## On the greatest prime factor of (ab+1)(bc+1)(ca+1)

by

YANN BUGEAUD (Strasbourg)

**1. Introduction.** For any rational number r > 0, we denote by P(r) the greatest prime factor of r, with the convention that P(1) = 1. Győry, Sárközy & Stewart [4] conjectured that if a > b > c are positive integers, then

(1) 
$$P((ab+1)(bc+1)(ca+1)) \to \infty$$

as a tends to infinity.

Very recently, Stewart & Tijdeman [7] showed that (1) holds under the additional hypothesis  $\log a / \log(c+1) \to \infty$ . More precisely, using Baker's theory of linear forms in logarithms, they proved the following result.

THEOREM A. There exists an effectively computable positive numerical constant  $\kappa_1$  such that, if  $a \ge b > c$ , then

 $P((ab+1)(bc+1)(ca+1)) > \kappa_1 \log(\log a / \log(c+1)).$ 

Further, Győry & Sárközy [3] confirmed the conjecture in the special case when at least one of the rational numbers a, b, c, a/b, b/c, c/a has bounded prime factors. Their result can be reformulated in the following qualitative form (we denote by |I| the cardinality of a finite set I).

THEOREM B. Let  $\mathcal{A}$  be a finite set of triples (a, b, c) of integers a > b > c > 0. Let  $p_1 < \ldots < p_s$  be distinct primes, and let S denote the set of positive rational numbers that can be obtained from the  $p_i$ 's by multiplication and division. Assume that for all triples (a, b, c) in  $\mathcal{A}$ , at least one of the numbers a, b, c, a/b, b/c or c/a is contained in S. Then there exists a triple (a, b, c) in  $\mathcal{A}$  such that

(2)  $P((ab+1)(bc+1)(ca+1)) \ge \kappa_2 \log |\mathcal{A}| \log \log |\mathcal{A}|,$ 

provided that  $\log |\mathcal{A}| \geq s/\kappa_2^2$ , where  $\kappa_2$  is an effectively computable positive numerical constant.

<sup>1991</sup> Mathematics Subject Classification: 11D61, 11N25.

<sup>[45]</sup> 

Theorem B is an immediate consequence of a lower bound for the number of distinct prime factors of (ab+1)(bc+1)(ca+1), whose proof depends on Evertse's powerful estimate of the number of solutions of S-unit equations, obtained by ineffective methods. That is the reason why the lower bound in (2) depends on the cardinality of  $\mathcal{A}$  and not on the size of its elements.

In the present work, we slightly generalize Theorem B, using a totally different approach, which e.g. leads to an explicit lower bound for  $P((ab+1) \times (bc+1)(ca+1))$  in terms of the maximum of a, b and c, provided that P(a) is bounded from above. As in the proof of Theorem A, we use Baker's theory. However, our main tool is an estimate for simultaneous linear forms in logarithms due to Loxton [5].

## 2. Statement of the results

THEOREM 1. Let  $a \ge b > c$  be positive integers. Let  $\alpha$  denote any element of the set a, b, c, a/b, b/c, c/a. Then there exists an effectively computable positive numerical constant  $\kappa_3$  such that

$$P(\alpha(ab+1)(bc+1)(ca+1)) \ge \kappa_3 \log \log a.$$

Theorem B can be deduced from Theorem 1, but with a weaker lower bound. Indeed, define the sets  $\mathcal{A}$  and S as in Theorem B, and set  $M = \max_{(a,b,c)\in\mathcal{A}} a$ . Assume that for all triples (a, b, c) in  $\mathcal{A}$ , we have  $a \in S$ . Since, obviously,  $|\mathcal{A}| \leq M^3$ , it follows from Theorem 1 that if  $p_s < \kappa_3 \log \log |\mathcal{A}|^{1/3}$ , then there exists a triple (a, b, c) in  $\mathcal{A}$  (e.g. a triple with a = M) such that

$$P((ab+1)(bc+1)(ca+1)) \ge \kappa_3 \log \log |\mathcal{A}|^{1/3}.$$

As mentioned in the introduction, we prove Theorem 1 by using Loxton's estimates for simultaneous linear forms in logarithms. One of the interests of our work is to present a new application of this nice result, which, to our knowledge, has only been utilized in [5], [1] and [2].

In connection with the conjecture proposed by Győry & Sárközy [3], we formulate the following open problem.

CONJECTURE. Let  $a \ge b > c$  be positive integers. There exists an effectively computable positive numerical constant  $\kappa_4$  such that

$$P((ab+1)(bc+1)(ca+1)) \ge \kappa_4 \log \log a.$$

We note that, in view of Lemma 2, this conjecture is true when a = b. It is also true, by Theorem 1, when one of the numbers a, b, c, a/b, b/c, c/a has all its prime factors less than  $\kappa_3 \log \log a$ , and, by Theorem A, when  $\log c < (\log a)^{1-\delta}$  for some fixed positive constant  $\delta$ . Further, if true, our conjecture would imply Győry & Sárközy's. **3.** Auxiliary lemmas. Our main tool is the following result of Loxton [5].

LEMMA 1. Let  $n \geq 1$  be an integer, and let  $\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_n$  be non-zero multiplicatively independent rational numbers. Consider the linear forms

$$A_i = b_{i1} \log \alpha_1 + \ldots + b_{in} \log \alpha_n \quad (i = 1, 2)$$

where the  $b_{ij}$ 's denote rational integers. Assume that the matrix  $(b_{ij})$  has rank two and that the height of  $\alpha_j$  (resp.  $b_{ij}$ ) is at most  $A_j$  ( $\geq 4$ ) (resp. B ( $\geq 4$ )). Then

$$\max\{|\Lambda_1|, |\Lambda_2|\} > \exp\{-(16n)^{200n} (\log A_1 \dots \log A_n)^{2/3} \log B\}.$$

Proof. This is a weaker form of Theorem 4 of [5]. We note that the numerical constant can be significantly reduced, but this is irrelevant to the present work.  $\blacksquare$ 

We also need a lower bound for the prime factor of a quadratic polynomial.

LEMMA 2. Let g denote a quadratic polynomial with integral coefficients and with distinct roots. Then there exists an effectively computable positive constant  $\kappa_5 = \kappa_5(g)$ , depending only on g, such that, for every integer  $x \ge 2$ , we have

$$P(g(x)) \ge \kappa_5 \log \log x.$$

Proof. This is Corollary 7 of Schinzel [6]. ■

4. **Proofs.** We prove the theorem for  $\alpha = a$  and we briefly indicate how one should modify our arguments in order to get the other five cases. In the sequel  $\kappa_6, \ldots, \kappa_{11}$  denote effectively computable positive numerical constants.

In view of Theorem A, we can assume that  $b > c \ge 16$ . Hence, setting

$$\Lambda_1 := \frac{ac+1}{ac}$$
 and  $\Lambda_2 := \frac{(ac+1)(bc+1)}{c^2(ab+1)}$ 

we obtain  $0 < \log \Lambda_1 < a^{-1}$  and  $0 < \log \Lambda_2 < b^{-1}$ .

Denote by  $2 =: p_1 < p_2 < \ldots$  the sequence of primes arranged in increasing order, and assume that  $p_r = P(a(ab+1)(bc+1)(ca+1))$ . Then there exist rational integers  $l_i$  and  $m_i$ ,  $1 \le i \le r$ , with absolute values bounded by  $6 \log a$ , such that

$$\log \Lambda_1 = \sum_{i=1}^r l_i \log p_i - \log c, \quad \log \Lambda_2 = \sum_{i=1}^r m_i \log p_i - 2 \log c.$$

If c has no prime divisor greater than  $p_r$ , then

 $P(a(ab+1)(bc+1)(ca+1)) = P(ac(ab+1)(bc+1)(ca+1)) \ge P(ac(ac+1)),$ which, by Lemma 2, is greater than or equal to  $\kappa_6 \log \log a$ . If this is not the case,  $\log \Lambda_1$  and  $\log \Lambda_2$  are not proportional unless we have  $\Lambda_1^2 = \Lambda_2$ , i.e.  $(ac+1)(ab+1) = a^2(bc+1)$ . But this is excluded since a > 1.

Hence, we may assume that the hypotheses of Lemma 1 are satisfied, and we get

(3) 
$$\log \log \max\{\Lambda_1, \Lambda_2\} > -(17r)^{200r} \Big(\prod_{i=1}^r \log p_i\Big) (\log c)^{2/3} \log \log a$$
  
 $> -e^{\kappa_7 p_r} (\log c)^{2/3} \log \log a,$ 

by the prime number theorem. Since  $\log \log \max{\{\Lambda_1, \Lambda_2\}} < -\log b$ , we infer from (3) that

(4) 
$$p_r \ge \kappa_8 \log\left(\frac{\log b}{\log^3 \log a}\right)$$

Combining (4) with Theorem A, we obtain

$$2p_r \ge \kappa_1 \log\left(\frac{\log a}{\log(c+1)}\right) + \kappa_8 \log\left(\frac{\log b}{\log^3 \log a}\right) \ge \kappa_9 \log \log a,$$

which is the desired estimate.

In order to prove Theorem 1 for  $\alpha = b$  and  $\alpha = c$ , we introduce  $\Lambda_3 := (bc+1)/bc$ , which satisfies  $0 < \log \Lambda_3 < b^{-1}$ . We work with  $\Lambda_2$  and  $\Lambda_3$  and proceed exactly as for the case  $\alpha = a$ . Hence, we get

$$P(b(ab+1)(bc+1)(ca+1)) \ge \kappa_{10} \log(\log b / \log^3 \log a)$$

and

$$P(c(ab+1)(bc+1)(ca+1)) \ge \kappa_{11} \log(\log b / \log^3 \log a),$$

and we conclude by applying Theorem A.

The proof for the remaining cases is similar. If  $\alpha = a/b$  (resp.  $\alpha = b/c$ ,  $\alpha = c/a$ ), we use  $\Lambda_1$  and  $\Lambda_3$  (resp.  $\Lambda_2$  and  $\Lambda_3$ ,  $\Lambda_1$  and  $\Lambda_2$ ).

## References

- B. Brindza, *Thue equations and multiplicative independence*, in: Number Theory and Cryptography (Sydney, 1989), London Math. Soc. Lecture Note Ser. 154, Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 1990, 213–220.
- B. Brindza and K. Győry, On unit equations with rational coefficients, Acta Arith. 53 (1990), 367–388.
- [3] K. Győry and A. Sárközy, On prime factors of integers of the form  $(ab+1)(bc+1) \times (ca+1)$ , ibid. 79 (1997), 163–171.
- [4] K. Győry, A. Sárközy and C. L. Stewart, On the number of prime factors of integers of the form ab + 1, ibid. 74 (1996), 365–385.
- [5] J. H. Loxton, Some problems involving powers of integers, ibid. 46 (1986), 113–123.

- [6] A. Schinzel, On two theorems of Gelfond and some of their applications, ibid. 13 (1967), 177–236.
- [7] C. L. Stewart and R. Tijdeman, On the greatest prime factor of  $(ab+1)(ac+1) \times (bc+1)$ , ibid. 79 (1997), 93–101.

Université Louis Pasteur U.F.R. de mathématiques 7, rue René Descartes 67084 Strasbourg, France E-mail: bugeaud@math.u-strasbg.fr

> Received on 23.9.1997 and in revised form on 10.3.1998

(3266)