1 + \log\left(1 + \frac{\log K}{p_s}\right)\right).$$

Next, by (5.24),

$$\frac{\log K}{p_s} \le \frac{\log K}{s} \le (1+o(1))\log\log\log p$$

thus, by the prime number theorem,

$$\frac{p_s}{\log p_s} = s + o(s).$$

Using (5.24) again, we deduce

$$\begin{aligned}\log\Psi(K,p_s) &\le (1+o(1))\frac{\log K}{\log\log p-2\log\log K}\log\log\log p\\ &\le (1+o(1))\frac{5\log K}{\log\log p}\log\log\log p.\end{aligned}\tag{5.25}$$

Using Lemma 16 and (5.18) we get

$$\log\Psi(K,q)\le \log K-(1+o(1))\frac{\log K}{\log\log p}\log\frac{\log K}{\log\log p}.$$

Thus, for $K\ge K_3$ we have the inequality

$$\log\Psi(K,q)\le \log K-(1+o(1))\frac{6\log K}{\log\log p}\log\log\log p.\tag{5.26}$$

Combining (5.25) and (5.26) gives

$$\begin{aligned}\log\Psi(K,p_s)+\log\Psi(K,q) &\le \log K-(1+o(1))\frac{\log K}{\log\log p}\log\log\log p\\ &\le \log K-(1+o(1))\frac{\log K_3}{\log\log p}\log\log\log p\\ &\le \log K-(1+o(1))(\log\log p)^6\log\log\log p.\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, by (5.21), $S(K)\ll(\log p)^{-2}$. Observing that the sum $S_p(K_2,K_3)$ does not exceed the sum of $O(\log p)$ of sums $S_p(K)$ with $K_3<K\le K_2$, we complete the proof. □

5.6. **Estimating $S_p(K_3,0)$.**

Lemma 30. *We have*

$$S_p(K_3,0)=O(1).$$

Proof. Since $X(k,p)=\emptyset$ for $k^k<p/2$ we can always assume that k is large enough.

For $K\le K_3$ we estimate the following sums similar to ones given by (5.20):

$$S(K)=\sum_{\substack{k\mid p-1,\\ K/V<k\le K}}\frac{T((p-1)/k,p)}{k},\tag{5.27}$$

where

$$V=(\log p)^{0.01}.\tag{5.28}$$

As before, we put $s=s_0(K,K)$.

By (5.24), we have $\log s \le \log\log K - 1$. Also, $\log r \ge \log\log p - \log\log K - 2$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} s &\le \frac{\log K}{\log\log p - 2\log\log K} \\ &\le \tilde{u}\left(1 + O\left(\frac{\log\log\log p}{\log\log p}\right)\right) + O(1), \end{aligned} \tag{5.29}$$

where

$$\tilde{u} = \frac{\log K}{\log\log p}. \tag{5.30}$$

Identify an integer x given by its prime number factorisation

$$x = \prod_{q \in \mathcal{P}} q^{\sigma_q}$$

with the sequence $(\sigma_q)_{q\in\mathcal{P}}$. Then the set $X(k,p)$ becomes a subset $\mathcal{F}$ of $\mathcal{X}$ of Section 5.3. As can be seen from the proof of Theorem 1 (see (2.1)) it satisfies the condition (i) of Lemma 27. Clearly, it also satisfies the condition (ii) of Lemma 27 with $L = \log K$.

We now fix some M with $1 < M < \log K$ (to be chosen later). Let $\mathcal{K}_g$ be the set of "good" $k \le K$ for which the condition (iii) of Lemma 27 also holds for $X(k,p)$.

Then the bound of Lemma 27 yields that for $k \in \mathcal{K}_g$ we have

$$\#X(k,p) \le \left(c\frac{\log K}{M}\right)^s \tag{5.31}$$

for some absolute constant $c > 0$.

Let $\mathcal{K}_b$ be the set of the remaining "bad" $k \le K$ for which the condition (iii) of Lemma 27 fails.

Now we define a list (a multiset) $\mathcal{L}$ of integers $m \in (K/V, K]$. For any $k \in (K/V, K]$ and for any $l \le K/k$ we write kl as many as $T((p-1)/k, p)$ times. Thus, we have

$$\#\mathcal{L} = \sum_{\substack{k \mid p-1, \\ K/V < k \le K}} T((p-1)/k, p) \left\lfloor \frac{K}{k} \right\rfloor.$$

Hence,

$$\sum_{\substack{k \mid p-1, \\ K/V < k \le K}} \frac{T((p-1)/k, p)}{k} \le 2K^{-1}\#\mathcal{L}. \tag{5.32}$$

For any $m \le K$ the number of occurrences of m in $\mathcal{L}$ is, by Lemma 22,

$$\sum_{\substack{k|(p-1,m),\\ K/V<k\le K}} T((p-1)/k,p) \le \#X\left((p-1,m),p\right).$$

We say that m is "good" if $(p-1,m)$ is "good", and m is "bad" if $(p-1,m)$ is "bad". We split $\mathcal{L}$ into the sublists $\mathcal{L}_g$ and $\mathcal{L}_b$ formed by "good" and "bad" elements, respectively.

We have

$$\#\mathcal{L}_b = \sum_{\substack{k|p-1,\\ K/V<k\le K,\\ k\in\mathcal{K}_b}} \#X(k,p)\left\lfloor \frac{K}{k}\right\rfloor.$$

Therefore,

$$\#\mathcal{L}_b \le K\Sigma_b(K), \tag{5.33}$$

where

$$\Sigma_b(K) = \sum_{\substack{k|p-1,\\ K/V<k\le K\\ k\in\mathcal{K}_b}} \frac{\#X(k,p)}{k}.$$

We now estimate $\Sigma_b(K)$.

We assume that $k \in \mathcal{K}_b$. Then for some set $\mathcal{Q} \subseteq \mathcal{P}$ satisfying (5.8) and distinct integers $x_1, x_2 \in X(k,p)$ for the rational number $\gamma = x_1/x_2$ we have

$$\gamma = \prod_{q\in\mathcal{Q}} q^{\sigma_q}, \qquad \sigma_q \in \mathbb{Z}. \tag{5.34}$$

Since $x_1, x_2 \in [1,k] \subseteq [1,K]$, we have

$$\sum_{q\in\mathcal{Q}} |\sigma_q| \log q \le 2\log K. \tag{5.35}$$

Fix an arbitrary set $\mathcal{Q}$ satisfying (5.8) and estimate the number N of rational numbers γ satisfying (5.34) and (5.35).

For some real parameter $\tau > 0$ we partition $\mathcal{Q}$ as $\mathcal{Q} = \mathcal{Q}_1 \cup \mathcal{Q}_2$ where $\mathcal{Q}_1 = \mathcal{Q} \cap [1, e^\tau]$. A crude estimate gives the bound

$$N \le N_1 N_2$$

where

$$N_1 = \#\left\{(\sigma_q)_{q\in\mathcal{Q}_1} \ : \ \sum_{q\in\mathcal{Q}_1} |\sigma_q| \le 2\log K\right\};$$
$$N_2 = \#\left\{(\sigma_q)_{q\in\mathcal{Q}_2} \ : \ \sum_{q\in\mathcal{Q}_2} |\sigma_q| \le \frac{2\log K}{\tau}\right\}.$$

Since, trivially, $\#\mathcal{Q}_1 \le e^\tau$ and by (5.8) we also have $\#\mathcal{Q}_2 < M/\tau$, we derive

$$N \le (4\log K + 1)^{e^\tau}\left(4\frac{\log K}{\tau} + 1\right)^{M/\tau}.$$

Taking $\tau = 0.6\log M$ we obtain

$$N < (\log K)^{2M/\log M},$$

provided that K is large enough.

Clearly, there are at most e^M possible sets $\mathcal{Q}$ satsifying (5.8). Therefore, we see that there is a finite set $\mathcal{U} \subseteq \mathbb{Q}$ (independent of $k \le K$) of cardinality

$$\#\mathcal{U} \le e^M(\log K)^{2M/\log M}$$

such that if $k \in \mathcal{K}_b$ then there are two distinct integers $x_1, x_2 \in X(k,p)$ with $x_1/x_2 \in \mathcal{U}$.

Let r be the multiplicative order of x_1/x_2 modulo p. Since $p \mid x_1^r - x_2^r$ and $1 \le x_1, x_2 \le k$ we derive $p \le k^r$. Hence for $k \le K \le K_3$ we have

$$r \ge \frac{\log p}{\log k} > (\log p)^{1/2}.$$

Let $\mathcal{R}$ be the subset of all multiplicative orders modulo p that are greater than $(\log p)^{1/2}$ of all rational number $\gamma \in \mathcal{U}$. Clearly

$$\#\mathcal{R} \le \#\mathcal{U} \le e^M(\log K)^{2M/\log M}. \tag{5.36}$$

From the definition of $X(k,p)$ we see that $x_1^k \equiv x_2^k \pmod p$. So if r is the multiplicative order of x_1/x_2 then $r \mid k$.

Thus if $k \in \mathcal{K}_b$ then $k \equiv 0 \pmod r$ for some $r \in \mathcal{R}$. Thus, the contribution $\Sigma_b(K)$ to $S(K)$ from "bad" k is

$$\Sigma_b(K) = \sum_{\substack{k\mid p-1,\\ K/V<k\le K\\ k\in\mathcal{K}_b}} \frac{\#X(k,p)}{k} \le \sum_{r\in\mathcal{R}} \sum_{\substack{k\mid p-1,\\ K/V<k\le K\\ r\mid k}} \frac{\#X(k,p)}{k}.$$

Applying Corollary 24 and then Corollary 26, we derive

$$\begin{aligned}\Sigma_b(K) &\le \frac{V\Psi(K,p_s)}{K}\sum_{\substack{r\in\mathcal{R}\\ r|p-1}}\tau((p-1)/r,K/r)\\ &\le \frac{V\Psi(K,p_s)}{K}\sum_{\substack{r\in\mathcal{R}\\ r|p-1}}\Psi(K/r,q)\end{aligned} \tag{5.37}$$

where, as before, the prime q is defined by (5.17).

As we have noticed, only the values of k with $k^k \ge p/2$ are of interest. So we can always assume that

$$K \ge \frac{\log p}{2\log\log p}.$$

In particular for the parameter $\tilde{u}$ given by (5.30) we have $\tilde{u} \gg 1$.

We also see from (5.29) that

$$\frac{p_s}{\log p_s} \le \tilde{u}\left(1 + O\left(\frac{1}{\log(\tilde{u}+1)}\right)\right).$$

So, to estimate $\Psi(K,p_s)$ we use Lemma 12, where we see that the corresponding values of Z satisfies the inequality

$$Z \le \frac{p_s}{\log p_s}\left(1+\log\left(1+\frac{\log K}{p_s}\right)\right).$$

We also note that

$$\frac{\log K}{p_s} \gg \frac{\log K}{\tilde{u}\log(\tilde{u}+1)} = \frac{\log\log p}{\log(\tilde{u}+1)} \gg \frac{\log\log p}{\log\log\log p}.$$

Therefore

$$\begin{aligned}Z &\le \frac{p_s}{\log p_s}\left(1+\log\frac{\log K}{p_s}+o(1)\right)\\ &= \tilde{u}\left(1+O\left(\frac{1}{\log(\tilde{u}+1)}\right)\right)\left(\log\frac{\log K}{\tilde{u}\log(\tilde{u}+1)}+O(1)\right)\\ &= \tilde{u}\left(1+O\left(\frac{1}{\log(\tilde{u}+1)}\right)\right)\left(\log\frac{\log\log p}{\log(\tilde{u}+1)}+O(1)\right).\end{aligned}$$

We now see from Lemma 12 that

$$\log\Psi(K,p_s) \le \tilde{u}\left(1+O\left(\frac{1}{\log(\tilde{u}+1)}\right)\right)\left(\log\frac{\log\log p}{\log(\tilde{u}+1)}+O(1)\right).$$

from which we derive

$$\log\Psi(K,p_s) \le \tilde{u}\left(\log\frac{\log\log p}{\log(\tilde{u}+1)}+O\left(\frac{\log\log\log p}{\log(\tilde{u}+1)}\right)\right). \tag{5.38}$$

To estimate $\Psi(K/r, q)$ for $r \ge r_0$ where $r_0 = (\log p)^{1/2}$ we write

$$\Psi(K/r, q) \le \Psi(K/r_0, q).$$

Then, using (5.18), for

$$u = \frac{\log(K/r_0)}{\log q},$$

we obtain

$$u = \tilde{u} - 1/2 + o(1).$$

Now Lemma 17 yields the estimate

$$\Psi(K/r, q) \le \Psi(K/r_0, q) \ll \frac{K}{r_0}\rho(\tilde{u} - 1/2 + o(1)) \ll \frac{K}{r_0}\tilde{u}^{-\tilde{u}}. \tag{5.39}$$

Substituting (5.38) and (5.39) in (5.37), we derive

$$\Sigma_b(K) \le \frac{V\#\mathcal{R}}{r_0}\exp(\xi)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}\xi &= \tilde{u}\left(\log\frac{\log\log p}{\log(\tilde{u}+1)} - \log(\tilde{u}+1) + O\left(\frac{\log\log\log p}{\log(\tilde{u}+1)}\right)\right)\\ &= \tilde{u}\left(\log\frac{\log\log p}{\tilde{u}\log(\tilde{u}+1)} + O\left(\frac{\log\log\log p}{\log(\tilde{u}+1)}\right)\right).\end{aligned}$$

Considering the cases $\tilde{u} \le (\log\log p)^{1/3}$ and $\tilde{u} > (\log\log p)^{1/3}$ separately, we see that

$$\tilde{u}\frac{\log\log\log p}{\log(\tilde{u}+1)} = O\left((\log\log p)^{1/2} + \tilde{u}\right).$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned}\Sigma_b(K) \le V\#\mathcal{R}&(\log p)^{-1/2+o(1)}\\ &\exp\left(\tilde{u}\left(\log\frac{\log\log p}{\tilde{u}\log(\tilde{u}+1)} + C\right)\right)\end{aligned} \tag{5.40}$$

for some absolute constant $C > 1$. Considering the cases $\tilde{u} \le U_1$, $U_1 < \tilde{u} \le U_2$ and $\tilde{u} > U_2$ separately, where

$$U_1 = \frac{\log\log p}{(\log\log\log p)^2} \qquad \text{and} \qquad U_2 = e^{2C}\frac{\log\log p}{\log\log\log p},$$

we see that

$$\tilde{u}\left(\log\frac{\log\log p}{\tilde{u}\log(\tilde{u}+1)} + C\right) \ll \frac{\log\log p\log\log\log\log p}{\log\log\log p} = o(\log\log p).$$

So inserting this bound in (5.40) and recalling (5.28) and (5.36) we arrive to the estimate

$$\Sigma_b(K) \le e^M (\log K)^{2M/\log M} (\log p)^{-0.49+o(1)}$$

Taking

$$M = 10^{-2} \log\log p \tag{5.41}$$

and recallinq (5.33) we finally derive

$$\#\mathcal{L}_b \ll K(\log p)^{-1/3}. \tag{5.42}$$

To estimate $\#\mathcal{L}_g$ we observe that for any "good" m the number of occurencies of m in $\mathcal{L}$ is estimated by the bound (5.31) which with M given by (5.41) becomes

$$\#X\left((p-1,m),p\right) \le (c_0\tilde{u})^s$$

where $c_0 = 100c$.

The multiset $\mathcal{L}$ contains only elements from the set

$$\mathfrak{L} = \{dl \le K \ : \ d \mid p-1, \ l \le V\}.$$

Hence,

$$\#\mathcal{L}_g \le (c_0\tilde{u})^s \#\mathfrak{L}. \tag{5.43}$$

We can estimate $\#\mathfrak{L}$ by Lemma 25 as

$$\#\mathfrak{L} \le \Psi(K, q*), \tag{5.44}$$

where $q*$ is the largest prime number with

$$\prod_{\substack{V<\ell\le q* \\ \ell \text{ prime}}} \ell \le p-1.$$

By the prime number theorem,

$$\prod_{\substack{\ell\le q* \\ \ell \text{ prime}}} \ell \le pe^{O(V)}.$$

Using the pirme number theorem again and (5.28) we get

$$q* \le (1+o(1)) \log\left(pe^{O(V)}\right) = (1+o(1))\log p.$$

By Lemma 17 we have

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi(K, q*) &\ll K\rho(w) \\ &= K\exp\left(-w(\log(w+1) + \log\log(w+2) + O(1))\right), \end{aligned}$$

where

$$w = \tilde{u} = \frac{\log K}{\log q*} = \tilde{u}(1+o(1/\log\log p)) = \tilde{u}(1+o(\tilde{u}^{-1/6})).$$

Therefore,

$$\Psi(K, q*) \ll K\rho(w) = K \exp\left(-\tilde{u}(\log(\tilde{u}+1) + \log\log(\tilde{u}+2) + O(1))\right).$$

Combining this inequality with (5.43) and (5.44) we get

$$\#\mathcal{L}_g \ll K \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}\tilde{u}\log\log(\tilde{u}+2)\right). \tag{5.45}$$

We now see from (5.32), (5.42), and (5.45) that

$$\sum_{\substack{k \mid p-1,\\ K/V < k \le K}} \frac{T((p-1)/k, p)}{k} \ll (\log p)^{-1/3} + \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}\tilde{u}\log\log(\tilde{u}+2)\right).$$

Taking the sum over $K = (\log p)^{\nu/100}$, $100 \le \nu \le 100(\log\log p)^6$ with $\tilde{u} = \nu/100$ and for $K = K_3$ with $\tilde{u} = (\log\log p)^6$ we conclude the proof. □

5.7. **Proof of Theorem 11.** Theorem 11 follows immediately from the equation (5.5), the asymptotic formula (5.6) and Lemmas 28, 29 and 30.

5.8. **Lower bound.** To prove (1.14) we recall that for any $d \mid p-1$ we have

$$T(d, p) = \frac{1}{d}\varphi\left(\frac{p-1}{d}\right) + O\left(p^{1/2+o(1)}\right),$$

where $\varphi(k)$ is the Euler function, see [16, Proposition 4.3(a)]. Thus for any D, we derive from (5.1) that

$$F(p) \ge \sum_{\substack{d \mid p-1\\ d \le D}} dT(d, p) = \sum_{\substack{d \mid p-1\\ d \le D}} \varphi\left(\frac{p-1}{d}\right) + O\left(Dp^{1/2+o(1)}\right). \tag{5.46}$$

Using the trivial bound $\varphi(k) \le k$ we now obtain

$$\sum_{\substack{d \mid p-1\\ d \le D}} \varphi\left(\frac{p-1}{d}\right) = \sum_{d \mid p-1} \varphi\left(\frac{p-1}{d}\right) + O\left(p^{1+o(1)}D^{-1}\right). \tag{5.47}$$

Also, it is known that

$$\sum_{d \mid p-1} \varphi\left(\frac{p-1}{d}\right) = p - 1. \tag{5.48}$$

Taking $D = p^{1/4}$, we see that (5.46), (5.47) and (5.48) imply (1.14).

5.9. **Estimates for almost all primes.** Take an arbitrary increasing function $g : \mathbb{R}_+ \to \mathbb{R}_+$ such that $g(u) \to \infty$ as $u \to \infty$. It is easy to see from the proof of Lemma 30 that

$$S(K_3, K_4) = o(1)$$

where

$$K_4 = (\log p)^{g(p)/3}.$$

Combining this with Lemmas 28 and 29, we get

$$\sum_{\substack{k|p-1,\\ k>K_4}} \frac{T((p-1)/k, p)}{k} = 1 + o(1).$$

Therefore, taking

$$\widetilde{K}_4 = (\log x)^{g(x)/3}$$

for a sufficiently large x, by the arguments from [1, Section 5] we conclude that the conjecture (1.12) of J. Holden and P. Moree [16] holds for all but at most

$$E(x) \le \sum_{k \le \widetilde{K}_4} \sum_{j \le k} \sum_{p | k^k - (-j)^k} 1 \ll \widetilde{K}_4^3 = (\log x)^{g(x)}$$

primes $p \le x$, which substantially improves the bound

$$E(x) \ll \exp\left(12 \frac{\log x}{\log\log x}\right).$$

from [5, Section 5].

Acknowledgement

The research was carried out while the second author was visiting the Institute for Advanced Study; the hospitality and excellent working conditions of this institution are gratefully appreciated.

The research of J. B. was was supported in part by National Science Foundation Grant DMS-0808042, that of S. K. by Russian Fund for Basic Research Grant N. 11-01-00329 and that of I. S. by Australian Research Council Grant DP1092835.

References

[1] E. Bombieri, J. Bourgain and S. V. Konyagin, *Roots of polynomials in subgroups of $\mathbb{F}_p{}^*$ and applications to congruences*, Int. Math. Res. Notices, **2009** (2009), Art. ID rnn 802, 1–33.

[2] J. Bourgain, *Mordell's exponential sum estimate revisited*, J. Amer. Math. Soc. **18** (2005), 477–479.

[3] J. Bourgain, *On the distribution of the residues of small multiplicative subgroups of $\mathbb{F}_p$*, Israel J. Math. **172** (2009), 61–74.

[4] J. Bourgain and M. Z. Garaev, *On a variant of sum-product estimates and explicit exponential sum bounds in prime fields*, Math. Proc. Cambridge Phil. Soc., **146** (2009), 1–21.

[5] J. Bourgain, S. V. Konyagin and I. E. Shparlinski, *Product sets of rationals, multiplicative translates of subgroups in residue rings and fixed points of the discrete logarithms*, Int. Math. Res. Notices, **2008** (2008), Art. ID rnn 090, 1–29.

[6] M. Campbell and C. Pomerance, *Explicit estimates on some problems concerning primitive roots*, Preprint, 2002.

[7] T. H. Chan and I. E. Shparlinski, *On the concentration of points on modular hyperbolas and exponential curves*, Acta Arith., **142** (2010), 59–66.

[8] J. Cilleruelo and M. Z. Garaev, *Concentration of points on two and three dimensional modular hyperbolas and applications*, Preprint, 2010 (available from `http://arxiv.org/abs/1007.1526`).

[9] J. Cilleruelo and J. Jiménez Urroz, *The hyperbola $xy = N$*, J. Théorie des Nombres of Bordeaux, **12** (2000), 87–92.

[10] C. Cobeli and A. Zaharescu, *An exponential congruence with solutions in primitive roots*, Rev. Roumaine Math. Pures Appl., **44** (1999), 15–22.

[11] M. Drmota and R. Tichy, *Sequences, discrepancies and applications*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1997.

[12] D. Grigoriev and G. Tenenbaum, *A low complexity probabilistic test for integer multiplication*, J. Complexity, **26** (2010), 263–267.

[13] A. Hildebrand and G. Tenenbaum, *Integers without large prime factors*, J. Théorie des Nombres de Bordeaux, **5** (1993), no. 2, 411–484.

[14] J. Holden, *Fixed points and two cycles of the discrete logarithm*, Lect. Notes in Comp. Sci., Springer–Verlag, Berlin, **2369** (2002), 405–416.

[15] J. Holden and P. Moree, *New conjectures and results for small cycles of the discrete logarithm*, High Primes and Misdemeanours: Lectures in Honour of the 60th Birthday of Hugh Cowie Williams, Fields Institute Communications, **41** (2004), Amer. Math. Soc., 245–254.

[16] J. Holden, P. Moree, *Some heuristics and results for small cycles of the discrete logarithm*, Math. Comp. **75** (2006), 419–449.

[17] S. V. Konyagin and I. E. Shparlinski, *Character sums with exponential functions and their applications*, Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 1999.

[18] J. F. Koksma, *Some theorems on diophantine inequalities*, Math. Centrum Scriptum no. 5, Amsterdam, 1950.

[19] W. Rudin, *Functional analysis*, McGraw-Hill Science/Engineering/Math, 1991.

[20] P. Szüsz, *On a problem in the theory of uniform distribution*, Comptes Rendus Premier Congrès Hongrois, Budapest, 1952, 461–472 (in Hungarian).

[21] W. P. Zhang, *On a problem of Brizolis*, Pure Appl. Math., **11** (1995), suppl., 1–3 (in Chinese).

School of Mathematics, Institute for Advanced Study, Princeton, NJ 08540, USA
E-mail address: bourgain@math.ias.edu

Steklov Mathematical Institute, 8, Gubkin Street, Moscow, 119991, Russia
E-mail address: konyagin@mi.ras.ru

Department of Computing, Macquarie University, North Ryde, Sydney, NSW 2109, Australia
E-mail address: igor.shparlinski@mq.edu.au