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Abstract

Using GCD sums, we show, in particular, that any arithmetic progression with the begin-
ning at zero, which is contained in an arbitrary integer set $S$ with $|SS| \ll |S|$ has size at most
$O(\log |S| \cdot (\log \log |S|)^3)$. This result can be considered as an integer analogue of Vinogradov’s
question about the least quadratic non–residue. The proof rests on a certain repulsion prop-
erty of the function $f(x) = \log x$. Also, we consider the case of general $k$–convex functions $f$
and obtain a new incidence result for collections of the curves $y = f(x) + c$.

1 Introduction

Having a ring $R$ with two operations $+$ and $\cdot$ one can define the sumset of sets $A, B \subseteq R$ as

$$A + B = \{a + b : a \in A, b \in B\}$$

and, similarly, the product set

$$AB = \{a \cdot b : a \in A, b \in B\}.$$  

The sum–product phenomenon (see, e.g., [19]) predicts that additive and multiplicative structure
cannot coexist up to some natural algebraic constrains. This can be expressed in many different
ways see, e.g., [6] and in our paper we consider just one of them. Let us formulate a particular
case of the main result, which is contained in Theorem 12 from Section 3. Clearly, our Theorem
1 is the best possible up to the log log factor.

**Theorem 1** Let $S \subseteq \mathbb{Z}$ be a finite set, $|SS| \ll |S|$ and $A \subseteq S$ be an arithmetic progression
with the beginning at zero. Then

$$|A| \ll \log |S| \cdot (\log \log |S|)^3.$$  (1)

The result above can be considered as an integer analogue of Vinogradov’s question about
the least quadratic non–residue. Namely, having a prime number $p$ one can take the subgroup of
squares $\mathcal{R} \subseteq \mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z}$ with the product set $\mathcal{R}\mathcal{R}$ equals $\mathcal{R}$ and ask the question about the maximal
length of the arithmetic progression with the beginning at zero, belonging to $\mathcal{R}$. Size of this
arithmetic progression is usually denoted as \( n_p \) and it is known \([5]\) that there are infinitely many primes such that
\[
n_p \gg \log p \cdot \log \log p.
\]
On the other hand, GRH implies \([2]\) that
\[
n_p = O(\log^2 p)
\]
(the best unconditional bound belongs to Burgess \([7]\) who proved \( n_p \ll p^{\frac{1}{4}+o(1)} \)). Thus in the integer case our Theorem \([1]\) gives upper bound \([1]\) of a comparable quality.

Our another result is Theorem \([3]\) from Section \([3]\).

**Theorem 2** Let \( A, S \subset \mathbb{Z} \) be finite sets and \( 0 \leq \alpha < 1/6 \) be any number. Suppose that \( |A + A| \leq K|A| \) with
\[
K \ll \exp(\log^\alpha |A|)
\]
and
\[
|S| \ll \exp \left( \frac{\log^{2-6\alpha} |A|}{\log \log |A|} \right).
\]
Then for an absolute constant \( C > 0 \) and a certain \( a \in A \) one has
\[
|(A - a)S| \gg |S| \cdot \exp(C \log^{1-3\alpha} |A|).
\]
In particular, \( |(A - A)S| \gg |S| \cdot \exp(C \log^{1-3\alpha} |A|) \).

The result above can be considered as the first step towards the main conjecture from \([3]\) where authors do not assume that the additional condition \([2]\) takes place (also, see papers \([10]\), \([11]\) in this direction).

The method of the proofs of Theorems \([1]\), \([2]\) uses so-called GCD sums (see, e.g., \([1]\), \([5]\), \([4]\), \([12]\)), which are connected with a series of questions of the Uniform Distribution, as well as Number Theory in particular, with large values of the zeta function. In our paper we follow beautiful exposition of random zeta functions approach from \([12]\). Thus our method extensively uses the integer arithmetic. It is interesting to obtain some analogues of Theorems \([1]\), \([2]\) for subsets of \( \mathbb{R} \) or \( \mathbb{C} \).

If one takes the function \( f(x) = \log x \), then Theorem \([2]\) can be considered as a repulsion result concerning the logarithmic function. Namely, estimate \([4]\) says that \( |f(A - a) + \log S| \) must be significantly larger than \( |S| \) for rather big sets \( S \) as in \([3]\). The first results in the direction were obtained in \([9]\) for general \( k \)-convex functions (that is having strictly monotone the first \( k \) derivatives). Recall \([9]\), Theorem 1.4].

**Theorem 3** Let \( A \) be a finite set of real numbers contained in an interval \( I \) and let \( f \) be a function which is \( k \)-convex on \( I \) for some \( k \geq 1 \). Suppose that \( |A| > 10k \). Then if \( |A + A - A| \leq K|A| \), then we have
\[
\left| 2^k f(A) - (2^k - 1)f(A) \right| \geq \frac{|A|^{k+1}}{(CK)^{2k+1-k-2}(\log |A|)^{2k+2-k-4}}
\]
for some absolute constant \( C > 0 \).
In this direction we obtain a result on common energy of an arbitrary set $S$ and the image of a $k$–convex function (the required definitions can be found in Section 2). Of course general Theorem 4 below gives weaker bounds than Theorem 1 in the particular case $f(x) = \log x$.

**Theorem 4** Let $f$ be a function which is $k$–convex on a set $I$ for some $k \geq 1$. Suppose that $|I + I - I| \leq |I|^{1+\epsilon}$. Then for any finite set $S \subset \mathbb{R}$ with $|I| \geq |S|^{\varepsilon}$, $\varepsilon \gg 1/k$, $\varepsilon \leq \exp(-1/(c\varepsilon))$ there is $\delta(\varepsilon) > 0$ such that

$$E^+(f(I), S) \ll |I|^2|S|^{1-\delta(\varepsilon)}.$$  \hspace{1cm} (5)

In particular, $|f(I) + S| \gg |S|^{1+\delta(\varepsilon)}$.

Using the Plünnecke inequality (see estimate (9) below) one can show that to have growth as in (4) under the assumptions as in (2) Theorem 3 requires the condition

$$|S| \leq \exp(O(\log |A| \cdot \log \log |A|))$$  \hspace{1cm} (6)

and our restriction (3) is wider. Theorem 12 as well as Proposition 11 below require much weaker restrictions on $|S|$ but provide a smaller growth.

Finally, recall the main result from [17], which can be considered as a quantitative version of some results from [6].

**Theorem 5** Let $p$ be a primes number, $A, B, C \subseteq \mathbb{F}_p$ be arbitrary sets, and $k \geq 1$ be such that $|A||B|^{1+\frac{(k+1)}{2^k}} \leq p$ and

$$|B|^{\frac{k}{k+4} + \frac{1}{2(k+4)}} \geq |A| \cdot C_*^{(k+4)/4} \log^k(|A||B|),$$

where $C_* > 0$ is an absolute constant. Then

$$\max\{|AB|, |A + C|\} \geq 2^{-3}|A| \cdot \min\{|C|, |B|^{\frac{1}{k+4}}2^{-k}\},$$

and for any $\alpha \neq 0$

$$\max\{|AB|, |(A + \alpha)C|\} \geq 2^{-3}|A| \cdot \min\{|C|, |B|^{\frac{1}{k+4}}2^{-k}\}.$$  

The result above takes place in $\mathbb{R}$ as well. In this case we do not need any conditions containing the characteristic $p$. The main difference between Theorems 2, 4 and Theorem 5 is that $A$ is large and $B$ is small in Theorem 5 but the opposite situation takes place in Theorem 3 (here $|A| = |I| = |f(I)|$) and similar in Theorem 2.

The author thanks Christoph Aistleitner for useful discussions.
2 Definitions and preliminaries

Let $G$ be an abelian group. Put $E^+(A, B)$ for the common additive energy of two sets $A, B \subseteq G$ (see, e.g., [19]), that is,

$$E^+(A, B) = \left| \{(a_1, a_2, b_1, b_2) \in A \times A \times B \times B : a_1 + b_1 = a_2 + b_2\} \right|.$$ 

If $A = B$, then we simply write $E^+(A)$ instead of $E^+(A, A)$ and the quantity $E^+(A)$ is called the additive energy in this case. Sometimes we write $E^+(f_1, f_2, f_3, f_4)$ for the additive energy of four real functions, namely,

$$E^+(f_1, f_2, f_3, f_4) = \sum_{x, y, z} f_1(x)f_2(y)f_3(x + z)f_4(y + z).$$

Thus $E^+(f_1, f_2, f_3, f_4)$ pertains to additive quadruples, weighed by the values of $f_1, f_2, f_3, f_4$. It can be shown using the Hölder inequality (see, e.g., [19]) that

$$E^+(f_1, f_2, f_3, f_4) \leq (E^+(f_1)E^+(f_2)E^+(f_3)E^+(f_1))^{1/4}.$$  (7)

More generally, we deal with a higher energy

$$T_k^+(A) := \left| \{(a_1, \ldots, a_k, a'_1, \ldots, a'_k) \in A^{2k} : a_1 + \cdots + a_k = a'_1 + \cdots + a'_k\} \right|$$

and similar $T_k^+(f)$ for a general function $f$. Sometimes we use representation function notations like $r_{A+B}(x)$ or $r_{A+A-B}$, which counts the number of ways $x \in G$ can be expressed as a sum $a + b$ or as a sum $a + a' - b$ with $a, a' \in A$, $b \in B$, respectively. For example, $|A| = r_{A-A}(0)$ and $E^+(A) = r_{A+A-A-A}(0) = \sum_x r_{A+A}^2(x) = \sum_x r_{A-A}^2(x)$. In the same way define the common multiplicative energy of two sets $A, B$

$$E^\times(A, B) = \left| \{(a_1, a_2, b_1, b_2) \in A \times A \times B \times B : a_1b_1 = a_2b_2\} \right|,$$

and $T_k^\times(A)$, $T_k^\times(f)$ and so on.

If $G$ is an abelian group, then the Plünnecke–Ruzsa inequality (see, e.g., [19]) takes place

$$|nA - mA| \leq \left( \frac{|A+A|}{|A|^2} \right)^{n+m} \cdot |A|,$$  (9)

and

$$|nA| \leq \left( \frac{|A+A|}{|A|^2} \right)^n \cdot |A|.$$  (10)

Now recall our current knowledge about the Polynomial Freiman–Ruzsa Conjecture, see [13], [15] and [19]. We need a simple consequence of [15] Proposition 2.5, Theorem 2.7. Recall that if $P_1, \ldots, P_d \subseteq \mathbb{Z}$ are arithmetic progressions, then $Q := P_1 + \cdots + P_d$ is a generalized arithmetic progression (GAP) of dimension $d$. A generalized arithmetic progression, $Q$, is called to be proper if $|Q| = \prod_{j=1}^d |P_j|$. For properties of generalized arithmetic progressions consult, e.g., [19].

**Theorem 6** Let $A \subseteq \mathbb{Z}$ be a finite set, $|A + A| \leq K|A|$ and $\kappa > 3$ be any constant. Then there is a proper GAP $H$ of size at most $|A| \exp(O(\log^\kappa K))$ and dimension $O(\log^\kappa K)$ such that for a set of shifts $X$, $|X| \leq \exp(O(\log^\kappa K))$ one has $A \subseteq H + X$.

All logarithms are to base 2. The signs $\ll$ and $\gg$ are the usual Vinogradov symbols. For a positive integer $n$, let $[n] = \{1, \ldots, n\}$. 

3 The proof of the main result

Now we obtain Theorem 2 from the Introduction. Following the method from [12] we recall some required definitions.

For each prime \( p \) take a random variable \( X_p \), which is uniformly distributed on \( S^1 \) and let all \( X_p \) be independent. For every \( n \in \mathbb{N} \), \( n = p_1^{\omega_1} \cdots p_s^{\omega_s} \), where \( p_j, j \in [s] \) are different primes put \( X_n := \prod_{j=1}^{s} X_{p_j}^{\omega_j} \). Then define the random zeta function by the formula (let \( \alpha \) be a real number, \( \alpha > \frac{1}{2} \), say)

\[
\zeta_X(\alpha) := \sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \frac{X_n}{n^{\alpha}} = \prod_{p} \left(1 - \frac{X_p}{p^{\alpha}}\right)^{-1}.
\] (11)

Using the product formula (11) one can compute the moments of the random zeta function (11), see [12] (or just similar calculations in our Lemma 10 below).

**Lemma 7** Let \( l \) be a positive integer. Then

\[
\log \mathbb{E} |\zeta_X(\alpha)|^{2l} \ll \begin{cases} 
\frac{l \log \log l}{1 - \alpha}, & \alpha = 1, l \geq 3 \\
C(\alpha)^{l/\alpha}(\log l)^{l-1}, & 1/2 < \alpha < 1, l \geq 3 \\
l^2 \log \left(\frac{1}{2\alpha-1}\right), & 1/2 < \alpha, l \geq 3
\end{cases}
\]

where \( C(\alpha) = \frac{\alpha}{1-\alpha} + \frac{\alpha}{2\alpha-1} \).

Also, for any function \( g : \mathbb{Z} \to \mathbb{C} \) consider the following random analogue of its "multiplicative" Fourier transform

\[
\tilde{g}(X) = \sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} g(n) X_n.
\] (12)

Clearly, we have an analogue of the Parseval identity

\[
\mathbb{E}|\tilde{g}(X)|^2 = \|g\|_2^2,
\] (13)

and, moreover, for \( k \geq 1 \) one has

\[
\mathbb{E}|\tilde{g}(X)|^{2k} = T^*_k(g).
\] (14)

Further one can compute

\[
\mathbb{E}|\tilde{g}(X)\zeta_X(\alpha)|^2 = \sum_{n_1,n_2,m_1,m_2 : n_1m_1 = n_2m_2} \frac{g(m_1)\overline{g}(m_2)}{(n_1n_2)^{\alpha}} = \zeta(2\alpha) \sum_{m_1,m_2} \frac{g(m_1)\overline{g}(m_2) \cdot \gcd(m_1,m_2)^{2\alpha}}{(m_1m_2)^{\alpha}}
\] (15)

and hence GCD sum (15) can be interpreted as the multiplicative energy (see the definition of Fourier transform (12)) of our weight \( g \) with the random zeta function \( \zeta_X(\alpha) \). It is easy to see (consult estimate (18) below) that it can be converted further to the ordinary multiplicative energy of the function \( g \) and the interval \([N]\).

We follow the method from [12], [14], [11] to give the proof of Lemma 8 below. Generally speaking, our bound (17) is close to the optimal one, see [5].
Lemma 8 Let \( w : \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{0\} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+ \) be a non-negative function and \( N \) be a positive integer. Then for any positive integer \( s \) one has
\[
\mathbb{E}^x([N], w) \ll N\|w\|_2^2 \exp \left( C \sqrt{s^{-1} \log \log N \cdot \log(T_{s+1}^x(w))} - 2(s+1) \right) + 2 \log \log N \right) \ll \ (16)
\]
\[
\ll N\|w\|_2^2 \exp \left( C \sqrt{\log \log N \cdot \log([\|w\|_1\|w\|_2^{-1}])} + 2 \log \log N \right), \quad (17)
\]
where \( C > 0 \) is an absolute constant.

Proof. Let \( L = \log N \) and \( \alpha \in (1/2, 1] \). Using the Dirichlet principle, as well as estimate (7), we find a positive number \( U \leq N \) such that
\[
\mathbb{E}^x([N], w) \ll L^2 \sum_{U < n_1, n_2 \leq U, m_1, m_2 : n_1 m_1 = n_2 m_2} w(m_1)w(m_2) \ll L^2 U^{2\alpha} \sum_{U < n_1, n_2 \leq U, m_1, m_2 : n_1 m_1 = n_2 m_2} \frac{w(m_1)w(m_2)}{(n_1 n_2)^\alpha}.
\]
In terms of the random zeta function (11), we see that the last sum is, clearly, does not exceed
\[
\sum_{n_1, n_2, m_1, m_2 : n_1 m_1 = n_2 m_2} \frac{w(m_1)w(m_2)}{(n_1 n_2)^\alpha} = \mathbb{E}|\widehat{w}(X)\zeta_X(\alpha)|^2.
\]
Thus
\[
\mathbb{E}^x([N], w) \ll L^2 U^{2\alpha} \mathbb{E}|\widehat{w}(X)\zeta_X(\alpha)|^2
\]
and our task is to estimate the last expectation. Let \( l \geq 3 \) be an integer parameter, which we will choose later. Also, let \( T_{s+1} = T_{s+1}^x(w) \). Thanks to identities (13), (14), Lemma 7 and the Hölder inequality, we have
\[
\mathbb{E}|\widehat{w}(X)\zeta_X(\alpha)|^2 \leq \mathbb{E}^{1-1/l}|\widehat{w}(X)|^{2-2(l-1)} \cdot \mathbb{E}^{1/l}|\zeta_X(\alpha)|^{2l} \leq \ (19)
\]
\[
\leq (\mathbb{E}|\widehat{w}(X)|^{2s^{1-l} \alpha - 1}) \mathbb{E}|\widehat{w}(X)|^{2s^{1-l} \alpha - 2} \cdot \mathbb{E}^{1/l}|\zeta_X(\alpha)|^{2l} = ||w||_2^2 \frac{1}{l \log l} \cdot \mathbb{E}^{1/l}|\zeta_X(\alpha)|^{2l} \leq \ (20)
\]
\[
\ll \|w\|_2^2 \exp \left( \frac{1}{l \log l} \cdot \min \left\{ \frac{C(\alpha)^{1/\alpha}}{\|w\|_2^{1-2(s+1)/2}}, 1 \right\} \right). \quad (21)
\]
Put \( X = s^{-1} \log(T_{s+1}||w||_2^{-2(s+1)}) \geq 0 \). First of all, take the second term in the minimum in (21). In this case we see that the optimal choice of \( l \) is \( l \sim X^{1/2} \log^{-1/2}(1/(2\alpha - 1)) \). Hence
\[
\mathbb{E}|\widehat{w}(X)\zeta_X(\alpha)|^2 \ll \|w\|_2^2 \exp \left( O \left( X^{1/2} \log^{1/2} \frac{1}{2\alpha - 1} \right) \right).
\]
Now we take \( \alpha = \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{\log N} \) (one can check that this choice of \( \alpha \) allows us to choose \( l \geq 3 \)) and using \( U \leq N \), we get in view of (18) that
\[
\mathbb{E}^x([N], w) \ll L^2 N\|w\|_2^2 \exp \left( O \left( s^{-1} \log \log N \cdot \log(T_{s+1}||w||_2^{-2(s+1)}) \right) \right).
\]
To obtain (17) just notice that $T_{s+1} \leq \|w\|_{L^2}^{2s} \|w\|_2^2$. This completes the proof. □

Using lemma above we obtain in particular, Theorem 9 from the Introduction.

**Theorem 9** Let $A, S \subset \mathbb{Z}$ be finite sets and $0 \leq \alpha < 1/6$ be any number. Suppose that $|A + A| \leq K|A|$ with

$$K \ll \exp(\log^\alpha |A|)$$

and

$$|S| \ll \exp \left( \frac{\log^{2-6\alpha} |A|}{\log \log |A|} \right).$$

Then there are at least $\exp(-O(\log^{1-6\alpha} |A|))$ elements $a \in A$ such that

$$|(A - a)S| \gg |S| \cdot \exp(O(\log^{1-3\alpha} |A|)).$$

In addition, if $|S + S| \leq K_s|S|$, then (24) takes place provided

$$K_s \log |S| \ll \exp \left( \frac{\log^{2-6\alpha} |A|}{\log \log |A|} \right).$$

**Proof.** Using Theorem 6 we find a proper GAP $H$ of size at most $|A| \cdot \exp(O(\log^\alpha K))$ and dimension $d = O(\log^\alpha K)$ such that for a set of shifts $X$, $|X| \leq \exp(O(\log^\alpha K))$ one has $A \subseteq H + X$. Here $\kappa > 3$ is any number. We have $H = P_1 + \cdots + P_d$, where the sum is direct and all $P_j$ are arithmetic progressions. Without loss of generality we can assume that for $P = P_1$ one has $|P| \geq |H|^{1/d}$. Also, there is $x \in X$ such that $|A \cap (H + x)| \geq |A|/|X|$ and hence

$$|A| \cdot \exp(-O(\log^\alpha K)) \leq |A|/|X| \leq |A \cap (H + x)| \leq \sum_{y \in P_2 + \cdots + P_d} |A \cap (P + y + x)|.$$

Thus there exists $y \in P_2 + \cdots + P_d + x$ such that

$$|P| \cdot \exp(-O(\log^\alpha K)) \leq |P||A|/|H| \cdot \exp(-O(\log^\alpha K)) =$$

$$= |A| \cdot \exp(-O(\log^\alpha K)(|P_2| \cdots |P_d|)^{-1} \leq |A \cap (P + y)|. \quad (26)$$

For any $a \in A \cap (P + y)$, we have $D_s := A \cap (P + y) - a \subseteq (A - A) \cap (P - P)$. Applying Lemma 8 the lower bound $|P| \geq |H|^{1/d}$ and using the Holder inequality several times, as well as estimate (26), we obtain

$$|D_s S| \geq \frac{|D_s|^2|S|^2}{E^x(P - P, S)} \gg \frac{|A \cap (P + y)|^2|S|^2}{E^x(P, S)} \gg |S||P| \cdot \exp(-O(\log^\alpha K + \sqrt{\log \log |P| \cdot \log |S|}))$$

$$\gg |S| \cdot \exp \left( O \left( \frac{\log |A|}{\log^\alpha K} - \log^\alpha K - \sqrt{\log \log |A| \cdot \log |S|} \right) \right).$$

Thanks to our conditions (22), (23), we obtain

$$|D_s S| \gg |S| \cdot \exp \left( O \left( \frac{\log |A|}{\log^\alpha K} \right) \right) \gg \exp \left( O \left( \frac{\log |A|}{\log^\alpha K} \right) \right) \gg (27)$$
\[ |D_s S| \gg |S| \cdot \exp(O(\log^{1-3\alpha} |A|)) \quad (28) \]

as required.

To obtain (25) just repeat the previous calculations and use Lemma 8 with the parameter \( s = 1 \). By Solymosi’s result [18] we know that \( E^\times(S) \ll |S + S|^2 \log |S| \ll K^2 |S|^2 \log |S| \) and we arrive to an analogue of (27), (28)

\[ |D_s S| \gg |S| \cdot \exp\left(O\left(\frac{\log |A|}{\log^c K} - \sqrt{\log \log |A| \cdot \log(K^2 \log |S|)}\right)\right). \]

This completes the proof. \( \square \)

Now consider another zeta function, which allows to make calculations above better and even simpler. Let \( \alpha > 0 \) be a real number and \( z \) be a positive integer. Then

\[ Z_X(\alpha) := \prod_{z \leq p < 2z} \left(1 + \frac{X_p}{p^\alpha}\right). \quad (29) \]

Denote by \( P_z \) the set of all primes in \([z, 2z)\) and let \( g \) be any non-negative function. Since the support of \( Z_X(\alpha) \) coincides with all possible products of primes from \( P_z \) and \( 1 \), we see that the function \( Z_X(\alpha) \) can be used to calculate the common energy of the set \( P_z \) with any function \( g \), namely,

\[ E^\times(g, P_z) < 4^\alpha z^{2\alpha} \cdot |\hat{g}(X)Z_X(\alpha)|^2. \quad (30) \]

Thus to compute \( E^\times(g, P_z) \) we need to estimate all moments of the function \( Z_X(\alpha) \) similar to Lemma 7.

**Lemma 10** Let \( \alpha > 0 \) be any real number, \( l \) be a positive integer and \( l \leq z^\alpha \). Then

\[ \log \mathbb{E}|Z_X(\alpha)|^{2l} \ll \frac{l^2 z^{1-2\alpha}}{\log z}. \]

**Proof.** In view of the fact that all the variables \( X_p, p \in P_z \) are independent, we have

\[ \mathbb{E}|Z_X(\alpha)|^{2l} = \prod_{z \leq p < 2z} \mathbb{E}\left(1 + \frac{X_p}{p^\alpha}\right)^l \left(1 + \frac{\overline{X_p}}{p^\alpha}\right)^l := \prod_{z \leq p < 2z} E_l(p), \]

and

\[ E_l(p) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} \left(1 + \frac{e^{i\theta}}{p^\alpha}\right)^l \left(1 + \frac{e^{-i\theta}}{p^\alpha}\right)^l d\theta = \sum_{n=0}^l \binom{l}{n}^2 \frac{1}{p^{2\alpha n}}. \]

Using the condition \( l \leq z^\alpha \), we obtain \( \log E_l(p) \leq 2l^2/p^{2\alpha} \). Hence

\[ \log \mathbb{E}|Z_X(\alpha)|^{2l} \leq 2l^2 \sum_{z \leq p < 2z} p^{-2\alpha} \ll \frac{l^2 z^{1-2\alpha}}{\log z}. \]

This completes the proof. \( \square \)

Now we formulate an analogue of Lemma 8 allowing to calculate the common energy of the set \( P_z \) with a general weight \( w \).
**Proposition 11** Let \( w : \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{0\} \to \mathbb{R}^+ \) be a non-negative function and \( s, z \) be positive integers. Suppose that

\[
\log(T_{s+1}^x(w)) \|w\|_2^{-2(s+1)} \leq \frac{sz}{\log z}.
\]

(31)

Then for any \( \alpha > 0 \) the following holds

\[
E^x(P_z, w) \ll z^{2\alpha} \|w\|_2^2 \exp \left( Cz^{1/2-\alpha} \sqrt{s^{-1} \log^{-1} z \cdot \log(T_{s+1}^x(w)) \|w\|_2^{-2(s+1)} } \right).
\]

(32)

In particular, for any \( \varepsilon > 0 \) one has

\[
E^x(P_z, w) \ll \varepsilon z^{2\alpha} \|w\|_2^2 \exp \left( C\varepsilon^{-1} z^{-1/2} \sqrt{s^{-1} \log^{-1} z \cdot \log(T_{s+1}^x(w)) \|w\|_2^{-2(s+1)} } \right).
\]

(33)

**Proof.** Let \( X = s^{-1} \log(T_{s+1}^x(w)) \|w\|_2^{-2(s+1)} \). Choose \( l = (X \log z / z)^{1/2} z^\alpha \). Thanks to our assumption (31), we have \( l \leq z^\alpha \). Using Lemma 10 as in lines (19)—(21), combining with bound (30), we get

\[
E^x(P_z, w) \ll z^{2\alpha} \|w\|_2^2 \exp \left( Cz^{1/2-\alpha} \sqrt{s^{-1} \log^{-1} z \cdot \log(T_{s+1}^x(w)) \|w\|_2^{-2(s+1)} } \right).
\]

(34)

Taking \( \alpha = 1 - \frac{\log(1/\varepsilon)}{\log z} \), we obtain

\[
E^x(P_z, w) \ll \varepsilon z^{2\alpha} \|w\|_2^2 \exp \left( C\varepsilon^{-1} z^{-1/2} \sqrt{s^{-1} \log^{-1} z \cdot \log(T_{s+1}^x(w)) \|w\|_2^{-2(s+1)} } \right).
\]

This completes the proof. \( \square \)

Now we derive an upper bound for size of arithmetic progressions belonging to sets having small product set. Again, our bound (35) below is better than (6), which gives \( |A| \leq \exp(O(\log |S| / \log \log |S|)) \). The same can be said concerning estimate (3).

**Theorem 12** Let \( S \subset \mathbb{Z} \) be a set, \( |SS| \leq M|S| \) and \( A \subseteq S \) be an arithmetic progression with the beginning at zero. Then

\[
|A| \ll M^2 \log |S| \cdot \log^3 (M^2 \log |S|).
\]

(35)

**Proof.** We use the arguments of the proof of Theorem 9, combining with estimate (33) of Proposition 11 instead of bounds (16)—(17) of Lemma 8. Let \( A = \{0, d, \ldots, dl\} \). Put \( z = \lfloor l/2 \rfloor \) and consider the set \( P_z \subseteq [l] \). Take \( s = 1 \) and \( \varepsilon = c/(M \log^2 |A|) \), where \( c > 0 \) is a sufficiently
small constant. We have \(|P^2| \gg |A| / \log |A|\). If (35) does not hold, then applying Proposition 11 and the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality, we derive

\[
M|S| \geq |SS| \geq |P^2S| \geq \frac{|P^2|^2|S|^2}{E \times (P^2, S)} \gg \\
\gg c^{-1}M|S| \exp \left( -Cc^{-1}M \log^2 |A| \cdot \sqrt{\frac{\log |S|}{|A| \log |A|}} \right) \gg c^{-1}M|S|
\]

and this is a contradiction because the constant \(c\) can be taken sufficiently small. Clearly, we can assume that assumption (31) of Proposition 11 takes place because otherwise result follows immediately. This completes the proof.

Of course in Theorem 12 one can consider more general arithmetic progressions as well but in this case one should control the beginning and the step of such progression, simultaneously. Also, the dependence on \(M\) in the first multiple in (35) must be at least linear even for rather small \(M\). Indeed, just take \(S = A\Gamma\), where \(\Gamma\) is a geometric progression, say.

4 On general \(k\)-convex functions

In [9, Theorem 1.3] authors obtained the following growth result for sequences of the form \(A = f([N])\), where \(f\) is an arbitrary \(k\)-convex function.

**Theorem 13** Let \(k \geq 2\) be an integer and let \(A\) be a \(k\)-convex sequence. Then

\[
|2^kA - (2^k - 1)A| \gg \frac{|A|^{k+1}}{2^k}
\]

Thus Theorem 3 from the Introduction can be considered as a "statistical" version of Theorem 13. Also, notice that the dependence on \(k\) in Theorem 13 is better.

In this Section we show how Theorem 3 implies an upper bound for the higher energy of any \(k\)-convex function. Basically, we repeat the combination of the arguments from [13, Theorem 13] and [16, Theorem 23].

**Theorem 14** Let \(f\) be a function which is \(k\)-convex on a set \(I\) for some \(k \geq 1\). Suppose that \(|I + I - I| \leq |I|^{1+\epsilon}\). Then for all \(l \leq 2^k\), \(\epsilon \leq \frac{\log l}{l}\) one has

\[
T^{+}_{2^j}(f(I)) \ll |I|^{2^j + 1 - c \log l}, \tag{36}
\]

for a certain absolute constant \(c > 0\).

**Proof.** Put \(A = f(I)\). Let \(T^+_{2^j} := T^+_{2^j}(A)\) and \(T_1 = |A|^2\). Our task is to prove for any \(j \in [l]\) that

\[
T_{2^j} \leq \frac{T_{2^{j-1}} |A|^{2^j}}{Q}, \tag{37}
\]
where \( Q = |A|^{\frac{\log j}{j}} \) because it clearly implies (36). Suppose not. Put \( L = O(k \log |A|) \). By the dyadic Dirichlet principle and the Hölder inequality in the form (7) there is a number \( \Delta > 0 \) and a set \( P = \{ x \in \mathbb{Z} : \Delta < r_{2j-1} A(x) \leq 2\Delta \} \) such that

\[
L^4 \Delta^4 E^+(P) \geq T_{2j} \geq \frac{|A|^{2j} T_{2j-1}}{Q} \geq \frac{(\Delta |P|)^2 \Delta^2 |P|}{Q}.
\]

(38)

Indeed, we can assume that (36) does not hold (otherwise there is nothing to prove) and thus by our condition \( j \leq l \leq 2^k \) one has

\[
|A|^{2j-1} \geq \Delta \gg |A|^{2j-1 - \epsilon \log j}
\]

and hence we do indeed have the upper bound (38) with the quantity \( L \). Further from (38), we obtain \( \Delta \geq L^{-4} T_{2j} |A|^{-3 \cdot 2j-1} \) and

\[
E^+(P) \gg L^{-4} \frac{|P|^3}{Q} := \frac{|P|^3}{Q_1}.
\]

(39)

Also notice that \( \Delta^4 E^+(P) \leq \Delta^2 |P| (\Delta |P|)^2 \leq T_{2j-1} (\Delta |P|)^2 \) and hence from (38), we get

\[
\Delta |P| \geq \frac{|A|^{2j-1}}{L^2 Q^{1/2}}.
\]

(40)

Similarly, \( \Delta^4 E^+(P) \leq (\Delta^2 |P|) |A|^{2j-2} |P|^2 \leq T_{2j-1} |A|^{2j-2} |P|^2 \) and thus from (38), we derive

\[
|P| \geq \frac{|A|}{L^2 Q^{1/2}}.
\]

(41)

By the Balog–Szemerédi–Gowers Theorem (see, e.g., [19]), we find \( P_\ast \subseteq P \) such that \( |P_\ast| \gg |P| Q_1^{C_\ast} \), and \( |P_* + P_*| \ll Q_1^{C_\ast} |P_*| \). Here \( C_\ast > 1 \) is an absolute constant, which may change from line to line. By the definition of the set \( P \), we have

\[
\Delta |P_*| \leq \sum_{x \in P_\ast} r_{2j-1} A(x) = \sum_{x_1, \ldots, x_{2j-1} \in A} r_{P_*} A(x_1 + \cdots + x_{2j-1} - x).
\]

Hence there is a shift \( x \) and a set \( A_* \subseteq A \cap (P_* - x) \) such that

\[
|A_*| \gg |A| \geq |P_*|/|A|^{2j-1} \gg |A| (LQ)^{-C_\ast}.
\]

(42)

Here we have used bound (39). The set \( A_* \) has the form \( A_* = f(S) \), where \( S \subseteq I \) is a set of the same size. Clearly,

\[
|S + S - S| \leq |I + I - I| \leq |I|^{1+\epsilon} = |A|^{1+\epsilon} / |A_*| \cdot |S| := K|S|.
\]

Applying Theorem 3 with a parameter \( t = t(j) \leq k \), which we will choose later, combining with inequality (39), we obtain

\[
\frac{|A_*|^t}{(CK)^{2t+1-t-2} (\log |A_*|)^{2t+2-t-4}} \leq |2^t A_* - (2^t - 1) A_*| \leq |2^t P_* - (2^t - 1) P_*| \ll
\]
Thanks to estimate (41), we know that $K \ll (LQ)^{C^*}|A|^t$. By the assumption $\epsilon \leq \frac{\log t}{t^2}$ and hence $K \ll (LQ)^{C^*}$ (with another constant $C^*$ of course) by our choice of $Q$. Using this estimate, as well as both inequalities from (41), combining with (39) and the lower bound $|P_*| \gg |P|Q^{-C^*}$, we derive from (42)

$$
\ll Q_1^{(2^{t+1}-1)C^*}|P_*|.
$$

(42)

$$
\Delta|P_*| \cdot |A|^{t+1-2^{t-1}} Q_1^{C^*2^t} \leq \left( \frac{\Delta|P_*|}{A|^{2^{t-1}-1}} \right)^{t+1} \ll Q_1^{C^*2^t}|P_*|.
$$

Hence

$$
\Delta|A|^{t+1-2^{t-1}} \ll Q_1^{C^*2^t}
$$

and in view of (38), we get

$$
|A|^{2^{t-1}-(t+1)} Q_1^{C^*2^t}|A|^{3^{2^{t-1}-1}} \gg T_{2^t} \gg |A|^{2^{t+1} - c \log j}.
$$

Now take the parameter $t$ as $t(j) = \log j$. It follows that for sufficiently large constant $C'$ we get $Q \gg |A|^{\log j \over c \log j}$. This completes the proof. \(\Box\)

Theorem 14 can be used to obtain a series of lower bounds for various combinations of different sets see, e.g., \[9, Corollary 1.5\]. We restrict ourself by just one consequence. Much more stronger results for subsets of $Z$ were obtained in \[10, 11\].

**Corollary 15** Let $m$ be a positive integer, $A_1, \ldots, A_{2m} \subset \mathbb{R}$ be sets of the same size $|A_1|$, $|A_jA_j| \ll |A_j|$, $j \in [2^m]$. Then for any non-zero shifts $z_1, \ldots, z_{2^m}$ one has

$$
|(A_1 + z_1) \ldots (A_{2^m} + z_{2^m})| \gg |A_1|^c \log m.
$$

**Proof.** For any $z \neq 0$ consider the function $f_z(x) = \log(z + e^x)$. Then $f_z$ is $k$–convex for any $k$. Also, for $I = \log A$, where $A$ is any of the sets $A_j$, $j \in [2^m]$ one has in view of (9) that $|I + I - I| \ll |I|$. Applying Theorem 14 for $f = f_z$, and $l = m$, we see that $T_{2^m}(A + z) \ll |A|^{2^{m+1} - c \log m}$. Hence by the Hölder inequality

$$
|A_1|^{2^{m+1}} \leq |(A_1 + z_1) \ldots (A_{2^m} + z_{2^m})| \cdot \sum_{x} r_{(A_1+z_1)\ldots(A_{2^m}+z_{2^m})}^2(x) \leq
$$

$$
\leq |(A_1 + z_1) \ldots (A_{2^m} + z_{2^m})| \cdot \left( \prod_{j=1}^{2^m} T_{2^m}(A_j + z_j) \right)^{1/2^m} \ll |(A_1 + z_1) \ldots (A_{2^m} + z_{2^m})| \cdot |A_1|^{2^{m+1} - c \log m}
$$

as required. \(\Box\)

Now we obtain a new incidence result for one–parametric curves.
**Theorem 16** Let $f$ be a function which is $k$–convex on a set $I$ for some $k \geq 1$. Suppose that $|I + I - I| \leq |I|^{1+\epsilon}$ and $\epsilon \leq \frac{\log k}{k}$. Then for any finite sets $B, C \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ with $|I| \geq |B|^\epsilon$, $\epsilon \gg 1/k$ and $\epsilon \leq \exp(-1/(\epsilon^2))$ there is $\delta(\epsilon) = \exp(-\exp(O(1/\epsilon))) > 0$ such that

$$|\{(i, b, c) \in I \times B \times C : f(i) + b = c\}| \ll \sqrt{|B||C||I|} \cdot |B|^{-\delta(\epsilon)}.$$  

**Proof.** Let $A = f(I) \cup (-f(I))$ and let $\sigma$ be cardinality of the set on the left–hand side of (43). Using the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality several times, we obtain for any $j$

$$\sigma^{2j} \leq |C|^{2j-1} |B|^{2j-1-1} \sum_x r_{2j}(x) r_{B-B}(x).$$

Applying the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality one more time, we get

$$\sigma^{2j+1} \leq |C|^{2j} |B|^{2j-2} E^+_j(B) T_{2j}(A).$$

Now suppose that $j \leq 2^k$. Then by Theorem 14 and the trivial bound $E^+_j(B) \leq |B|^2$, we obtain

$$\sigma^{2j+1} \ll |C|^{2j} |B|^{2j} \cdot |B||I|^{2j+1-c \log j}.$$

It gives us

$$\sigma \ll \sqrt{|B||C||I|} \cdot \left(\frac{|B|}{|I|^{c \log j}}\right)^{2-(j+1)}$$

By our assumption $|I| \geq |B|^\epsilon$ and hence taking $j \gg \exp(1/(\epsilon^2))$, we derive

$$\sigma \ll \sqrt{|B||C||I|} \cdot |B|^{-2^{-(j+1)}}$$

as required. Here $\delta(\epsilon) \sim \exp(-\exp(1/\epsilon^2))$. This completes the proof. \qed

The incidence result above implies Theorem 3 from the Introduction.

**Corollary 17** Let $f$ be a function which is $k$–convex on a set $I$ for some $k \geq 1$. Suppose that $|I + I - I| \leq |I|^{1+\epsilon}$. Then for any finite set $B \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ with $|I| \geq |B|^\epsilon$, $\epsilon \gg 1/k$, $\epsilon \leq \exp(-1/(\epsilon^2))$ there is $\delta(\epsilon) > 0$ such that

$$E^+_j(f(I), B) \ll |I|^2 |B|^{1-\delta(\epsilon)}.$$  

(44)

In particular, $|f(I) + B| \gg |B|^{1+\delta(\epsilon)}$.

**Proof.** Let $\tau > 0$ be a real number and

$$S_{\tau} = \{s \in \mathbb{R} : |\{(i, b) \in I \times B : f(i) + b = s\}| \geq \tau\}.$$

Using Theorem 14 we have

$$|S_{\tau}| \leq \sqrt{|B||S_{\tau}|} B^{-\delta(\epsilon)}.$$  

By summation we obtain 14 and the bound $|f(I) + B| \gg |B|^{1+\delta(\epsilon)}$ follows from the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality. This completes the proof. \qed
References


Steklov Mathematical Institute,
ul. Gubkina, 8, Moscow, Russia, 119991
and
IITP RAS,
Bolshoy Karetny per. 19, Moscow, Russia, 127994
and
MIPT,
Institutskii per. 9, Dolgoprudnii, Russia, 141701
ilya.shkredov@gmail.com