ARBITRARILY TIGHT BOUNDS
ON THE DISTRIBUTION OF SMOOTH INTEGERS

DANIEL J. BERNSTEIN

Abstract. This paper presents lower bounds and upper bounds on the distribution of smooth integers; builds an algebraic framework for the bounds; shows how the bounds can be computed at extremely high speed using FFT-based power-series exponentiation; explains how one can choose the parameters to achieve any desired level of accuracy; and discusses several generalizations.

1. Introduction

A positive integer is \( y \)-smooth if it has no prime divisors larger than \( y \). Define \( \Psi(H, y) \) as the number of \( y \)-smooth integers in \([1, H]\).

This paper presents lower bounds and upper bounds on \( \Psi \). The bounds are parametrized, and can be made arbitrarily close to \( \Psi \), as discussed in section 4. The proofs are easy; for example, a typical lower bound is

\[
\Psi(H, 17) = \# \left\{ (a, b, c, d, e, f, g) : 2^a 3^b 5^c 7^d 11^e 13^f 17^g \leq H \right\}
\geq \# \left\{ (a, b, c, d, e, f, g) : 2^a 3^b 5^c 7^d 11^e 13^f 17^g \leq H \right\}
\]

where \( 3 = 2^{1230/776} > 3 \), \( 5 = 2^{1802/776} > 5 \), \( 7 = 2^{2179/776} > 7 \), \( 11 = 2^{2872/776} > 11 \), \( 13 = 2^{2872/776} > 13 \), and \( 17 = 2^{3172/776} > 17 \). What makes these bounds interesting is that they can be computed at extremely high speed, even when \( y \) is large. See section 3.

As far as I know, the first publication of bounds of this type was by Coppersmith in [24]. Coppersmith showed how to compute an arbitrarily tight lower bound on a variant of \( \Psi \) in a reasonable amount of time. The main improvements in this paper are the fast algorithms in section 3 and the algebraic framework in section 2.

Several generalizations are discussed in section 5. For example, one can quickly compute accurate bounds on the distribution of \( y \)-smooth ideals in each ideal class in a number field.
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Other work. There are many limited-precision approximations to $\Psi$. See [82, 72, 66, and 81] for detailed surveys of the results and the underlying techniques.

Dickman in [29] observed that $\lim_{y \to \infty} \Psi(y^n, y^a) / y^a = \rho(u)$ for $u > 0$. Here $\rho$ is the unique continuous function satisfying $\rho(u) = 1$ for $0 < u \leq 1$ and $\rho(u) = \int_{u-1}^{u} \rho(t) \, dt$ for $u > 1$. One can rapidly compute $\rho$ and some useful variants of $\rho$ to high accuracy; see [95, 20, 71, section 9], [50], [49], [77], [21, section 3], [70], and [3, section 4]. For asymptotics as $u \to \infty$ see [15], [26], [17], [64], [88], and [96]. Hildebrand in [61] showed that the error $|\Psi(H, y)/H \rho(u) - 1|$, where $H = y^n$, is at most a constant (which has not been computed) times $(\log(u + 1))/\log y$ if $u \geq 1$, $H \geq 3$, and $\log y \geq (\log \log H)^{1.667}$. For prior results see [23], [16], [84], [22], [27], [31], [32], [51], [18], [59], and [57].

De Bruijn in [25] pointed out that $H \int_{0}^{H} \rho(u - (\log t)/\log y) \, d((t) / t)$ is a better approximation to $\Psi(H, y)$. See [87] and [66] for further information, I am not aware of any attempts to compute this approximation.

Rankin in [85] observed that $\Psi(H, y) \leq H^s / \prod_{p \leq y} (1 - p^{-s})$ for any $s > 0$. This upper bound is minimized when $s$ satisfies $\sum_{p \leq y} (\log p)/(p^s - 1) = \log H$. Hildebrand and Tenenbaum in [65] showed that the approximation

$$\frac{1}{s} \left( \frac{2\pi}{2\pi} \sum_{p \leq y} \frac{p^s(\log p)^2}{(p^s - 1)^2} \right)^{-1/2} H^s \prod_{p \leq y} \frac{1}{1 - p^{-s}}$$


to $\Psi(H, y)$, with the same choice of $s$ as in Rankin’s bound, has error at most a constant (again not computed) times $1/\left(1 + (\log y) / y\right)$. Hunter and Sorensen in [67] showed that one can compute these approximations in time roughly $y$. Sorensen subsequently suggested replacing each $\sum_{p \leq y}$ with $\sum_{p \leq y} + \sum_{c < p \leq y}$ for some $c$ between 0 and 1, then approximating $\sum_{c < p \leq y}$ by an integral; this saves time at the expense of accuracy.

See [92] and [30] for more information on $\Psi(H, y)$ when $y$ is extremely small: in particular, on the accuracy of approximations such as $\Psi(H, 5) \approx (\log H)^3 / 6(\log 2)(\log 3)(\log 5)$.

Notation. $\log$ means $\log_2$.

$\ldots$ means 1 if $\ldots$ is true, 0 otherwise. For example, $[r \geq 0]$ means 1 if $r$ is nonnegative, 0 otherwise.

$r \mapsto \ldots$ means the function that maps $r$ to $\ldots$. Here $r$ is a dummy variable used in $\ldots$. The domain of the function is usually $\mathbb{R}$ and is always clear from context. For example, $r \mapsto r^2$ is the function $f : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ such that $f(r) = r^2$, and $r \mapsto |r| \in \mathbb{Z}$ is the function $g : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ such that $g(r) = 1$ for $r \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $g(r) = 0$ for $r \notin \mathbb{Z}$. 
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2. ONE-VARIABLE DISCRETE GENERALIZED POWER SERIES

A series over \(\mathbb{Q}\) is a function \(f : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{Q}\) such that \(\{r \leq h : f(r) \neq 0\}\) is finite for every \(h \in \mathbb{R}\). A distribution over \(\mathbb{Q}\) is a function \(e : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{Q}\) such that \(\{r < v : e(r) \neq 0\}\) is empty for some \(v \in \mathbb{R}\). Observe that any series over \(\mathbb{Q}\) is a distribution over \(\mathbb{Q}\).

The reader should think of a series \(f\) as a formal sum \(\sum_{r \in \mathbb{R}} f(r)z^r\). The set of series includes (formal) fractional power series such as \(1 + z^{1230/776} + z^{2460/776} + \cdots\), i.e., \(r \mapsto [r \geq 0]r \in (1230/776)\mathbb{Z}\). It also includes Dirichlet series such as \(\zeta = \sum_{n \geq 1} n^{-s} = 1 + x + x^3 + x^5 + \cdots\).

**Theorem 2.1.** Let \(e\) be a distribution over \(\mathbb{Q}\). Let \(f\) be a series over \(\mathbb{Q}\). Then \(\{r \in \mathbb{R} : e(r)f(t-r) \neq 0\}\) is finite for every \(t \in \mathbb{R}\); the function \(c = (t \mapsto \sum_{r \in \mathbb{R}} e(r)f(t-r))\) is a distribution over \(\mathbb{Q}\); and if \(e\) is a series over \(\mathbb{Q}\) then \(c\) is a series over \(\mathbb{Q}\).

The distribution \(c\) here is the product of \(e\) and \(f\), abbreviated \(ef\).

**Proof.** There is some \(v \in \mathbb{R}\) such that \(\{r < v : e(r) \neq 0\}\) is empty; and \(\{s \leq t - v : f(s) \neq 0\}\) is finite, so \(\{r \geq v : f(t-r) \neq 0\}\) is finite. Thus \(\{r : e(r)f(t-r) \neq 0\}\) is finite.

There is some \(w \in \mathbb{R}\) such that \(\{s < w : f(s) \neq 0\}\) is empty. Now \(e(r)f(t-r) = 0\) for all \(t < v + w\) and all \(r \in \mathbb{R}\): if \(r < v\) then \(e(r) = 0\); if \(r \geq v\) then \(t-r < w\) so \(f(t-r) = 0\). Hence \(\sum_{r \in \mathbb{R}} e(r)f(t-r) = 0\) for all \(t < v + w\). Thus \(c\) is a distribution.

Finally, fix \(h \in \mathbb{R}\). If \(e\) is a series then \(\{r \leq h - w : e(r) \neq 0\}\) is finite, and \(\{s \leq h - v : f(s) \neq 0\}\) is finite, so \(\{t \leq h : c(t) \neq 0\}\) is finite. (If \(t \leq h\) and \(c(t) \neq 0\) then \(e(r)f(s) \neq 0\) for some \(r, s\) with \(r + s = t\). Then \(e(r) \neq 0\) so \(r \geq v\) so \(s = t-r \leq h-v\); similarly \(r \leq h-w\).) \(\square\)

**Theorem 2.2.** Let \(e\) be a distribution over \(\mathbb{Q}\). Let \(f\) and \(g\) be series over \(\mathbb{Q}\). Then \(efg = (ef)g\).

**Proof.** \((efg)(t) = \sum_s e(s) \cdot (fg)(t-s) = \sum_s \sum_r f(r)g(t-r) = \sum_s \sum_s e(s)f(u-s)g(t-u) = \sum_u (ef)(u) \cdot g(t-u) = ((ef)g)(t)\). \(\square\)

In particular, product is associative on series. Consequently the set of series is a commutative ring under the following operations: 0 is \(r \mapsto 0\); 1 is \(r \mapsto [r = 0]\); \(-f\) is \(r \mapsto -f(r)\); \(f + g\) is \(r \mapsto f(r) + g(r)\); and \(fg\) is the product defined above. The set of fractional power series is a subring, as is the set of Dirichlet series.

Define \(distr\) as the distribution \(r \mapsto [r \geq 0]\). The distribution of terms of \(f\) is the product \(distrf\), i.e., the function \(h \mapsto \sum_{s \leq h} f(s)\). This
is consistent with the usual notion of the (logarithmic) distribution of terms of a Dirichlet series: for example, distr $\zeta$ is the function $h \mapsto [2^h]$, which counts positive integers $n$ with $\log n \leq h$.

**Theorem 2.3.** Let $e_1, e_2$ be distributions over $\mathbb{Q}$. Let $f$ be a series over $\mathbb{Q}$. If $e_1 \geq e_2$ and $f \geq 0$ then $e_1 f \geq e_2 f$.

Here $\geq$ is pointwise comparison of functions: $f \geq 0$ means that $f(r) \geq 0$ for all $r$, and $e_1 \geq e_2$ means that $e_1(r) \geq e_2(r)$ for all $r$.

**Proof.** $(e_1 f)(t) = \sum_r e_1(r) \cdot f(t - r) \geq \sum_r e_2(r) \cdot f(t - r) = (e_2 f)(t)$. □

**Theorem 2.4.** Let $f_1, \ldots, f_n, g_1, \ldots, g_n$ be series over $\mathbb{Q}$ with $f_i \geq 0$, $g_i \geq 0$, and distr $f_i \geq$ distr $g_i$ for all $i$. Then distr $f_1 \cdots f_n \geq$ distr $g_1 \cdots g_n$.

**Proof.** For $n = 0$: distr $1 \geq$ distr $1$.

For $n \geq 1$: By induction distr $f_1 \cdots f_{n-1} \geq$ distr $g_1 \cdots g_{n-1}$. Apply Theorem 2.3 twice:

$$distr f_1 \cdots f_{n-1} f_n \geq distr g_1 \cdots g_{n-1} f_n = distr f_n g_1 \cdots g_{n-1} = distr g_1 \cdots g_{n-1} g_n$$

since $f_n \geq 0$ and $g_1 \cdots g_{n-1} \geq 0$. □

**Notes.** The proofs here are standard, but I do not know a reference for the results. The larger ring of “one-variable generalized power series over $\mathbb{Q}$” — functions $f : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{Q}$ such that every nonempty subset of $\{ r \in \mathbb{R} : f_r \neq 0 \}$ has a least element—is widely known but is not equipped with a useful notion of distribution. This larger ring was introduced by Malcev; see [86] for more information.

3. **Bounds on the distribution of smooth integers**

Fix positive integers $y$ and $\alpha$. For each prime $p \leq y$ select a real number $\overline{p} \geq p$, preferably as small as possible, with $\alpha \log \overline{p} \in \mathbb{Z}$. Define $f$ as the series $\sum_n n$ is $y$-smooth $| x^{\log n} = \prod_{p \leq y} (1 + x^{\log \overline{p}} + x^{2 \log \overline{p}} + \cdots)$, and define $g$ as the series $\prod_{p \leq y} (1 + x^{\log \overline{p}} + x^{2 \log \overline{p}} + \cdots)$.

Observe that $g$ is a fractional power series with far fewer terms than $f$. For example, if $y = 10^6$, $\alpha = 776$, and $\overline{p}$ is chosen reasonably, then $g$ is the series

$$x^0/776 + x^{776/776} + x^{1230/776} + x^{1552/776} + x^{1802/776} + x^{2006/776}$$

$$+ \cdots + 2286594704425498206172550218939 x^{100000/776} + \cdots ,$$

with fewer than 100000 terms having exponents below 100000/776, while $f$ has more than $10^{33}$ terms in the same exponent range.
Now \( \text{distr}(1 + x_{2^{g_0}} + x_{2^{1+g_0}} + \cdots) \geq \text{distr}(1 + x_{2^{g_p}} + x_{2^{2+g_p}} + \cdots) \), so \( \text{distr} f \geq \text{distr} g \) by Theorem 2.4. In other words,

\[
(h \mapsto \Psi(2^h, y)) \geq \text{distr} \exp \sum_{p \leq y} \left( x_{2^{g_p}} + \frac{1}{2} x_{2^{2+g_p}} + \frac{1}{3} x_{3+g_p} + \cdots \right)
\]

where \( \exp \) is the usual exponential function on fractional power series. This is my lower bound on \( \Psi \). The analogous upper bound is

\[
(h \mapsto \Psi(2^h, y)) \leq \text{distr} \exp \sum_{p \leq y} \left( x_{2^{g_p}} + \frac{1}{2} x_{2^{2+g_p}} + \frac{1}{3} x_{3+g_p} + \cdots \right)
\]

with \( p \leq p \). See Figure 1 for an example of the lower bound.

If \( g = \sum_{n \geq 0} g_n x^{n/\alpha} \) then \( \Psi(2^{n/\alpha}, y) \geq (\text{distr} g)(n/\alpha) = g_0 + \cdots + g_n \)

By computing \( g \) mod \( x^h \), i.e., computing the integers \( g_0, g_1, \ldots, g_{h-1} \), one obtains lower bounds on \( \Psi(H, y) \) for every \( H \) in the geometric progression \( 2^0, 2^{1/\alpha}, \ldots, 2^{h-2/\alpha}, 2^{h-1/\alpha} \). See Figure 2.
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**Figure 1.** For \( y = 7 \) and \( \alpha = 5 \): Graphs of \( g \), \( \text{distr} g \), and \( h \mapsto \Psi(2^h, y) \), restricted to \([0, 10] \). Vertical range \([0, 143] \).
A split-radix FFT uses \((12 + o(1))h\alpha \log h\alpha\) additions and multiplications in \(\mathbb{R}\) to multiply in \(\mathbb{R}[x^{1/\alpha}] / x^h\); see [9]. Brent's exponentiation algorithm in [11] then uses \((88 + o(1))h\alpha \log h\alpha\) additions and multiplications in \(\mathbb{R}\) to compute \(g \mod x^h\) given \(\log g \mod x^h\). The constant 88 can be improved to 34; see [10]. One can enumerate primes \(p \leq y\) as described in [2]; the computation of \(\log g \mod x^h\) involves a few additions for each \(p\).

It should be possible to carry out the operations in \(\mathbb{R}\) in rather low precision if all the coefficients are scaled properly. However, I have not yet analyzed the roundoff error here. I instead compute \(g \mod (x^h, q)\) for several primes \(q\) by exponentiating \(\log g \mod (x^h, q)\). Logarithms do not make sense in \((\mathbb{Z}/q)[x^{1/\alpha}]\), but they do make sense in \((\mathbb{Z}/q)[x^{1/\alpha}] / x^h\) when \(q\) exceeds \(h\alpha\).

Software that performs these computations for any \(y \leq 2^{30}\), with \(h\alpha = 262144\) and \(\alpha = 776\), is available from \url{http://cr.yp.to/psibound.html}. The software uses \(4.5 \cdot 10^{10}\) Pentium-III cycles for \(y = 10^6\) or \(9.3 \cdot 10^{10}\) cycles for \(y = 10^9\). It prints a sequence of lower bounds on \(\Psi(H, y)\) for 262144 values of \(H\) up to \(2^{262144/776}\). The choice of \(\alpha\) is explained in the next section; the analogous upper-bound computation uses \(\alpha = 771\).

The computation of \(\log g\) can be improved. If \(y\) is large then there are many primes \(p\) for each value of \(\log p\), and there are faster ways to count them than to enumerate them. Sorenson points out that the counts can be saved if one wants to handle several values of \(y\).
4. Accuracy

Write $g = \prod_{p \leq y}(1 + x^{\log p} + x^{2\log p} + \cdots)$ as in the previous section, so that $\Psi(H, y) \geq (\text{distr}(\log H)).$ How close is $\Psi(H, y)$ to $(\text{distr}(\log H))$? How close is it to the analogous upper bound?

One can answer this question by computing and comparing the bounds. The software described above finds that $\Psi(2^{300}, 2^{300})/2^{300} > 3.012 \cdot 10^{-11},$ for example, and $\Psi(2^{300}, 2^{300})/2^{300} < 3.047 \cdot 10^{-11};$ evidently both bounds are quite close. (In contrast, $\rho(10) \approx 2.770 \cdot 10^{-11}.$)

But this answer does not provide any guidance in choosing $\alpha$ before the computation is done. How can we select $\alpha$ to achieve a particular level of accuracy? Are some choices of $\alpha$ better than others?

This section considers another answer: if $\varepsilon$ is chosen properly then $1 \leq \Psi(H, y)/(\text{distr}(\log H)) \leq \Psi(H, y)/(\Psi(H^{1/(1+\varepsilon)}), y).$ The point is that one can already have a good estimate for the ratio $\Psi(H, y)/\Psi(H^{1/(1+\varepsilon)}, y),$ namely $1 + \varepsilon \log H.$ Here is a brief summary of the literature:

- Hildebrand in [60] proved that, for an extremely broad range of $H$ and $y,$ the ratio is at most about $1 + \varepsilon(H/\Psi(H^{1/(1+\varepsilon)}), y)) \log y.$
- Hildebrand in [62] proved that, when $\varepsilon$ is not very small, the ratio is at most $H^{\varepsilon/(1+\varepsilon)},$ which is approximately $1 + \varepsilon \log H.$
- Hensley in [58] proved that $\Psi(H, y)/\Psi(H/c, y)$ is around $c$ for typical values of $H$ and $y$ if $c$ is close to 2. Consequently the product of many ratios of the form $\Psi(H, y)/\Psi(H^{1/(1+\varepsilon)}, y),$ for varying $H,$ must be large. Quite a few of the ratios have to be at least about $H^{\varepsilon/(1+\varepsilon)}.$

For uniform lower bounds see [41], [4], [52], [75], [69], and [98]. See [66] and [40] for precise asymptotics when $\varepsilon$ is not very small and $\log y$ is noticeably bigger than $(\log H)^{5/6}.$

How $\varepsilon$ depends on $\alpha.$ Define $\varepsilon$ as the maximum of $(\log p)/\log p - 1$ for primes $p \leq y.$ Then

$$\text{distr}(1 + x^{(1+\varepsilon) \log p} + x^{2(1+\varepsilon) \log p} + \cdots) \leq \text{distr}(1 + x^{\log p} + x^{2\log p} + \cdots)$$

so $\Psi(H^{1/(1+\varepsilon)}, y) \leq (\text{distr}(\log H)).$ (Zagier comments that this inequality also allows $g$ to serve as an upper bound on $\Psi.$)

Assume for simplicity that $\bar{p}$ is chosen as small as possible, so that $\alpha \log \bar{p} = [\alpha \log p].$ Note that $\bar{z} = 2;$ this is the point of the requirement that $\alpha$ be an integer. Then $\varepsilon \leq 1/(\alpha \log 3).$

When $\alpha$ increases by a factor of 10, this upper bound on $\varepsilon$ decreases by a factor of 10. The computation described in the previous section takes about 10 times as long and produces bounds for 10 times as many values of $H.$
Some values of $\alpha$ are particularly good. If $\alpha \log 3$ is within $(\log 3)/\log 7$ of the next integer, and $\alpha \log 5$ is within $(\log 5)/\log 7$ of the next integer, then $\epsilon \leq 1/(\alpha \log 7)$. If $\alpha = 776$ then $1/(\alpha \log 3) \approx 0.000813$, while $\epsilon \approx 0.000226$. It is easy to see that $\epsilon \alpha \to 0$ for selected $\alpha \to \infty$.

Experiments show that $(\text{distr } g)(\log H)$ is usually closer to $\Psi(H, y)$ than to $\Psi(H^{1/(1+\epsilon)}, y)$. A more precise analysis would be interesting.

**Exact computation of $\Psi$.** If $H$ is slightly below an integer, and $\epsilon$ is slightly below $1/H \log H$, then $\lfloor H^{1/(1+\epsilon)} \rfloor = \lfloor H \rfloor$, so $\Psi(H, y)$ is exactly $(\text{distr } g)(\log H)$.

Fast power-series exponentiation is not useful in this extreme case. Series such as $g$ should be represented in sparse form: a multiset $S$ of integers represents the series $\sum_{n \in S} x^{n/\alpha}$. Straightforward series multiplication then takes at most $2\Psi(H, y)$ additions of integers, each integer having about $\log H$ bits, to produce the portion of $g$ relevant to $\Psi(H, y)$. The result reveals the approximate logarithm of every smooth number $n \leq H$ with enough accuracy to recover $n$ or $n - 1$.

Occasionally one wants to know $\Psi(H, y)$ for only one $H$. Partition $\{p \leq y\}$ into two sets $P_1$ and $P_2$; factor $g$ as $g_1g_2$ accordingly; compute $g_1$ and $g_2$; finally compute $(\text{distr } g)(\log H)$ as $\sum_{r}(\text{distr } g_1)(r) \cdot g_2(\log H - r)$. The total number of relevant terms of $g_1$ and $g_2$, hence the total time needed, can be quite a bit smaller than $\Psi(H, y)$.

**Notes.** The ideas in this paper evolved as follows. I presented the exact $\Psi$ algorithms in [7]. That paper was not phrased in the language of series; I used logarithms and $\alpha$ merely because additions are faster than multiplications.

I subsequently noticed that reducing $\alpha$ would produce bounds on $\Psi$ at high speed. In 1997, I rephrased the algorithms in the language of series, and realized the relevance of fast power-series exponentiation. An extended abstract of this paper appeared in [8]. I found Coppersmith’s article [24] in 2000 as I was preparing the bibliography for this paper.

5. **Generalizations and variants**

**Omitting tiny primes.** One can replace $\{p \leq y\}$ by a subset, such as $\{p : z < p \leq y\}$. For previous work see [37], [89], and [90].

**Squarefree integers.** One can restrict the powers of $p$ that are allowed to appear: for example, one can replace $1 + x_{\beta p} + x_{2\beta p} + \cdots$ by $1 + x^{\beta p}$ to bound the distribution of smooth squarefree integers. For previous work see [44] and [80].
Arithmetic progressions. Fix a positive integer \( m \). Define \( \Psi(H,y,i) \) as the number of \( y \)-smooth integers \( n \in [1,H] \) with \( n \equiv i \pmod{m} \).

Let \( S \) be the finite monoid \( \mathbb{Z}/m \) under multiplication. The ring \( \mathbb{Q}[S] \) is the set of functions \( a : S \to \mathbb{Q} \) with the following operations: \( 0 \) is \( s \mapsto 0 \); \( 1 \) is \( s \mapsto [s = 1] \); \(-a \) is \( s \mapsto -a(s) \); \( a + b \) is \( s \mapsto a(s) + b(s) \); and \( ab \) is \( s \mapsto \sum_{u:v = u} a(t)b(u) \). Define a partial order \( a \geq b \) meaning that \( a(s) \geq b(s) \) for all \( s \). Everything in section 2 generalizes immediately to series over \( \mathbb{Q}[S] \).

Define \( \pi : \mathbb{Z} \to \mathbb{Q}[S] \) as \( n \mapsto ([s = n \mod m]) \). Then \( \pi \) is a monoid morphism: \( \pi(1) = 1 \) and \( \pi(m') = \pi(n)\pi(n') \). The images \( \pi(0), \pi(1), \ldots, \pi(m - 1) \) are linearly independent over \( \mathbb{Q} \).

Define \( f \) as the series \( \sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} [n \text{ is } y\text{-smooth}] \pi(n) x^{y\lceil \log n \rceil} \) over \( \mathbb{Q}[S] \). Then \( \text{distr } f(\log H) = \sum_{0 \leq i < m} \pi(i) \Psi(H,y,i) \). For example, if \( m = 3 \) and \( y = 5 \), then \( f \) is the series

\[
\begin{align*}
\pi(0) & (x^{2^{3\log \log 5}} + x^{2^{5\log \log 5}} + x^{2^{7\log \log 5}} + x^{2^{9\log \log 5}} + x^{2^{11\log \log 5}} + \cdots) \\
+ \pi(1) & (x^{2^{1\log \log 5}} + x^{2^{3\log \log 5}} + x^{2^{5\log \log 5}} + x^{2^{7\log \log 5}} + x^{2^{9\log \log 5}} + \cdots) \\
+ \pi(2) & (x^{2^{2\log \log 5}} + x^{2^{4\log \log 5}} + x^{2^{6\log \log 5}} + x^{2^{8\log \log 5}} + x^{2^{10\log \log 5}} + \cdots),
\end{align*}
\]

and \( \text{distr } f(\log 12) = 4\pi(0) + 3\pi(1) + 3\pi(2) \).

Now \( f \) is the product over \( p \) of \( 1 + \pi(p)x^{y\lceil \log p \rceil} + \pi(p)^2 x^{2y\lceil \log p \rceil} + \cdots \), and \( \text{distr } (1 + \pi(p)x^{y\lceil \log p \rceil} + \pi(p)^2 x^{2y\lceil \log p \rceil} + \cdots) \geq \text{distr } (1 + \pi(p)x^{y\lceil \log p \rceil} + \pi(p)^2 x^{2y\lceil \log p \rceil} + \cdots) \), so \( \text{distr } f \geq \text{distr } \exp \sum_{\text{prime } p} y\pi(p)x^{y\lceil \log p \rceil} + \frac{1}{2}\pi(p)^2 x^{2y\lceil \log p \rceil} + \cdots \). A fractional-power-series exponentiation over \( \mathbb{Q}[S] \) thus produces a lower bound on \( \text{distr } f \), i.e., a lower bound on \( \Psi(H,y,i) \) for each \( i \) and various \( H \). One can save time by working in the smaller ring \( \mathbb{Q}[(\mathbb{Z}/m)^*] \) and ignoring primes that divide \( m \).

For previous work see \([16],[36],[53],[54],[38],[39],[33],[5],[47],[48],[93],[97], \) and \([34]\). See \([43]\) for more information on monoid rings and group rings.

Number fields. Let \( K \) be a number field, \( R \) its ring of integers. A nonzero ideal \( n \) of \( R \) is \( y\)-smooth if it has no prime divisors of norm larger than \( y \). Define \( f \) as the series \( \sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} [n \text{ is } y\text{-smooth}] x^{y\lceil \log \text{norm } n \rceil} \). Then \( f \) is the product of \( 1 + x^{y\lceil \log \text{norm } p \rceil} + x^{2y\lceil \log \text{norm } p \rceil} + \cdots \) over smooth prime ideals \( p \). One obtains a lower bound on \( \text{distr } f \) by increasing each \( y\lceil \log \text{norm } p \rceil \) to a nearby multiple of \( 1/\alpha \). For previous work see \([68]\) (in the case \( K = \mathbb{Q}[\sqrt{-1}] \)), \([42],[35],[55],[72],[73],[79], \) and \([12]\).

In some applications—notably integer factorization with the number field sieve, as described in \([74]\)—one wants to know the distribution of smooth elements of \( R \). A fractional-power-series exponentiation over \( \mathbb{Q}[G] \), where \( G \) is the ideal class group of \( R \), produces bounds on the distribution of smooth ideals in each ideal class; in particular, the distribution of smooth
principal ideals. One can replace $G$ by a ray class group or a ray class monoid to bound smoothness in arithmetic progressions. The use of these techniques to estimate the speed of the number field sieve will be discussed in a subsequent paper.

**Function fields.** Dirichlet series for function fields over $\mathbb{F}_q$ are already power series: $\lg \text{ norm } n \in (\lg q) \mathbb{Z}$ for every nonzero ideal $n$. For example, the sum of $[n]$ is $2^\text{smooth} x^{|\text{norm } n|}$ for nonzero polynomials $n$ over $\mathbb{F}_q$ is $1 + 2x + 4x^2 + \cdots + 335653893002534131235548574x^{39} + \cdots$. The bounds in this paper boil down to a known algorithm to compute the exact coefficients of this series. For asymptotic estimates see [19], [76], [6], and [83].

**Coprime pairs.** Consider the series

$$\sum_{n_1, n_2} [n_1 \text{ is } y\text{-smooth}] [n_2 \text{ is } y\text{-smooth}] [\gcd \{n_1, n_2\} = 1] x_1^{\lfloor \log n_1 \rfloor} x_2^{\lfloor \log n_2 \rfloor}$$

in two variables $x_1, x_2$. This series is the product over smooth primes $p$ of $1 + x_1^{kp} + x_1^{2kp} + \cdots + x_2^{2kp} + x_2^{2kp} + \cdots$. With a two-variable power-series exponentiation one can bound the distribution of smooth coprime pairs $(n_1, n_2)$.

This is, for $y = 89$, the problem considered by Coppersmith in [24]. Coppersmith replaced exponents $k \log p$ by $\lfloor k \log p \rfloor / \alpha$, and multiplied the resulting series; I replace $k \log p$ by $k [\alpha \log p] / \alpha$, which is not quite as small but is better suited for exponentiation.

For limited-precision estimates see [44], [45], and [46].

**Number of prime factors.** The series $\sum_n [n \text{ is } y\text{-smooth}] x^{\lfloor \log n \rfloor} \alpha(n)$ in two variables $x, w$, where $\Omega(n) = \sum_p \text{ord}_p n$, is the product over smooth primes $p$ of $1 + x^{kp} w + x^{2kp} w^2 + \cdots$. The exponentiation here is faster than in the case of coprime pairs, because the exponents of $w$ are very small. For previous work see [28], [56], and [63].

**Semismoothness.** The analysis and optimization of factoring algorithms often relies on the distribution of positive integers $n$ that have no prime divisors larger than $x$ and at most one prime divisor larger than $y$. This is not a local condition, but the sum of $x |\log n|$ is nevertheless a product

$$\left(1 + \sum_{y < p \leq x} x^{kp}\right) \prod_{p \leq y} (1 + x^{kp} + x^{2kp} + \cdots)$$

of sparse series with nonnegative coefficients, so one can efficiently bound the distribution of these $n$’s. For previous work see [71] and [3].
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