

See discussions, stats, and author profiles for this publication at: <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/272743905>

PIATETSKI–SHAPIRO MEETS CHEBOTAREV

ARTICLE · NOVEMBER 2015

READS

18

2 AUTHORS, INCLUDING:



[Ahmet muhtar Guloglu](#)

Bilkent University

12 PUBLICATIONS 29 CITATIONS

SEE PROFILE

PIATETSKI-SHAPIRO MEETS CHEBOTAREV

YILDIRIM AKBAL AND AHMET MUHTAR GÜLOĞLU

ABSTRACT. Let K be a finite Galois extension of the field \mathbb{Q} of rational numbers. We prove an asymptotic formula for the number of the Piatetski-Shapiro primes not exceeding a given quantity for which the associated Frobenius class of automorphisms coincide with any given conjugacy class in the Galois group of K/\mathbb{Q} . In particular, this shows that there are infinitely many Piatetski-Shapiro primes of the form $a^2 + nb^2$ for any given natural number n .

1. INTRODUCTION

In 1953 Ilya Piatetski-Shapiro proved in [12] an analog of the prime number theorem for primes of the form $\lfloor n^c \rfloor$, where $\lfloor x \rfloor = \max\{n \in \mathbb{N} : n \leq x\}$, n runs through positive integers and $c > 0$ is fixed. He showed that such primes constitute a thin subset of the primes; more precisely, that the number $\pi_c(x)$ of these primes not exceeding a given number x is asymptotic to $x^{1/c}/\log x$, provided that $c \in (1, 12/11)$. Since then, the admissible range of c has been extended by many authors and the result is currently known for $c \in (1, 2817/2426)$ (cf. [13]).

A related question is to determine the asymptotic behavior of a particular subset of these primes; for example, those belonging to a given arithmetic progression, or those of the form $a^2 + nb^2$. The former was considered by Leitmann and Wolke (cf. [8]) in 1974, and it has been used in a recent paper by Roger et al. (cf. [1]) to show the existence of infinitely many Carmichael numbers that are products of the Piatetski-Shapiro primes.

For both of the aforementioned examples, the problem can be interpreted as counting the Piatetski-Shapiro primes that belong to a particular Chebotarev class of some number field (see Theorem 1 and the remark following Theorem 2). Motivated by this observation, we study in this paper the following more general problem:

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification*. Primary 11L07; Secondary 11R45, 11B83.

Key words and phrases. Chebotarev's density theorem, Piatetski-Shapiro prime number theorem, exponential sums over ideals, generalized Vaughan's identity, van der Corput's Method, Vinogradov's method.

Take a finite Galois extension K/\mathbb{Q} and a conjugacy class C in the Galois group $G = \text{Gal}(K/\mathbb{Q})$. Put

$$\pi(K, C) = \{p \text{ prime} : \gcd(p, \Delta_K) = 1; [K/\mathbb{Q}, p] = C\}$$

where Δ_K is the discriminant of K , and the Artin symbol $[K/\mathbb{Q}, p]$ is defined as the conjugacy class of the Frobenius automorphism associated with any prime ideal \mathfrak{P} of K above p . Recall that the Frobenius automorphism is the generator of the decomposition group of \mathfrak{P} , which is the cyclic subgroup of automorphisms of G that fixes \mathfrak{P} . The Chebotarev Density Theorem as given by Lemma 5 below states that the natural density of primes in $\pi(K, C)$ is $|C|/|G|$; that is,

$$\pi(K, C, x) \sim \frac{|C|}{|G|} \text{li}(x) \quad (x \rightarrow \infty)$$

where $\pi(K, C, x) = \#\{p \leq x : p \in \pi(K, C)\}$ and $\text{li}(x) = \int_2^x (\log t)^{-1} dt$ is the logarithmic integral.

Our intent in this paper is to find an asymptotic formula for the number of the Piatetski-Shapiro primes that belong to $\pi(K, C)$. To this end, we define the counting function

$$\pi_c(K, C, x) = \#\{p \leq x : p \in \pi(K, C); p = \lfloor n^c \rfloor \text{ for some } n \in \mathbb{N}\}.$$

The first result we prove in this direction is for abelian extensions K/\mathbb{Q} . By the Kronecker-Weber Theorem this problem easily reduces to counting the Piatetski-Shapiro primes in an arithmetic progression, which was handled in [8] as we have mentioned above. We do, however, reprove their theorem here in a slightly different manner following a more recent method given in [4, §4.6] that utilizes Vaughan's identity.

Before stating our first result, we recall that the conductor \mathfrak{f} of an abelian extension K/\mathbb{Q} is the modulus of the smallest ray class field $K^\mathfrak{f}$ containing K .

Theorem 1. *Let K/\mathbb{Q} be an abelian extension of conductor \mathfrak{f} . Take any automorphism σ in the Galois group $G = \text{Gal}(K/\mathbb{Q})$. Then, there exists an absolute constant $D > 0$ and a constant $x_0(\mathfrak{f})$ such that for any fixed $c \in (1, 12/11)$ and $x \geq x_0(\mathfrak{f})$, we have*

$$\pi_c(K, \{\sigma\}, x) = \frac{1}{c|G|} \text{li}(x^{1/c}) + O(x^{1/c} \exp(-D\sqrt{\log x}))$$

where the implied constant depends only on c .

Next, we consider a non-abelian Galois extension K/\mathbb{Q} . Given a conjugacy class C in G , take any representative $\sigma \in C$ and put $d_L = [G : \langle \sigma \rangle] =$

$[L : \mathbb{Q}]$, where L is the fixed field corresponding to the cyclic subgroup $\langle \sigma \rangle$ of G generated by σ . Note that $d_L \geq 2$. As in the abelian case, we obtain a similar asymptotic formula, only this time the range of c depends on the size of d_L (not on L , hence σ). This is due to the nature of an exponential sum that appears in the estimate of one of the error terms. In this case, we prove the following result:

Theorem 2. *Let K, C, G and d_L be as defined above. Then, there exists an absolute constant $D > 0$, and a constant x_0 which depends on the degree d_K and the discriminant Δ_K of K such that for $x \geq x_0$ and for c that satisfies*

$$1 < c < 1 + \begin{cases} (2^{d_L+1}d_L + 1)^{-1} & \text{if } d_L \leq 10, \\ (6(d_L^3 + d_L^2) \log(125d_L) - 1)^{-1} & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

we have

$$\pi_c(K, C, x) = \frac{|C|}{c|G|} \text{li}(x^{1/c}) + O(x^{1/c} \exp(-D|\Delta_K|^{-1/2}(\log x)^{1/2}))$$

where the implied constant depends on c , the degree d_L and the discriminant Δ_L of the intermediate field L defined above.

The asymptotic formula above follows from the effective version of the Chebotarev density theorem (see Lemma 5) coupled with an adaptation of the method in [4, §4.6] to our case using an analog of Vaughan's identity for number fields (see Lemma 10). The main difference from [4, §4.6] here is that one has to deal with the estimate of an exponential sum that runs over the integral ideals of L (see §2.3, §2.7) and most of the paper is devoted to the estimate of this sum. The main idea in a nutshell to handle the exponential sum in §2.3 is to split it into ray classes, then choose an integral basis for each class, and finally use van der Corput's method for small values of d_L , and Vinogradov's Method for the rest on one of the integer variables.

As an application, we consider the ring class field L_n of the order $\mathbb{Z}[\sqrt{-n}]$ in the imaginary quadratic field $K = \mathbb{Q}(\sqrt{-n})$ where n is a positive integer. It follows from [3, Lemma 9.3] that L_n is a Galois extension of \mathbb{Q} with Galois group isomorphic to $\text{Gal}(L_n/K) \rtimes (\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z})$, where the non-trivial element of $\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}$ acts on $\text{Gal}(L_n/K)$ by sending σ to its inverse σ^{-1} . For example, $\text{Gal}(L_{27}/\mathbb{Q}) \simeq S_3$ is non-abelian, while $\text{Gal}(L_3/\mathbb{Q})$ is abelian since $L_3 = \mathbb{Q}(\sqrt{-3})$. In any case, we have from [3, Theorem 9.4] that if p is an odd prime not dividing n then $p = a^2 + nb^2$ for some integers a, b if and only if p splits completely in L_n , which occurs exactly when $[L_n/\mathbb{Q}, p]$ is the identity automorphism $\mathbf{1}_G$ of $G = \text{Gal}(L_n/\mathbb{Q})$. Therefore, as a corollary of the theorems above we see that the number of Piatetski-Shapiro primes up

to x that are of the form $a^2 + nb^2$ is asymptotic to $(c|G|)^{-1}\text{li}(x^{1/c})$ as $x \rightarrow \infty$ for any c in the range given by the relevant Theorem above depending on whether L_n/\mathbb{Q} is abelian. Note that by [3, Lemma 9.3], L_n/\mathbb{Q} is abelian only if $[L_n : K] \leq 2$. On the other hand, $[L_n : K]$ is the class number $h(\mathbb{Z}[\sqrt{-n}])$ of the order $\mathbb{Z}[\sqrt{-n}]$, which by [3, Theorem 7.24] is an integral multiple of $h(K)$. Since it is also known that there are only finitely many n such that $h(K) \leq 2$, we conclude that for all but finitely many $n > 0$, L_n/\mathbb{Q} is non-abelian.

Remark 3. Adapting the most recent methods that have been used for the classical Piatetski-Shapiro problem it may be possible to obtain a slightly larger range for c in both Theorems 1 and 2, although we have not attempted to do so for the sake of simplicity.

Remark 4. If one assumes GRH for the Dedekind zeta function of K , then the best one can show with our methods is that the asymptotic formula

$$\pi_c(K, C, x) = \frac{|C|}{c|G|}\text{li}(x^{1/c}) + O(x^{1/c-\epsilon(c)})$$

holds for sufficiently large x and with an $\epsilon(c) > 0$ that approaches zero as c tends to the upper limit of its range given in Theorems 1 and 2. Note that it is also possible to give an explicit expression for $\epsilon(c)$, but requires some extra work. One can also get an error of the form $O(x^{1/c-\epsilon})$ for a fixed small $\epsilon > 0$ at the expense of a smaller range for c .

1.1. Preliminaries and Notation. We use Vinogradov's notation $f \ll g$ to mean that $|f(x)| \leq Cg(x)$, where g is a positive function and $C > 0$ is a constant. Similarly, we define $f \gg g$ to mean $|f| \geq Cg$ and $f \asymp g$ to mean both $f \ll g$ and $f \gg g$.

We write $e(z)$ for $\exp(2\pi iz)$.

For any finite field extension L/\mathbb{Q} , we shall write Δ_L for its absolute discriminant and d_L for its degree $[L : \mathbb{Q}] = r_1 + 2r_2$, where r_1 is the number of real embeddings of L . We denote the ring of integers of L by \mathfrak{O}_L and the absolute norm of an ideal \mathfrak{a} is denoted by $\mathfrak{N}\mathfrak{a}$.

The letter p always denotes an ordinary prime number. Similarly, we use the letters \mathfrak{p} , \mathfrak{P} for prime ideals.

Preliminaries. Here we state some of the auxiliary lemmas that shall be needed for the proof of Theorem 2.

Lemma 5 (Chebotarev density theorem). *Let K/\mathbb{Q} be a Galois extension and C a conjugacy class in the Galois group G . If $d_K > 1$, there exists an*

absolute, effectively computable constant D and a constant $x_0 = x_0(d_K, \Delta_K)$ such that if $x \geq x_0$, then

$$\pi(K, C, x) = \frac{|C|}{|G|} \text{li}(x) + O\left(x \exp(-D|\Delta_K|^{-1/2} \sqrt{\log x})\right)$$

where the implied constant is absolute. Furthermore, if GRH holds for the Dedekind zeta function of K , then for $x \geq 2$,

$$\left| \pi(K, C, x) - \frac{|C|}{|G|} \text{li}(x) \right| \leq c_1 \left(\frac{|C|}{|G|} x^{1/2} \log(|\Delta_K| x^{d_K}) + \log |\Delta_K| \right)$$

where c_1 is an effectively computable positive absolute constant.

Proof. The result immediately follows by combining [7, Theorems 1.1, 1.3 and 1.4]. \square

We refer to [2, Lemma 2] for the following result.

Lemma 6. *Let L/\mathbb{Q} be a finite extension of degree d_L and discriminant Δ_L . For each ideal \mathfrak{a} of L , there exists a basis $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{d_L}$ such that for any embedding τ of L ,*

$$(1.1) \quad A_1^{-d_L+1} (\mathfrak{N}\mathfrak{a})^{1/(2d_L)} \leq |\tau \alpha_j| \leq A_1 (\mathfrak{N}\mathfrak{a})^{1/d_L}$$

where $A_1 = d_L^{d_L} |\Delta_L|^{1/2}$.

For the proof of the next lemma, see for example [6, Theorem 11.8].

Lemma 7. *Let L be a finite extension and \mathfrak{U} be a nonzero ideal in the ring of integers \mathfrak{O}_L . There exists an element $\alpha \neq 0$ in \mathfrak{U} such that*

$$\mathfrak{N}(\alpha \mathfrak{U}^{-1}) \leq \frac{d_L!}{d_L^{d_L}} \left(\frac{4}{\pi} \right)^{r_2} |\Delta_L|^{1/2},$$

where $2r_2$ is the number of complex embeddings of L .

2. PROOF OF THEOREM 2

We start with the observation that the expression $\lfloor -p^\delta \rfloor - \lfloor -(p+1)^\delta \rfloor$ is either 0 or 1, where $\delta = 1/c$, and the latter holds exactly when $p = \lfloor n^c \rfloor$ for some $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Using this characterization and the identity

$$\begin{aligned} \lfloor -p^\delta \rfloor - \lfloor -(p+1)^\delta \rfloor &= (p+1)^\delta - p^\delta + \psi(-(p+1)^\delta) - \psi(-p^\delta) \\ &= \delta p^{\delta-1} + O(p^{\delta-2}) + \psi(-(p+1)^\delta) - \psi(-p^\delta), \end{aligned}$$

where $\psi(x) = x - \lfloor x \rfloor - 1/2$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \pi_c(K, C, x) &= \sum_{\substack{p \leq x \\ p \in \pi(K, C)}} \delta p^{\delta-1} + \sum_{\substack{p \leq x \\ p \in \pi(K, C)}} (\psi(-(p+1)^\delta) - \psi(-p^\delta)) \\ &\quad + O(\log x). \end{aligned}$$

Using partial summation, it follows from Lemma 5 that for $x \geq x_0 = x_0(d_K, |\Delta_K|)$,

$$\sum_{\substack{p \leq x \\ p \in \pi(K, C)}} \delta p^{\delta-1} = \frac{|C|}{c|G|} \text{li}(x^{1/c}) + O(x^{1/c} \exp(-D|\Delta_K|^{-1/2} \sqrt{\log x}))$$

where the implied constant is absolute.

The rest of this section deals with the estimate of the sum involving ψ . For any function $f(x)$, we put $F(f, x) = f(-(x+1)^\delta) - f(-x^\delta)$. Using dyadic division yields

$$\sum_{\substack{p \leq x \\ p \in \pi(K, C)}} F(\psi, p) = \sum_{\substack{1 \leq N < x \\ N=2^k}} \sum_{\substack{N < p \leq N_1 \\ p \in \pi(K, C)}} F(\psi, p)$$

where $N_1 = \min(x, 2N)$. By Vaaler's theorem (see, e.g., [4, Appendix]) we can approximate $\psi(x)$ with the function

$$\psi^*(x) = \sum_{1 \leq |h| \leq H} a_h e(hx), \quad (a_h \ll h^{-1})$$

where the error estimate $\psi(x) - \psi^*(x) \ll \Delta(x)$ holds for some non-negative function Δ given by

$$\Delta(x) = \sum_{|h| < H} b(h) e(hx), \quad (b(h) \ll H^{-1}).$$

Using the definition of Δ , it follows from [4, p. 48] that

$$\sum_{\substack{N < p \leq N_1 \\ p \in \pi(K, C)}} F(\psi - \psi^*, p) \ll \sum_{N < n \leq N_1} \Delta(-n^\delta) \ll NH^{-1} + N^{\delta/2} H^{1/2}.$$

Thus, taking

$$(2.1) \quad H = N^{1-\delta+\varepsilon}$$

yields

$$\sum_{p \in \pi(K, C, x)} F(\psi - \psi^*, p) \ll x^\delta \exp(-D|\Delta_K|^{-1/2} \sqrt{\log x})$$

provided that $1 < c < 2$ and $\varepsilon > 0$ is sufficiently small, both of which are assumed in what follows.

Having dealt with the error term, we now turn to the sum involving ψ^* . Using partial summation we obtain

$$\sum_{\substack{N < p \leq N_1 \\ p \in \pi(K, C)}} F(\psi^*, p) \ll \frac{1}{\log N} \max_{N' \in (N, N_1]} \left| \sum_{\substack{N < n \leq N' \\ n \in \pi(K, C)}} F(\psi^*, n) \Lambda(n) \right| + O(\sqrt{N})$$

where $\langle \pi(K, C) \rangle$ denotes the set of integers whose prime factors belong to $\pi(K, C)$. Recalling the definition of ψ^* above we derive that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\substack{N < n \leq N' \\ n \in \langle \pi(K, C) \rangle}} F(\psi^*, n) \Lambda(n) &= \sum_{1 \leq |h| \leq H} a_h \sum_{\substack{N < n \leq N' \\ n \in \langle \pi(K, C) \rangle}} F(e(hx), n) \Lambda(n) \\ &\ll \sum_{1 \leq h \leq H} h^{-1} \left| \sum_{\substack{N < n \leq N' \\ n \in \langle \pi(K, C) \rangle}} e(hn^\delta) \phi_h(n) \Lambda(n) \right|, \end{aligned}$$

where $\phi_h(x) = 1 - e(h((x+1)^\delta - x^\delta))$. Using the bounds

$$\phi_h(x) \ll hx^{\delta-1}, \quad \phi'_h(x) \ll hx^{\delta-2},$$

and partial summation we see that the inner sum above is

$$\ll hN^{\delta-1} \max_{N' \in (N, N_1]} \left| \sum_{\substack{N < n \leq N' \\ n \in \langle \pi(K, C) \rangle}} e(hn^\delta) \Lambda(n) \right|.$$

Thus, to finish the proof of Theorem 2 it is enough to show that

$$\sum_h \left| \sum_{\substack{N < n \leq N' \\ n \in \langle \pi(K, C) \rangle}} e(hn^\delta) \Lambda(n) \right| \ll N \exp(-D|\Delta_K|^{-1/2} \sqrt{\log N}).$$

Lemma 8. *Take a representative $\sigma \in C$. Let L be the fixed field of the cyclic group $\langle \sigma \rangle$ generated by σ . Then, for $N' \leq N_1 \leq 2N$,*

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\substack{N < n \leq N' \\ n \in \langle \pi(K, C) \rangle}} e(hn^\delta) \Lambda(n) \\ = \frac{|C|}{|G|} \sum_{\psi} \overline{\psi(\sigma)} \sum_{\substack{\mathfrak{a} \subseteq \mathfrak{D}_L \\ N < \mathfrak{N}\mathfrak{a} \leq N'}} \psi([K/L, \mathfrak{a}]) \Lambda_L(\mathfrak{a}) e(h(\mathfrak{N}\mathfrak{a})^\delta) + O(\sqrt{N}) \end{aligned}$$

where the first summation is taken over all characters of $\text{Gal}(K/L)$ and the second is over powers of prime ideals of L that are unramified in K .

Proof. Since K/L is abelian we obtain by the orthogonality of characters of $\text{Gal}(K/L)$, the expression

$$\sum_{\psi} \overline{\psi(\sigma)} \sum_{\substack{\mathfrak{a} \subseteq \mathfrak{D}_L \\ N < \mathfrak{N}\mathfrak{a} \leq N'}} \psi([K/L, \mathfrak{a}]) \Lambda_L(\mathfrak{a}) e(h(\mathfrak{N}\mathfrak{a})^\delta)$$

equals

$$\text{ord}_G(\sigma) \sum_{\substack{\mathfrak{a} \subseteq \mathfrak{D}_L \\ N < \mathfrak{N}\mathfrak{a} \leq N' \\ [K/L, \mathfrak{a}] = \sigma}} \Lambda_L(\mathfrak{a}) e(h(\mathfrak{N}\mathfrak{a})^\delta).$$

Removing prime ideals \mathfrak{p} of L with $\deg \mathfrak{p} > 1$ and powers of prime ideals \mathfrak{p}^k with $k > 1$, the last sum can be written as

$$\sum_{\substack{N < \mathfrak{N}\mathfrak{p} \leq N' \\ [K/L, \mathfrak{p}] = \sigma \\ \mathfrak{N}\mathfrak{p} \text{ is prime}}} e(h(\mathfrak{N}\mathfrak{p})^\delta) \log \mathfrak{N}\mathfrak{p} + O(\sqrt{N}),$$

or

$$\sum_{N < p \leq N'} \left(\sum_{\substack{\mathfrak{p} \subseteq \mathfrak{D}_L \\ [K/L, \mathfrak{p}] = \sigma \\ \mathfrak{N}\mathfrak{p} = p}} 1 \right) e(hp^\delta) \log p + O(\sqrt{N}).$$

If p is a prime that is unramified in K and \mathfrak{p} is a prime ideal of L above p satisfying $[K/L, \mathfrak{p}] = \sigma$, then \mathfrak{p} remains prime in K and

$$[K/L, \mathfrak{p}] = \sigma \text{ and } \mathfrak{N}\mathfrak{p} = p \iff [K/\mathbb{Q}, \mathfrak{p}\mathfrak{D}_K] = \sigma.$$

In particular, $[K/\mathbb{Q}, p] = C$. Furthermore, the number of prime ideals \mathfrak{P} of K above such a prime p with $[K/\mathbb{Q}, \mathfrak{P}] = \sigma$ equals $[C_G(\sigma) : \langle \sigma \rangle]$, where $C_G(\sigma)$ is the centralizer of σ in G . The result now follows by observing that $|C_G(\sigma)| = |G|/|C|$ and noting that

$$\sum_{\substack{N < n \leq N' \\ n \in \langle \pi(K, C) \rangle}} e(hn^\delta) \Lambda(n) = \sum_{\substack{p \in \pi(K, C) \\ N < p \leq N'}} e(hp^\delta) \log p + O(\sqrt{N}).$$

□

Remark 9. From now on we shall write $\chi(\mathfrak{a})$ for the composition $\Psi([K/L, \mathfrak{a}])$. Note that since K/L is abelian, χ is a character of the ray class group $J^{\mathfrak{f}}/P^{\mathfrak{f}}$ (see, e.g., [10, p. 525]) where \mathfrak{f} is the conductor of the extension K/L . Furthermore, we shall require that $\chi(\mathfrak{a}) = 0$ whenever \mathfrak{a} is not coprime to \mathfrak{f} . This way, we can assume that the inner sum in the lemma above runs over all integral ideals of L .

Our current objective is to prove that

$$\sum_h \left| \sum_{\substack{\mathfrak{a} \subseteq \mathfrak{D}_L \\ N < \mathfrak{N}\mathfrak{a} \leq N'}} \chi(\mathfrak{a}) \Lambda_L(\mathfrak{a}) e(h(\mathfrak{N}\mathfrak{a})^\delta) \right| \ll N \exp(-D|\Delta_K|^{-1/2} \sqrt{\log N}).$$

We start with an analog of Vaughan's identity for number fields.

Lemma 10. *Let $u, v \geq 1$. For any ideal $\mathfrak{a} \subseteq \mathfrak{D}_L$ with $\mathfrak{N}\mathfrak{a} > u$,*

$$\begin{aligned} \Lambda_L(\mathfrak{a}) &= \sum_{\substack{\mathfrak{b}\mathfrak{c}=\mathfrak{a} \\ \mathfrak{N}\mathfrak{b} \leq v}} \mu_L(\mathfrak{b}) \log \mathfrak{N}\mathfrak{c} \\ &\quad - \sum_{\substack{\mathfrak{b}\mathfrak{c}\mathfrak{d}=\mathfrak{a} \\ \mathfrak{N}\mathfrak{b} \leq v, \mathfrak{N}\mathfrak{c} \leq u}} \mu_L(\mathfrak{b}) \Lambda_L(\mathfrak{c}) - \sum_{\substack{\mathfrak{c}\mathfrak{e}=\mathfrak{a} \\ \mathfrak{N}\mathfrak{c} > u, \mathfrak{N}\mathfrak{e} > v}} \Lambda_L(\mathfrak{c}) \sum_{\substack{\mathfrak{b}\mathfrak{d}=\mathfrak{e} \\ \mathfrak{N}\mathfrak{b} \leq v}} \mu_L(\mathfrak{b}) \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\mu_L(\mathfrak{a}) = \begin{cases} (-1)^k, & \text{if } \mathfrak{a} = \mathfrak{p}_1 \cdots \mathfrak{p}_k, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

and

$$\Lambda_L(\mathfrak{a}) = \begin{cases} \log \mathfrak{N}\mathfrak{p}, & \text{if } \mathfrak{a} = \mathfrak{p}^k \text{ for some } k \geq 1, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Proof. We use the identity

$$\Lambda_L(\mathfrak{a}) = \sum_{\mathfrak{b}\mathfrak{c}=\mathfrak{a}} \mu_L(\mathfrak{b}) \log \mathfrak{N}\mathfrak{c}$$

and then follow the argument preceding [5, proposition 13.4]. Finally, note that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\substack{\mathfrak{b}\mathfrak{c}\mathfrak{d}=\mathfrak{a} \\ \mathfrak{N}\mathfrak{b}>v, \mathfrak{N}\mathfrak{c}>u}} \mu_L(\mathfrak{b}) \Lambda_L(\mathfrak{c}) &= \sum_{\substack{\mathfrak{c}\mathfrak{e}=\mathfrak{a} \\ \mathfrak{N}\mathfrak{c}>u}} \Lambda_L(\mathfrak{c}) \sum_{\substack{\mathfrak{b}\mathfrak{d}=\mathfrak{c} \\ \mathfrak{N}\mathfrak{b}>v}} \mu_L(\mathfrak{b}) \\ &= \sum_{\substack{\mathfrak{c}\mathfrak{e}=\mathfrak{a} \\ \mathfrak{N}\mathfrak{c}>u, \mathfrak{N}\mathfrak{e}>v}} \Lambda_L(\mathfrak{c}) \left(\sum_{\mathfrak{b}\mathfrak{d}=\mathfrak{c}} \mu_L(\mathfrak{b}) - \sum_{\substack{\mathfrak{b}\mathfrak{d}=\mathfrak{c} \\ \mathfrak{N}\mathfrak{b}\leq v}} \mu_L(\mathfrak{b}) \right) \\ &= - \sum_{\substack{\mathfrak{c}\mathfrak{e}=\mathfrak{a} \\ \mathfrak{N}\mathfrak{c}>u, \mathfrak{N}\mathfrak{e}>v}} \Lambda_L(\mathfrak{c}) \sum_{\substack{\mathfrak{b}\mathfrak{d}=\mathfrak{c} \\ \mathfrak{N}\mathfrak{b}\leq v}} \mu_L(\mathfrak{b}). \end{aligned}$$

□

We assume from now on that $u < N$. It follows from Lemma 10 that

$$\sum_{\substack{\mathfrak{a} \subseteq \mathfrak{O}_L \\ N < \mathfrak{N}\mathfrak{a} \leq N'}} \chi(\mathfrak{a}) \Lambda_L(\mathfrak{a}) e(h(\mathfrak{N}\mathfrak{a})^\delta) = S_1 + S_2 + S_3$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} S_1 &= - \sum_{\substack{\mathfrak{a} \subseteq \mathfrak{O}_L \\ N < \mathfrak{N}\mathfrak{a} \leq N'}} \chi(\mathfrak{a}) e(h(\mathfrak{N}\mathfrak{a})^\delta) \sum_{\substack{\mathfrak{c}\mathfrak{e}=\mathfrak{a} \\ \mathfrak{N}\mathfrak{c}>u, \mathfrak{N}\mathfrak{e}>v}} \Lambda_L(\mathfrak{c}) \sum_{\substack{\mathfrak{b}\mathfrak{d}=\mathfrak{c} \\ \mathfrak{N}\mathfrak{b}\leq v}} \mu_L(\mathfrak{b}), \\ S_2 &= \sum_{\substack{\mathfrak{a} \subseteq \mathfrak{O}_L \\ N < \mathfrak{N}\mathfrak{a} \leq N'}} \chi(\mathfrak{a}) e(h(\mathfrak{N}\mathfrak{a})^\delta) \sum_{\substack{\mathfrak{b}\mathfrak{c}=\mathfrak{a} \\ \mathfrak{N}\mathfrak{b}\leq v}} \mu_L(\mathfrak{b}) \log \mathfrak{N}\mathfrak{c}, \\ S_3 &= - \sum_{\substack{\mathfrak{a} \subseteq \mathfrak{O}_L \\ N < \mathfrak{N}\mathfrak{a} \leq N'}} \chi(\mathfrak{a}) e(h(\mathfrak{N}\mathfrak{a})^\delta) \sum_{\substack{\mathfrak{b}\mathfrak{c}\mathfrak{d}=\mathfrak{a} \\ \mathfrak{N}\mathfrak{b}\leq v, \mathfrak{N}\mathfrak{c}\leq u}} \mu_L(\mathfrak{b}) \Lambda_L(\mathfrak{c}). \end{aligned}$$

2.1. Estimate of S_1 . We first need an auxiliary result.

Lemma 11. *Let X, Y be positive integers and*

$$(2.2) \quad \begin{aligned} \alpha(m) &= - \sum_{\substack{\mathfrak{c} \subseteq \mathfrak{D}_L \\ \mathfrak{N}\mathfrak{c} = m}} \chi(\mathfrak{c}) \Lambda_L(\mathfrak{c}), \\ \beta(n) &= \sum_{\substack{\mathfrak{c} \subseteq \mathfrak{D}_L \\ \mathfrak{N}\mathfrak{c} = n}} \chi(\mathfrak{c}) \sum_{\substack{\mathfrak{b}\mathfrak{d} = \mathfrak{c} \\ \mathfrak{N}\mathfrak{b} \leq v}} \mu_L(\mathfrak{b}). \end{aligned}$$

Then,

$$\sum_{X < m \leq 2X} |\alpha(m)|^2 \ll X \log^{2d_L-1} X, \quad \sum_{Y < n \leq 2Y} |\beta(n)|^2 \ll Y (\log Y)^{4d_L^2}.$$

Proof. By Cauchy-Schwartz inequality

$$\sum_{Y < n \leq 2Y} |\beta(n)|^2 \leq \sum_{Y \leq n \leq 2Y} \left(\sum_{\substack{\mathfrak{c} \subseteq \mathfrak{D}_L \\ \mathfrak{N}\mathfrak{c} = n}} 1 \right) \sum_{\substack{\mathfrak{c} \subseteq \mathfrak{D}_L \\ \mathfrak{N}\mathfrak{c} = n}} \left(\sum_{\substack{\mathfrak{b}\mathfrak{d} = \mathfrak{c} \\ \mathfrak{N}\mathfrak{b} \leq v}} \mu_L(\mathfrak{b}) \right)^2 \leq \sum_{Y \leq n \leq 2Y} g(n)$$

where $g(n)$ is the multiplicative function defined by

$$g(n) = \left(\sum_{\substack{\mathfrak{c} \subseteq \mathfrak{D}_L \\ \mathfrak{N}\mathfrak{c} = n}} 1 \right) \sum_{\substack{\mathfrak{c} \subseteq \mathfrak{D}_L \\ \mathfrak{N}\mathfrak{c} = n}} \tau^2(\mathfrak{c})$$

and $\tau(\mathfrak{c})$ is the number of integral ideals of L that divide \mathfrak{c} . Note that for any prime $p \geq 2$, $g(p) \leq 4d_L^2$, while for $k > 1$ we see that the number of ideals \mathfrak{c} with $\mathfrak{N}\mathfrak{c} = p^k$ is bounded by

$$\binom{d_L + k - 1}{d_L - 1} = e^{\sum_{m=1}^k \log\left(1 + \frac{d_L - 1}{m}\right)} \leq e^{\sum_{m=1}^k \frac{d_L - 1}{m}} \leq (ek)^{d_L - 1}$$

and $\tau^2(\mathfrak{c}) \leq (k + 1)^2 \leq 4k^2$. Thus, $g(p^k) \leq 4e^{d_L - 1} k^{d_L + 1}$. It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \log \left(1 + \frac{g(p)}{p} + \frac{g(p^2)}{p^2} + \dots \right) &= \log \left(1 + \frac{g(p)}{p} \right) + O(1/p^2) \\ &\leq \frac{4d_L^2}{p} + O(1/p^2) \end{aligned}$$

where the implied constant depends on d_L . Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{Y \leq n \leq 2Y} g(n) &\leq 2Y \sum_{Y \leq n \leq 2Y} \frac{g(n)}{n} \leq 2Y e^{\sum_{p \leq 2Y} \log \left(1 + \frac{g(p)}{p} + \frac{g(p^2)}{p^2} + \dots \right)} \\ &\leq 2Y e^{O(1) + 4d_L^2 \sum_{p \leq 2Y} \frac{1}{p}} \ll_{d_L} Y (\log Y)^{4d_L^2}. \end{aligned}$$

As for the other sum, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{X < m \leq 2X} |\alpha(m)|^2 &\leq \sum_{X \leq m \leq 2X} \sum_{\substack{\mathfrak{c} \subseteq \mathfrak{D}_L \\ \mathfrak{N}\mathfrak{c} = m}} 1 \cdot \sum_{\substack{\mathfrak{c} \subseteq \mathfrak{D}_L \\ \mathfrak{N}\mathfrak{c} = m}} (\Lambda_L(\mathfrak{c}))^2 \\
&= \sum_{X \leq m \leq 2X} (\Lambda(m))^2 \left(\sum_{\substack{\mathfrak{c} \subseteq \mathfrak{D}_L \\ \mathfrak{N}\mathfrak{c} = m}} 1 \right)^2 \\
&\ll_{d_L} (\log X)^2 \sum_{X \leq p^k \leq 2X} k^{2(d_L-1)} \\
&\ll (\log X)^{2d_L} \sum_{X \leq p^k \leq 2X} 1 \ll X (\log X)^{2d_L-1},
\end{aligned}$$

as claimed. \square

We are now ready to estimate S_1 . First, rewrite S_1 as

$$\begin{aligned}
S_1 &= - \sum_{\substack{\mathfrak{c}, \mathfrak{e} \\ \mathfrak{N}\mathfrak{c} > v; \mathfrak{N}\mathfrak{e} > u \\ N \leq \mathfrak{N}(\mathfrak{c}\mathfrak{e}) \leq N'}} \chi(\mathfrak{c}) \left(\sum_{\substack{\mathfrak{b}\mathfrak{d} = \mathfrak{c} \\ \mathfrak{N}\mathfrak{b} \leq v}} \mu_L(\mathfrak{b}) \right) \chi(\mathfrak{e}) \Lambda_L(\mathfrak{c}) e(h(\mathfrak{N}\mathfrak{c}\mathfrak{e})^\delta) \\
&= \sum_{\substack{n, m \\ n > v; m > u \\ N < nm \leq N'}} \alpha(m) \beta(n) e(h(nm)^\delta)
\end{aligned}$$

where $\alpha(m)$ and $\beta(n)$ are given by (2.2). Let

$$(2.3) \quad u = v = N^{\delta-1+\eta}$$

and split the ranges of m and n into $\ll \log^2 N$ subintervals of the form $[X, 2X]$ and $[Y, 2Y]$ such that $N/4 \leq XY \leq 2N$, $v < X, Y < N'/v$. Summing over $h \leq H$ we conclude from Lemma 11 and [4, Lemma 4.13] with the exponent pair $(k, l) = (1/2, 1/2)$ that the contribution of each subinterval is

$$\begin{aligned}
&\ll (H^{7/6} N^{\delta/6+5/6} \min(X^{-1/6}, Y^{-1/6}) + H N^{1/2} \max(X, Y)^{1/2}) \\
&\quad \cdot (\log N)^{2d_L^2+d_L+1/2} \\
&\ll (N^{2-1/12-\delta} + N^{5/2-3\delta/2-\eta/2}) N^{8\varepsilon/6}.
\end{aligned}$$

Finally, summing over X and Y we conclude that the estimate

$$\sum_h |S_1| \ll N \exp(-D|\Delta_K|^{-1/2} \sqrt{\log N})$$

holds provided that

$$(2.4) \quad 1 - \delta < \min\left(\frac{1}{12}, \frac{\eta}{3}\right),$$

and $\varepsilon > 0$ is sufficiently small, both of which we shall assume in what follows.

2.2. Estimate of S_3 . We rewrite S_3 as $S_4 + S_5$ where

$$S_4 = - \sum_{\mathfrak{N}\mathfrak{c} \leq v} \chi(\mathfrak{c}) \left(\sum_{\substack{\mathfrak{b}\mathfrak{c}=\mathfrak{c} \\ \mathfrak{N}\mathfrak{b} \leq v, \mathfrak{N}\mathfrak{c} \leq u}} \mu_L(\mathfrak{b}) \Lambda_L(\mathfrak{c}) \right) \sum_{\substack{\mathfrak{d} \\ N < \mathfrak{N}(\mathfrak{d}\mathfrak{c}) \leq N'}} \chi(\mathfrak{d}) e(h(\mathfrak{N}(\mathfrak{d}\mathfrak{c}))^\delta) \\ \ll \log N \sum_{\substack{\mathfrak{c} \\ \mathfrak{N}\mathfrak{c} \leq v}} \left| \sum_{\substack{\mathfrak{d} \\ N < \mathfrak{N}(\mathfrak{d}\mathfrak{c}) \leq N'}} \chi(\mathfrak{d}) e(h(\mathfrak{N}(\mathfrak{d}\mathfrak{c}))^\delta) \right|,$$

and

$$S_5 = - \sum_{\substack{\mathfrak{d}, \mathfrak{c} \\ v < \mathfrak{N}\mathfrak{c} \leq v^2 \\ N < \mathfrak{N}(\mathfrak{d}\mathfrak{c}) \leq N'}} \chi(\mathfrak{d}) \chi(\mathfrak{c}) \left(\sum_{\substack{\mathfrak{b}\mathfrak{c}=\mathfrak{c} \\ \mathfrak{N}\mathfrak{b} \leq v, \mathfrak{N}\mathfrak{c} \leq u}} \mu_L(\mathfrak{b}) \Lambda_L(\mathfrak{c}) \right) e(h(\mathfrak{N}(\mathfrak{d}\mathfrak{c}))^\delta) \\ = \sum_{\substack{n, m \\ v < m \leq v^2 \\ N < nm \leq N'}} \alpha(m) \beta(n) e(h(nm)^\delta)$$

with

$$\alpha(m) = \sum_{\substack{\mathfrak{c} \\ \mathfrak{N}\mathfrak{c}=m}} \chi(\mathfrak{c}) \left(\sum_{\substack{\mathfrak{b}\mathfrak{c}=\mathfrak{c} \\ \mathfrak{N}\mathfrak{b} \leq v, \mathfrak{N}\mathfrak{c} \leq u}} \mu_L(\mathfrak{b}) \Lambda_L(\mathfrak{c}) \right) \\ \beta(n) = \sum_{\substack{\mathfrak{d} \\ \mathfrak{N}\mathfrak{d}=n}} \chi(\mathfrak{d}).$$

To estimate S_5 we split the ranges of m and n as we did for S_1 with the only difference that we now have $v < X \leq v^2$ and $N/v^2 < Y < N'/v$ in addition to $N/4 \leq XY \leq 2N$. Furthermore, an analog of Lemma 11 can easily be established for the coefficients $\alpha(m)$ and $\beta(n)$ and will be omitted here. Using [4, Lemma 4.13] once again we see that the estimate

$$\sum_{h \leq H} |S_5| \ll \left(N^{2-\delta-1/12} + N^{2-\delta} v^{-1/2} + N^{3/2-\delta} v \right) N^{2\varepsilon} \\ \ll N \exp(-D|\Delta_K|^{-1/2} \sqrt{\log N})$$

holds if we assume (2.4), that $\varepsilon > 0$ is sufficiently small and that

$$(2.5) \quad 3\eta \leq 1.$$

Finally, we note that S_4 can be estimated exactly the same way that S_2 will be handled in the next section. It does not impose any further restrictions on the range of δ than S_2 does, thus we skip it.

2.3. Estimate of S_2 . We rewrite S_2 as

$$S_2 = \sum_{\substack{\mathfrak{d} \\ \mathfrak{N}\mathfrak{d} \leq v}} \chi(\mathfrak{d}) \mu_L(\mathfrak{d}) \sum_{\substack{\mathfrak{c} \\ N/\mathfrak{N}\mathfrak{d} < \mathfrak{N}\mathfrak{c} \leq N'/\mathfrak{N}\mathfrak{d}}} \chi(\mathfrak{c}) e(h(\mathfrak{N}\mathfrak{c}\mathfrak{d})^\delta) \log \mathfrak{N}\mathfrak{c}$$

and start with the estimate of

$$S = \sum_{\substack{\mathfrak{c} \\ N/\mathfrak{f}\mathfrak{d} < \mathfrak{N}\mathfrak{c} \leq N'/\mathfrak{f}\mathfrak{d}}} \chi(\mathfrak{c}) e(h(\mathfrak{N}\mathfrak{c}\mathfrak{d})^\delta)$$

Recall that χ is a ray class character of modulus \mathfrak{f} . Splitting S into ray classes \mathfrak{K} we obtain $S = \sum_{\mathfrak{K}} \chi(\mathfrak{K}) S_{\mathfrak{K}}$ where

$$S_{\mathfrak{K}} = \sum_{\substack{\mathfrak{c} \in \mathfrak{K} \\ N/\mathfrak{f}\mathfrak{d} < \mathfrak{N}\mathfrak{c} \leq N'/\mathfrak{f}\mathfrak{d}}} e(h(\mathfrak{N}\mathfrak{c}\mathfrak{d})^\delta).$$

Since there are only finitely many classes it is enough to consider a fixed class \mathfrak{K} . Let \mathfrak{b} be an integral ideal in the inverse class \mathfrak{K}^{-1} . Any integral ideal $\mathfrak{c} \in \mathfrak{K}$ is given by $\alpha\mathfrak{b}^{-1}$ for some $\alpha \in \mathfrak{b} \cap L_{\mathfrak{f},1}$, where

$$L_{\mathfrak{f},1} := \{x \in L^* : x \equiv 1 \pmod{\mathfrak{f}}, \text{ and } x \text{ is totally positive}\}.$$

Thus, we have

$$S_{\mathfrak{K}} = \sum_{\substack{\alpha\mathfrak{a} \\ \alpha \in \mathfrak{b} \cap L_{\mathfrak{f},1} \\ P^{d_L} < \mathfrak{N}(\alpha\mathfrak{d}_L) \leq (P')^{d_L}}} e(h(\mathfrak{N}(\alpha\mathfrak{a}\mathfrak{d}))^\delta)$$

where $\mathfrak{a} = \mathfrak{b}^{-1}$,

$$(2.6) \quad P = \left(\frac{N}{\mathfrak{N}(\mathfrak{a}\mathfrak{d})} \right)^{1/d_L} \quad \text{and} \quad P' = \left(\frac{N'}{\mathfrak{N}(\mathfrak{a}\mathfrak{d})} \right)^{1/d_L}.$$

Since \mathfrak{f} and \mathfrak{b} are coprime ideals, we can find an $\alpha_0 \in \mathfrak{b}$ such that $\alpha_0 \equiv 1 \pmod{\mathfrak{f}}$. Hence, the condition that $\alpha \in \mathfrak{b} \cap L_{\mathfrak{f},1}$ is equivalent to the conditions that $\alpha \equiv \alpha_0 \pmod{\mathfrak{f}\mathfrak{b}}$ and that α is totally positive.

Define a linear transformation T from L to the Minkowski space $L_{\mathbb{R}} := \{(z_\tau) \in L_{\mathbb{C}} : z_\tau = \overline{z_{\overline{\tau}}}\}$ by

$$T\alpha = (\tau_1\alpha, \dots, \tau_{d_L}\alpha)$$

where $L_{\mathbb{C}} := \prod_{\tau} \mathbb{C}$ and $\tau_1, \dots, \tau_{d_L}$ are the embeddings of L with the first r_1 embeddings being real and the first $r_1 + r_2$ corresponding to the different archimedean valuations of L .

Note that $\alpha, \beta \in \mathfrak{b} \cap L_{\mathfrak{f},1}$ generate the same ideal if and only if they differ by a unit $u \in \mathfrak{D}_L^* \cap L_{\mathfrak{f},1}$. Since $\mathfrak{D}_L^* \cap L_{\mathfrak{f},1}$ is of finite index in \mathfrak{D}_L^* , its free part is of rank $r = r_1 + r_2 - 1$. Let ξ_1, \dots, ξ_r be a system of fundamental units for $\mathfrak{D}_L^* \cap L_{\mathfrak{f},1}$ and E the invertible $r \times r$ matrix whose rows are given by $\ell(T\xi_1), \dots, \ell(T\xi_r)$ where $\ell : L_{\mathbb{C}}^* \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^r$ is defined by

$$\ell(z_1, \dots, z_{d_L}) = (\log |z_1|, \dots, \log |z_r|).$$

If L contains exactly ω roots of unity, then for any $t \in \mathbb{R}^*$, $\ell(T(t\alpha)) = \ell(T(t\beta))$ holds for exactly ω associates α of a given $\beta \in L^*$. Thus, in order

to pick a representative $\alpha \in \mathfrak{b} \cap L_{\mathfrak{f},1}$ for the ideal $\alpha\mathfrak{a} \in \mathfrak{K}$ that is unique up to multiplication by roots of unity in L , we impose the condition that $\ell(T\alpha)E^{-1} \in [0, 1)^r$. At this point, we define the set

$$\Gamma_0 := \{\mathbf{z} \in L_{\mathbb{C}}^* : 1 < \mathfrak{N}\mathbf{z} \leq N'/N; \ell(\mathbf{z})E^{-1} \in [0, 1)^r; z_1, \dots, z_{r_1} > 0\}$$

where norm $\mathfrak{N}\mathbf{z} = \mathfrak{N}(z_1, \dots, z_{d_L}) := \prod_i z_i$. Recalling the definition of $S_{\mathfrak{K}}$ above and noting that $\mathfrak{N}T\alpha = \mathfrak{N}_{L/\mathbb{Q}}(\alpha)$ for $\alpha \in L^*$, we see that

$$\omega S_{\mathfrak{K}} = \sum_{\substack{\alpha \in \alpha_0 + \mathfrak{fb} \\ T\alpha \in P\Gamma_0}} e(h(\mathfrak{N}(\alpha\mathfrak{a}\mathfrak{d}))^\delta).$$

Fix a \mathbb{Z} -basis $\{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{d_L}\}$ for the integral ideal \mathfrak{fb} that satisfies (1.1) and let M be the invertible matrix whose rows are given by $T\alpha_1, \dots, T\alpha_{d_L}$. Since for $\alpha \in \alpha_0 + \mathfrak{fb}$, $T\alpha$ can be written as $T\alpha_0 + \mathbf{n}M$ for some unique $\mathbf{n} \in \mathbb{Z}^{d_L}$, we see that $\omega S_{\mathfrak{K}} = \sum_{\mathbf{n} \in \mathbb{Z}^{d_L}} f(\mathbf{n})$, where $f : \mathbb{R}^{d_L} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is given by

$$f(\mathbf{x}) = \begin{cases} e(D(\mathfrak{N}(\mathbf{x}_0 + \mathbf{x}M))^\delta) & \text{if } \mathbf{x}_0 + \mathbf{x}M \in P\Gamma_0, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

$\mathbf{x}_0 = T\alpha_0$, and $D = h(\mathfrak{N}(\mathfrak{a}\mathfrak{d}))^\delta$. Partitioning \mathbb{R}^{d_L} into a disjoint union of translates B of $[0, Y)^{d_L}$, where $Y \geq 1$ is an integer to be chosen later, we obtain

$$\sum_{\mathbf{n} \in \mathbb{Z}^{d_L}} f(\mathbf{n}) = \sum_B \sum_{\mathbf{n} \in B \cap \mathbb{Z}^{d_L}} f(\mathbf{n}).$$

Note that the condition $\ell(\mathbf{z})E^{-1} \in [0, 1)^r$ in the definition of Γ_0 above implies the existence of positive constants $c_1 = c_1(d_L, \Delta_L)$ and $c_2 = c_2(d_L, \Delta_L)$ such that for any $\alpha \in L^*$ with $T\alpha \in P\Gamma_0$ and any embedding τ of L , we have

$$c_1 P < |\tau\alpha| < c_2 P.$$

Let \mathbf{R} be the region $\{(z_1, \dots, z_{d_L}) \in L_{\mathbb{R}} : c_1 P < |z_i| < c_2 P\}$. Suppose that f is not identically zero on $B \cap \mathbb{Z}^{d_L}$ for some B . If $\mathbf{x}_0 + BM$ is partially contained in \mathbf{R} then it must be intersecting the boundary of \mathbf{R} . Thus, we see that the contribution of such B to the sum $\sum_{\mathbf{n}} f(\mathbf{n})$ is $O(YP^{d_L-1})$. For the rest of the boxes B for which $f(B \cap \mathbb{Z}^{d_L}) \neq 0$, we necessarily have that $\mathbf{x}_0 + BM \subseteq \mathbf{R}$. From now on, we assume that B is such a box. By the arguments in §2.7, there exist constants $C_1 = C_1(k, d_L, \Delta_L)$, $C_2 = C_2(k, d_L, \Delta_L)$ and a matrix $U \in SL(d_L, \mathbb{Z})$ such that for $N \geq C_1$, $1 \leq Y \leq C_2 P$ and any $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_{d_L}) \in BU^{-1}$, we have

$$(2.7) \quad \left| \frac{\partial^k}{\partial x_1^k} g_U(\mathbf{x}) \right| \asymp P^{\delta d_L - k} \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{\partial \lambda_i}{\partial x_1}(\mathbf{x}) \gg P^{-1}$$

where g_U is given by (2.13), λ_i 's are determined by the condition $\ell(\mathbf{x}_0 + \mathbf{x}UM) = (\lambda_1(\mathbf{x}), \dots, \lambda_r(\mathbf{x}))E$, and the implied constants depend on k (only if relevant) and on d_L and Δ_L . After a change of variable we obtain

$$(2.8) \quad \sum_{\mathbf{n} \in B \cap \mathbb{Z}^{d_L}} f(\mathbf{n}) = \sum_{\mathbf{n} \in BU^{-1} \cap \mathbb{Z}^{d_L}} f(\mathbf{n}U) = \sum_{(n_2, \dots, n_{d_L}) \in \mathbb{Z}^{d_L}} \dots \sum_{\substack{n_1 \in \mathbb{Z} \\ \mathbf{n} \in BU^{-1} \cap \mathbb{Z}^{d_L}}} f(\mathbf{n}U)$$

where $\mathbf{n} = (n_1, \dots, n_{d_L})$. Since $f(B \cap \mathbb{Z}^{d_L}) \not\equiv 0$ there is at least one tuple (n_2, \dots, n_{d_L}) such that $f(\mathbf{n}U) \not\equiv 0$ for $n_1 \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $\mathbf{n} \in BU^{-1} \cap \mathbb{Z}^{d_L}$. Fix such a tuple. It follows from (2.7) with $k = 1$ that both λ_i 's and the norm function are monotonic and thus there is an interval $I = I(n_2, \dots, n_{d_L})$ of length at most $O(Y)$ such that the function $f(x; n_2, \dots, n_{d_L}) \neq 0$ for $x \in I$. We are now ready to estimate (2.8). We shall do so in what follows using different methods according to the size of the degree d_L of the extension L/\mathbb{Q} .

2.4. Vinogradov's Method - Large degree. Assume that $d_L \geq 11$. It follows from (2.7) that there exist positive constants $C_3 = C_3(d_L, \Delta_L)$ and $C_4 = C_4(d_L, \Delta_L)$ such that

$$\frac{1}{A_0} \leq \left| \frac{\partial^{d_L+1}}{\partial x_1^{d_L+1}} (Dg_U(\mathbf{x})) \right| \leq \frac{C_4}{A_0},$$

where

$$A_0 = \frac{P^{d_L(1-\delta)+1}}{C_3 D} = \frac{N^{1-\delta+1/d_L}}{C_3 h(\mathfrak{N}(\mathfrak{a}\mathfrak{d}))^{1+1/d_L}}.$$

Using (2.1) and (2.3) we see that

$$\frac{N^{1/d_L - \varepsilon - (1+1/d_L)(\eta+\delta-1)}}{C_3 (\mathfrak{N}(\mathfrak{a}))^{1+1/d_L}} < A_0 \leq \frac{P^{d_L(1-\delta)+1}}{C_3 (\mathfrak{N}(\mathfrak{a}))^\delta}.$$

Therefore, assuming that $\eta < 1/(1+d_L)$ and ε is sufficiently small it follows from Lemma 7 that for sufficiently large N , we have $A_0 > 1$. Put $\rho = 1/(3d_L^2 \log(125d_L))$ and take

$$(2.9) \quad Y = A_0^{1/((2+2/d_L)(1-\rho))}.$$

Using equation (2.4), the upper bound for A_0 above and the inequality $(1 + 1/d_L)(1 - \rho) > 1$, we obtain for sufficiently large N that

$$(2.10) \quad A_0^{1/(2+2/d_L)} < Y \leq \min(C_2 P, A_0).$$

If the interval I in (2.8) satisfies

$$A_0^{1/(2+2/d_L)} \ll |I|,$$

we derive from (2.10) and [15, Theorem 2a, p. 109] that

$$\sum_{\substack{n_1 \in I \\ \mathbf{n} \in BU^{-1} \cap \mathbb{Z}^{d_L}}} e(Dg_U(\mathbf{n})) \ll |I|^{1-\rho} \ll Y^{1-\rho}.$$

For smaller intervals I , trivially estimating the sum yields a contribution $\ll Y^{1-\rho}$ due to the choice of Y in (2.9). Since the number of tuples $(n_2, \dots, n_{d_L}) \in \mathbb{Z}^{d_L-1}$ such that $\mathbf{n} \in BU^{-1} \cap \mathbb{Z}^{d_L}$ is $O(Y^{d_L-1})$ we obtain

$$\sum_{\mathbf{n} \in B \cap \mathbb{Z}^{d_L}} f(\mathbf{n}) \ll Y^{d_L-\rho}.$$

Therefore, the contribution to the sum in (2.8) of those B for which $f(B \cap \mathbb{Z}^{d_L}) \neq 0$ and $\mathbf{x}_0 + BM \subseteq R$ is $\ll P^{d_L} Y^{-\rho}$, and this is already larger than the contribution from the rest of the boxes B .

Using (2.6) and partial summation and then summing over the ray classes \mathfrak{K} we see that the sum

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\substack{\mathfrak{c} \\ N/\mathfrak{N}\mathfrak{d} < \mathfrak{N}\mathfrak{c} \leq N'/\mathfrak{N}\mathfrak{d}}} \chi(\mathfrak{c}) e(h(\mathfrak{N}\mathfrak{c}\mathfrak{d})^\delta) \log \mathfrak{N}\mathfrak{c} \\ \ll \frac{N}{\mathfrak{N}\mathfrak{d}} \left(\frac{N^{1-\delta+1/d_L}}{h(\mathfrak{N}\mathfrak{d})^{1+1/d_L}} \right)^{-\frac{\rho}{(2+2/d_L)(1-\rho)}} \log N \\ = N^{1-\frac{\rho(1-\delta+1/d_L)}{(2+2/d_L)(1-\rho)}} (\mathfrak{N}\mathfrak{d})^{\frac{\rho}{2(1-\rho)}-1} h^{\frac{\rho}{(2+2/d_L)(1-\rho)}} \log N. \end{aligned}$$

Finally, summing over ideals \mathfrak{d} with $\mathfrak{N}\mathfrak{d} \leq v$ using the fact that $\sum_{\mathfrak{N}\mathfrak{d} \leq x} 1 \ll x$ (see for example [6, Statement 2.15]) and then summing over h with $h \leq H$ we obtain from (2.1) and (2.3) that

$$\sum_{h \leq H} |S_2| \ll N^{1-\frac{\rho(1-\delta+1/d_L)}{(2+2/d_L)(1-\rho)}} v^{\frac{\rho}{2(1-\rho)}} H^{1+\frac{\rho}{(2+2/d_L)(1-\rho)}} \log N \ll N^{1+q+2\varepsilon}$$

where

$$q = \frac{1}{2(1-\rho)} \left(-\frac{\rho}{d_L+1} + (1-\delta)(2-3\rho) + \rho\eta \right).$$

Thus, assuming (2.4) and choosing

$$(2.11) \quad \frac{\eta}{3} = \frac{\rho}{2(d_L+1)} = \frac{1}{6(d_L+1)d_L^2 \log(125d_L)}$$

we see that both (2.5) and the inequality $q < 0$ hold. We conclude that for sufficiently large N and sufficiently small $\varepsilon > 0$,

$$\sum_{h \leq H} |S_2| \ll N \exp(-D|\Delta_K|^{-1/2} \sqrt{\log N})$$

provided that $d_L \geq 11$.

2.5. Van Der Corput's Method - Small degree. By [4, Theorem 2.8] and (2.7) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{n} \in BU^{-1} \cap \mathbb{Z}^{d_L} \\ n_1}} e(Dg_U(\mathbf{n})) &\ll Y \lambda^{1/(2^{k+2}-2)} + Y^{1-1/2^{k+1}} \\ &\quad + Y^{1-1/2^{k-1}+1/2^{2k}} \lambda^{-1/2^{k+1}} \end{aligned}$$

where $\lambda := DP^{d_L \delta - (k+2)}$. Note that this bound is no better than the trivial estimate unless $\lambda < 1$. Therefore, we shall require that $\eta < 1/(d_L + 1)$. With this assumption, we obtain that for $k \geq d_L - 1$, for sufficiently large N and sufficiently small $\varepsilon > 0$, both of the inequalities $k+2 > d_L \delta$ and $\lambda < 1$ hold, since by (2.1), (2.3) and (2.4) we have

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda = DP^{d_L \delta - (k+2)} &= \frac{h(\mathfrak{N}(\mathfrak{a}\mathfrak{d}))^\delta}{(N/(\mathfrak{N}\mathfrak{a}\mathfrak{d}))^{(k+2-d_L \delta)/d_L}} \ll \frac{HN^\delta}{(N/v)^{(k+2)/d_L}} \\ &\ll N^{1+\frac{k+2}{d_L}(\eta+\delta-2)+\varepsilon}. \end{aligned}$$

We derive as before that the contribution from the boxes B for which $f(B \cap \mathbb{Z}^{d_L}) \neq 0$ and $\mathbf{x}_0 + BM \subseteq R$ is

$$\ll P^{d_L} \left(\lambda^{1/(2^{k+2}-2)} + Y^{-1/2^{k+1}} + Y^{-1/2^{k-1}+1/2^{2k}} \lambda^{-1/2^{k+1}} \right),$$

while that from the rest of the boxes B is $O(YP^{d_L-1})$. Combining these estimates yields the bound $S_{\mathfrak{R}} \ll P^{d_L} (\lambda^{1/(2^{k+2}-2)} + G(Y))$, where

$$G(Y) = Y^{-1/2^{k+1}} + Y^{-1/2^{k-1}+1/2^{2k}} \lambda^{-1/2^{k+1}} + YP^{-1}.$$

Using [4, Lemma 2.4] it follows that for some $Y \in [1, C_2 P]$,

$$\begin{aligned} G(Y) &\ll P^{-1/(1+2^{k+1})} + \left(P^{-1/2^{k-1}+1/2^{2k}} \lambda^{-1/2^{k+1}} \right)^{1/(1+1/2^{k-1}-1/2^{2k})} \\ &\quad + P^{-1} + P^{-1/2^{k+1}} + \lambda^{-1/2^{k+1}} P^{-1/2^{k-1}+1/2^{2k}} \\ &\ll P^{-1/(1+2^{k+1})} + \left(P^{-1/2^{k-1}+1/2^{2k}} \lambda^{-1/2^{k+1}} \right)^{1/(1+1/2^{k-1}-1/2^{2k})}. \end{aligned}$$

Note that in order to have $P^{-1/2^{k-1}+1/2^{2k}} \lambda^{-1/2^{k+1}} < 1$ one needs that $k < d_L + 2$, which can be seen using (2.1), (2.3), (2.4), (2.6) and that $\eta < 1/(d_L + 1)$. Using equation (2.6), the fact that $\lambda = DP^{d_L \delta - (k+2)}$ and partial summation we derive that the sum

$$(\log N)^{-1} \sum_{\substack{\mathfrak{c} \\ N/\mathfrak{N}\mathfrak{d} < \mathfrak{N}\mathfrak{c} \leq N'/\mathfrak{N}\mathfrak{d}}} \chi(\mathfrak{c}) e(h(\mathfrak{N}\mathfrak{c}\mathfrak{d})^\delta) \log \mathfrak{N}\mathfrak{c}$$

is

$$\begin{aligned} &\ll h^{1/(2^{k+2}-2)} \mathfrak{N}(\mathfrak{d})^{\frac{k+2}{d_L(2^{k+2}-2)}-1} N^{1+\frac{d_L\delta-(k+2)}{d_L(2^{k+2}-2)}} \\ &+ N^{1+\frac{1+2^{k-1}(k-2-d_L\delta)}{d_L(2^{2k}+2^{k+1}-1)}} (\mathfrak{N}\mathfrak{d})^{-\frac{1+2^{k-1}(k-2)}{d_L(2^{2k}+2^{k+1}-1)}-1} h^{-\frac{1}{2^{k+1}+4-2^{1-k}}} \\ &+ (N/\mathfrak{N}\mathfrak{d})^{1-\frac{1}{d_L(1+2^{k+1})}}. \end{aligned}$$

Summing over ideals \mathfrak{d} with $\mathfrak{N}\mathfrak{d} \leq v$, and then over $h \leq H$ we see that $(\log N)^{-1} \sum_{h \leq H} |S_2|$ is

$$\begin{aligned} &\ll H^{1+1/(2^{k+2}-2)} v^{\frac{k+2}{d_L(2^{k+2}-2)}} N^{1+\frac{d_L\delta-(k+2)}{d_L(2^{k+2}-2)}} + H N^{1-\frac{1}{d_L(1+2^{k+1})}} v^{\frac{1}{d_L(1+2^{k+1})}} \\ &+ N^{1+\frac{1+2^{k-1}(k-2-d_L\delta)}{d_L(2^{2k}+2^{k+1}-1)}} H^{1-\frac{1}{2^{k+1}+4-2^{1-k}}} \\ &\ll N^{1+q_1(k)+2\varepsilon} + N^{1+q_2(k)+\varepsilon} + N^{1+q_3(k)+\varepsilon} \end{aligned}$$

where, assuming (2.5), it follows that the exponents $q_i(k)$ satisfy

$$\begin{aligned} q_1(k) &= (1-\delta) \left(1 + \frac{1}{2^{k+2}-2} \right) + (\delta-1+\eta) \frac{k+2}{d_L(2^{k+2}-2)} \\ &\quad + \frac{d_L\delta-(k+2)}{d_L(2^{k+2}-2)} \\ &< \frac{1}{d_L(2^{k+2}-2)} \left(\frac{\eta}{3} (d_L(2^{k+2}-2) + 2k+4) + d_L - k - 2 \right), \\ q_2(k) &= 1 - \delta - \frac{1}{d_L(1+2^{k+1})} + (\delta-1+\eta) \frac{1}{d_L(1+2^{k+1})} \\ &< \frac{1}{d_L(1+2^{k+1})} \left(\frac{\eta}{3} (d_L(1+2^{k+1}) + 2) - 1 \right), \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} q_3(k) &= \frac{1+2^{k-1}(k-2-d_L\delta)}{d_L(2^{2k}+2^{k+1}-1)} + (1-\delta) \left(1 - \frac{1}{2^{k+1}+4-2^{1-k}} \right) \\ &< \frac{1+2^{k-1}(k-2-d_L)}{d_L(2^{2k}+2^{k+1}-1)} + \frac{\eta}{3}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, for sufficiently small ε , the estimate

$$\sum_h |S_2| \ll N \exp(-D|\Delta_K|^{-1/2} \sqrt{\log N})$$

holds provided that for $1 \leq d_L - 1 \leq k \leq d_L + 1$,

$$(2.12) \quad \frac{\eta}{3} = \min \left(\frac{1}{3(d_L+1)+\varepsilon}, \frac{k+2-d_L}{d_L(2^{k+2}-2)+2k+4}, \frac{1}{d_L(1+2^{k+1})+2}, \frac{2^{k-1}(d_L+2-k)-1}{d_L(2^{2k}+2^{k+1}-1)} \right).$$

2.6. Conclusion of Theorem 2. Upon comparing (2.11) and (2.12) we conclude that for $2 \leq d_L < 11$, the maximum value for $\eta/3$ (hence the widest range for δ) is obtained via Van Der Corput's Method when $k = d_L - 1$ is substituted into the function

$$\frac{k + 2 - d_L}{d_L(2^{k+2} - 2) + 2k + 4},$$

while for $d_L \geq 11$ one needs to use Vinogradov's method; in this case, we obtain

$$\frac{\eta}{3} = \frac{1}{6(d_L + 1)d_L^2 \log(125d_L)}.$$

With the above choice of η , the claimed range for c in Theorem 2 follows easily from (2.4).

Remark 12. To estimate S_2 , one may also use [14, Lemma 6.12] for $d_L \geq 7$, but the result is worse than what we have already obtained.

2.7. Derivative of the Norm Function. In this section we prove some auxiliary Lemmas used in the estimate of S_2 .

Lemma 13. *Let $V \in GL(d_L, \mathbb{R})$, $\mathbf{n} \in \mathbb{Z}^{d_L}$ and $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{R}^{d_L}$. Put*

$$(2.13) \quad g_V(\mathbf{x}) = |\Re(\mathbf{x}_0 + \mathbf{x}VM)|^\delta, \quad \tilde{g}_{\mathbf{u}}(t) = |\Re(\mathbf{x}_0 + \mathbf{n}M + t\mathbf{u}M)|^\delta.$$

Then, for any $k \geq 1$,

$$(2.14) \quad \left. \frac{\partial^k g_V}{\partial x_1^k} \right|_{\mathbf{x}=\mathbf{n}V^{-1}} = \frac{d^k}{dt^k} \tilde{g}_{V_1}(0) \\ = \sum_{\substack{i_1, \dots, i_k \\ 1 \leq i_j \leq d_L}} \dots \sum D_{i_1} \dots D_{i_k} F(\mathbf{x}_0 + \mathbf{n}M) v_{i_1} \dots v_{i_k}$$

where $F(z_1, \dots, z_{d_L}) = \prod_{i=1}^{d_L} z_i^\delta$, $D_i = \frac{\partial}{\partial z_i}$, v_i is the i th component of the vector $V_1 M$ and V_1 is the first row of V .

Proof. The result easily follows by induction and chain rule for derivatives. \square

Lemma 14. *Given $\mathbf{a} \in \mathbf{R}$, there exists $\mathbf{v} = \mathbf{v}(\mathbf{a}) \in \mathbb{R}^{d_L}$ and a positive constant $\tilde{c}_1 = \tilde{c}_1(k, d_L, \Delta_L)$ such that for any $k \geq 1$,*

$$\left| \frac{d^k}{dt^k} \tilde{g}(0) \right| \geq \tilde{c}_1 P^{\delta d_L - k}$$

where $\tilde{g}(t) = |\Re(\mathbf{a} + t\mathbf{v}M)|^\delta$.

Proof. Assume first that L has no real embeddings and that the first two coordinates in $L_{\mathbb{R}}$ correspond to conjugate embeddings. Write $\mathbf{a} = (a_1, a_2, \dots, a_{d_L})$

and take $\mathbf{v}(\mathbf{a}) = \left(\frac{a_1}{|a_1|}, \frac{a_2}{|a_2|}, 0, \dots, 0\right)M^{-1}$. Note that $a_1 = \bar{a}_2$ since $\mathbf{a} \in L_{\mathbb{R}}$. Using Lemma 13 with $V_1 = \mathbf{v}$ and $\mathbf{x}_0 + \mathbf{n}M = \mathbf{a}$ we see that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d^k}{dt^k} \tilde{g}(0) &= \sum_{\substack{i_1, \dots, i_k \\ 1 \leq i_j \leq d_L}} D_{i_1} \dots D_{i_k} F(\mathbf{a}) v_{i_1} \dots v_{i_k} \\ &= \sum_{j=0}^k \frac{k!}{j!(k-j)!} D_1^j D_2^{k-j} F(\mathbf{a}) \left(\frac{a_1}{|a_1|}\right)^j \left(\frac{a_2}{|a_2|}\right)^{k-j} \\ &= \frac{k! F(\mathbf{a})}{|a_1|^k} \sum_j \binom{\delta}{j} \binom{\delta}{k-j} = \frac{k! F(\mathbf{a})}{|a_1|^k} \binom{2\delta}{k} \end{aligned}$$

where $\binom{\delta}{j}$ is the coefficient of x^j in the Taylor series expansion of $(1+x)^\delta$ and the last equality follows by writing $(1+x)^{2\delta} = (1+x)^\delta \cdot (1+x)^\delta$ in two ways as series and comparing the coefficients of x^k . Since $\mathbf{a} \in \mathbf{R}$, $c_1 P < |a_i| < c_2 P$ for each i . We thus obtain

$$\left| \frac{d^k}{dt^k} \tilde{g}(0) \right| \geq c_1^{\delta d_L} c_2^{-k} P^{\delta d_L - k} k! \left| \binom{2\delta}{k} \right|.$$

If L has at least one real embedding, take $\mathbf{v} = (1, 0, \dots, 0)M^{-1}$. In this case, Lemma 13 gives

$$\left| \frac{d^k}{dt^k} \tilde{g}(0) \right| = |\delta(\delta-1) \dots (\delta-k+1) F(\mathbf{a}) a_1^{-k}| \geq c_1^{\delta d_L} c_2^{-k} P^{\delta d_L - k} k! \left| \binom{\delta}{k} \right|.$$

Since $\delta \in (1/2, 1)$ and is fixed, we obtain the claimed lower bound. \square

Lemma 15. *Given $\mathbf{a} = \mathbf{x}_0 + \mathbf{n}M \in \mathbf{R}$ where $\mathbf{n} \in \mathbb{Z}^{d_L}$, there exists a matrix $U \in SL(d_L, \mathbb{Z})$ such that for any $k \geq 1$,*

$$\frac{\partial^k g_U(\mathbf{n}U^{-1})}{\partial x_1^k} \gg P^{\delta d_L - k}, \quad \frac{\partial \lambda_i(\mathbf{n}U^{-1})}{\partial x_1} \gg P^{-1} \quad (i = 1, \dots, r)$$

where g_U is given by (2.14) and the implied constants depend on d_L and Δ_L , with the first one also depending on k .

Proof. Using Lemma 14 we find a vector $\tilde{\mathbf{v}} = (\tilde{v}_1, \dots, \tilde{v}_{d_L}) \in \mathbb{R}^{d_L}$. Put $\mathbf{v} = \tilde{\mathbf{v}}M = (v_1, \dots, v_{d_L})$. Suppose that for some $Q > 0$, there exists $\tilde{\mathbf{u}} = (\tilde{u}_1, \dots, \tilde{u}_{d_L}) \in \mathbb{Z}^{d_L}$ such that $|\tilde{u}_i - Q\tilde{v}_i| < 1$. Put $\mathbf{u} = \tilde{\mathbf{u}}M$ and $\mathbf{w} = \mathbf{u} - Q\mathbf{v} =$

(w_1, \dots, w_{d_L}) . By Lemma 13 we see that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d^k}{dt^k} \tilde{g}_{\tilde{\mathbf{u}}}(0) &= \sum_{\substack{i_1, \dots, i_k \\ 1 \leq i_j \leq d_L}} D_{i_1} \dots D_{i_k} F(\mathbf{a}) \prod_{l=1}^k (Qv_{i_l} + w_{i_l}) \\ &= \sum_{\substack{i_1, \dots, i_k \\ 1 \leq i_j \leq d_L}} D_{i_1} \dots D_{i_k} F(\mathbf{a}) \left(Q^k v_{i_1} \dots v_{i_k} + \sum_{l=1}^k Q^{k-l} A_l(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{w}) \right) \\ &= Q^k \frac{d^k}{dt^k} \tilde{g}_{\tilde{\mathbf{v}}}(0) + \sum_{l=1}^k Q^{k-l} \sum_{\substack{i_1, \dots, i_k \\ 1 \leq i_j \leq d_L}} D_{i_1} \dots D_{i_k} F(\mathbf{a}) A_l(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{w}). \end{aligned}$$

Let's write $D_{i_1} \dots D_{i_k} F(\mathbf{a})$ by grouping the same indices as $D_{j_1}^{l_1} \dots D_{j_r}^{l_r} F(\mathbf{a})$ with j_i 's distinct and $\sum_i l_i = k$. Since $\mathbf{a} \in \mathbf{R}$, $c_1 P < |a_i| < c_2 P$ for each i . Thus, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |D_{j_1}^{l_1} \dots D_{j_r}^{l_r} F(\mathbf{a})| &= |F(\mathbf{a})| \prod_i \frac{|\delta(\delta-1) \dots (\delta-l_i+1)|}{|a_i|^{l_i}} \\ &\leq (c_2 P)^{\delta d_L} \prod_i \frac{|\delta(\delta-1) \dots (\delta-l_i+1)|}{(c_1 P)^{l_i}} \leq c_3 P^{\delta d_L - k} \end{aligned}$$

for some constant $c_3 = c_3(k, d_L, \Delta_L) > 0$. Owing to the way $\tilde{\mathbf{v}}$ is constructed in Lemma 14, each $|v_i| \leq 1$. Furthermore, each w_i is bounded only in terms of d_L and Δ_L . Therefore, there exists a constant $c_4 = c_4(k, d_L, \Delta_L)$ such that $|A_l(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{w})| \leq c_4$. We thus conclude from Lemma 14 that

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \frac{d^k}{dt^k} \tilde{g}_{\tilde{\mathbf{u}}}(0) \right| &\geq Q^k \left| \frac{d^k}{dt^k} \tilde{g}_{\tilde{\mathbf{v}}}(0) - \sum_{l=1}^k Q^{k-l} \sum_{\substack{i_1, \dots, i_k \\ 1 \leq i_j \leq d_L}} D_{i_1} \dots D_{i_k} F(\mathbf{a}) A_l(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{w}) \right| \\ &\geq P^{\delta d_L - k} (\tilde{C}_1 Q^k - C_{k-1} Q^{k-1} - \dots - C_1 Q - C_0) \end{aligned}$$

for some constants $C_i = C_i(k, d_L, \Delta_L) > 0$.

Next, let $G_U(\mathbf{x}) = \ell(\mathbf{x}_0 + \mathbf{x}UM)E^{-1}$. Note that $\lambda_i(\mathbf{x})$ is the i th coordinate of this function. Writing $\mathbf{a} = (a_1, \dots, a_{d_L})$ and $\mathbf{u} = (u_1, \dots, u_{d_L})$ we derive that

$$\frac{\partial G_U(\mathbf{x})}{\partial x_1} \Big|_{\mathbf{x}=\mathbf{n}U^{-1}} = \left(\operatorname{Re}\left(\frac{u_1}{a_1}\right), \dots, \operatorname{Re}\left(\frac{u_r}{a_r}\right) \right) E^{-1}$$

where $\operatorname{Re}(z)$ denotes the real part of z . Recalling that $u_i = Qv_i + w_i$ we conclude as before that

$$\left| \frac{\partial \lambda_i(\mathbf{n}U^{-1})}{\partial x_1} \right| \geq P^{-1}(\tilde{C}_1 Q - \tilde{C}_0)$$

for some positive constants \tilde{C}_1 and \tilde{C}_0 that depend only on d_L and Δ_L .

It follows that there exists a constant $Q_0 = Q_0(k, d_L, \Delta_L) > 0$ such that both polynomials in Q above are positive for $Q > Q_0$. If all the components of $\tilde{\mathbf{v}}$ are equal we fix some $Q > Q_0$ and let $\tilde{u}_1 = \lceil Q\tilde{v}_1 \rceil$ and $\tilde{u}_i = \lfloor Q\tilde{v}_i \rfloor$ (if any \tilde{u}_i turns out to be zero, we can instead choose all $\tilde{u}_i = 1$). Otherwise, find the first index i_0 such that $|\tilde{v}_{i_0}| = \max_i |\tilde{v}_i|$ and choose $Q = (p - 1/2)/|\tilde{v}_{i_0}|$, where p is the smallest prime $> Q_0|\tilde{v}_{i_0}|$. Choose $\tilde{u}_{i_0} = \pm p$ depending on the sign of \tilde{v}_{i_0} , and the rest of the \tilde{u}_j 's as either the ceiling or the floor of $Q\tilde{v}_j$ so that $0 < |\tilde{u}_j| < |\tilde{u}_{i_0}| = p$ for $j \neq i_0$. In either case, we can find a vector $\tilde{\mathbf{u}} \in \mathbb{Z}^{d_L}$ that satisfies $|\tilde{u}_i - Q\tilde{v}_i| < 1$ and that $\gcd(\tilde{u}_1, \dots, \tilde{u}_{d_L}) = 1$. It follows from [11, Corollary II.1] that $\tilde{\mathbf{u}}$ then can be completed to a matrix $U \in SL(d_L, \mathbb{Z})$ with $\tilde{\mathbf{u}}$ as the first row. Thus, the claimed lower bound follows by noting that

$$\frac{\partial^k g_U(\mathbf{n}U^{-1})}{\partial x_1^k} = \frac{d^k}{dt^k} \tilde{g}_{\tilde{\mathbf{u}}}(0) \gg P^{\delta d_L - k}.$$

□

Suppose now that $\mathbf{x}_0 + \mathbf{n}M \in P\Gamma_0$ for some $\mathbf{n} \in B \cap \mathbb{Z}^{d_L}$. It follows from Lemma 15 with $\mathbf{a} = \mathbf{x}_0 + \mathbf{n}M$ that there exists a matrix U such that the inequality

$$\left| \frac{\partial^k}{\partial x_1^k} g_U(\mathbf{x}) \right| \geq c_3 P^{\delta d_L - k}$$

holds for some positive constant $c_3 = c_3(k, d_L, \Delta_L)$ where $\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{n}U^{-1}$. If \mathbf{x}' is any other point in BU^{-1} it follows from the Mean Value Theorem for integrals, Lemma 13 and the fact that $\mathbf{x}_0 + BM \subseteq \mathbf{R}$ that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial^k}{\partial x_1^k} g_U(\mathbf{x}) - \frac{\partial^k}{\partial x_1^k} g_U(\mathbf{x}') &= \int_0^1 \frac{d}{dt} \left(\frac{\partial^k}{\partial x_1^k} g_U(t\mathbf{x} + (1-t)\mathbf{x}') \right) dt \\ &\ll Y P^{\delta d_L - k - 1} \end{aligned}$$

where the implied constant, say c_4 , depends on k , d_L , and Δ_L . In particular, it does not depend on the choice of $\mathbf{x}' \in BU^{-1}$. Thus, for any point $\mathbf{x}' \in BU^{-1}$, the lower bound

$$\left| \frac{\partial^k}{\partial x_1^k} g_U(\mathbf{x}') \right| \geq \frac{c_3}{2} P^{\delta d_L - k}$$

holds provided that $1 \leq Y \leq c_3 P / (2c_4)$. This condition imposes a further restriction on N ; namely, that $N^{2-\delta-\eta} \geq \mathfrak{N}\mathfrak{a}(2c_4/c_3)^{d_L}$. Assuming $\eta < 1/d_L$ and that $\mathfrak{N}\mathfrak{a}$ is bounded (follows from Lemma 7), it follows that for sufficiently large N , and all $\mathbf{x}' \in BU^{-1}$,

$$\frac{\partial^k}{\partial x_1^k} g_U(\mathbf{x}') \asymp P^{\delta d_L - k}$$

where the implied constants depend only on k , d_L and Δ_L provided $1 \leq Y \ll P$. Using the same argument we can also show that λ_i 's are monotonic in the first variable on BU^{-1} .

3. PROOF OF THEOREM 1

By the definition of the conductor (cf. [10, Ch. VI - 6.3 and 6.4]), K^f/K is the smallest ray class field containing the abelian extension K/\mathbb{Q} . Furthermore, every ray class field over \mathbb{Q} corresponds to a cyclotomic extension. In particular, it follows from [10, Proposition 6.7] that there is an integer q such that $f = (q)$ and K^f is the q th cyclotomic extension of \mathbb{Q} .

Fix $\sigma_0 \in G$ and put $A_0 = \{\sigma \in \text{Gal}(L/\mathbb{Q}) : \sigma|_K = \sigma_0\}$, where $\sigma|_K$ is the restriction of σ to K . Then, it follows from [6, Ch. 3, Property 2.4] that the set $\pi(K, \{\sigma_0\})$ is the *disjoint* union of the sets $\pi(L, \{\sigma\})$ for $\sigma \in A_0$. Therefore, we conclude that

$$\pi_c(K, \{\sigma_0\}, x) = \sum_{\sigma \in A_0} \pi_c(L, \{\sigma\}, x).$$

Since each $\sigma \in A_0$ corresponds to some $a_\sigma \in (\mathbb{Z}/q\mathbb{Z})^*$, we have $\pi_c(L, \{\sigma\}, x) = \pi_c(x; q, a_\sigma)$, where the latter counts the Piatetski-Shapiro primes not exceeding x that are congruent to a_σ modulo q .

By [9, Corollary 11.21] there exists an absolute constant $D > 0$ and a constant $x_0(f)$ such that for $x \geq x_0(f)$, we have

$$\sum_{\substack{p \leq x \\ p \equiv a_\sigma \pmod{q}}} ((p+1)^\delta - p^\delta) = \frac{\delta}{\varphi(q)} \text{li}(x^\delta) + O(x^\delta \exp(-D\sqrt{\log x}))$$

where the implied constant is absolute. Furthermore, as in the proof of Theorem 2, choosing $H = N^{1-\delta+\varepsilon}$ we derive that the difference

$$\pi_c(x; q, a_\sigma) - \sum_{\substack{p \leq x \\ p \equiv a_\sigma \pmod{q}}} ((p+1)^\delta - p^\delta)$$

is

$$\ll \sum_{\substack{1 \leq N < x \\ N=2^k}} N^{\delta-1} \sum_{h \leq H} \max_{N' \in (N, N_1]} \left| \sum_{\substack{N < n \leq N' \\ n \equiv a_\sigma \pmod{q}}} e(hn^\delta) \Lambda(n) \right| + x^\delta \exp(-D\sqrt{\log x})$$

where D is the same constant above. Thus, to finish the proof it suffices to show that for any $N' \in (N, N_1]$,

$$\sum_{h \leq H} \left| \sum_{\substack{N < n \leq N' \\ n \equiv a_\sigma \pmod{q}}} e(hn^\delta) \Lambda(n) \right| \ll N \exp(-D\sqrt{\log N}).$$

Using Vaughan's identity (see, e.g., [5, Proposition 13.4]) and assuming that $v = u < N$ we obtain

$$\sum_{\substack{N < n \leq N' \\ n \equiv a_\sigma \pmod{q}}} e(hn^\delta) \Lambda(n) = S_1 + S_2 + S_3$$

where

$$S_1 = - \sum_{\substack{N < n \leq N' \\ n \equiv a_\sigma \pmod{q}}} e(hn^\delta) \sum_{\substack{n=cd \\ c, d > v}} \Lambda(c) \sum_{\substack{d=ab \\ b \leq v}} \mu(b),$$

$$S_2 = \sum_{\substack{N < n \leq N' \\ n \equiv a_\sigma \pmod{q}}} e(hn^\delta) \sum_{\substack{n=ab \\ b \leq v}} \mu(b) \log a,$$

and

$$S_3 = - \sum_{\substack{N < n \leq N' \\ n \equiv a_\sigma \pmod{q}}} e(hn^\delta) \sum_{\substack{n=abc \\ b, c \leq v}} \mu(b) \Lambda(c).$$

Using Dirichlet characters χ modulo q we obtain

$$S_1 = - \frac{1}{\varphi(q)} \sum_{\chi \pmod{q}} \overline{\chi(a_\sigma)} \sum_{\substack{N < cd \leq N' \\ c, d > v}} \chi(d) \left(\sum_{\substack{d=ab \\ b \leq v}} \mu(b) \right) \chi(c) \Lambda(c) e(h(cd)^\delta),$$

where φ is Euler's totient function. By [4, Lemma 4.13] we conclude as in the non-abelian case that

$$N^{-4\varepsilon/3} \sum_h |S_1| \ll N^{2-1/12-\delta} + N^{2-\delta} v^{-1/2}.$$

For S_2 , we use additive characters modulo q to obtain

$$S_2 = \frac{1}{q} \sum_{k=0}^{q-1} e(-ka_\sigma/q) \sum_{\substack{b \leq v \\ N/b < a \leq N'/b}} \mu(b) \sum_a e(f(a)) \log a,$$

where $f(x) = hb^\delta x^\delta + kbx/q$. Since $|f''(x)| \asymp hb^2 N^{\delta-2}$ for $N/b < x \leq N'/b$ we conclude from [4, Theorem 2.2] that

$$\sum_{\substack{a \\ N/b < a \leq N'/b}} e(h(ab)^\delta + kab/q) \ll N^{\delta/2} h^{1/2} + h^{-1/2} b^{-1} N^{1-\delta/2}.$$

Using partial summation and then summing over $b \leq v$ followed by $h \leq H$ we obtain

$$\sum_h |S_2| \ll \left(N^{\delta/2} H^{3/2} v + H^{1/2} N^{1-\delta/2} \right) \log^2 N \ll N^{3/2-\delta+2\varepsilon} v.$$

Write S_3 as $-S_4 - S_5$, where

$$S_4 = \sum_{d \leq v} \sum_{d=bc} \mu(b) \Lambda(c) \sum_{\substack{N/d < a \leq N'/d \\ ad \equiv a_\sigma \pmod{q}}} e(h(ad)^\delta) \\ \ll \log N \sum_{d \leq v} \left| \sum_{\substack{N/d < a \leq N'/d \\ ad \equiv a_\sigma \pmod{q}}} e(h(ad)^\delta) \right|,$$

and

$$S_5 = \sum_{\substack{N < ad \leq N' \\ ad \equiv a_\sigma \pmod{q} \\ u < d \leq v^2}} e(h(ad)^\delta) \sum_{\substack{d=bc \\ b, c \leq v}} \mu(b) \Lambda(c).$$

Applying [4, Lemma 4.13] once again we conclude as we did for S_1 above that

$$N^{-4\epsilon/3} \sum_h |S_5| \ll N^{2-\delta-1/12} + N^{2-\delta} v^{-1/2} + N^{3/2-\delta} v.$$

Finally, we note that S_4 can be handled exactly the same way as S_2 . Choosing $v = N^{\delta-1/2-3\epsilon}$ with a sufficiently small ϵ and combining all the estimates obtained above we see that

$$\sum_{h \leq H} \left| \sum_{\substack{N < n \leq N' \\ n \equiv a_\sigma \pmod{q}}} e(hn^\delta) \Lambda(n) \right| \ll N \exp(-D\sqrt{\log N}),$$

as desired, provided that $c \in (1, 12/11)$.

The proof of Theorem 1 is thus completed by noting that the number of elements in A_0 equals $|Gal(L/K)| = \varphi(q) |\Delta_K|^{-1}$.

Acknowledgements. We are much obliged to Professor Roger Heath-Brown for his invaluable suggestions and comments on this work. We also thank the referee for carefully reading the manuscript and making helpful suggestions. This work was partially supported by TÜBİTAK grant 112T180.

REFERENCES

- [1] R. C. Baker; W. D. Banks; J. Brüdern; I. E. Shparlinski; A. J. Weingartner. *Piatetski-Shapiro Sequences*, Acta Arith. 157 (2013), no. 1, 37-68. 1730-6264
- [2] K. M. Bartz. *On a theorem of A. V. Sokolovskiĭ*, Acta Arith, 34 (1977/78), no. 2, 113 - 126.
- [3] D. A. Cox. *Primes of the form $x^2 + ny^2$* . Fermat, class field theory and complex multiplication. A Wiley-Interscience Publication. John Wiley

- & Sons, Inc., New York, 1989. xiv+351 pp. ISBN: 0-471-50654-0; 0-471-19079-9
- [4] S. W. Graham; G. Kolesnik, *van der Corput's method of exponential sums*, London Mathematical Society Lecture Note Series, 126. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1991. vi+120 pp. ISBN: 0-521-33927-8
 - [5] H. Iwaniec; E. Kowalski, *Analytic number theory*. American Mathematical Society Colloquium Publications, 53. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2004. xii+615 pp. ISBN: 0-8218-3633-1
 - [6] G. J. Janusz. *Algebraic number fields*, Pure and Applied Mathematics, Vol. 55. Academic Press [A Subsidiary of Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Publishers], New York-London, 1973. x+220 pp.
 - [7] J. C. Lagarias; A. M. Odlyzko. *Effective versions of the Chebotarev density theorem*, Algebraic number fields: L-functions and Galois properties (Proc. Sympos., Univ. Durham, Durham, 1975), pp. 409-464. Academic Press, London, 1977.
 - [8] D. Leitmann; D. Wolke, *Primzahlen der Gestalt $[n^\Gamma]$ in arithmetischen Progressionen*. (German) Arch.Math. (Basel), 25 (1974), 492 - 494.
 - [9] H. L. Montgomery; R. C. Vaughan, *Multiplicative number theory. I. Classical theory.*, Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics, 97. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2007. xviii+552 pp. ISBN: 978-0-521-84903-6; 0-521-84903-9
 - [10] J. Neukirch, *Algebraic number theory*, Translated from the 1992 German original and with a note by Norbert Schappacher. With a foreword by G. Harder. Grundlehren der Mathematischen Wissenschaften [Fundamental Principles of Mathematical Sciences], 322. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1999. xviii +571 pp.
 - [11] M. Newman, *Integral Matrices*, Pure and Applied Mathematics, Vol. 45. Academic Press, New York-London, 1972. xvii+224 pp.
 - [12] I. I. Piatetski-Shapiro, *On the distribution of prime numbers in sequences of the form $[f(n)]$* , (Russian) Mat. Sbornik N.S. 33 (75), (1953). 559 - 566.
 - [13] J. Rivat; P. Sargos, *Nombres premiers de la forme $[n^c]$* , Canad. J. Math, 53 (2001), no. 2, 414-433.
 - [14] E. C. Titchmarsh, *The theory of the Riemann zeta-function*, Second edition. Edited and with a preface by D. R. Heath-Brown. The Clarendon Press, Oxford University Press, New York, 1986. x+412 pp.

- [15] I. M. Vinogradov, *The method of trigonometrical sums in the theory of numbers*. Translated from the Russian, revised and annotated by K. F. Roth and Anne Davenport. Reprint of the 1954 translation. Dover Publications, Inc., Mineola, NY, 2004. x+180 pp. ISBN: 0-486-43878-3

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, BILKENT UNIVERSITY, 06800 BILKENT, ANKARA, TURKEY

E-mail address: yildirim.akbal@bilkent.edu.tr

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, BILKENT UNIVERSITY, 06800 BILKENT, ANKARA, TURKEY

E-mail address: guloglua@fen.bilkent.edu.tr