

Constellations in prime elements of number fields

Wataru Kai, Masato Mimura, Akihiro Munemasa,
Shin-ichiro Seki, Kiyoto Yoshino



Abstract

Given *any* number field, we prove that there exist arbitrarily shaped constellations consisting of pairwise non-associate prime elements of the ring of integers. This result extends the celebrated Green–Tao theorem on arithmetic progressions of rational primes and Tao’s theorem on constellations of Gaussian primes. Furthermore, we prove a constellation theorem on prime representations of binary quadratic forms with integer coefficients. More precisely, for a non-degenerate primitive binary quadratic form F which is not negative definite, there exist arbitrarily shaped constellations consisting of pairs of integers (x, y) for which $F(x, y)$ is a rational prime. The latter theorem is obtained by extending the framework from the ring of integers to the pair of an order and its invertible fractional ideal.

1 Introduction

The following theorem of Green and Tao is a monumental work in additive number theory.

Theorem 1.1 (The Green–Tao theorem [GT08]). *There exist arithmetic progressions of primes of arbitrary length.*

In order to consider multidimensional generalizations of this result, we introduce a terminology of *constellations*. For a finite subset S of a \mathbb{Z} -module \mathcal{Z} (we will consider only a free module of finite rank), we call a set of the form $\alpha + kS := \{\alpha + ks : s \in S\}$ a *constellation with the shape S* . Here, α is an element of \mathcal{Z} and k is a positive integer. In this paper,

2020 *Mathematics Subject Classification*. Primary 11B30; Secondary 11B25, 11H55, 11N05, 11R04, 05C55.

Key words and phrases. the Green–Tao theorem; the relative Szemerédi theorem; binary quadratic forms

we abbreviate it as an *S*-constellation; it is also known as a *homothetic copy* of *S*. In the literature, some authors allow k to be a negative integer. When a subset A of \mathcal{Z} contains an *S*-constellation for any finite subset S of \mathcal{Z} , we say that “there exist constellations of arbitrary shape in \mathcal{Z} consisting of elements of A ” or “the constellation theorem holds for A .” Note that for a subset $A \subseteq \mathbb{Z}$, the existence of arithmetic progressions of arbitrary length is equivalent to that of constellations of arbitrary shape.

As the Gaussian counterpart of the Green–Tao theorem, Tao established the following.

Theorem 1.2 (Constellation theorem in the Gaussian primes [Tao06]). *There exist constellations of arbitrary shape in the ring of Gaussian integers $\mathbb{Z}[\sqrt{-1}]$ consisting of Gaussian primes.*

In the same paper, Tao [Tao06, 12 Discussion] conjectured that Theorem 1.1 could be extended in the following two ways.

- (1) Extension to other number fields (= the constellation theorem in the prime elements of an arbitrary number field).
- (2) Extension to a relatively dense subset A of the direct product \mathcal{P}^n of the set of primes (= the multidimensional Szemerédi theorem holds in the primes). More precisely, there exist constellations of arbitrary shape in \mathbb{Z}^n consisting of elements of A .

Recently, the second conjecture has been settled independently by three research groups, Tao–Ziegler [TZ15], Fox–Zhao [FZ15] and Cook–Magyar–Titichetrakun [CMT18].

In this paper, we resolve the first conjecture in the affirmative. The main theorem in this paper is stated in its simplest form as follows; various refined statements will be introduced in Section 2. We denote by \mathcal{O}_K the ring of integers of a number field K .

Theorem 1.3 (Constellation theorem in the prime elements of a number field). *Let K be a number field. Then there exist constellations of arbitrary shape in \mathcal{O}_K consisting of prime elements of \mathcal{O}_K .*

In the above theorem, the statement for the case of $K = \mathbb{Q}$ is equivalent to the Green–Tao theorem (Theorem 1.1); that for the case of $K = \mathbb{Q}(\sqrt{-1})$ is exactly the constellation theorem in the Gaussian primes (Theorem 1.2). The definitions and facts on number fields that appear in this section are summarized in Section 3.

Tao remarks in [Tao06, 12 Discussion] that his method of proving Theorem 1.2 is likely to extend to K at least if the class number of K is 1 and the unit group \mathcal{O}_K^\times is finite. There exist only nine such number fields other than \mathbb{Q} and all of them are imaginary quadratic by Dirichlet’s unit theorem and the Baker–Heegner–Stark theorem; see for instance, [Sta67]. For a general number field, the class number may be strictly greater than 1 or the unit group may be infinite. Both of these two cause problems for formulating an appropriate statement of generalizations of Theorem 1.2.

If the class number is greater than 1, then not all irreducible elements are prime elements. As already mentioned in Theorem 1.3, the prime elements suffice to guarantee the existence

of constellations of arbitrary shape. The unit group acts on the set of prime elements by multiplication. In Corollary 1.5, we strengthen Theorem 1.3 by showing the existence of constellations consisting of primes from distinct orbits. The original method of Tao [Tao06] does not extend to the proof of Theorem 1.3 in a straightforward manner due to the above two obstacles.

We will describe the difficulties in the latter part of this introduction.

In this paper, for a number field K , we denote by \mathcal{P}_K the set of all prime elements of the ring of integers \mathcal{O}_K . We employ some concepts in order to extend conjecture (1) to a ‘Szemerédi-type’ theorem and to refine the statement in the case that the unit group is infinite. For an integral basis ω of K , we denote by $\|\cdot\|_{\infty,\omega}: \mathcal{O}_K \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ the ℓ_∞ -length with respect to the basis ω ; see Definition 2.2. For a non-empty set $X \subseteq \mathcal{O}_K$ and its subset $A \subseteq X$, we define the *relative upper asymptotic density measured by the ℓ_∞ -length $\|\cdot\|_{\infty,\omega}$* of A in X by

$$\bar{d}_{X,\omega}(A) := \limsup_{M \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\#(A \cap \mathcal{O}_K(\omega, M))}{\#(X \cap \mathcal{O}_K(\omega, M))},$$

where $\mathcal{O}_K(\omega, M) := \{\alpha \in \mathcal{O}_K : \|\alpha\|_{\infty,\omega} \leq M\}$. We say that two elements of $\mathcal{O}_K \setminus \{0\}$ are *associate* if they lie in the same orbit for the action $\mathcal{O}_K^\times \curvearrowright \mathcal{O}_K \setminus \{0\}$ by multiplication. We call a two-point subset $\{\alpha, \beta\}$ of $\mathcal{O}_K \setminus \{0\}$ an *associate pair* if α and β are associate. The following theorem is a strengthening of Theorem 1.3.

Theorem 1.4 (Szemerédi-type theorem in the prime elements of a number field). *Let K be a number field and ω an integral basis of K . Assume that a subset A of \mathcal{P}_K has a positive relative upper asymptotic density measured by $\|\cdot\|_{\infty,\omega}$ in \mathcal{P}_K , namely, $\bar{d}_{\mathcal{P}_K,\omega}(A) > 0$. Then there exist constellations of arbitrary shape in \mathcal{O}_K consisting only of elements of A without associate pairs.*

In Subsection 2.1, we state Theorem A, which may be seen as a version of Theorem 1.4 in a finitary setting. Theorem A is the first main theorem of the present paper. As a corollary to Theorem 1.4, we obtain the following.

Corollary 1.5. *In the statement of Theorem 1.3, we can take constellations that do not admit associate pairs.*

If the unit group is finite, then we see that Theorem 1.3 and Corollary 1.5 are equivalent in a simple argument using the pigeonhole principle. On the other hand, if the unit group is infinite, then Corollary 1.5 seems stronger than Theorem 1.3. Although Corollary 1.5 is derived immediately from Theorem 1.4, we prove it prior to Theorem 1.4. More precisely, we prove Corollary 1.5 by using Theorem 2.8 and the existence of a ‘good’ fundamental domain (Section 4); see Subsection 7.5.

Next, we briefly discuss the technical problems of the proofs in the case of general number fields. Recall that the class number of K can be greater than 1, in which case prime element factorization in \mathcal{O}_K fails. From this viewpoint, it may be said that prime elements are ‘few.’ One of the key steps to the proofs of Theorem 1.1 and Theorem 1.2 is to prove *Goldston–Yıldırım type asymptotic formulas*; these are used to confirm the hypotheses of a relative

version of the multidimensional Szemerédi theorem. Since the proofs of Goldston–Yıldırım type asymptotic formulas involve the existence and uniqueness of factorizations, it is a non-trivial problem to extend the proof to the case where the class number of K is not 1. In the work of Green–Tao and Tao, they consider some variants of the von Mangoldt function to obtain Goldston–Yıldırım type asymptotic formulas. However, if the unit group \mathcal{O}_K^\times is infinite, naive generalizations of their variants do *not* make any sense; in their summations, an element would be summed for infinitely many times.

To address the two difficulties above, we switch the framework from that of elements in \mathcal{O}_K to that of *ideals*. This is the standard approach in algebraic number theory since Dedekind. It also enables us to treat our problems of all number fields *in a unified manner*.

The role of the prime number theorem in the case of \mathbb{Z} is played by the *Chebotarev density theorem*; it asserts that principal prime ideals account for a certain proportion in prime ideals. From this viewpoint, the prime elements are ‘not too few.’ If we take a fundamental domain for $\mathcal{O}_K^\times \curvearrowright \mathcal{O}_K \setminus \{0\}$, then each prime element in this domain exactly corresponds to each (non-zero) principal prime ideal. We need to count prime elements with respect to ℓ_∞ -length, while prime ideals are counted with respect to (ideal) norms. To connect these two scales, we introduce the notion of *norm-length compatibility* (*NL-compatibility* for short) of fundamental domains; We will have a desired estimate of numbers of prime elements measured by ℓ_∞ -length in an NL-compatible fundamental domain. Then the *relative multidimensional Szemerédi theorem* applies, and we establish our constellation theorem for this domain. Next, we prove Theorem 1.4, whose statement does not involve fundamental domains. For the proof, we will establish a certain *reduction theorem* of this case to the case with a fundamental domain; see Theorem 2.11. The reduction theorem is proved with the aid of the geometry of numbers.

On the full resolution of the conjecture (1) in Tao’s paper [Tao06], the main novel points are summarized as follows.

- [Pseudorandom part] We formulate the Goldston–Yıldırım type asymptotic formula (Theorem 6.2) by focusing on ideals of \mathcal{O}_K instead of elements of \mathcal{O}_K .
- [Counting part] We employ an NL-compatible fundamental domain for counting of prime elements. Then we reduce a general case to this setting.

In this manner, we can treat the case where the class number is greater than 1 or the unit group is infinite.

In the last part of this section, we describe an application to binary quadratic forms with integer coefficients, which is obtained as a corollary to refinements of our theorems for quadratic fields. We say that $F: \mathbb{Z}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ is a *primitive (binary) quadratic form* if it is of the form $F(x, y) = ax^2 + bxy + cy^2$, where a, b, c are integers with $\gcd(a, b, c) = 1$. A fundamental problem in number theory asks which primes, or -1 multiples of them, are represented by F . In this paper, motivated by this problem, we obtain a combinatorial theorem for pairs $(x, y) \in \mathbb{Z}^2$ satisfying $F(x, y) \in \mathcal{P}_\mathbb{Q}$. The detailed statement is presented as Theorem C in Subsection 2.1; the following theorem is a simplified version of it. The discriminant D_F of F is defined by $D_F := b^2 - 4ac$.

Theorem 1.6 (Constellation theorem on prime representations of binary quadratic forms). *Let $F: \mathbb{Z}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ be a primitive quadratic form. Assume that its discriminant D_F is not a perfect square and that F is not negative definite. Then, for a given finite set $S \subseteq \mathbb{Z}^2$, there exists an S -constellation \mathcal{S} in \mathbb{Z}^2 such that the function $F(x, y)$ takes distinct prime values on \mathcal{S} .*

The above condition on D_F is necessary. Indeed, if D_F is a perfect square, then $F(x, y)$ is not irreducible over \mathbb{Z} . If F is indefinite, the above theorem also implies the existence of an S -constellation on which $F(x, y)$ takes distinct negative prime values. In order to prove Theorem 1.6 for general coefficients (a, b, c) , we extend the framework of our constellation theorem. More precisely, we consider a pair $(\mathcal{O}, \mathfrak{c})$, where \mathcal{O} is an order in K and \mathfrak{c} is an invertible fractional ideal of \mathcal{O} . The original case is where \mathcal{O} and \mathfrak{c} both equal \mathcal{O}_K .

Acknowledgments

The authors are grateful to Seiichi Azuma, Toshiki Matsusaka, Kota Saito, Keiju Sono and Yuta Suzuki for discussions. Wataru Kai is supported in part by JSPS KAKENHI grant number JP18K13382. Masato Mimura is supported in part by JSPS KAKENHI grant number JP17H04822 and 21K03241. Akihiro Munemasa is supported in part by JSPS KAKENHI grant number JP20K03527. Shin-ichiro Seki is supported in part by JSPS KAKENHI grant number JP18J00151 and JP21K13762. Kiyoto Yoshino is supported by JSPS KAKENHI grant number JP21J14427.

Contents

1	Introduction	1
2	Precise statements of main theorems and the outline of the proofs	7
2.1	Main theorems	7
2.2	Constellations in prime elements inside a fundamental domain	11
2.3	The idea of proofs and the organization of this paper	13
3	Preliminaries on algebraic number theory	18
3.1	The ring of integers and its ideals	18
3.2	The unit group and ideal class group	20
3.3	p -Ideals	21
3.4	The Dedekind zeta function and density of ideals	23
3.5	Distribution of rational primes	25
4	Norm-length compatibility and geometry of numbers	26
4.1	Weighted multiplicative Minkowski embedding	26
4.2	Geometric characterization of NL-compatibility	27
4.3	Construction of the domain $\mathcal{D}_K(\epsilon, \sigma)$	30
4.4	Counting elements in \mathcal{O}_K^\times -orbits with respect to the ℓ_∞ -length	33

5	Relative multidimensional Szemerédi theorem	37
5.1	The statement of the relative multidimensional Szemerédi theorem	37
5.2	Relative hypergraph removal lemma	39
5.3	Construction of pseudorandom weighted hypergraphs	41
5.4	The proof of the relative multidimensional Szemerédi theorem	43
6	Goldston–Yıldırım type asymptotic formula	46
6.1	Von Mangoldt function and its variants	46
6.2	Statement of Goldston–Yıldırım type asymptotic formula	47
6.3	The expectation of the characteristic function	51
6.4	The expectation of the characteristic function for p -ideals	53
6.5	Estimate for the error by a change of domain of integration	55
6.6	Calculation of the main term	60
6.7	Goldston–Yıldırım type asymptotic formula for ideals	69
7	Construction of pseudorandom measures and estimates of weighted densities	73
7.1	Outline of the proof of Theorem A	74
7.2	Construction of the pseudorandom measure	75
7.3	Comparison between counts with the norm scale and with the ℓ_∞ -length scale	78
7.4	Estimates of weighted densities	81
7.5	Proof of Theorem 2.8	83
8	Szemerédi-type theorems in prime elements of number fields	86
8.1	Preliminaries to the axiomatized constellation theorems	86
8.2	Axiomatized constellation theorems of type 1	91
8.3	Counting prime elements from above	96
8.4	Reduction to the case of a fixed fundamental domain	98
9	Szemerédi-type theorems for short intervals	106
9.1	Statements of the theorems for short intervals	107
9.2	Strong form for the case $K = \mathbb{Q}$	109
9.3	Slide trick	111
9.4	Axiomatized constellation theorems for short intervals	112
9.5	Proofs of Theorems 9.16 and 9.17	116
9.6	Constellations consisting of elements whose norms are close	122
10	Constellations in ideals and quadratic forms	123
10.1	Strategy for the proof of Theorem 10.1	124
10.2	Preliminaries on invertible ideals of orders	126
10.3	Ideal norms of invertible fractional ideals	128
10.4	‘Prime elements’ in ideals and subpseudorandom condition	131
10.5	Counting elements by the Chebotarev density theorem	132
10.6	Proof of Theorem 10.5	137

10.7 Proof of Theorem 10.1	138
A Binary quadratic forms and quadratic fields	141
A.1 Definitions	141
A.2 The correspondence	143
A.3 Well-definedness of correspondence (1)	144
A.4 On well-definedness of correspondence (2)	145
A.5 End of the proof of Theorem A.5	146

2 Precise statements of main theorems and the outline of the proofs

In this section, we state three main theorems in the present paper. Theorem A is a finitary version of Theorem 1.4. Theorem B is a short interval version of Theorem A. Theorem C is a precise version of Theorem 1.6.

In Subsection 2.3, we give an overview of the proofs of our constellation theorems. This mainly follows the ingenious method of Green–Tao and Tao; we simplify some detail, which includes the use of a recent result of Conlon–Fox–Zhao. In our main argument, we construct a fundamental diagram among ‘five worlds’; see Subsection 2.3 for details.

2.1 Main theorems

In this subsection, we present the statements of our main theorems, Theorems A, B and C. First, we define the (*ideal*) *norm* of a non-zero element α of \mathcal{O}_K for a number field K ; see also Remark 3.6. As mentioned in Introduction, the ℓ_∞ -*length* of $\alpha \in \mathcal{O}_K$ is defined for a fixed integral basis $\boldsymbol{\omega}$ of K . Here we state the exact definitions of them. These are two distinct scales on \mathcal{O}_K used in this paper.

Definition 2.1 (Norm). Let K be a number field of degree n . For $\alpha \in \mathcal{O}_K \setminus \{0\}$, we define the *norm* $\mathbf{N}(\alpha)$ by

$$\mathbf{N}(\alpha) := \#(\mathcal{O}_K/\alpha\mathcal{O}_K) \quad (< +\infty).$$

For a non-negative real number L , we set

$$\mathcal{O}_K(L) := \{\alpha \in \mathcal{O}_K \setminus \{0\} : \mathbf{N}(\alpha) \leq L\}.$$

Definition 2.2 (ℓ_∞ -length). Let \mathcal{Z} be a free \mathbb{Z} -module of rank $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Let $\mathbf{v} = (v_1, v_2, \dots, v_n)$ be a \mathbb{Z} -basis of \mathcal{Z} . Then, we define the ℓ_∞ -length of $\alpha \in \mathcal{Z}$ for \mathbf{v} by

$$\|\alpha\|_{\infty, \mathbf{v}} := \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} |a_i|,$$

where $\alpha = \sum_{1 \leq i \leq n} a_i v_i$. For a non-negative real number M , we set

$$\mathcal{Z}(\mathbf{v}, M) := \{\alpha \in \mathcal{Z} : \|\alpha\|_{\infty, \mathbf{v}} \leq M\}.$$

As is well known, the ring of integers \mathcal{O}_K of a number field K of degree n is a free \mathbb{Z} -module of rank n . We use the symbol $\boldsymbol{\omega}$ for its integral basis in this paper. In particular, ℓ_∞ -length $\|\cdot\|_{\infty, \boldsymbol{\omega}}$ on \mathcal{O}_K and the set $\mathcal{O}_K(\boldsymbol{\omega}, M) \subseteq \mathcal{O}_K$ are defined by Definition 2.2. Furthermore, Definition 2.2 applies to the case where \mathcal{Z} is a non-zero ideal \mathfrak{a} of \mathcal{O}_K . For $\alpha \in \mathcal{O}_K \setminus \{0\}$, its norm $\mathbf{N}(\alpha)$ and its ℓ_∞ -length $\|\alpha\|_{\infty, \boldsymbol{\omega}}$ are both positive integers. Nevertheless, we allow the parameters L, M to be non-negative real numbers in the definitions of $\mathcal{O}_K(L)$ and $\mathcal{O}_K(\boldsymbol{\omega}, M)$ above. This is for avoiding inessential issues of integrality.

We introduce the notion of standard shapes; this is useful for estimates of the number of constellations in our main theorems.

Definition 2.3 (Standard shape, the number of S -constellations). Let \mathcal{Z} be a \mathbb{Z} -module and $S \subseteq \mathcal{Z}$ a finite set.

- (1) The set S is called a *standard shape* if the following hold: $0 \in S$, $S = -S$, and S generates \mathcal{Z} as a \mathbb{Z} -module.
- (2) Assume that $S \neq \emptyset$. For a finite subset $X \subseteq \mathcal{Z}$, $\mathcal{N}_S(X)$ denotes the number of distinct S -constellations in X .

Let \mathfrak{a} be a non-zero ideal of \mathcal{O}_K . Then, for $\alpha, \beta \in \mathfrak{a} \setminus \{0\}$ we say that they are *associate* if these elements lie in the same orbit of the action $\mathcal{O}_K^\times \curvearrowright \mathfrak{a} \setminus \{0\}$ by multiplication. For $A \subseteq \mathfrak{a} \setminus \{0\}$, we define an *associate pair* in A to be a two-point subset $\{\alpha, \beta\}$ of A consisting of associate elements. We have already defined this concept in Introduction in the case where $\mathfrak{a} = \mathcal{O}_K$. In this paper, we study the existence of constellations *without associate pairs*. Furthermore, if the shape S is standard, then we evaluate the number of S -constellations without associate pairs.

Definition 2.4. Let K be a number field and \mathfrak{a} a non-zero ideal of \mathcal{O}_K . Let S be a non-empty finite subset of \mathcal{O}_K . For a finite set $X \subseteq \mathfrak{a}$, $\mathcal{N}_S^\sharp(X)$ denotes the number of S -constellations in X without associate pairs.

Now we exhibit our first main theorem. This is a finitary version of Theorem 1.4 in Introduction.

Theorem A (Szemerédi-type theorem in the prime elements of a number field: finitary version). *Let K be a number field and $\boldsymbol{\omega}$ an integral basis of K . Let δ be a positive real number and S a finite subset of \mathcal{O}_K . Then there exists a positive integer M_0 depending on $\boldsymbol{\omega}, \delta$ and S such that the following holds true.*

- (1) *If $M \geq M_0$ and a subset A of $\mathcal{P}_K \cap \mathcal{O}_K(\boldsymbol{\omega}, M)$ satisfies*

$$\#A \geq \delta \cdot \#(\mathcal{P}_K \cap \mathcal{O}_K(\boldsymbol{\omega}, M)), \quad (2.1)$$

then there exists an S -constellation in A without associate pairs.

- (2) If S is a standard shape, then there exists a constant $\gamma > 0$ depending on ω, δ and S such that in (1),

$$\mathcal{N}_S^\sharp(A) \geq \gamma \cdot \frac{M^{n+1}}{(\log M)^{\#S}}$$

holds true. Here, n is the degree of K .

On the estimate of the number of S -constellations in the main theorem, Theorem A (2), it seems natural that the negative power of \log appears in view of the Chebotarev density theorem (Theorem 3.21 (2)). For a given finite set $S \subseteq \mathcal{O}_K$, we can construct a standard shape by inflating S as follows: add some elements of a basis of \mathcal{O}_K to S if S does not generate \mathcal{O}_K . Let \mathcal{S} be the resulting set, and consider $\mathcal{S} \cup (-\mathcal{S}) \cup \{0\}$. Note that for some S , the inflating process above may be done in a better manner. For this reason, the assumption on S in Theorem A (2) does not lose its generality. In general, for a finite set $X \subseteq \mathcal{O}_K \setminus \{0\}$, the inequality $\mathcal{N}_S^\sharp(X) \leq \mathcal{N}_S(X)$ holds. Hence, we have also a lower bound of $\mathcal{N}_S(A)$ by Theorem A (2).

We use the terms ‘finitary versions’ and ‘infinitary versions’ in the following standard manner: a statement of the existence of constellations in a certain subset of the set of the form $\mathcal{Z}(\mathbf{v}, M)$ for sufficiently large M is called a ‘finitary’ statement. A statement on the existence of constellations in a subset A of a certain subset X of \mathcal{Z} where A has a positive relative upper asymptotic density in X is called an ‘infinitary’ one. Theorem A is an example of the former; Theorem 1.4 is one of the latter.

Our second main theorem may be seen as a ‘short interval version’ of Theorem A.

Definition 2.5 (ℓ_∞ -interval). Let \mathcal{Z} be a free \mathbb{Z} -module of finite rank and \mathbf{v} its \mathbb{Z} -basis. For $x \in \mathcal{Z}$ and a positive real number M , the ℓ_∞ -interval $\mathcal{Z}(\mathbf{v}, x, M)$ is defined to be

$$\mathcal{Z}(\mathbf{v}, x, M) := \{\alpha \in \mathcal{Z} : \|\alpha - x\|_{\infty, \mathbf{v}} \leq M\}.$$

Theorem B (A short interval version of the Szemerédi-type theorem in the prime elements of a number field: finitary version = Theorem 9.5). *Let K be a number field and ω an integral basis of K . Let δ be a positive real number and S a finite subset of \mathcal{O}_K . Take a real number a with $0 < a < 1$. Then there exist a positive integer M_0 depending on ω, δ, S and a , and a positive real number $\eta > 0$ depending only on ω and δ such that the following hold true.*

- (1) If $M \geq M_0$ and a subset A of $\mathcal{P}_K \cap \mathcal{O}_K(\omega, M)$ satisfies

$$\#A \geq \delta \cdot \#(\mathcal{P}_K \cap \mathcal{O}_K(\omega, M)), \tag{2.2}$$

then there exists $x \in A$ with

$$\eta M \leq \|x\|_{\infty, \omega} \leq M \tag{2.3}$$

such that $A \cap \mathcal{O}_K(\omega, x, \|x\|_{\infty, \omega}^a)$ contains an S -constellation without associate pairs.

- (2) If S is a standard shape, then there exists a constant $\gamma > 0$ depending on ω, δ, S and a such that the following holds: in (1), we can take x in such a way that

$$\mathcal{N}_S^\sharp(A \cap \mathcal{O}_K(\omega, x, \|x\|_{\infty, \omega}^a)) \geq \gamma \cdot \frac{M^{a(n+1)}}{(\log M)^{\#S}}$$

holds. Here, n is the degree of K .

An infinitary version of Theorem B will be stated as Corollary 9.6 in Section 9. The case $K = \mathbb{Q}$ of Corollary 9.6 is written in [TZ08, Remark 2.4] in more general ‘polynomial progression’ setting; see Remark 9.7.

In the last part of this subsection, we state a precise version of Theorem 1.6 as an application to binary quadratic forms with integer coefficients. Let $F(x, y) = ax^2 + bxy + cy^2 \in \mathbb{Z}[x, y]$ be a quadratic form and $D_F = b^2 - 4ac$ its discriminant. Assume that D_F is not a perfect square. By multiplying -1 if necessary, we may assume that $a > 0$. If $D_F < 0$, then F is positive definite and if $D_F > 0$, then F is indefinite. In this paper, $\mathcal{P} = \{2, 3, 5, 7, 11, \dots\}$ denotes the set of *positive* rational prime numbers. We consider the set $F^{-1}(\mathcal{P})$ (respectively, $F^{-1}(-\mathcal{P})$) of elements (x, y) at which the value of F (respectively, $-F$) is a prime number:

$$F^{-1}(\mathcal{P}) = \{(x, y) \in \mathbb{Z}^2 : F(x, y) \in \mathcal{P}\}, \quad \text{and} \quad F^{-1}(-\mathcal{P}) = \{(x, y) \in \mathbb{Z}^2 : -F(x, y) \in \mathcal{P}\}.$$

The following is our third main theorem.

Theorem C (Szemerédi-type theorem on prime representations of binary quadratic forms). *Let $F(x, y) := ax^2 + bxy + cy^2 \in \mathbb{Z}[x, y]$ be a primitive quadratic form whose discriminant D_F is not a perfect square. Assume that $a > 0$. Let \mathbf{u} be the standard basis of \mathbb{Z}^2 .*

- (1) *Let $A \subseteq F^{-1}(\mathcal{P})$ be a set which has a positive relative upper asymptotic density measured by $\|\cdot\|_{\infty, \mathbf{u}}$ in $F^{-1}(\mathcal{P})$, that means*

$$\bar{d}_{F^{-1}(\mathcal{P}), \mathbf{u}}(A) := \limsup_{M \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\#(A \cap \mathbb{Z}^2(\mathbf{u}, M))}{\#(F^{-1}(\mathcal{P}) \cap \mathbb{Z}^2(\mathbf{u}, M))} > 0.$$

Then, for every finite set $S \subseteq \mathbb{Z}^2$, there exists an S -constellation \mathcal{S} in A .

- (2) *Assume that $D_F > 0$. Let $A \subseteq F^{-1}(-\mathcal{P})$ be a set which has a positive relative upper asymptotic density measured by $\|\cdot\|_{\infty, \mathbf{u}}$ in $F^{-1}(-\mathcal{P})$, that means*

$$\bar{d}_{F^{-1}(-\mathcal{P}), \mathbf{u}}(A) := \limsup_{M \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\#(A \cap \mathbb{Z}^2(\mathbf{u}, M))}{\#(F^{-1}(-\mathcal{P}) \cap \mathbb{Z}^2(\mathbf{u}, M))} > 0.$$

Then, for every finite set $S \subseteq \mathbb{Z}^2$, there exists an S -constellation \mathcal{S} in A .

In both (1) and (2), we can furthermore take \mathcal{S} in such a way that the function $F(x, y)$ takes distinct prime values on \mathcal{S} .

Theorem C (1) says the constellation theorem holds for $F^{-1}(\mathcal{P})$; Theorem C (2) says if moreover $D_F > 0$, then the constellation theorem also holds for $F^{-1}(-\mathcal{P})$. See Theorem 10.36 for a general statement on norm forms.

2.2 Constellations in prime elements inside a fundamental domain

In this subsection, we state Theorem 2.8 (a finitary version) and Corollary 2.10 (an infinitary version), restricted forms of Theorem A and Theorem 1.4. Proving these theorems is the *first goal of this paper*, and their proofs contain most of the new ideas of this paper.

The difference between their settings is whether we consider sets inside a fundamental domain for the action $\mathcal{O}_K^\times \curvearrowright \mathcal{O}_K \setminus \{0\}$ by multiplication. If we take a fundamental domain \mathcal{D} , then the correspondence $\alpha \mapsto \alpha\mathcal{O}_K$ gives a bijection from \mathcal{D} to the set of non-zero principal ideals and hence counting of elements is reduced to that of ideals.

We call a fundamental domain for the action $\mathcal{O}_K^\times \curvearrowright \mathcal{O}_K \setminus \{0\}$ an \mathcal{O}_K^\times -*fundamental domain* in this paper. We will use this terminology without referring to the action any further.

Definition 2.6 (\mathcal{O}_K^\times -fundamental domain). A set $\mathcal{D} \subseteq \mathcal{O}_K \setminus \{0\}$ is called an \mathcal{O}_K^\times -*fundamental domain*, if $\mathcal{O}_K \setminus \{0\}$ is decomposed as the following disjoint union:

$$\mathcal{O}_K \setminus \{0\} = \bigsqcup_{\eta \in \mathcal{O}_K^\times} \eta\mathcal{D}.$$

We formulate a prime element constellation theorem inside an \mathcal{O}_K^\times -fundamental domain \mathcal{D} as follows: we consider $\mathcal{P}_K \cap \mathcal{D}$ instead of \mathcal{P}_K , and take a subset A of it. Here we warn that if $\#(\mathcal{O}_K^\times) = \infty$, then there exists an \mathcal{O}_K^\times -fundamental domain \mathcal{D} such that the constellation theorem for $\mathcal{P}_K \cap \mathcal{D}$ does *not* hold. This fact will be proved as Proposition 4.13. Thus, the following question arises: “for which \mathcal{O}_K^\times -fundamental domain can we ensure that a constellation theorem holds?” We answer this question by introducing the notion of *NL-compatible* fundamental domains. The NL-compatibility is defined for a subset of $\mathcal{O}_K \setminus \{0\}$ as follows.

Definition 2.7 (NL-compatibility). Let K be a number field of degree n . A set $X \subseteq \mathcal{O}_K \setminus \{0\}$ is *NL-compatible* (*norm-length compatible*) if the following condition is satisfied: there exist an integral basis $\boldsymbol{\omega}$ of K and a constant $C = C(\boldsymbol{\omega}, X) > 0$ such that, for every $\alpha \in X$,

$$C\|\alpha\|_{\infty, \boldsymbol{\omega}}^n \leq \mathbf{N}(\alpha) \tag{2.4}$$

holds.

The existence of a constant C above is independent of the choice of an integral basis $\boldsymbol{\omega}$; the exact value of C depends. Note that the opposite inequality always holds: there exists $C' = C'(\boldsymbol{\omega}) > 0$ such that for all $\alpha \in \mathcal{O}_K \setminus \{0\}$, we have $\mathbf{N}(\alpha) \leq C'\|\alpha\|_{\infty, \boldsymbol{\omega}}^n$. The NL-compatibility has a basis-free characterization in terms of the geometry of numbers. If the unit group \mathcal{O}_K^\times is infinite, then not all \mathcal{O}_K^\times -fundamental domains are NL-compatible. Nevertheless, NL-compatible \mathcal{O}_K^\times -fundamental domains always exist. These results are shown in Section 4.

Theorem 2.8 (Theorem A restricted to an NL-compatible fundamental domain = Theorem 7.11). *Let K be a number field, $\boldsymbol{\omega}$ an integral basis of K and \mathcal{D} an NL-compatible*

\mathcal{O}_K^\times -fundamental domain (which exists by Proposition 4.11). Let δ be a positive number and S a finite subset of \mathcal{O}_K . Then there exists a positive integer M_0 depending on $\omega, \mathcal{D}, \delta$ and S such that the following hold: if $M \geq M_0$ and a subset A of $\mathcal{P}_K \cap \mathcal{D} \cap \mathcal{O}_K(\omega, M)$ satisfies

$$\#A \geq \delta \cdot \#(\mathcal{P}_K \cap \mathcal{D} \cap \mathcal{O}_K(\omega, M)), \quad (2.5)$$

then there exists an S -constellation in A . Furthermore, if S is a standard shape, then there exists a constant $\gamma > 0$ depending only on $\omega, \mathcal{D}, \delta$ and S such that in the setting above,

$$\mathcal{N}_S(A) \geq \gamma \cdot \frac{M^{n+1}}{(\log M)^{\#S}}$$

holds true. Here n is the degree of K .

Note that, for a finite subset A of an \mathcal{O}_K^\times -fundamental domain, we have $\mathcal{N}_S(A) = \mathcal{N}_S^\sharp(A)$ because constellations in A never admit associate pairs.

The proof of Theorem 2.8 is completed in Section 7. It is used to prove Corollary 1.5 in Subsections 7.5.

Let us deduce an infinitary consequence of Theorem 2.8. In order to state it, we define the relative upper asymptotic density for both the norm scale and the ℓ_∞ -length scale. The latter is defined also in Introduction.

Definition 2.9. Let X be a non-empty subset of $\mathcal{O}_K \setminus \{0\}$ and A a subset of X .

- (1) Assume that, for every non-negative real number L , X satisfies $\#(X \cap \mathcal{O}_K(L)) < \infty$. Then the *relative upper asymptotic density of A measured by norm in X* is defined by

$$\bar{d}_X(A) := \limsup_{L \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\#(A \cap \mathcal{O}_K(L))}{\#(X \cap \mathcal{O}_K(L))}.$$

- (2) Let ω be an integral basis of K . Then the *relative upper asymptotic density of A measured by ℓ_∞ -length in X* is defined by

$$\bar{d}_{X,\omega}(A) := \limsup_{M \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\#(A \cap \mathcal{O}_K(\omega, M))}{\#(X \cap \mathcal{O}_K(\omega, M))}.$$

For an \mathcal{O}_K^\times -fundamental domain \mathcal{D} , the set $X = \mathcal{P}_K \cap \mathcal{D}$ satisfies the assumption in (1), while $X = \mathcal{P}_K$ does not if $\#(\mathcal{O}_K^\times) = \infty$. The norm scale naturally appears in algebraic number theory. However, to prove constellation theorems, we need to convert this setting to that of the ℓ_∞ -length scale. The NL-compatibility enables this conversion.

Corollary 2.10 (Corollary 1.5 restricted to an NL-compatible fundamental domain). *Let K be a number field and \mathcal{D} an NL-compatible \mathcal{O}_K^\times -fundamental domain. Assume that a set $A \subseteq \mathcal{P}_K \cap \mathcal{D}$ satisfies either $\bar{d}_{\mathcal{P}_K \cap \mathcal{D}}(A) > 0$ or $\bar{d}_{\mathcal{P}_K \cap \mathcal{D}, \omega}(A) > 0$ for an integral basis ω of K . Then there exist constellations of an arbitrary shape in \mathcal{O}_K consisting of elements of A .*

Corollary 2.10 immediately follows from Theorem 2.8 at least if we assume the second condition $\bar{d}_{\mathcal{P}_K \cap \mathcal{D}, \omega}(A) > 0$; the deduction is written down in full in Subsection 7.5. In fact, the conditions $\bar{d}_{\mathcal{P}_K \cap \mathcal{D}}(A) > 0$ and $\bar{d}_{\mathcal{P}_K \cap \mathcal{D}, \omega}(A) > 0$ are equivalent; see Subsection 7.3.




Figure 1: The fundamental diagram

2.3 The idea of proofs and the organization of this paper

We give an overview of the proof of our first major goal, Theorem 2.8. We use the relative hypergraph removal lemma of Conlon–Fox–Zhao ([CFZ15, Theorem 2.12], Theorem 5.10) as a black box. Contrastingly, we do not appeal to the existing constellation theorems, Theorem 1.1 or Theorem 1.2, in the proof. Our proofs yield these theorems as special cases.

In what follows, we fix a number field K , its integral basis ω and a standard shape $S \subseteq \mathcal{O}_K$. Our goal is to find an S -constellation in the given set $A \subseteq \mathcal{P}_K \cap \mathcal{D}$. We will do so by going back and forth among the ‘five worlds’ in the ‘fundamental diagram’; see Figure 1. Let us describe these worlds in the left-to-right order.

- *The world of hypergraphs V* : V is an (r -uniform) hypergraph system which is constructed in Subsection 5.3 following Solymosi’s idea. Each vertex in V represents a hyperplane in \mathbb{Z}^r . The mapping T , which connects two worlds V and \mathbb{Z}^r , maps a hyperedge in V to the intersection of the corresponding r hyperplanes.¹
- *The world of higher dimension \mathbb{Z}^r* : this is a free \mathbb{Z} -module of rank higher than (or equal to) that of $\mathcal{O}_K \simeq \mathbb{Z}^n$. The rank r is determined by the relation $r + 1 = \#S$. Via a homomorphism $\phi_S: \mathbb{Z}^r \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_K$ associated to S , the standard basis and the origin of \mathbb{Z}^r provide a canonical lift of the shape S . A constellation in \mathbb{Z}^r with this shape is called a *corner*.
- *The N -world $(\mathcal{O}_K, \|\cdot\|_{\infty, \omega}, N)$* : the following three worlds are all \mathcal{O}_K as sets. In this world, we construct a pseudorandom measure $\tilde{\lambda}$ by ‘ W -trick.’ We use the ℓ_∞ -length scale $\|\cdot\|_{\infty, \omega}$ and the parameter N to limit the scale.
- *The M -world $(\mathcal{O}_K, \|\cdot\|_{\infty, \omega}, M)$* : this is the world where the given set A lives, and it

¹Actually we do not construct a single mapping T , but a family of mappings T_j ($1 \leq j \leq r + 1$). We use a similar convention for E and ν . See Subsection 5.3 for details.

is connected to the N -world by an affine transformation. We use the ℓ_∞ -length scale $\|\cdot\|_{\infty, \omega}$ and the parameter M , which will be larger than N by a relatively small factor.

- *The L -world* ($\mathcal{O}_K, \mathbf{N}, L$): this world is connected to the M -world by the identity map. The difference between these two worlds is that we take the (ideal) norm scale $\mathbf{N}(\cdot)$ in the L -world. We use the parameter L , which will differ from M^n by a constant factor.

The sketch of the proofs of Theorem 2.8 and Corollary 2.10 goes as follows.

Step 1: We start the proof from the ‘ M -world.’ Take an NL-compatible \mathcal{O}_K^\times -fundamental domain \mathcal{D} and a relatively dense subset A of $\mathcal{P}_K \cap \mathcal{D}$. More precisely, the relative density of A measured by ℓ_∞ -length $\|\cdot\|_{\infty, \omega}$ in $\mathcal{P}_K \cap \mathcal{D}$ is greater than a certain positive constant. Our goal is to prove that if the parameter M is large enough, then there exists an S -constellation in $A \cap \mathcal{O}_K(\omega, M)$. Since \mathcal{P}_K is sparse in \mathcal{O}_K , we cannot apply the classical multidimensional Szemerédi theorem (Theorem 5.2) directly to $A \cap \mathcal{O}_K(\omega, M)$. Instead, we aim to show that the ‘weighted density’ of A with respect to a certain weight function λ is not small. We define the weight function λ by using a variant of the von Mangoldt function. Since the norm scale $\mathbf{N}(\cdot)$ is easier to measure the desired density than the ℓ_∞ -length scale $\|\cdot\|_{\infty, \omega}$, we switch to the ‘ L -world.’

Step 2: Apply a version of the Chebotarev density theorem (Theorem 3.21 (2)) in the ‘ L -world,’ and deduce the following: if A is relatively dense measured by the norm \mathbf{N} in $\mathcal{P}_K \cap \mathcal{D}$, then the weighted density of A with respect to λ is greater than a certain constant.

Step 3: Then we return to the ‘ M -world.’ The NL-compatibility of \mathcal{D} relates the density by norm to that by ℓ_∞ -length. Hence, we conclude that the weighted density of A with respect to λ measured by ℓ_∞ -length is greater than a certain positive constant if the parameter M is large enough.

To the best of our knowledge, in order to apply known Szemerédi-type theorems to this A , we need to confirm an extra condition on the measure λ . More precisely, we aim to employ the relative multidimensional Szemerédi theorem, originating from Green–Tao [GT08]; λ is required to be a *pseudorandom measure*. Since it is difficult to show the pseudorandomness of λ , we precompose a certain affine transformation to λ and investigate this modified function instead of λ . Via this affine transformation, we switch from the ‘ M -world’ to the ‘ N -world.’

Step 4: Choose an appropriate parameter w , and define W to be the product $W = \prod_{p \leq w} p$ of prime numbers not exceeding w . We perform the following ‘ W -trick’: pick $b \in \mathcal{O}_K$ according to A , w and M . We define $B \subseteq \mathcal{O}_K$ as the inverse image of A under the affine transformation $\text{Aff}_{W, b}; \beta \mapsto W\beta + b$. We consider $\lambda \circ \text{Aff}_{W, b}$ and define $\tilde{\lambda}$ by multiplying a normalizing factor. Then we can prove the pseudorandomness of $\tilde{\lambda}$ by using the *Goldston–Yıldırım type asymptotic formula* (Theorem 6.2). In its proof, the W -trick helps to eliminate the bias caused by small prime numbers. In the ‘ N -world,’ we can show that the weighted density of B with respect to the weight $\tilde{\lambda}$ is still greater than a constant. Thus, it is possible

to apply the *relative multidimensional Szemerédi theorem* (Theorem 5.4) and obtain an S -constellation in B . In what follows, we also describe how this latter theorem is proved. For this purpose, the ‘world of higher dimension \mathbb{Z}^r ’ shows up.

Step 5: Let $C \subseteq \mathbb{Z}^r$ be the inverse image of B under ϕ_S in the ‘world of higher dimension \mathbb{Z}^r .’ Then the weighted density of C with respect to the weight $\tilde{\lambda} \circ \phi_S$ is still greater than a constant.

Step 6: A weighted hypergraph ν on V is constructed from $\tilde{\lambda} \circ \phi_S$, and the pseudorandomness of ν follows from that of $\tilde{\lambda}$. Let E be the inverse image of C under T . The elements of E are hyperedges. Since the weighted density of C is greater than a certain constant, removing hyperedges from E with small weighted density with respect to the weight ν does not completely eliminate isomorphic copies of $K_{r+1}^{(r)}$. Here $K_{r+1}^{(r)}$ denotes the $(r+1)$ -vertex complete r -graph. By the *relative hypergraph removal lemma* (Theorem 5.10), this implies that there exists an isomorphic copy of $K_{r+1}^{(r)}$ whose $r+1$ hyperedges are sent to distinct $r+1$ points by T , provided that M is large enough.

Step 7: By sending such a copy of $K_{r+1}^{(r)}$ in E under T , we obtain a corner consisting of elements of C in \mathbb{Z}^r . The image of the resulting corner in C under ϕ_S is an S -constellation in B . This completes the rough description of the proof of our relative multidimensional Szemerédi theorem.

Finally, the image of this S -constellation under $\text{Aff}_{W,b}$ is a desired S -constellation in A !

It should be noted that this paper is not actually written in the order described in Steps 1–7. At the beginning of Sections 5–7, we indicate the corresponding steps in this overview.

After achieving the first goal, we prove that Theorem A and Theorem 2.8 are equivalent to each other (and so are Corollary 2.10 and Theorem 1.4); see Remark 8.30. For this proof, we need a further counting argument, which is based on the geometry of numbers:

Theorem 2.11 (= Corollary 8.29). *Let K be a number field, ω its integral basis. Assume that $A \subseteq \mathcal{P}_K$ satisfies $\bar{d}_{\mathcal{P}_K, \omega}(A) > 0$. Then, there exists an NL-compatible \mathcal{O}_K^\times -fundamental domain $\mathcal{D} = \mathcal{D}(A, \omega)$ such that*

$$\bar{d}_{\mathcal{P}_K \cap \mathcal{D}, \omega}(A \cap \mathcal{D}) > 0$$

holds.

See Theorem 8.22 in the case of the finitary version and Theorem 8.28 in the case of the infinitary version in full generality. In Section 8 where the above theorem is presented, we focus on the deduction ‘counting condition + pseudorandomness \implies constellation theorem’ in our setting and axiomatize it. In Section 9, we refine the axiomatization formulated in Section 8, and prove Theorem B, a short interval version of Theorem A. There, a ‘slide trick,’ a form of the pigeonhole principle, is in addition employed in order to take an appropriate b in Step 4; see Lemma 9.9.

These axiomatizations can be further extended to the case where the total space is a non-zero ideal \mathfrak{a} of \mathcal{O}_K . This leads to a constellation theorem for a pair of an order in K

and its invertible fractional ideal (Theorem 10.5). This theorem derives Theorem C, via the correspondence between binary quadratic forms and pairs of quadratic orders and their invertible fractional ideals (Theorem A.5). We present a proof of the correspondence in the appendix for the reader's convenience. We remark that to define the counterpart of prime elements is non-trivial in our constellation theorem; see Definitions 10.4. For instance, if \mathfrak{a} is not principal, then non-principal prime ideals show up in the definitions, in contrast to the case of Theorem 1.4.

We briefly summarize here the differences between the previous work [GT08, Tao06] and this paper. We have already discussed novelty and ideas for Goldston–Yıldırım type asymptotic formulas, the NL-compatibility and the setting without a fundamental domain in Introduction. The simplification of the proof of Goldston–Yıldırım type asymptotic formulas by using a smooth function χ was introduced in an unpublished note by Tao and subsequently used in [Tao06] and this method is also used in this paper.

There exist several different formulations of the ‘relative multidimensional Szemerédi theorem’ (RMST) in the literature. In this paper, we establish Theorem 5.4; seemingly, the present paper may be the first place where the RMST of this form is explicitly stated. In the work of Green–Tao [GT08] and Tao [Tao06], a condition called the *correlation condition* was imposed on their definitions of pseudorandomness in addition to the *linear forms condition*. Conlon–Fox–Zhao [CFZ15] succeeded in removing this correlation condition from their formulation of the RMST. To do this, they proved the relative hypergraph removal lemma (RHRL) which only requires the linear forms condition. Note that the RMST in [CFZ15, Theorem 3.1] is stated in terms of finite additive groups, as is [GT08, Theorem 3.5] and [Tao06, Theorem 2.18]. For this reason, some additional arguments were needed in their work to switch from \mathbb{Z}^n to finite additive groups, and to go back. In this paper, although we appeal to the RHRL of Conlon–Fox–Zhao, we do *not* transfer our setting to that of finite additive groups. Instead, we follow the argument of Solymosi; see Steps 5–7 in the above overview. Moreover, our argument of estimating a weighted density seems more straightforward than that in the previous work.

Due to the simplifications mentioned above, the complete proofs of Theorem A (the finitary version) and Theorem B (the short interval version) require *no* technical complication beyond that of Theorem 1.3. In some earlier work on constellation theorems for $K = \mathbb{Q}$ or $\mathbb{Q}(\sqrt{-1})$, detailed proofs of the corresponding theorems were omitted.

Plan. This paper is organized as follows: in Section 3, we briefly summarize some facts in algebraic number theory needed in this paper.

In Section 4, we study the NL-compatibility by using the geometry of numbers, and give a geometric characterization of it (Theorem 4.7). We also construct an NL-compatible \mathcal{O}_K^\times -fundamental domain $\mathcal{D}_K(\epsilon, \sigma)$ from a fixed system of fundamental units ϵ of K and a field embedding $\sigma: K \hookrightarrow \mathbb{C}$. We also prove some facts on the relation between the counts of prime principal ideals and of prime elements.

In Section 5, we formulate and prove our relative multidimensional Szemerédi theorem.

In Section 6, we prove the Goldston–Yıldırım type asymptotic formula in the number

field setting. To formulate it, we need algebraic backgrounds from Section 3.

In Section 7, we present the full proof of Theorem 2.8. For this proof, we construct a pseudorandom measure with the aid of the Goldston–Yıldırım type asymptotic formula. Then we make an estimate of the weighted density of a well-chosen set and apply the relative multidimensional Szemerédi theorem.

In Section 8, we prove Theorem A. In the proof, we axiomatize the argument in the proof of Theorem 2.8. By employing Lemma 4.14, we reduce the general setting of Theorem A to that with a fundamental domain; see Theorem 8.22 for details. Theorem 1.4 is also verified.

In Section 9, we demonstrate Theorem B. The proof uses an additional argument, the ‘slide trick,’ to that of Theorem A.

In Section 10, we formulate and prove our prime element constellation theorem with respect to the pair of an order and its invertible fractional ideal (Theorem 10.5). It derives a constellation theorem for a norm form (Theorem 10.36). By combining this with the classical correspondence between binary quadratic forms and the pairs where the orders are quadratic (Theorem A.5), we establish Theorem C.

In Appendix, we present a proof of the correspondence above.

Notation. Let $\mathbb{N} = \{1, 2, 3, \dots\}$ denote the set of positive integers and $\mathcal{P} = \{2, 3, 5, \dots\}$ the set of rational prime numbers. A subset of \mathcal{P} truncated by a real number x is expressed by a subscript. For example,

$$\mathcal{P}_{\leq x} = \{p \in \mathcal{P} : p \leq x\}, \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{P}_{> x} = \{p \in \mathcal{P} : p > x\}.$$

For $m \in \mathbb{N}$, set $[m] := \{1, 2, 3, \dots, m\}$. For $m_1, m_2 \in \mathbb{Z}$ satisfying $m_1 \leq m_2$, set $[m_1, m_2] := \{l \in \mathbb{Z} : m_1 \leq l \leq m_2\}$. When we use $[a_1, a_2]$ in the sense of a real closed interval, we write $[a_1, a_2]_{\mathbb{R}}$ to distinguish it. Similarly in the case of (half-)open intervals. For a finite set A , $\#A$ denotes the cardinality of A . We write $\#A = \infty$ to mean that the set A is infinite. For a non-empty finite set J and a positive integer r , $\binom{J}{r}$ denotes the set $\{e \in 2^J : \#e = r\}$ of subsets with cardinality r . For a mapping f , $\text{Im}(f)$ denotes the image of f . For a set A , $\mathbf{1}_A$ denotes the indicator function of A . For a function $f: X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ on a set X and a non-empty finite subset $A \subseteq X$, we use the expectation symbol to denote the average of f over A :

$$\mathbb{E}(f \mid A) = \mathbb{E}(f(a) \mid a \in A) := \frac{1}{\#A} \sum_{a \in A} f(a).$$

For functions $f, g: X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, if $f(x) \leq g(x)$ holds for all $x \in X$, then we write $f \leq g$. For a \mathbb{Z} -module \mathcal{Z} , $W \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $b \in \mathcal{Z}$, the affine transformation $\text{Aff}_{W,b}$ is defined by

$$\text{Aff}_{W,b}: \mathcal{Z} \rightarrow \mathcal{Z}; \quad \beta \mapsto W\beta + b.$$

We use big- O and little- o notation in the following sense for statements that take into account some parameters that are not necessarily ‘numbers.’ Let x be a (natural, real or complex) numerical parameter and t_1, \dots, t_k a part of parameters under consideration. Let $a \in \mathbb{C}$. Let f and g be functions with parameters under consideration, where g is non-negative. If there exists a positive-valued function C_{t_1, \dots, t_k} depending only on t_1, \dots, t_k such

that $|f| \leq C_{t_1, \dots, t_k} \cdot g$, then we write $f = O_{t_1, \dots, t_k}(g)$. If the inequality is valid only on a certain neighborhood of a , then we write $O_{x \rightarrow a; t_1, \dots, t_k}(g)$. If there exists a positive-valued function $c_{t_1, \dots, t_k}(x)$ depending only on x, t_1, \dots, t_k and satisfying $\lim_{x \rightarrow a} c_{t_1, \dots, t_k}(x) = 0$ such that $|f| \leq c_{t_1, \dots, t_k} \cdot g$ on a certain neighborhood of a , then we write $f = o_{x \rightarrow a; t_1, \dots, t_k}(g)$. The convergence of c need not be uniform for t_1, \dots, t_k . We use similar expressions for $a = +\infty$; in this case we only use a natural or positive real numerical parameter, and the symbol $+\infty$ is simply written as ∞ in this paper.

3 Preliminaries on algebraic number theory

In this section, we summarize necessary materials from algebraic number theory. All results in this section are known; see [Neu99, Hec81, HW08] for details.

Setting 3.1. Throughout this section, with the exception of Subsection 3.5, K will denote a *number field of degree n* , that is, a finite extension of the rational number field \mathbb{Q} with $n = [K : \mathbb{Q}]$.

3.1 The ring of integers and its ideals

The subset of K consisting of elements which are integral over \mathbb{Z} forms a subring called the *ring of integers* of K , and we denote it by \mathcal{O}_K . By [Neu99, Chapter I, Proposition 2.10], \mathcal{O}_K is a free \mathbb{Z} -module of rank n ; a \mathbb{Z} -basis of \mathcal{O}_K is called an *integral basis* of K . We also denote by Ideals_K the set of non-zero ideals, and $|\text{Spec}(\mathcal{O}_K)|$ the set of non-zero prime ideals, of \mathcal{O}_K .

Theorem 3.2 (Prime ideal decomposition, see [Neu99, Chapter I, Theorem 3.3]). *The mapping*

$$\bigoplus_{|\text{Spec}(\mathcal{O}_K)|} \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} \rightarrow \text{Ideals}_K; \quad (e_{\mathfrak{p}})_{\mathfrak{p}} \mapsto \prod_{\mathfrak{p} \in |\text{Spec}(\mathcal{O}_K)|} \mathfrak{p}^{e_{\mathfrak{p}}} \quad (3.1)$$

is an isomorphism of commutative monoids.

For two ideals $\mathfrak{a} \in \text{Ideals}_K \cup \{(0)\}$ and $\mathfrak{b} \in \text{Ideals}_K$, we write $\mathfrak{b} \mid \mathfrak{a}$ if $\mathfrak{b} \supseteq \mathfrak{a}$ holds. If $\mathfrak{a} \neq (0)$, then this is equivalent to saying that the exponent of each \mathfrak{p} appearing in the prime decomposition of \mathfrak{b} is at most that of \mathfrak{a} .

In Section 10, we will treat fractional ideals of \mathcal{O}_K , which generalize ideals. A *fractional ideal* \mathfrak{a} of \mathcal{O}_K is a finitely generated \mathcal{O}_K -submodule of K . For a non-zero fractional ideal \mathfrak{a} of \mathcal{O}_K , the set $\mathfrak{a}^{-1} := \{x \in K : x\mathfrak{a} \subseteq \mathcal{O}_K\}$ is again a non-zero fractional ideal, called the *inverse fractional ideal* of \mathfrak{a} ; we have $\mathfrak{a}\mathfrak{a}^{-1} = \mathcal{O}_K$; see [Neu99, Chapter I, Proposition 3.8] for the proof. The following generalization of Theorem 3.2 will be employed in Section 10. Up to Section 9, fractional ideals will not show up.

Theorem 3.3 (Prime ideal decomposition of fractional ideals, see [Neu99, Chapter I, Corollary 3.9]). *The mapping from $\bigoplus_{|\text{Spec}(\mathcal{O}_K)|} \mathbb{Z}$ to the group of non-zero fractional ideals of \mathcal{O}_K defined by*

$$(v_{\mathfrak{p}})_{\mathfrak{p}} \mapsto \prod_{\mathfrak{p} \in |\text{Spec}(\mathcal{O}_K)|} \mathfrak{p}^{v_{\mathfrak{p}}}$$

is an isomorphism of commutative groups.

We define the *ideal norm* of an ideal $\mathfrak{a} \in \text{Ideals}_K$ by $\mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{a}) := \#(\mathcal{O}_K/\mathfrak{a})$. If \mathfrak{a} is a principal ideal, that is, $\mathfrak{a} = \alpha\mathcal{O}_K$ for some $\alpha \in \mathcal{O}_K \setminus \{0\}$, then $\mathbf{N}(\alpha\mathcal{O}_K)$ coincides with the ideal norm $\mathbf{N}(\alpha)$ of α defined in Definition 2.1.

Let $\sigma: K \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ be a homomorphism of fields. If the image of σ is contained in \mathbb{R} , then we call σ a *real embedding*, and a *complex embedding* otherwise. If we denote by r_1 the number of real embeddings of K , and by r_2 that of conjugate pairs of complex embeddings of K , then $n = r_1 + 2r_2$ holds.

Setting 3.4. We denote by $\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_{r_1}, \sigma_{r_1+1}, \dots, \sigma_{r_1+2r_2}$ the embeddings of K into \mathbb{C} . We choose the numbering in such a way that $\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_{r_1}$ are real embeddings, while conjugate pairs of complex embeddings are $(\sigma_{r_1+1}, \sigma_{r_1+r_2+1}), (\sigma_{r_1+2}, \sigma_{r_1+r_2+2}), \dots, (\sigma_{r_1+r_2}, \sigma_{r_1+2r_2})$.

Lemma 3.5 (see [Neu99, Chapter 1, Proposition 2.6]). *Under Setting 3.4, we have*

$$\mathbf{N}(\alpha) = \prod_{i \in [r_1]} |\sigma_i(\alpha)| \prod_{j \in [r_2]} |\sigma_{r_1+j}(\alpha)|^2$$

for $\alpha \in \mathcal{O}_K \setminus \{0\}$.

In particular, $\mathbf{N}(W) = W^n$ for $W \in \mathbb{N}$.

Remark 3.6. When $A \rightarrow B$ is a homomorphism of commutative unital rings which makes B a free A -module of finite rank, the *norm* $N_{B/A}(b) \in A$ of an element $b \in B$ is defined to be the determinant of the A -linear map induced by multiplication by $b: B \rightarrow B$.

In the case of $\mathbb{Q} \rightarrow K$, the norm of $\alpha \in K$ is known to be equal to the product $\sigma_1(\alpha)\sigma_2(\alpha) \cdots \sigma_{r_1+2r_2}(\alpha)$. Lemma 3.5 says its absolute value is equal to the ideal norm $\mathbf{N}(\alpha)$, except when $\alpha = 0$, for which the ideal norm $\mathbf{N}(0)$ is not defined in Definition 2.1.

Lemma 3.7 (see [Neu99, Chapter I, Proposition 6.1]). *Let $\mathfrak{a} = \prod_{\mathfrak{p} \in |\text{Spec}(\mathcal{O}_K)|} \mathfrak{p}^{e_{\mathfrak{p}}}$ be the prime ideal decomposition of an ideal $\mathfrak{a} \in \text{Ideals}_K$. Then*

$$\mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{a}) = \prod_{\mathfrak{p} \in |\text{Spec}(\mathcal{O}_K)|} \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{p})^{e_{\mathfrak{p}}}.$$

Next we introduce two number theoretic functions.

Definition 3.8. The *totient function* φ_K of K is defined by

$$\varphi_K: \text{Ideals}_K \rightarrow \mathbb{N}; \quad \mathfrak{a} \mapsto \#((\mathcal{O}_K/\mathfrak{a})^\times).$$

For $\alpha \in \mathcal{O}_K \setminus \{0\}$, we write $\varphi_K(\alpha) := \varphi_K(\alpha\mathcal{O}_K)$.

Proposition 3.9 (see [Hec81, Theorem 80 in §27]). *For $\mathfrak{a} \in \text{Ideals}_K$, we have*

$$\varphi_K(\mathfrak{a}) = \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{a}) \prod_{\mathfrak{p} \in |\text{Spec}(\mathcal{O}_K)|, \mathfrak{p}|\mathfrak{a}} (1 - \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{p})^{-1}).$$

Definition 3.10. We define the *Möbius function* $\mu_K: \text{Ideals}_K \rightarrow \{0, \pm 1\}$ by

$$\mu_K(\mathfrak{a}) = \begin{cases} (-1)^r & \text{if } \mathfrak{a} \text{ is a product of } r \ (\geq 0) \text{ distinct prime ideals,} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

It follows from the definition that the Möbius function is *multiplicative*, that is, $\mu_K(\mathfrak{ab}) = \mu_K(\mathfrak{a})\mu_K(\mathfrak{b})$ for ideals \mathfrak{a} and \mathfrak{b} relatively prime to each other.

Proposition 3.11. *Given a function $f: \text{Ideals}_K \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$, define $g: \text{Ideals}_K \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ by*

$$g(\mathfrak{a}) := \sum_{\mathfrak{b} \in \text{Ideals}_K, \mathfrak{b}|\mathfrak{a}} f(\mathfrak{b}).$$

Then

$$f(\mathfrak{a}) = \sum_{\substack{\mathfrak{b}, \mathfrak{c} \in \text{Ideals}_K \\ \mathfrak{b} \cdot \mathfrak{c} = \mathfrak{a}}} \mu_K(\mathfrak{b}) \cdot g(\mathfrak{c}).$$

Proof. Since Ideals_K is isomorphic to $\text{Ideals}_{\mathbb{Q}}$ as monoids by Theorem 3.2, the result follows from the property of the standard Möbius function $\mu_{\mathbb{Q}}$. \square

The next lemma may be regarded as a refinement of complete multiplicativity of the ideal norm (Lemma 3.7), and will be employed in Section 8. We will present a proof of a more general statement of this lemma in Section 10; see Proposition 10.10.

Lemma 3.12. *For $\mathfrak{a}, \mathfrak{b} \in \text{Ideals}_K$, we have an isomorphism $\mathcal{O}_K/\mathfrak{b} \simeq \mathfrak{a}/\mathfrak{ab}$ of \mathcal{O}_K -modules.*

3.2 The unit group and ideal class group

The multiplicative group \mathcal{O}_K^\times of \mathcal{O}_K is called the *unit group* of K . The subgroup of \mathcal{O}_K^\times consisting of torsion elements is denoted by $\mu(K)$ (not to be confused with the Möbius function μ_K). We continue to assume Settings 3.1 and 3.4.

Lemma 3.13 (see [Neu99, Chapter I, Proposition 7.1]). *The group $\mu(K)$ is finite. Moreover, an element $\alpha \in \mathcal{O}_K \setminus \{0\}$ is in $\mu(K)$ if and only if $|\sigma_i(\alpha)| = 1$ for all $i \in [r_1 + r_2]$.*

We define $\overline{\mathcal{O}_K^\times} := \mathcal{O}_K^\times / \mu(K)$. The group $\overline{\mathcal{O}_K^\times}$ is torsion-free with rank $r_1 + r_2 - 1$ by Dirichlet's unit theorem ([Neu99, Chapter I, Theorem 7.4]). See also Theorem 4.5. A sequence $\epsilon = (\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2, \dots, \epsilon_{r_1+r_2-1})$ which gives a basis $(\overline{\epsilon_1}, \overline{\epsilon_2}, \dots, \overline{\epsilon_{r_1+r_2-1}})$ of $\overline{\mathcal{O}_K^\times}$ is called *fundamental units* of K .

There is an invariant of K called the *class number*, which is a positive integer; this will show up in the Chebotarev density theorem. For the sake of completeness, let us give a

quick definition. Define an equivalence relation \sim on Ideals_K as follows. We declare $\mathfrak{a} \sim \mathfrak{b}$ if there exist $\gamma, \delta \in \mathcal{O}_K \setminus \{0\}$ such that the equality of ideals $(\gamma) \cdot \mathfrak{a} = (\delta) \cdot \mathfrak{b}$ holds. The set of equivalence classes Ideals_K / \sim inherits the monoid structure from Ideals_K . It is known that this is in fact a group (see [Neu99, Chapter I, Definition 3.7 to Proposition 3.8]), called the *ideal class group*. It is furthermore known that this is a finite group (see [Neu99, Chapter I, Theorem 6.3]), and its order, written $h = h_K$, is the *class number*.

3.3 p -Ideals

Recall from Notation in Subsection 2.3 that the set of rational primes is denoted by $\mathcal{P} = \{2, 3, 5, \dots\}$. For $\mathfrak{p} \in |\text{Spec}(\mathcal{O}_K)|$, the intersection $\mathfrak{p} \cap \mathbb{Z}$ is a non-zero prime ideal of \mathbb{Z} . Hence, there exists a unique $p \in \mathcal{P}$ such that $\mathfrak{p} \cap \mathbb{Z} = p\mathbb{Z}$. In this case, we call \mathfrak{p} a *prime p -ideal*, and the set of prime p -ideals is denoted by $|\text{Spec}(\mathcal{O}_K)|^{(p)}$. For $\mathfrak{p} \in |\text{Spec}(\mathcal{O}_K)|^{(p)}$, the quotient $\mathcal{O}_K/\mathfrak{p}$ is a finite extension field of the finite prime field \mathbb{F}_p . The extension degree $f_{\mathfrak{p}} := [\mathcal{O}_K/\mathfrak{p} : \mathbb{F}_p]$ is called the *degree* of \mathfrak{p} . Then $\mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{p}) = p^{f_{\mathfrak{p}}}$ holds.

For the prime ideal decomposition $\mathfrak{a} = \prod_{\mathfrak{p} \in |\text{Spec}(\mathcal{O}_K)|} \mathfrak{p}^{e_{\mathfrak{p}}}$ of $\mathfrak{a} \in \text{Ideals}_K$, for each $p \in \mathcal{P}$, we define

$$\mathfrak{a}^{(p)} := \prod_{\mathfrak{p} \in |\text{Spec}(\mathcal{O}_K)|^{(p)}} \mathfrak{p}^{e_{\mathfrak{p}}};$$

it is called the *p -part* of \mathfrak{a} . Then we have

$$\mathfrak{a} = \prod_{p \in \mathcal{P}} \mathfrak{a}^{(p)}.$$

An ideal $\mathfrak{a} \in \text{Ideals}_K$ is called a *p -ideal* if $\mathfrak{a}^{(p)} = \mathfrak{a}$, or equivalently, $\mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{a})$ is a power of p . Observe that \mathcal{O}_K is a p -ideal for every $p \in \mathcal{P}$. We denote the set of p -ideals of \mathcal{O}_K by $\text{Ideals}_K^{(p)}$. For $\mathfrak{a}, \mathfrak{b} \in \text{Ideals}_K$ and $p \in \mathcal{P}$, we have $(\mathfrak{a} \cap \mathfrak{b})^{(p)} = \mathfrak{a}^{(p)} \cap \mathfrak{b}^{(p)}$.

When $K = \mathbb{Q}$, we have $\mathcal{O}_K = \mathbb{Z}$, and the positive generator of the p -part of an ideal $D\mathbb{Z}$ ($D \in \mathbb{N}$) is denoted by $D^{(p)}$. We then have

$$D = \prod_{p \in \mathcal{P}} D^{(p)},$$

which is the prime factorization of D .

We now exhibit two lemmas needed in Section 6. Let Z be a finite abelian group. Then Z admits a unique decomposition

$$Z = \bigoplus_{p \in \mathcal{P}} Z^{(p)},$$

where $Z^{(p)}$ is a p -group for each p . More explicitly, $Z^{(p)} = \{z \in Z : \exists e \geq 0, p^e \cdot z = 0\}$. We call $Z^{(p)}$ the *p -part* of Z .

Lemma 3.14. *Let $p \in \mathcal{P}$.*

- (1) Let $\mathfrak{c} \in \text{Ideals}_K$. The p -part $(\mathcal{O}_K/\mathfrak{c})^{(p)}$ of the finite abelian group $\mathcal{O}_K/\mathfrak{c}$ is isomorphic to $\mathcal{O}_K/(\mathfrak{c}^{(p)})$ by the composition

$$(\mathcal{O}_K/\mathfrak{c})^{(p)} \hookrightarrow \mathcal{O}_K/\mathfrak{c} \twoheadrightarrow \mathcal{O}_K/(\mathfrak{c}^{(p)})$$

of the inclusion followed by the canonical surjection.

- (2) Let Z and W be finite abelian groups. Then the following map gives a bijection

$$\text{Hom}(Z, W) \xrightarrow{\cong} \bigoplus_{p \in \mathcal{P}} \text{Hom}(Z^{(p)}, W^{(p)}); \quad \psi \mapsto (\psi^{(p)})_{p \in \mathcal{P}},$$

where $\psi^{(p)}$ is defined as the restriction of ψ to $Z^{(p)}$.

Proof. To prove (1), simply take the p -part of both sides of the isomorphism by the Chinese remainder theorem:

$$\mathcal{O}_K/\mathfrak{c} \xrightarrow{\cong} \prod_{p \in \mathcal{P}} \mathcal{O}_K/\mathfrak{c}^{(p)}.$$

Next we prove (2). Since Z and W are finite abelian groups, we have decompositions into finite direct products $Z \simeq \bigoplus_{p \in \mathcal{P}} Z^{(p)}$ and $W \simeq \bigoplus_{\ell \in \mathcal{P}} W^{(\ell)}$. This implies the direct sum decomposition

$$\text{Hom}(Z, W) \xrightarrow{\cong} \bigoplus_{p, \ell \in \mathcal{P}} \text{Hom}(Z^{(p)}, W^{(\ell)}) = \bigoplus_{p \in \mathcal{P}} \text{Hom}(Z^{(p)}, W^{(p)}),$$

where the last equality follows by observing that $\text{Hom}(Z^{(p)}, W^{(\ell)}) = 0$ for $p \neq \ell$. Thus, a homomorphism $\psi : Z \rightarrow W$ is determined by its p -components $\psi^{(p)} : Z^{(p)} \rightarrow W^{(p)}$. Since $\psi^{(p)}$ is the composition of the three homomorphisms $Z^{(p)} \xrightarrow{\psi|_{Z^{(p)}}} W^{(p)} \hookrightarrow W \twoheadrightarrow W^{(p)}$ in which the composition of the last two is the identity, the claimed correspondence follows. \square

An ideal $\mathfrak{a} \in \text{Ideals}_K$ is said to be *square-free* if, in the prime ideal decomposition $\mathfrak{a} = \prod_{\mathfrak{p} \in |\text{Spec}(\mathcal{O}_K)|} \mathfrak{p}^{e_{\mathfrak{p}}}$, the condition $e_{\mathfrak{p}} \in \{0, 1\}$ holds for all $\mathfrak{p} \in |\text{Spec}(\mathcal{O}_K)|$.

Lemma 3.15. *For $p \in \mathcal{P}$, we have $\#(|\text{Spec}(\mathcal{O}_K)|^{(p)}) \leq n$. In particular, the number of square free p -ideals is at most 2^n .*

Proof. Every $\mathfrak{p} \in |\text{Spec}(\mathcal{O}_K)|^{(p)}$ appears in the prime ideal decomposition of $p\mathcal{O}_K$. Thus

$$p\mathcal{O}_K = \prod_{\mathfrak{p} \in |\text{Spec}(\mathcal{O}_K)|^{(p)}} \mathfrak{p}^{e_{\mathfrak{p}}}, \quad e_{\mathfrak{p}} \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Taking the norm of both sides using Lemma 3.7, we find

$$n = \sum_{\mathfrak{p} \in |\text{Spec}(\mathcal{O}_K)|^{(p)}} f_{\mathfrak{p}} e_{\mathfrak{p}} \geq \#(|\text{Spec}(\mathcal{O}_K)|^{(p)}).$$

This proves the first statement. The second statement follows from the first by the definition of square-freeness. \square

Let us record the following corollary to the Chinese remainder theorem. Lemma 3.16 will be employed in Subsection 6.7 and Section 10.

Lemma 3.16 (Chinese Remainder Theorem for modules). *Let M be a module over a (commutative unital) ring A and $\mathfrak{a}_1, \dots, \mathfrak{a}_s$ mutually coprime ideals of A . Then we have an equality of ideals*

$$\bigcap_{i \in [s]} \mathfrak{a}_i = \prod_{i \in [s]} \mathfrak{a}_i \tag{3.2}$$

and the next natural maps of rings and A -modules are isomorphisms:

$$A / \left(\prod_{i \in [s]} \mathfrak{a}_i \right) \xrightarrow{\cong} \prod_{i \in [s]} A / \mathfrak{a}_i, \tag{3.3}$$

$$M / \left(\prod_{i \in [s]} \mathfrak{a}_i \right) M \xrightarrow{\cong} \prod_{i \in [s]} M / \mathfrak{a}_i M. \tag{3.4}$$

Proof. The Chinese remainder theorem provides (3.2) and (3.3). For (3.4), consider the tensor product of (3.3) and M over A and apply [AM16, Chapter 2, Exercise 2]. (The usual proof of the Chinese remainder theorem equally works to prove (3.4).) \square

3.4 The Dedekind zeta function and density of ideals

In this subsection, we present some results on the Dedekind zeta function and density of ideals for a number field K .

Definition 3.17 (Dedekind zeta function; see [Neu99, Chapter VII, Definition 5.1]). The sum

$$\sum_{\mathfrak{a} \in \text{Ideals}_K} \frac{1}{\mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{a})^s}$$

converges absolutely and uniformly on every compact subset of the domain $\text{Re}(s) > 1$ in the complex plane. Here, the power is defined by $\mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{a})^s = \exp(s \log \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{a}))$ where $\log \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{a}) \in \mathbb{R}$ (among other branches of \log). We call the analytic function defined by this sum the *Dedekind zeta function* of K , and denote it by ζ_K .

Proposition 3.18 (see [Neu99, Chapter VII, Proposition 5.2]). *The infinite product*

$$\prod_{\mathfrak{p} \in |\text{Spec}(\mathcal{O}_K)|} \left(1 - \frac{1}{\mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{p})^s} \right)^{-1}$$

converges absolutely on the domain $\text{Re}(s) > 1$, and coincides with $\zeta_K(s)$.

It is known that the Dedekind zeta function ζ_K has analytic continuation to a meromorphic function on \mathbb{C} .

Theorem 3.19 (see [Neu99, Chapter VII, Corollary 5.11]). *The Dedekind zeta function ζ_K has a pole of order 1 at $s = 1$, and this is the unique pole. The residue $\kappa = \kappa_K$ of ζ_K at $s = 1$ is a positive real number.*

The residue $\kappa = \kappa_K$ can be expressed in terms of the class number $h = h_K$ (Subsection 3.2) and an invariant called the regulator of K . This expression is known as the class number formula. In this paper, however, we do not need the explicit form of κ .

Proposition 3.20 (Density of ideals; see [Hec81, Theorem 121 in §40]). *The residue κ of ζ_K at $s = 1$ coincides with the limit of the density of ideals in the following sense:*

$$\lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\#\{\mathfrak{a} \in \text{Ideals}_K : \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{a}) \leq L\}}{L} = \kappa > 0.$$

Next we turn to prime ideals. Item (1) of Theorem 3.21 will be used to bound from above the number of certain elements related to prime ideals in Proposition 8.27, Proposition 9.21 and Subsection 10.6. Item (2) of Theorem 3.21 will be used to bound from below the number of prime elements.

Theorem 3.21. (1) (Landau's prime ideal theorem, see [Hei67, Theorem 3]). *We have*

$$\#\{\mathfrak{p} \in |\text{Spec}(\mathcal{O}_K)| : \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{p}) \leq L\} = (1 + o_{L \rightarrow \infty; K}(1)) \cdot \frac{L}{\log L}.$$

(2) (Chebotarev density theorem for principal prime ideals). *Denote by $|\text{Spec}(\mathcal{O}_K)|^{\text{PI}}$ the set of non-zero principal prime ideals of \mathcal{O}_K . Let h be the class number of K . Then*

$$\#\{\mathfrak{p} \in |\text{Spec}(\mathcal{O}_K)|^{\text{PI}} : \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{p}) \leq L\} = (1 + o_{L \rightarrow \infty; K}(1)) \cdot \frac{1}{h} \cdot \frac{L}{\log L}.$$

Proof of (2). This is a special case of the Chebotarev density theorem [Hei67, Theorem 4], a reformulation of which is stated as Theorem 10.28 below. See the paragraph after Theorem 10.28 for how to deduce our current statement. \square

Remark 3.22. Some readers might be more familiar with the Chebotarev density theorem in the analytic density version (e.g. [Neu99, Chapter VII, Theorem 13.2]):

$$\lim_{s \rightarrow 1+0} \frac{\prod_{\mathfrak{p} \in |\text{Spec}(\mathcal{O}_K)|^{\text{PI}}} \left(1 - \frac{1}{\mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{p})^s}\right)^{-1}}{\log\left(\frac{1}{s-1}\right)} = \frac{1}{h}. \quad (3.5)$$

In general, if $f(s) = \sum_{n \geq 1} \frac{a_n}{n^s}$ is a Dirichlet series with real coefficients convergent in the domain $\text{Re}(s) > 1$, then the following inequalities are known:

$$\limsup_{x \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{\sum_{1 \leq n \leq x} a_n}{\log\left(\frac{x}{\log x}\right)} \geq \limsup_{s \rightarrow 1+0} \frac{f(s)}{\log\left(\frac{1}{s-1}\right)}, \quad \liminf_{s \rightarrow 1+0} \frac{f(s)}{\log\left(\frac{1}{s-1}\right)} \geq \liminf_{x \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{\sum_{1 \leq n \leq x} a_n}{\log\left(\frac{x}{\log x}\right)}. \quad (3.6)$$

The proof is straightforward with Abel's summation method. See for example [Lan53, Definition on p. 103 and Theorem on p. 118].

By setting $a_n := \#\{\mathfrak{p} \in |\mathrm{Spec}(\mathcal{O}_K)|^{\mathrm{PI}} : \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{p}) = n\}$, we can see that Theorem 3.21 (2) implies (3.5). Conversely, given (3.5), by the first half of (3.6) we conclude that the following estimate for the number of principal prime ideals holds for *infinitely many* $x \in \mathbb{N}$:

$$\#\{\mathfrak{p} \in |\mathrm{Spec}(\mathcal{O}_K)|^{\mathrm{PI}} : \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{p}) \leq x\} \geq \frac{1}{2h} \cdot \frac{x}{\log x}.$$

Whereas the assertion above is weaker than that of Theorem 3.21 (2), this suffices for the proofs of infinitary statements such as Theorem 1.3 and Corollary 1.5.

3.5 Distribution of rational primes

In this subsection we list three results on the distribution of primes in $K = \mathbb{Q}$. We use the notation introduced in Subsection 2.3. As in Subsection 3.4, L will denote a real parameter greater than 1. The number of rational primes not exceeding L is denoted by $\pi(L)$.

The first result, Lemma 3.23 below, will be used in the proof of Lemma 6.24.

Lemma 3.23. *For $L > 1$, we have*

$$\sum_{p \in \mathcal{P}_{>L}} \frac{1}{p^2} = O\left(\frac{1}{L \log L}\right).$$

Proof. It follows from inequality (3.7) below and [HW08, (22.4.2)] that

$$\pi(L) \leq L^{\frac{3}{5}} + \frac{5}{3} \cdot \frac{\vartheta(L)}{\log L} < \left(1 + \frac{10}{3} \log 2\right) \cdot \frac{L}{\log L} < \frac{3.5L}{\log L}.$$

By Abel's summation formula (see [HW08, Theorem 421]), we obtain

$$\sum_{p \in \mathcal{P}_{>L}} \frac{1}{p^2} = -\frac{\pi(L)}{L^2} + 2 \int_L^\infty \frac{\pi(t)}{t^3} dt \leq 7 \int_L^\infty \frac{dt}{t^2 \log t} \leq \frac{7}{L \log L},$$

as desired. □

The second result is known as Mertens's first theorem. It will be used in the proof of Lemma 6.26.

Proposition 3.24 (Mertens's first theorem; see [HW08, Theorem 425]). *For $L \geq 2$,*

$$\sum_{p \in \mathcal{P}_{\leq L}} \frac{\log p}{p} = \log L + O(1).$$

The third result is on the *first Chebyshev function*: $\vartheta(L) := \sum_{p \in \mathcal{P}_{\leq L}} \log p$. The prime number theorem is equivalently formulated as the asymptotic $\vartheta(L) = (1 + o_{L \rightarrow \infty}(1))L$. For us, the following linear bound, whose proof is considerably easier, suffices:

Proposition 3.25 (Chebyshev's theorem; see [HW08, Theorem 415]). *For $L \geq 1$, we have*

$$\vartheta(L) \leq 2(\log 2)L. \tag{3.7}$$

This will be employed to determine the choice of $w = w(M)$ in Section 7.

4 Norm-length compatibility and geometry of numbers

In this section, we study the NL-compatibility of subsets of $\mathcal{O}_K \setminus \{0\}$, which was introduced in Definition 2.7. In Subsection 4.1, we recall some definitions from the *geometry of numbers*, including Minkowski embeddings. In Subsection 4.2, we characterize the NL-compatibility in terms of the (weighted) multiplicative Minkowski embedding (Theorem 4.7). Then, in Subsection 4.3, we provide a way of constructing an NL-compatible \mathcal{O}_K^\times -fundamental domain (Definition 4.10, Proposition 4.11). The existence of an NL-compatible fundamental domain plays a key role throughout the present paper. We remark that these ideas have already been used essentially in [May20, Lemma 4.2].

In Subsection 4.4, we estimate the size of subsets of \mathcal{O}_K^\times -orbits truncated by bounding the ℓ_∞ -length. The results, Lemma 4.14 and Corollary 4.16, enable us to switch from counting ideals to counting elements in Sections 8–10. Here is the setting of this section.

Setting 4.1. Let K be a number field of degree n , and let $\omega = (\omega_1, \dots, \omega_n)$ be an integral basis of K . Let ϵ be fundamental units of K . We also use the notation defined in Setting 3.4 for embeddings. We say that a subset of a finite-dimensional real vector space is *bounded* if it is bounded with respect to some norm.

The notion of boundedness is independent of the choice of a norm. Indeed, it is equivalent to relative compactness in the natural topology.

4.1 Weighted multiplicative Minkowski embedding

Throughout this subsection, we use Setting 4.1. In this section, we introduce the additive Minkowski embedding and (weighted) multiplicative Minkowski embedding. We write

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_{i,\mathbb{R}}: K \otimes_{\mathbb{Q}} \mathbb{R} &\rightarrow \mathbb{R} & (i \in [r_1]), \\ \sigma_{r_1+j,\mathbb{R}}: K \otimes_{\mathbb{Q}} \mathbb{R} &\rightarrow \mathbb{C} & (j \in [2r_2]) \end{aligned}$$

for the \mathbb{R} -linear extensions of σ_i ($i \in [r_1]$) and σ_{r_1+j} ($j \in [2r_2]$). Then we define $\mathbf{N}_{\mathbb{R}}: K \otimes_{\mathbb{Q}} \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by

$$\mathbf{N}_{\mathbb{R}}(x) := \prod_{i \in [r_1]} |\sigma_{i,\mathbb{R}}(x)| \prod_{j \in [r_2]} |\sigma_{r_1+j,\mathbb{R}}(x)|^2. \quad (4.1)$$

This is the composite of the ring-theoretic norm (Remark 3.6) $N_{K \otimes_{\mathbb{Q}} \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{R}}: K \otimes_{\mathbb{Q}} \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and the absolute value $x \mapsto |x|$.

Definition 4.2. We define the *additive Minkowski embedding*

$$\mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{R}}: K \otimes_{\mathbb{Q}} \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{r_1} \times \mathbb{C}^{r_2}$$

by

$$\mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{R}}(x) := (\sigma_{1,\mathbb{R}}(x), \dots, \sigma_{r_1,\mathbb{R}}(x), \sigma_{r_1+1,\mathbb{R}}(x), \dots, \sigma_{r_1+r_2,\mathbb{R}}(x)) \quad (x \in K \otimes_{\mathbb{Q}} \mathbb{R}).$$

The restriction of $\mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{R}}$ to K will be denoted by \mathcal{M} . We also define the *weighted multiplicative Minkowski embedding*

$$\mathcal{L}_{\mathbb{R}}: (K \otimes_{\mathbb{Q}} \mathbb{R}) \setminus \{x \in K \otimes_{\mathbb{Q}} \mathbb{R} : \mathbf{N}_{\mathbb{R}}(x) = 0\} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{r_1+r_2}$$

by

$$\mathcal{L}_{\mathbb{R}}(x) := \mathbf{log}(\mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{R}}(x)), \tag{4.2}$$

where $\mathbf{log}: (\mathbb{R}^{\times})^{r_1} \times (\mathbb{C}^{\times})^{r_2} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{r_1+r_2}$ is defined by

$$\mathbf{log}(x_1, \dots, x_{r_1}, z_1, \dots, z_{r_2}) = (\log |x_1|, \dots, \log |x_{r_1}|, \sqrt{2} \log |z_1|, \dots, \sqrt{2} \log |z_{r_2}|).$$

In other words, the first r_1 coordinates of $\mathcal{L}_{\mathbb{R}}(x)$ are $\log |\sigma_{i,\mathbb{R}}(x)|$ ($i \in [r_1]$) and the latter r_2 are $\sqrt{2} \log |\sigma_{r_1+j,\mathbb{R}}(x)|$ ($j \in [r_2]$). See Remark 4.9 for the motivation of this specific weight convention. The restriction of $\mathcal{L}_{\mathbb{R}}$ to K^{\times} will be denoted by \mathcal{L} .

Lemma 4.3. *The additive Minkowski embedding $\mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{R}}$ is an isomorphism of \mathbb{R} -algebras.*

Proof. This follows from [Neu99, Chapter I, Proposition 5.2]. □

By definition we see that $\mathcal{L}: K^{\times} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{r_1+r_2}$ is a homomorphism of groups and that $\mu(K) \subseteq \ker \mathcal{L}$. By Lemma 3.13, we also have an inclusion $\mathcal{O}_K \cap \ker \mathcal{L} \subseteq \mu(K)$ so that \mathcal{L} induces an injection $\bar{\mathcal{L}}: \overline{\mathcal{O}_K^{\times}} := \mathcal{O}_K^{\times} / \mu(K) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{r_1+r_2}$.

Definition 4.4 (The hyperplane \mathcal{H} and vector u_0). We define a vector $u_0 \in \mathbb{R}^{r_1+r_2}$ by

$$u_0 := \underbrace{(1, 1, \dots, 1)}_{r_1}, \underbrace{(\sqrt{2}, \sqrt{2}, \dots, \sqrt{2})}_{r_2}.$$

Then we define the hyperplane \mathcal{H} in $\mathbb{R}^{r_1+r_2}$ by

$$\mathcal{H} := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^{r_1+r_2} : \langle x, u_0 \rangle = 0\}.$$

Here, $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ denotes the standard inner product on $\mathbb{R}^{r_1+r_2}$. We denote by $\mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{H}}$ the orthogonal projection from $\mathbb{R}^{r_1+r_2}$ onto the hyperplane \mathcal{H} .

Theorem 4.5. *The image $\bar{\mathcal{L}}(\overline{\mathcal{O}_K^{\times}})$ is a lattice of full rank in the hyperplane \mathcal{H} .*

Proof. This is essentially Dirichlet's unit theorem: [Neu99, Chapter I, Theorem 7.3]. □

4.2 Geometric characterization of NL-compatibility

We continue to use Setting 4.1.

Lemma 4.6. *Let Z be a subset of $K \otimes_{\mathbb{Q}} \mathbb{R}$. Then the following statements hold.*

- (1) *The set Z is bounded if and only if $\mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{R}}(Z) \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{r_1} \times \mathbb{C}^{r_2}$ is bounded.*
- (2) *Let $Z \subseteq (K \otimes_{\mathbb{Q}} \mathbb{R}) \setminus \{x : \mathbf{N}_{K,\mathbb{R}}(x) = 0\}$. If $\mathcal{L}_{\mathbb{R}}(Z)$ is bounded, then so is Z .*

- (3) Assume that $Z \subseteq (K \otimes_{\mathbb{Q}} \mathbb{R}) \setminus \{x : \mathbf{N}_{K, \mathbb{R}}(x) = 0\}$ is bounded and $\inf\{\mathbf{N}_{\mathbb{R}}(x) : x \in Z\} > 0$. Then $\mathcal{L}_{\mathbb{R}}(Z)$ is bounded.

Proof. Item (1) is obvious by Lemma 4.3. It follows that (2) and (3) are equivalent to the corresponding statements for subsets of $\mathbb{R}^{r_1} \times \mathbb{C}^{r_2}$. For $x = (x_1, \dots, x_{r_1}, z_1, \dots, z_{r_2}) \in \mathbb{R}^{r_1} \times \mathbb{C}^{r_2}$, denote by $N(x) = N_{\mathbb{R}^{r_1} \times \mathbb{C}^{r_2}/\mathbb{R}}(x) \in \mathbb{R}$ the ring-theoretic norm $N(x) = \prod_{i \in [r_1]} x_i \prod_{j \in [r_2]} |z_j|^2$. Now we have to prove:

- (2)' Let $Z \subseteq (\mathbb{R}^{\times})^{r_1} \times (\mathbb{C}^{\times})^{r_2}$. If $\mathbf{log}(Z) \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{r_1+r_2}$ is bounded, then so is Z .
- (3)' Assume that $Z \subseteq (\mathbb{R}^{\times})^{r_1} \times (\mathbb{C}^{\times})^{r_2}$ is bounded and $\inf\{N(x) : x \in Z\} > 0$. Then $\mathbf{log}(Z)$ is bounded.

Let us prove (2)'. In general, if $X \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ is a bounded set, then $\{z \in \mathbb{C}^{\times} : \log|z| \in X\}$ is bounded because this set can be written as $\{ue^x : u \in \mathbb{C}, |u| = 1, x \in X\}$. Hence (2)' follows.

Next we show (3)'. Write $x = (x_1, \dots, x_{r_1+r_2})$ for elements of $\mathbb{R}^{r_1} \times \mathbb{C}^{r_2}$. By the boundedness assumption on Z , there exists $C > 0$ such that the following holds for all $x \in Z$:

$$|x_j| < C \quad (j \in [r_1]), \quad |x_j|^2 < C \quad (j \in [r_1 + 1, r_2]).$$

Also, set $c = \inf\{N(x) : x \in Z\}$, which is positive by assumption. Then for every $i \in [r_1 + r_2]$, if we set $a = 1$ or 2 depending on whether $i \leq r_1$ or $i > r_1$, the following inequality holds for all $x \in Z$:

$$|x_i|^a = \frac{N(x)}{\prod_{j \in [r_1] \setminus \{i\}} |x_j| \prod_{j \in [r_1+1, r_2] \setminus \{i\}} |x_j|^2} > \frac{c}{C^{r_1+r_2-1}}.$$

Therefore there are uniform bounds on the values $\log|x_i|$ ($x \in Z, i \in [r_1 + r_2]$) from above and below, which implies that $\mathbf{log}(Z) \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{r_1+r_2}$ is bounded. \square

Theorem 4.7 (Geometric characterization of the NL-compatibility). *With reference to Setting 4.1, the following conditions are equivalent for $X \subseteq \mathcal{O}_K \setminus \{0\}$.*

- (i) X is NL-compatible;
- (ii) $(\mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{H}} \circ \mathcal{L})(X) (\subseteq \mathcal{H})$ is bounded. Here \mathcal{H} and $\mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{H}}$ are defined in Definition 4.4.

Proof. Note that the ℓ_{∞} -length $\|\cdot\|_{\infty, \omega}$ defined in Definition 2.2 can be naturally extended to K with values in \mathbb{Q} , and then to $K \otimes_{\mathbb{Q}} \mathbb{R}$ with values in \mathbb{R} (as the ℓ_{∞} -length with respect to the basis ω). This makes $K \otimes_{\mathbb{Q}} \mathbb{R}$ a normed vector space over \mathbb{R} . Let

$$\tilde{X} := \{\mathbf{N}(\alpha)^{-1/n} \alpha : \alpha \in X\} \subseteq K \otimes_{\mathbb{Q}} \mathbb{R}.$$

It follows from Definition 2.7 that (i) is equivalent to the boundedness of \tilde{X} . Since

$$\mathbf{N}_{K, \mathbb{R}}(\tilde{\alpha}) = 1 \quad (\tilde{\alpha} \in \tilde{X}), \tag{4.3}$$

we can use Lemma 4.6 (2) and (3) to conclude that \tilde{X} is bounded if and only if $\mathcal{L}_{\mathbb{R}}(\tilde{X})$ is bounded. Therefore, it only remains to establish

$$\mathcal{L}_{\mathbb{R}}(\tilde{X}) = (\mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{H}} \circ \mathcal{L})(X).$$

Observe that, for $t > 0$ and $x \in K \otimes_{\mathbb{Q}} \mathbb{R}$ with $\mathbf{N}_{K, \mathbb{R}}(x) \neq 0$, we have

$$\mathcal{L}_{\mathbb{R}}(t \cdot x) = \mathcal{L}_{\mathbb{R}}(x) + (\log t) \cdot u_0. \quad (4.4)$$

By (4.3), we have $\mathcal{L}_{\mathbb{R}}(\tilde{X}) \subseteq \mathcal{H}$, and hence

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_{\mathbb{R}}(\tilde{X}) &= \mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{H}}(\mathcal{L}_{\mathbb{R}}(\tilde{X})) \\ &= \{\mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{H}}(\mathcal{L}_{\mathbb{R}}(\mathbf{N}(\alpha)^{-1/n} \alpha)) : \alpha \in X\} \\ &= \{\mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{H}}(\mathcal{L}_{\mathbb{R}}(\alpha) + (\log \mathbf{N}(\alpha)^{-1/n}) u_0) : \alpha \in X\} \quad (\text{by (4.4)}) \\ &= \{\mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{H}}(\mathcal{L}(\alpha)) : \alpha \in X\} \\ &= (\mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{H}} \circ \mathcal{L})(X). \end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof. \square

We regard $\mathbb{R}^{r_1} \times \mathbb{C}^{r_2}$ as a normed real vector space by introducing the norm $\|\cdot\|_{\infty}$ defined by

$$\|(x_1, \dots, x_{r_1}, z_1, \dots, z_{r_2})\|_{\infty} = \max\{|x_1|, \dots, |x_{r_1}|, |z_1|, \dots, |z_{r_2}|\}. \quad (4.5)$$

Lemma 4.8. *Define*

$$\Theta := \max_{i \in [n]} \sum_{j \in [n]} |\sigma_i(\omega_j)|. \quad (4.6)$$

Then, for all $\alpha \in \mathcal{O}_K \setminus \{0\}$, we have inequalities

$$\|\mathcal{M}(\alpha)\|_{\infty} \leq \Theta \|\alpha\|_{\infty, \omega}, \quad (4.7)$$

$$\mathbf{N}(\alpha) \leq \Theta^n \|\alpha\|_{\infty, \omega}^n. \quad (4.8)$$

Proof. For $\alpha \in \mathcal{O}_K$, we have $|\sigma_i(\alpha)| \leq \Theta \|\alpha\|_{\infty, \omega}$ for all $i \in [n]$. This implies (4.7). Then (4.8) follows from (4.7) and Lemma 3.5. \square

Let \mathcal{D} be an NL-compatible \mathcal{O}_K^{\times} -fundamental domain on $\mathcal{O}_K \setminus \{0\}$. Then there exist constants $C = C(\omega, \mathcal{D}) > 0$ and $C' = C'(\omega) > 0$ such that

$$C \|\alpha\|_{\infty, \omega}^n \leq \mathbf{N}(\alpha) \leq C' \|\alpha\|_{\infty, \omega}^n \quad (\alpha \in \mathcal{D}). \quad (\text{NLC})$$

Indeed, the existence of C follows from Definition 2.7, while that of C' is ensured by Lemma 4.8. The inequality (NLC) will be used frequently in Sections 7 and 9.

Remark 4.9. In a conventional definition of the multiplicative Minkowski embedding, the coefficients of the logarithm of the imaginary embeddings are 2, instead of $\sqrt{2}$ in our Definition 4.2. The motivation for the coefficients $\sqrt{2}$ is as follows. With any coefficients, if we define \mathcal{H} such that we have $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{O}_K^\times) \subseteq \mathcal{H}$, and u_0 such that (4.4) holds, then our discussions so far work as well. In this case, we define $\mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{H}}: \mathbb{R}^{r_1+r_2} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$ as the projection associated with the decomposition $\mathbb{R}^{r_1+r_2} = \mathcal{H} \oplus \mathbb{R}u_0$. The advantage of our convention is that u_0 is orthogonal to \mathcal{H} with respect to the standard inner product of $\mathbb{R}^{r_1+r_2}$. This makes $\mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{H}}$ an orthogonal projection and makes our treatment in Subsection 4.4 slightly easier to write down.

4.3 Construction of the domain $\mathcal{D}_K(\epsilon, \sigma)$

We continue to use Setting 4.1. We fix fundamental units $\epsilon = (\epsilon_1, \dots, \epsilon_{r_1+r_2-1})$, and for each $i \in [r_1 + r_2 - 1]$, define $u_i := \overline{\mathcal{L}(\epsilon_i)}$. Then $u_1, u_2, \dots, u_{r_1+r_2-1}$ form a basis of \mathcal{H} , and hence $u_0, u_1, \dots, u_{r_1+r_2-1}$ form a basis of $\mathbb{R}^{r_1+r_2}$.

In this subsection, we construct an example of an NL-compatible \mathcal{O}_K^\times -fundamental domain. Its construction is classical (see for instance [Hec81, §40]) and in fact related to Proposition 3.20 on the density of ideals.

First, using the chosen fundamental units ϵ , we construct a preliminary domain $\tilde{\mathcal{D}}_K(\epsilon) \subseteq \mathcal{O}_K \setminus \{0\}$, which is almost an \mathcal{O}_K^\times -fundamental domain except that it is stable under the action of $\mu(K)$. Given an embedding $\sigma: K \hookrightarrow \mathbb{C}$, we then construct a fundamental domain $\mathcal{D}_K(\epsilon, \sigma)$ for the action $\mu(K) \curvearrowright \tilde{\mathcal{D}}_K(\epsilon)$. The \mathcal{O}_K^\times -fundamental domain $\mathcal{D}_K(\epsilon, \sigma)$ will turn out to be NL-compatible in Proposition 4.11.

Definition 4.10 (The fundamental domain $\mathcal{D}(\epsilon, \sigma)$). We define

$$\mathcal{C}_K(\epsilon) = \left\{ \left(\sum_{i \in [r_1+r_2-1]} y_i u_i \right) + y_0 u_0 : y_i \in [0, 1) \ (i \in [r_1 + r_2 - 1]), \ y_0 \in \mathbb{R} \right\}.$$

(1) We define a subset $\tilde{\mathcal{D}}_K(\epsilon)$ of $\mathcal{O}_K \setminus \{0\}$ as

$$\tilde{\mathcal{D}}_K(\epsilon) := \mathcal{L}_{\mathbb{R}}^{-1}(\mathcal{C}_K(\epsilon)) \cap (\mathcal{O}_K \setminus \{0\}).$$

(2) For an embedding $\sigma: K \hookrightarrow \mathbb{C}$, we define a subset $\mathcal{D}_K(\epsilon, \sigma)$ of $\mathcal{O}_K \setminus \{0\}$ as

$$\mathcal{D}_K(\epsilon, \sigma) := \left\{ \alpha \in \tilde{\mathcal{D}}_K(\epsilon) : 0 \leq \arg(\sigma(\alpha)) < \frac{2\pi}{\#\mu(K)} \right\},$$

where ‘arg’ denotes the argument of a non-zero complex number.

Proposition 4.11. *For an embedding $\sigma: K \hookrightarrow \mathbb{C}$, the set $\mathcal{D}_K(\epsilon, \sigma) \subseteq \mathcal{O}_K \setminus \{0\}$ is an \mathcal{O}_K^\times -fundamental domain which is NL-compatible.*

Proof. By Definition 4.10 (1), we have

$$(\mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{H}} \circ \mathcal{L})(\widetilde{\mathcal{D}}_K(\epsilon)) \subseteq \mathcal{C}_K(\epsilon) \cap \mathcal{H}.$$

Since $\mathcal{C}_K(\epsilon)$ is bounded, this implies that $(\mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{H}} \circ \mathcal{L})(\widetilde{\mathcal{D}}_K(\epsilon))$ is bounded. Then by Theorem 4.7, $\widetilde{\mathcal{D}}_K(\epsilon)$ is NL-compatible. Since $\mathcal{D}_K(\epsilon, \sigma) \subseteq \widetilde{\mathcal{D}}_K(\epsilon)$, $\mathcal{D}_K(\epsilon, \sigma)$ is also NL-compatible.

Next we show that $\mathcal{D}_K(\epsilon, \sigma)$ is an \mathcal{O}_K^\times -fundamental domain. It is clear from Definition 4.10 that $\mathcal{D}_K(\epsilon, \sigma) \subseteq \mathcal{O}_K \setminus \{0\}$. Since $\mu(K)$ is a cyclic group, we can write $\sigma(\mu(K)) = \langle \zeta \rangle$, where $\zeta = e^{2\pi\sqrt{-1}/(\#\mu(K))} \in \mathbb{C}$. Thus

$$\sigma(\widetilde{\mathcal{D}}_K(\epsilon)) = \bigsqcup_{\xi \in \mu(K)} \sigma(\xi \mathcal{D}_K(\epsilon, \sigma)). \quad (4.9)$$

Since $\mathbb{R}^{r_1+r_2} = \bigsqcup_{\bar{\eta} \in \overline{\mathcal{O}_K^\times}} (\overline{\mathcal{L}}(\bar{\eta}) + \mathcal{C}_K(\epsilon))$, we have

$$\mathcal{O}_K \setminus \{0\} = \bigsqcup_{\bar{\eta} \in \overline{\mathcal{O}_K^\times}} \mathcal{L}^{-1}(\overline{\mathcal{L}}(\bar{\eta}) + \mathcal{C}_K(\epsilon)) \cap (\mathcal{O}_K \setminus \{0\}) = \bigsqcup_{\bar{\eta} \in \overline{\mathcal{O}_K^\times}} \eta \bigsqcup_{\xi \in \mu(K)} \xi \mathcal{D}_K(\epsilon, \sigma) = \bigsqcup_{\eta \in \mathcal{O}_K^\times} \eta \mathcal{D}_K(\epsilon, \sigma)$$

by (4.9). Therefore, $\mathcal{D}_K(\epsilon, \sigma)$ is an \mathcal{O}_K^\times -fundamental domain. \square

Note that $\mathcal{L}_{\mathbb{R}}(\mathcal{D}_K(\epsilon, \sigma)) = \mathcal{C}_K(\epsilon)$.

Example 4.12. For $K = \mathbb{Q}(\sqrt{2})$, the ring of integers is $\mathcal{O}_K = \mathbb{Z}[\sqrt{2}]$, and we may take fundamental units to be $\epsilon = (1 + \sqrt{2})$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{C}_K(\epsilon) &= \{y_0(1, 1) + y_1(\log(\sqrt{2} + 1), \log(\sqrt{2} - 1)) : y_0 \in \mathbb{R}, y_1 \in [0, 1)\} \\ &= \{(x, y) : x, y \in \mathbb{R}, 0 \leq x - y < \log(3 + 2\sqrt{2})\}, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_{\mathbb{R}}^{-1}(\mathcal{C}_K(\epsilon)) &= \{a + b\sqrt{2} : a, b \in \mathbb{R}, a > 2b \geq 0 \text{ or } b > a \geq 0\} \\ &\cup \{a + b\sqrt{2} : a, b \in \mathbb{R}, a < 2b \leq 0 \text{ or } b < a \leq 0\}. \end{aligned}$$

Define an embedding $\sigma: K \hookrightarrow \mathbb{C}$ by $\sigma(x + y\sqrt{2}) = x + \sqrt{2}y$ ($x, y \in \mathbb{Q}$). Then, we have that $\mathcal{D}_K(\epsilon, \sigma) = \{a + b\sqrt{2} : a, b \in \mathbb{Z}, a > 2b \geq 0 \text{ or } b > a \geq 0\}$. In Figure 2, we illustrate the \mathcal{O}_K^\times -fundamental domain $\mathcal{D}_K(\epsilon, \sigma)$ and its image $\mathcal{C}_K(\epsilon)$ under $\mathcal{L}_{\mathbb{R}}$.

The following statement explains why we need the notion of NL-compatibility.

Proposition 4.13. *Assume the unit group of K is infinite, equivalently, $r_1 + r_2 \geq 2$. Let $S \subseteq \mathcal{O}_K$ be a finite subset with $\#S \geq 3$. Then there exists an \mathcal{O}_K^\times -fundamental domain $\mathcal{D}_S \subseteq \mathcal{O}_K \setminus \{0\}$ such that \mathcal{D}_S contains no S -constellation.*




Figure 2: The case $K = \mathbb{Q}(\sqrt{2})$ with $L = 6$, $L' = 1000$.

Proof. By Lemma 3.13, we have $(\mathcal{O}_K \setminus \{0\}) \cap \ker \mathcal{L} = \mu(K)$. Since \mathcal{O}_K^\times is infinite, there exists $\varepsilon \in \mathcal{O}_K^\times \setminus \ker \mathcal{L}$. We claim, for all $\alpha \in \mathcal{O}_K \setminus \{0\}$,

$$\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \|\mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{R}}(\varepsilon^m \alpha)\|_{\infty} = \infty. \quad (4.10)$$

Indeed, since $\varepsilon \in \mathcal{O}_K^\times$, we have $1 = \mathbf{N}(\varepsilon)$, while $\mathcal{L}(\varepsilon) \neq 0$ implies that $|\sigma_i(\varepsilon)| \neq 1$ for some $i \in [n]$. Thus, there exists $i_0 \in [r_1 + r_2]$ such that $|\sigma_{i_0}(\varepsilon)| > 1$. Then for $m \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\|\mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{R}}(\varepsilon^m \alpha)\|_{\infty} \geq |\sigma_{i_0}(\varepsilon^m \alpha)| = |\sigma_{i_0}(\varepsilon)|^m |\sigma_{i_0}(\alpha)| \rightarrow \infty \quad (m \rightarrow \infty).$$

Define

$$\mathcal{R} := \max_{\{s_1, s_2, s_3\} \in \binom{S}{3}} \frac{\|\mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{R}}(s_3) - \mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{R}}(s_2)\|_{\infty}}{\|\mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{R}}(s_2) - \mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{R}}(s_1)\|_{\infty}},$$

where $\binom{S}{3}$ is the family of all three-element subsets of S . Note that the denominator above is never zero by Lemma 4.3.

We enumerate the elements of the countable set $(\mathcal{O}_K \setminus \{0\})/\mathcal{O}_K^\times$ as $\{v_m : m \in \mathbb{N}\}$. Fix α_1 for a representative for v_1 . By (4.10), the image of the equivalence class $v_m \subseteq \mathcal{O}_K \setminus \{0\}$ under the embedding $\mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{R}}$ is unbounded. Thus, we may take a sequence $(\alpha_m)_{m \in \mathbb{N}}$, chosen inductively on m , such that for all $m \in \mathbb{N}$, α_m is a representative of v_m and

$$\|\mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{R}}(\alpha_{m+1})\|_{\infty} \geq (2\mathcal{R} + 2)\|\mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{R}}(\alpha_m)\|_{\infty} \quad (4.11)$$

holds. Let $\mathcal{D}_S := \{\alpha_m : m \in \mathbb{N}\}$. By construction, \mathcal{D}_S is an \mathcal{O}_K^\times -fundamental domain.

We will show that \mathcal{D}_S contains no S -constellation. Suppose, by way of contradiction, \mathcal{D}_S contains an S -constellation \mathcal{S} . By Lemma 4.3, we have

$$\mathcal{R} = \max_{\{s'_1, s'_2, s'_3\} \in \binom{\mathcal{S}}{3}} \frac{\|\mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{R}}(s'_3) - \mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{R}}(s'_2)\|_{\infty}}{\|\mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{R}}(s'_2) - \mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{R}}(s'_1)\|_{\infty}}. \quad (4.12)$$

Let $\beta_1, \beta_2, \beta_3 \in \mathcal{S}$ be distinct. Then, there exist distinct $m_1, m_2, m_3 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\beta_j = \alpha_{m_j}$ for $j = 1, 2, 3$. We may assume without loss of generality that $m_1 < m_2 < m_3$. Since

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{R}}(\beta_3) - \mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{R}}(\beta_2)\|_{\infty} &\geq \left| \|\mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{R}}(\alpha_{m_3})\|_{\infty} - \|\mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{R}}(\alpha_{m_2})\|_{\infty} \right| \\ &\geq ((2\mathcal{R} + 2)^{m_3 - m_2} - 1) \|\mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{R}}(\beta_2)\|_{\infty} \quad (\text{by (4.11)}) \\ &\geq (2\mathcal{R} + 1) \|\mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{R}}(\beta_2)\|_{\infty}, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{R}}(\beta_2) - \mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{R}}(\beta_1)\|_{\infty} &\leq \|\mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{R}}(\beta_2)\|_{\infty} + \|\mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{R}}(\beta_1)\|_{\infty} \\ &\leq \|\mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{R}}(\beta_2)\|_{\infty} + \frac{1}{2\mathcal{R} + 2} \|\mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{R}}(\beta_2)\|_{\infty} \quad (\text{by (4.11)}) \\ &< 2\|\mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{R}}(\beta_2)\|_{\infty}, \end{aligned}$$

we have

$$\frac{\|\mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{R}}(\beta_3) - \mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{R}}(\beta_2)\|_{\infty}}{\|\mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{R}}(\beta_2) - \mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{R}}(\beta_1)\|_{\infty}} > \frac{2\mathcal{R} + 1}{2} > \mathcal{R}.$$

This contradicts (4.12). □

4.4 Counting elements in \mathcal{O}_K^{\times} -orbits with respect to the ℓ_{∞} -length

In this subsection, we give an estimate on the size of subsets of the orbit $\mathcal{O}_K^{\times} \cdot \alpha$ truncated by ℓ_{∞} -length. More precisely, for $M \geq 1$, in Lemma 4.14 we give an upper bound on $\#((\mathcal{O}_K^{\times} \cdot \alpha) \cap \mathcal{O}_K(\boldsymbol{\omega}, M))$.

The results in this subsection are not needed to prove Theorem 2.8 because the mapping $\mathcal{O}_K \setminus \{0\} \ni \alpha \mapsto \alpha \mathcal{O}_K \in \text{Ideals}_K$ restricted to an \mathcal{O}_K^{\times} -fundamental domain is injective. However, to prove Theorem A, where we are no longer in an \mathcal{O}_K^{\times} -fundamental domain, an estimate as above is in addition required.

We continue to use Setting 4.1. Recall from Definition 4.2 the additive and weighted multiplicative Minkowski embeddings, and from Definition 4.4 the hyperplane \mathcal{H} and vector u_0 . Further, recall the ℓ_{∞} -length on $\mathbb{R}^{r_1} \times \mathbb{C}^{r_2}$ defined in (4.5), and the constant Θ defined in (4.6). We define the following sets:

$$\mathcal{Q} := (-\infty, 0]^{r_1 + r_2}, \quad \mathcal{T} := \frac{1}{n}(u_0 + \mathcal{Q}) \cap \mathcal{H}.$$

The following lemma is a key to counting the number of associates of a given element $\alpha \in \mathcal{O}_K \setminus \{0\}$ in $\mathcal{O}_K(\boldsymbol{\omega}, M)$. The assumption $\mathbf{N}(\alpha) \leq \Xi M^n$ in Lemma 4.14 (1) is not essential, as is seen from Lemma 4.8. We write $k := r_1 + r_2 - 1$.

Lemma 4.14. (1) *There exists $\Xi > 0$ depending only on ω , such that for all $M \geq 1$ and $\alpha \in \mathcal{O}_K \setminus \{0\}$ with $\mathbf{N}(\alpha) \leq \Xi M^n$,*

$$\#(\mathcal{O}_K^\times \cdot \alpha \cap \mathcal{O}_K(\omega, M)) \leq \Xi \cdot \left(\log \frac{\Xi M^n}{\mathbf{N}(\alpha)} \right)^k$$

holds.

(2) *There exists $\Xi' > 0$ depending only on ω , such that for all $M \geq 2$ and $\alpha \in \mathcal{O}_K \setminus \{0\}$,*

$$\#(\mathcal{O}_K^\times \cdot \alpha \cap \mathcal{O}_K(\omega, M)) \leq \Xi' \cdot (\log M)^k$$

holds.

Lemma 4.14 follows from the classical fact that the number of lattice points in a large enough, well-behaved bounded subset of a Euclidean space such as a convex body can be approximated by its volume, and in particular bounded by a multiple of the volume. For the convenience of the reader we explain the proof of Lemma 4.14 in a self-contained manner. The proof of Lemma 4.14 will be provided after the following auxiliary lemma. In these proof, see Figure 3.




Figure 3: Images under \mathcal{L} and areas in Lemmas 4.14 and 4.15

Lemma 4.15. *For $\alpha \in \mathcal{O}_K \setminus \{0\}$, the following statements hold.*

(1) $\mathcal{L}(\alpha) \in (\log(\Theta\|\alpha\|_{\infty,\omega}))u_0 + \mathcal{Q}$,

(2) *Let $M > 0$ and $\alpha \in \mathcal{O}_K(\Theta^n M^n)$. Then for every $\beta \in \mathcal{O}_K^\times \cdot \alpha \cap \mathcal{O}_K(\omega, M)$, we have*

$$\mathcal{L}(\beta) - \frac{\log \mathbf{N}(\alpha)}{n} u_0 \in \left(\log \frac{\Theta^n M^n}{\mathbf{N}(\alpha)} \right) \cdot \mathcal{T}.$$

Proof. Item (1) follows from (4.7). Since $\alpha \in \mathcal{O}_K(\Theta^n M^n)$, we have

$$(\log(\Theta^n M^n) - \log \mathbf{N}(\alpha))\mathcal{Q} = \mathcal{Q}.$$

Thus, by (1), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}(\beta) - \frac{\log \mathbf{N}(\alpha)}{n} u_0 &\in \left(\frac{1}{n} (\log(\Theta^n M^n) - \log \mathbf{N}(\alpha)) u_0 + \mathcal{Q} \right) \cap \mathcal{H} \\ &= \frac{1}{n} (\log(\Theta^n M^n) - \log \mathbf{N}(\alpha)) ((u_0 + \mathcal{Q}) \cap \mathcal{H}) \\ &= \left(\log \frac{\Theta^n M^n}{\mathbf{N}(\alpha)} \right) \cdot \mathcal{T}. \end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof. \square

Proof of Lemma 4.14. Pick a relatively compact Borel measurable fundamental domain \mathcal{F} of the lattice $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{O}_K^\times)$ in \mathcal{H} . Since 0 is an interior point of \mathcal{T} in \mathcal{H} , we may choose $c > 0$ in such a way that $\mathcal{F} \subseteq c \cdot \mathcal{T}$. Let

$$\Xi := \max \left\{ \# \mu(K) \cdot \frac{\text{Leb}^{(k)}(\mathcal{T})}{\text{Leb}^{(k)}(\mathcal{F})}, e^c \Theta^n \right\},$$

where $\text{Leb}^{(k)}$ denotes the k -dimensional Lebesgue measure.

If $\mathbf{N}(\alpha) > \Theta^n M^n$, then $\mathcal{O}_K^\times \cdot \alpha \cap \mathcal{O}_K(\omega, M) = \emptyset$ by Lemma 4.8. Thus, we assume $\mathbf{N}(\alpha) \leq \Theta^n M^n$.

We define $L(\alpha, M)$ and $\tilde{L}(\alpha, M)$ by

$$\begin{aligned} L(\alpha, M) &:= \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{O}_K^\times \cdot \alpha \cap \mathcal{O}_K(\omega, M)) - \frac{\log \mathbf{N}(\alpha)}{n} u_0, \\ \tilde{L}(\alpha, M) &:= \bigsqcup_{v \in L(\alpha, M)} (v + \mathcal{F}). \end{aligned} \tag{4.13}$$

Since

$$L(\alpha, M) \subseteq \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{O}_K^\times) + \mathcal{L}(\alpha) - \frac{\log \mathbf{N}(\alpha)}{n} u_0 \subseteq \mathcal{H}$$

and \mathcal{F} is a fundamental domain of the lattice $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{O}_K^\times)$ in \mathcal{H} , the union in the right-hand side of (4.13) is indeed disjoint. Since the restriction of \mathcal{L} to $\mathcal{O}_K \setminus \{0\}$ has kernel $\mu(K)$, we have

$$\#(\mathcal{O}_K^\times \cdot \alpha \cap \mathcal{O}_K(\omega, M)) = \# \mu(K) \cdot \# L(\alpha, M). \tag{4.14}$$

By Lemma 4.15 (2), we have

$$L(\alpha, M) \subseteq \left(\log \frac{\Theta^n M^n}{\mathbf{N}(\alpha)} \right) \cdot \mathcal{T}.$$

Hence

$$\tilde{L}(\alpha, M) = L(\alpha, M) + \mathcal{F} \subseteq \left(\log \frac{\Theta^n M^n}{\mathbf{N}(\alpha)} + c \right) \cdot \mathcal{T},$$

since \mathcal{T} is convex. Therefore, by (4.13), we obtain

$$\#L(\alpha, M) \cdot \text{Leb}^{(k)}(\mathcal{F}) = \text{Leb}^{(k)}(\tilde{L}(\alpha, M)) \leq \text{Leb}^{(k)}(\mathcal{T}) \left(\log \frac{\Theta^n M^n}{\mathbf{N}(\alpha)} + c \right)^k.$$

This, together with (4.14) implies the inequality in (1).

To prove (2), let $\Xi' := (\log_2 \Xi + n)^k \cdot \Xi$. Assuming $M \geq 2$, we have $\log(\Xi M^n) \leq (\log_2 \Xi + n) \log M$. Since $\mathbf{N}(\alpha) \geq 1$, the desired inequality follows from (1). \square

The following variant, Corollary 4.16, will be used to prove our results on quadratic forms in Section 10 via the machinery in Sections 8 and 9.

For a \mathbb{Z} -basis $\mathbf{v} = (v_1, \dots, v_n)$ of an ideal $\mathfrak{a} \in \text{Ideals}_K$, write

$$v_j = \sum_{i \in [n]} c_{ij} \omega_i \quad (j \in [n]),$$

where $c_{ij} \in \mathbb{Z}$ for $i, j \in [n]$. Define

$$C_{\mathbf{v}} := \max_{i \in [n]} \sum_{j \in [n]} |c_{ij}|.$$

Recall from Definition 2.2 the ℓ_∞ -length $\|\cdot\|_{\infty, \mathbf{v}}$ and the set $\mathfrak{a}(\mathbf{v}, M)$ for $M \geq 0$.

Corollary 4.16. *Let $\mathfrak{a} \in \text{Ideals}_K$, and let \mathbf{v} be a \mathbb{Z} -basis of \mathfrak{a} .*

(1) *There exists a constant $\Xi(\mathbf{v}) > 0$ depending on \mathbf{v} such that for all $M \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 2}$ and for all $\alpha \in \mathfrak{a} \cap \mathcal{O}_K(\Xi(\mathbf{v})M^n)$, the inequality*

$$\#(\mathcal{O}_K^\times \cdot \alpha \cap \mathfrak{a}(\mathbf{v}, M)) \leq \Xi(\mathbf{v}) \cdot \left(\log \frac{\Xi(\mathbf{v})M^n}{\mathbf{N}(\alpha)} \right)^k$$

holds.

(2) *There exists a constant $\Xi'(\mathbf{v}) > 0$ depending on \mathbf{v} such that, for all $M \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 2}$ and for all $\alpha \in \mathfrak{a} \setminus \{0\}$, the inequality*

$$\#(\mathcal{O}_K^\times \cdot \alpha \cap \mathfrak{a}(\mathbf{v}, M)) \leq \Xi'(\mathbf{v}) \cdot (\log M)^k$$

holds.

Proof. Let $\Xi(\mathbf{v}) := \Xi C_{\mathbf{v}}^n$. Let $M \geq 1$ and $\alpha \in \mathfrak{a} \setminus \{0\}$. Since $\mathfrak{a}(\mathbf{v}, M) \subseteq \mathcal{O}_K(\boldsymbol{\omega}, C_{\mathbf{v}}M)$, we have

$$\#(\mathcal{O}_K^\times \cdot \alpha \cap \mathfrak{a}(\mathbf{v}, M)) \leq \#(\mathcal{O}_K^\times \cdot \alpha \cap \mathcal{O}_K(\boldsymbol{\omega}, C_{\mathbf{v}}M)). \quad (4.15)$$

To prove (1), suppose further that $\alpha \in \mathcal{O}_K(\Xi(\mathbf{v})M^n) = \mathcal{O}_K(\Xi(C_{\mathbf{v}}M)^n)$. Since $C_{\mathbf{v}} \geq 1$, the desired inequality follows from Lemma 4.14 (1) and (4.15).

To prove (2), let $\Xi'(\mathbf{v}) := \Xi' \cdot (\log_2 C_{\mathbf{v}} + 1)^k$ and assume $M \geq 2$. Then we have $\Xi' \cdot (\log(C_{\mathbf{v}}M))^k \leq \Xi'(\mathbf{v})(\log M)^k$. Now the desired inequality follows from Lemma 4.14 (2) and (4.15). \square

5 Relative multidimensional Szemerédi theorem

We develop an axiomatic framework that enables us to carry out Steps 5–7 in Subsection 2.3. More specifically, the goal of this section is to prove the relative multidimensional Szemerédi theorem (Theorem 5.4) below.

Setting 5.1. Let \mathcal{Z} be a free \mathbb{Z} -module of rank n . Let $\mathbf{v} = (v_i)_{i \in [n]}$ be a basis for \mathcal{Z} . Fix a finite subset $S \subseteq \mathcal{Z}$ which is the shape of constellations we are looking for and assume it is a standard shape (Definition 2.3). Namely, S generates \mathcal{Z} as a \mathbb{Z} -module and satisfies $0 \in S$ and $S = -S$. Let r be the positive integer defined by $\#S = r + 1$ and write $S = \{s_1, \dots, s_r, s_{r+1} = 0\}$. For $j \in [r + 1]$, set $e_j := [r + 1] \setminus \{j\}$.

Recall that for a given positive integer N , we define $\mathcal{Z}(\mathbf{v}, N) = \{\sum_{i \in [n]} a_i v_i \in \mathcal{Z} : a_i \in [-N, N] \text{ for all } i \in [n]\}$. We often denote elements of direct products $(a_i)_{i \in I} \in \prod_{i \in I} A_i$ by a_I for short.

5.1 The statement of the relative multidimensional Szemerédi theorem

The following is a multidimensional generalization of the celebrated theorem of Szemerédi. It was first established by Furstenberg–Katznelson [FK78], whose proof is based on ergodic theory. See Gowers [Gow07, Theorems 10.2, 10.3] and Rödl–Schacht–Tengan–Tokushige [RSTT06, Section 2] for a proof using the hypergraph removal lemma.

Theorem 5.2 (Multidimensional Szemerédi theorem). *Let n be a positive integer, δ a positive real number and S a finite subset of \mathbb{Z}^n . Then, there exists a positive integer $N_{\text{MS}}(\delta, S)$ such that for every $N \geq N_{\text{MS}}(\delta, S)$ and every subset $B \subseteq [-N, N]^n$ with*

$$\mathbb{E}(\mathbf{1}_B \mid [-N, N]^n) \geq \delta,$$

there exist S -constellations in B .

In this article, we prove a relative version (in terms of weight) of the above theorem, Theorem 5.4, and use it in the proof of the main theorems. To state Theorem 5.4, we now introduce a condition on weight functions $\lambda: \mathcal{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$.

Definition 5.3 ((ρ, N, S) -linear forms condition). Assume Setting 5.1. For each $\omega \in \bigsqcup_{j \in [r+1]} \{0, 1\}^{e_j}$, we define a \mathbb{Z} -linear map $\psi_S^{(\omega)}: \mathbb{Z}^{2r+2} \rightarrow \mathcal{Z}$ as follows: if $j \in [r]$, then the map associated to $\omega = (\omega_i)_{i \in e_j} \in \{0, 1\}^{e_j}$ is

$$\psi_S^{(\omega)}(a_1^{(0)}, \dots, a_{r+1}^{(0)}, a_1^{(1)}, \dots, a_{r+1}^{(1)}) := \left(\sum_{i \in [r] \setminus \{j\}} (s_i - s_j) a_i^{(\omega_i)} \right) + s_j a_{r+1}^{(\omega_{r+1})} \quad (5.1)$$

and if $\omega = (\omega_i)_{i \in e_{r+1}} \in \{0, 1\}^{e_{r+1}}$, then we define

$$\psi_S^{(\omega)}(a_1^{(0)}, \dots, a_{r+1}^{(0)}, a_1^{(1)}, \dots, a_{r+1}^{(1)}) := \sum_{i \in [r]} s_i a_i^{(\omega_i)}. \quad (5.2)$$

Let $0 < \rho < 1$ be a real number and N a positive integer. A function $\lambda: \mathcal{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ is said to satisfy the (ρ, N, S) -linear forms condition if for every subset $\mathcal{B} \subseteq \mathbb{Z}^{r+1}$ that is the product of intervals of lengths $\geq N$ and every $(n_\omega)_\omega \in \{0, 1\}^{\bigsqcup_{j \in [r+1]} \{0, 1\}^{e_j}}$, we have

$$\left| \mathbb{E} \left(\prod_{j \in [r+1]} \prod_{\omega \in \{0, 1\}^{e_j}} (\lambda \circ \psi_S^{(\omega)})^{n_\omega} \mid \mathcal{B} \times \mathcal{B} \right) - 1 \right| \leq \rho. \quad (5.3)$$

A function $\lambda: \mathcal{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ satisfying the (ρ, N, S) -linear forms condition is also called a (ρ, N, S) -pseudorandom measure on \mathcal{Z} .

We note that this terminology differs from the usage in preceding work of [GT08] and [CFZ15]. The role of this definition will be clear in the proof of Proposition 5.14.

The goal in this section is the following theorem, whose proof will be completed in Subsection 5.4.

Theorem 5.4 (Relative multidimensional Szemerédi theorem). *Assume Setting 5.1. Then for every $\delta > 0$, there exist positive real numbers $\gamma = \gamma_{\text{RMS}}(\mathbf{v}, \delta, S)$ and $\rho = \rho_{\text{RMS}}(\mathbf{v}, \delta, S)$ such that the following holds: let N be a positive integer and λ a (ρ, N, S) -pseudorandom measure on \mathcal{Z} . Let $B \subseteq \mathcal{Z}(\mathbf{v}, N)$ be a subset satisfying the next two conditions:*

- (i) (Weighted density) $\mathbb{E}(\mathbf{1}_B \cdot \lambda \mid \mathcal{Z}(\mathbf{v}, N)) \geq \delta$,
- (ii) (Smallness) $\mathbb{E}(\mathbf{1}_B \cdot \lambda^{r+1} \mid \mathcal{Z}(\mathbf{v}, N)) \leq \gamma N$.

Then B contains an S -constellation.

This covers Theorem 5.2. Indeed, consider $\mathcal{Z} := \mathbb{Z}^n$ with the standard basis \mathbf{v} and $\lambda := \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{Z}}$; then Theorem 5.4 implies Theorem 5.2 with threshold $N_{\text{MS}}(\delta, S) = (\gamma_{\text{RMS}}(\mathbf{v}, \delta, S))^{-1}$.

In some Szemerédi-type theorems, it is possible to obtain lower bounds of the asymptotic number of S -constellations with respect to the parameter N . Results of this sort date back to Varnavides's [Var59] work on Roth's theorem. This is also the case for our Theorem 5.4 in a weighted sense we now state.

Theorem 5.5. *In the setting of Theorem 5.4, in addition to the existence of S -constellations in B , we have the following inequality:*

$$\mathbb{E} \left(\prod_{s \in S} (\mathbf{1}_B \cdot \lambda)(\alpha + ks) \mid (\alpha, k) \in \mathcal{Z}(\mathbf{v}, N) \times [N] \right) > \gamma.$$

Remark 5.6. The smallness condition guarantees that the contribution of the 'trivial' S -constellations (those of the form $a + 0 \cdot S = \{a\}$) is small. This condition is necessary to prove the existence of 'non-trivial' S -constellations. The classical Szemerédi theorem as in [GT08, Theorem 3.5] and the relative multidimensional Szemerédi theorems in [Tao06, Theorem 2.18], [CFZ15, Theorem 3.1] do not impose the smallness condition on their formulations of the relative multidimensional Szemerédi theorem; instead, in the step of applications, they argue that the smallness condition is satisfied if the parameter N is sufficiently large.

Remark 5.7. Our main problem is to show the existence of S -constellations in a subset $A \subseteq \mathcal{Z}$. In this article, the subset A is the set of prime elements of the ring of integers in a number field K . In this case, it seems difficult to construct directly a pseudorandom measure on $\mathcal{Z} = \mathcal{O}_K$ to make the relative multidimensional Szemerédi theorem applicable. We will instead employ the so-called W -trick, where we choose suitable $W \in \mathbb{N}$ and $b \in \mathcal{O}_K$ and try to apply the relative multidimensional Szemerédi theorem to the inverse image of A by the affine transformation $\text{Aff}_{W,b}: \mathcal{O}_K \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_K$. If we can find an S -constellation in the inverse image $\text{Aff}_{W,b}^{-1}(A)$, then we may send it back by $\text{Aff}_{W,b}$ to obtain one in A . This approach was also used effectively by Green–Tao [GT08].

Before ending this subsection, let us prove the following elementary fact. This implies that the family of maps $(\psi_S^{(\omega)})_\omega$ in Definition 5.3 satisfies the conditions on kernels in Theorem 6.2 in Section 6.

Lemma 5.8. (1) *For a given j and $\omega \in \{0, 1\}^{e_j}$, consider the defining formulas (5.1) and (5.2) for the map $\psi_S^{(\omega)}$. Then the indices $(i, \sigma) \in [r + 1] \times \{0, 1\}$ where the variable $a_i^{(\sigma)}$ has a non-trivial coefficient are precisely those in the following set:*

$$A^{(\omega)} := \{(i, \omega_i)\}_{i \in e_j}.$$

(2) *For distinct $\omega, \omega' \in \bigsqcup_{j \in [r+1]} \{0, 1\}^{e_j}$, we have $A^{(\omega)} \not\subseteq A^{(\omega')}$.*

(3) *For distinct $\omega, \omega' \in \bigsqcup_{j \in [r+1]} \{0, 1\}^{e_j}$, we have $\ker(\psi_S^{(\omega)}) \not\subseteq \ker(\psi_S^{(\omega')})$.*

Proof. Item (1) is clear from the definition.

Now we show (2). For the notational convenience, we show the opposite inclusion $A^{(\omega')} \not\subseteq A^{(\omega)}$. If $j \neq j'$, then we have $(j, \omega'_j) \in A^{(\omega')} \setminus A^{(\omega)}$. If $j = j'$, there exists an $i \in e_j$ with $\omega_i \neq \omega'_i$. For this i , we have $(i, \omega'_i) \in A^{(\omega')} \setminus A^{(\omega)}$.

The assertion (3) follows from (2). Indeed, we have that there exists an element $(i, \sigma) \in A^{(\omega')} \setminus A^{(\omega)}$ by assertion (2). The vector whose (i, σ) -entry is 1 and the others are 0 belongs to $\ker(\psi_S^{(\omega)}) \setminus \ker(\psi_S^{(\omega')})$. This completes the proof. \square

5.2 Relative hypergraph removal lemma

As is the case for the other versions [Tao06, Theorem 2.18], [CFZ15, Theorem 3.1], Theorem 5.4 is derived from the *relative hypergraph removal lemma*. We use the version of Conlon–Fox–Zhao [CFZ15, Theorem 2.12] which is a refinement of Tao’s [Tao06, Theorem 2.17], which in turn is a relative generalization of the hypergraph removal lemma of Gowers [Gow07] and Nagle–Rödl–Schacht–Skokan [RS06, NRS06, RS07b, RS07a]. Cook–Magyar–Titichetrakun have proved a further strengthening of the relative hypergraph removal lemma [CMT18, Theorem 1.4] to prove the multidimensional Szemerédi theorem in the primes, although we do not need this in this paper.

Let J be a non-empty finite set and r a positive integer. The pair of J and a subset $E \subseteq \binom{J}{r}$ is called an r -uniform hypergraph (r -graph for short). Here, recall $\binom{J}{r} = \{e \in 2^J : \#e = r\}$ from our notation. If further for each $j \in J$ a finite set V_j is given, then we call the tuple $((J, E); (V_j)_{j \in J})$ an r -graph system. For a subset $e \subseteq J$ of indices, we write $V_e := \prod_{j \in e} V_j$ for short and $x_e := (x_j)_{j \in e} \in V_e$. Let $V = ((J, E); (V_j)_{j \in J})$ be an r -graph system. We say g is a weighted hypergraph on V if g is a tuple $g = (g_e)_{e \in E}$ of functions $g_e: V_e \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$. For two weighted hypergraphs $g = (g_e)_{e \in E}$ and $g' = (g'_e)_{e \in E}$ on V , we write $g \leq g'$ if for all $e \in E$, we have $g_e \leq g'_e$ pointwise.

Definition 5.9. Let ρ be a positive real number and $V = ((J, E); (V_j)_{j \in J})$ an r -graph system. We say a weighted hypergraph ν on V is ρ -pseudorandom if the following inequality holds for every tuple $(n_\omega)_\omega \in \{0, 1\}^{\sqcup_{e \in E} \{0, 1\}^e}$:

$$\left| \mathbb{E} \left(\prod_{e \in E} \prod_{\omega \in \{0, 1\}^e} \nu_e(x_e^{(\omega)})^{n_\omega} \mid (x_J^{(0)}, x_J^{(1)}) \in V_J \times V_J \right) - 1 \right| \leq \rho. \quad (5.4)$$

Here, the symbol $x_e^{(\omega)}$ denotes the tuple $(x_j^{(\omega_j)})_{j \in e} \in V_e$.

Now we are ready to state the relative hypergraph removal lemma.

Theorem 5.10 (Relative hypergraph removal lemma [CFZ15, Theorem 2.12]). *For every positive integer k and every positive $\varepsilon > 0$, there are positive real numbers $\gamma = \gamma_{\text{RHR}}(k, \varepsilon) > 0$ and $\rho = \rho_{\text{RHR}}(k, \varepsilon) > 0$ such that the following holds: let $V = ((J, E); (V_j)_{j \in J})$ be an r -graph system with $r \leq k = \#J$ and g, ν two weighted hypergraphs on V with $g \leq \nu$. If ν is ρ -pseudorandom and the estimate*

$$\mathbb{E} \left(\prod_{e \in E} g_e(x_e) \mid x_J \in V_J \right) \leq \gamma \quad (5.5)$$

holds, then there exists a family of subsets $E_e \subseteq V_e$ for $e \in E$ such that the following hold:

$$\bigcap_{e \in E} (E_e \times V_{J \setminus e}) = \emptyset$$

and for all $e \in E$,

$$\mathbb{E} (g_e \cdot \mathbf{1}_{V_e \setminus E_e} \mid V_e) \leq \varepsilon.$$

Remark 5.11. It will be useful later that the only requirement on the weighted hypergraph ν is ρ -randomness, with ρ depending only on k and ε . This fact might not be clear from the reference [CFZ15], where they consider a family $(\nu^{(N)})_{N \in \mathbb{N}}$ and state the above result for N large enough without explicitly mentioning how the threshold for N is determined.

Theorem 5.10 can be verified by examining the proof of Conlon–Fox–Zhao [CFZ15, Theorem 2.12] as follows: first, note that the dependence on N stems solely from the relative counting lemma [CFZ15, Theorem 2.17]. Also note that their arguments actually show Theorem 5.12 below by examining each $o(1)$ related to ν in the proof. This verifies Theorem 5.10 above. Such a family-free argument has already appeared in Romanić–Wolf [RW19] for the study of a quantitative version of the 1-dimensional relative Szemerédi theorem.

Theorem 5.12 (Relative counting lemma). *Let k be a positive integer, and ε and ρ sufficiently small positive real numbers depending on k . Then there exist positive real numbers ² a_k and b_k depending only on k such that the following holds. Let $V = ((J, E); (V_j)_{j \in J})$ be an r -graph system with $r \leq k = \#J$ and ν a ρ -pseudorandom weighted hypergraph on V . Let g and \tilde{g} be two weighted hypergraphs on V with $g \leq \nu$ and $\tilde{g} \leq 1$ such that (g, \tilde{g}) is a ε -discrepancy pair; see [CFZ15, Definition 2.13] for this notion. Then we have*

$$\left| \mathbb{E} \left(\prod_{e \in E} g_e(x_e) \mid x_J \in V_J \right) - \mathbb{E} \left(\prod_{e \in E} \tilde{g}_e(x_e) \mid x_J \in V_J \right) \right| = O_k(\varepsilon^{a_k} + \rho^{b_k}).$$

5.3 Construction of pseudorandom weighted hypergraphs

Assume Setting 5.1. Let $\phi_S: \mathbb{Z}^r \rightarrow \mathcal{Z}$ be the homomorphism of \mathbb{Z} -modules sending the i -th standard vector $\epsilon_i \in \mathbb{Z}^r$ to $s_i \in \mathcal{Z}$ for each $i \in [r]$. Let $\epsilon_{r+1} \in \mathbb{Z}^r$ denote the zero vector for a notational purpose. Since S generates \mathcal{Z} by assumption, we have the following exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow \ker(\phi_S) \longrightarrow \mathbb{Z}^r \xrightarrow{\phi_S} \mathcal{Z} \longrightarrow 0,$$

which splits because \mathcal{Z} is a free \mathbb{Z} -module.

Lemma 5.13. *There exists a positive integer $U = U(\mathbf{v}, S)$ such that the following holds: for every positive integer N and every $\alpha \in \mathcal{Z}(\mathbf{v}, N)$, we have the inequality*

$$(2N + 1)^{r-n} \leq \#(\phi_S^{-1}(\alpha) \cap [-UN, UN]^r) \leq (2UN + 1)^{r-n}.$$

Proof. Choose a \mathbb{Z} -linear section $\sigma: \mathcal{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}^r$ to ϕ_S . Choose a basis w_1, \dots, w_{r-n} for the rank $r - n$ free \mathbb{Z} -module $\ker(\phi_S)$. Then the vectors $\sigma(v_1), \dots, \sigma(v_n), w_1, \dots, w_{r-n}$ form a basis for \mathbb{Z}^r . Let U be r times the maximum of the absolute values of the entries of this combined basis.

The second inequality easily follows from the fact that $\ker(\phi_S)$ has rank $r - n$. Next, by the choice of U , we have an inclusion of sets

$$\left\{ \sigma(\alpha) + \sum_{i \in [r-n]} b_i w_i : b_i \in [-N, N] \ (i \in [r-n]) \right\} \subseteq \phi_S^{-1}(\alpha) \cap [-UN, UN]^r,$$

which shows the first inequality. □

Let U be an integer given by Lemma 5.13. Let N be a positive integer and $\lambda: \mathcal{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ a function. By following Solymosi [Sol03], we construct a weighted hypergraph $\nu = \nu(\lambda, N, \mathbf{v}, S)$ as follows. Denote by $K_{r+1}^{(r)} = ([r+1], \binom{[r+1]}{r})$ the complete r -hypergraph with

²For instance, we may take $a_k = 2^{1-2^{2^{k-1}-1}}$ and $b_k = 2^{1-(k+2)2^{2^{k-1}-2}}$.

$r + 1$ vertices. By our notation $e_j = [r + 1] \setminus \{j\}$, we have $\binom{[r+1]}{r} = \{e_j : j \in [r + 1]\}$. For each integer a and index $j \in [r + 1]$, we define a hyperplane $H_j(a)$ of \mathbb{Z}^r by

$$H_j(a) := \begin{cases} \{(x_1, \dots, x_r) \in \mathbb{Z}^r : x_j = a\} & \text{if } j \in [r], \\ \{(x_1, \dots, x_r) \in \mathbb{Z}^r : \sum_{i \in [r]} x_i = a\} & \text{if } j = r + 1 \end{cases}$$

and a set V_j by

$$V_j := \begin{cases} \{H_j(a) : a \in [-UN, UN]\} & \text{if } j \in [r], \\ \{H_{r+1}(a) : a \in [-rUN, rUN]\} & \text{if } j = r + 1. \end{cases} \quad (5.6)$$

We define an r -graph system V by $V := (K_{r+1}^{(r)}; (V_j)_{j \in [r+1]})$. Let $j \in [r + 1]$. For every tuple $(H_i)_{i \in \prod_{i \in e_j} V_i}$, the intersection $\bigcap_{i \in e_j} H_i$ consists of a single point. Let $T_j : V_{e_j} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}^r$ be the map sending the given tuple to the point. We define a weighted hypergraph $\nu = (\nu_{e_j})_{j \in [r+1]}$ on V by the following composition:

$$\nu_{e_j} : V_{e_j} \xrightarrow{T_j} \mathbb{Z}^r \xrightarrow{\phi_S} \mathcal{Z} \xrightarrow{\lambda} \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}. \quad (5.7)$$

Here, we exhibit an explicit form of the map T_j . Set $\mathcal{B} = \mathcal{B}(N, \mathbf{v}, S) := [-UN, UN]^r \times [-rUN, rUN]$. Then, for every point $a_{[r+1]} \in \mathcal{B}$, we have

$$T_j((H_i(a_i))_{i \in e_j}) = \begin{cases} \left(a_1, \dots, a_{j-1}, a_{r+1} - \sum_{i \in [r] \setminus \{j\}} a_i, a_{j+1}, \dots, a_r \right) & \text{if } j \in [r], \\ (a_1, \dots, a_r) & \text{if } j = r + 1. \end{cases} \quad (5.8)$$

Proposition 5.14. *Let ρ be a positive real number. If the function $\lambda : \mathcal{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ satisfies the (ρ, N, S) -linear forms condition, then the weighted hypergraph ν constructed in (5.6) and (5.7) is ρ -pseudorandom.*

Proof. In the current situation, the expectation in (5.4) is equal to

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left(\prod_{j \in [r+1]} \prod_{\omega \in \{0,1\}^{e_j}} (\lambda \circ \phi_S \circ T_j)(H_{e_j}^{(\omega)})^{n_\omega} \left| (H_{[r+1]}^{(0)}, H_{[r+1]}^{(1)}) \in V_{[r+1]} \times V_{[r+1]} \right. \right) \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left(\prod_{j \in [r+1]} \prod_{\omega \in \{0,1\}^{e_j}} (\lambda \circ \phi_S \circ T_j)((H_i(a_i^{(\omega)}))_{i \in e_j})^{n_\omega} \left| (a_{[r+1]}^{(0)}, a_{[r+1]}^{(1)}) \in \mathcal{B} \times \mathcal{B} \right. \right). \end{aligned}$$

By (5.8) and defining formulas (5.1), (5.2), we have for each $\omega \in \bigsqcup_{j \in [r+1]} \{0, 1\}^{e_j}$,

$$(\phi_S \circ T_j)((H_i(a_i^{(\omega)}))_{i \in e_j}) = \psi_S^{(\omega)}(a_{[r+1]}^{(0)}, a_{[r+1]}^{(1)})$$

and hence the expectation above equals

$$\mathbb{E} \left(\prod_{j \in [r+1]} \prod_{\omega \in \{0,1\}^{e_j}} (\lambda \circ \psi_S^{(\omega)})^{n_\omega} \left| \mathcal{B} \times \mathcal{B} \right. \right).$$

Since λ satisfies the (ρ, N, S) -linear forms condition, the difference of the above value and 1 is at most ρ . This verifies the desired ρ -pseudorandomness. \square

5.4 The proof of the relative multidimensional Szemerédi theorem

We use notation in Theorem 5.4. We prove Theorems 5.4 and 5.5 simultaneously.

Proof of Theorems 5.4 and 5.5. For a positive real number $\delta > 0$, set

$$\varepsilon = \varepsilon(\mathbf{v}, \delta, S) := \frac{\delta}{(r+1)(rU)^r},$$

where U is the integer given by Lemma 5.13. Also, using Theorem 5.10, set

$$\gamma = \gamma_{\text{RMS}}(\mathbf{v}, \delta, S) := \frac{2}{3}\gamma_{\text{RHR}}(r+1, \varepsilon), \quad \rho = \rho_{\text{RMS}}(\mathbf{v}, \delta, S) := \rho_{\text{RHR}}(r+1, \varepsilon).$$

Let N be a positive integer, λ a (ρ, N, S) -pseudorandom measure on \mathcal{Z} and $B \subseteq \mathcal{Z}(\mathbf{v}, N)$ a subset satisfying the weighted density and the smallness conditions in Theorem 5.4. Let $\nu = \nu(\lambda, N, \mathbf{v}, S)$ be the weighted hypergraph defined in (5.7), which is ρ -pseudorandom by Proposition 5.14. Define a subset $E_{e_j} \subseteq V_{e_j}$ for each $j \in [r+1]$ by $E_{e_j} := (\phi_S \circ T_j)^{-1}(B)$ and a weighted hypergraph $g = (g_{e_j})_{j \in [r+1]}$ on V by $g_{e_j} := \mathbf{1}_{E_{e_j}} \cdot \nu_{e_j}$. Then we have $g \leq \nu$ in the sense discussed at the beginning of Subsection 5.2.

By the definitions and (5.8), we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left(\prod_{j \in [r+1]} g_{e_j}(H_{e_j}) \mid H_{[r+1]} \in V_{[r+1]} \right) \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left(\prod_{j \in [r+1]} (\mathbf{1}_{E_{e_j}} \cdot \nu_{e_j})((H_i(a_i))_{i \in e_j}) \mid a_{[r+1]} \in \mathcal{B} \right) \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left(\prod_{j \in [r+1]} (\mathbf{1}_{\phi_S^{-1}(B)} \cdot (\lambda \circ \phi_S))(a_{[r]} + k\epsilon_j) \mid a_{[r+1]} \in \mathcal{B} \right), \end{aligned} \quad (5.9)$$

where $k := a_{r+1} - \sum_{i \in [r]} a_i$. By the upper bound in Lemma 5.13 and the smallness condition, the contribution of those $a_{[r+1]}$'s with $k = 0$ in the above expectation is bounded from above by

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{2rUN+1} \mathbb{E}(\mathbf{1}_{\phi_S^{-1}(B)} \cdot (\lambda \circ \phi_S)^{r+1} \mid [-UN, UN]^r) \\ & \leq \frac{(2UN+1)^{r-n}}{2rUN+1} \cdot \frac{(2N+1)^n}{(2UN+1)^r} \cdot \mathbb{E}(\mathbf{1}_B \cdot \lambda^{r+1} \mid \mathcal{Z}(\mathbf{v}, N)) \leq \frac{\gamma}{2}. \end{aligned} \quad (5.10)$$

By way of contradiction, suppose that the contribution of those $a_{[r+1]}$'s with $k \neq 0$ in (5.9) is at most γ , that is

$$\mathbb{E} \left(\prod_{j \in [r+1]} (\mathbf{1}_{\phi_S^{-1}(B)} \cdot (\lambda \circ \phi_S))(a_{[r]} + k\epsilon_j) \mid \begin{array}{l} a_{[r+1]} \in \mathcal{B} \\ \text{with } k \neq 0 \end{array} \right) \leq \gamma. \quad (5.11)$$

Combined with (5.10), it implies that the value (5.9) does not exceed $\frac{3}{2}\gamma = \gamma_{\text{RHR}}(r+1, \varepsilon)$. Therefore, Theorem 5.10 applies, and there exists a family $(E'_{e_j})_{j \in [r+1]}$ of subsets $E'_{e_j} \subseteq V_{e_j}$ for $j \in [r+1]$ such that

$$\bigcap_{j \in [r+1]} (E'_{e_j} \times V_j) = \emptyset \quad (5.12)$$

and

$$\mathbb{E}(\mathbf{1}_{E_{e_j} \setminus E'_{e_j}} \cdot \nu_{e_j} \mid V_{e_j}) \leq \varepsilon \quad \text{for all } j \in [r+1]. \quad (5.13)$$

We will argue that this contradicts the assumption of the weighted density condition.

Define a map $\iota_0: \phi_S^{-1}(B) \cap [-UN, UN]^r \rightarrow V_{[r+1]}$ by

$$\iota_0(a_{[r]}) := \left(H_1(a_1), \dots, H_r(a_r), H_{r+1} \left(\sum_{i \in [r]} a_i \right) \right).$$

Denote by $\text{pr}_{e_j}: V_{[r+1]} \rightarrow V_{e_j}$ the projection which forgets the j -th entry. Then, for all $j \in [r+1]$, the map $T_j \circ \text{pr}_{e_j} \circ \iota_0$ coincides with the inclusion map from $\phi^{-1}(B) \cap [-UN, UN]^r$ to \mathbb{Z}^r . Hence by the definition of E_{e_j} , it follows that ι_0 maps into $\bigcap_{j \in [r+1]} (E_{e_j} \times V_j)$.

Let us write $\widetilde{E}_{e_j} := E_{e_j} \times V_j$ and $\widetilde{E}'_{e_j} := E'_{e_j} \times V_j$ for short. Consider the following decreasing sequence of subsets

$$\bigcap_{j \in [r+1]} \widetilde{E}_{e_j} \supseteq \left(\bigcap_{j \in [r]} \widetilde{E}_{e_j} \cap \widetilde{E}'_{e_{r+1}} \right) \supseteq \left(\bigcap_{j \in [r-1]} \widetilde{E}_{e_j} \cap \bigcap_{j \in [r, r+1]} \widetilde{E}'_{e_j} \right) \supseteq \dots \supseteq \bigcap_{j \in [r+1]} \widetilde{E}'_{e_j} = \emptyset,$$

where the last equality is (5.12). Consider also the associated partition

$$\bigcap_{j \in [r+1]} \widetilde{E}_{e_j} = \bigsqcup_{j \in [r+1]} \left(\widetilde{E}_{e_1} \cap \dots \cap \left(\widetilde{E}_{e_j} \setminus \widetilde{E}'_{e_j} \right) \cap \dots \cap \widetilde{E}'_{e_{r+1}} \right).$$

Composing the projection $\text{pr}_{e_j}: \widetilde{E}_{e_j} \setminus \widetilde{E}'_{e_j} \rightarrow E_{e_j} \setminus E'_{e_j}$, we obtain the following composite map

$$\iota: \phi_S^{-1}(B) \cap [-UN, UN]^r \xrightarrow{\iota_0} \bigcap_{j \in [r+1]} \widetilde{E}_{e_j} \rightarrow \bigsqcup_{j \in [r+1]} E_{e_j} \setminus E'_{e_j},$$

which is injective since $T_j \circ \text{pr}_{e_j} \circ \iota_0$ is an inclusion map.

If $a_{[r]} \in \phi_S^{-1}(B) \cap [-UN, UN]^r$ is mapped by ι into $E_{e_j} \setminus E'_{e_j}$, then we have by definition of ν_{e_j} ,

$$(\lambda \circ \phi_S)(a_{[r]}) = \nu_{e_j}(\iota(a_{[r]})).$$

Therefore by the injectivity of ι and the lower bound in Lemma 5.13 we have that

$$\begin{aligned} (2N+1)^{r-n} \sum_{\alpha \in \mathcal{Z}(\mathbf{v}, N)} (\mathbf{1}_B \cdot \lambda)(\alpha) &\leq \sum_{a_{[r]} \in [-UN, UN]^r} (\mathbf{1}_{\phi^{-1}(B)} \cdot (\lambda \circ \phi_S))(a_{[r]}) \\ &\leq \sum_{\substack{j \in [r+1] \\ H_{e_j} \in V_{e_j}}} (\mathbf{1}_{E_{e_j} \setminus E'_{e_j}} \cdot \nu_{e_j})(H_{e_j}). \end{aligned}$$

We divide this formula by $(2N + 1)^r$ and apply (5.13). Since $\#V_{e_j} \leq (2rUN + 1)^r$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}(\mathbf{1}_B \cdot \lambda \mid \mathcal{Z}(\mathbf{v}, N)) &\leq \frac{1}{(2N + 1)^r} \sum_{j \in [r+1]} \#V_{e_j} \cdot \mathbb{E}(\mathbf{1}_{E_{e_j} \setminus E'_{e_j}} \cdot \nu_{e_j} \mid V_{e_j}) \\ &< (r + 1)(rU)^r \varepsilon = \delta. \end{aligned}$$

This contradicts the assumption of the weighted density condition. Therefore our supposition (5.11) turns out false and we conclude:

$$\sum_{\substack{a_{[r]} \in [-UN, UN]^r \\ a_{r+1} \in [-rUN, rUN] \\ \text{with } k \neq 0}} \prod_{j \in [r+1]} (\mathbf{1}_{\phi_S^{-1}(B)} \cdot (\lambda \circ \phi_S))(a_{[r]} + k\epsilon_j) > \gamma \cdot \#\mathcal{B}, \quad (5.14)$$

where we recall $k = a_{r+1} - \sum_{i \in [r]} a_i$. By the upper bound in Lemma 5.13 and the assumptions $0 \in S$ and $S = -S$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{L.H.S. of (5.14)} &\leq \sum_{\substack{a_{[r]} \in [-UN, UN]^r \\ k \in [-2rUN, 2rUN] \setminus \{0\}}} \prod_{j \in [r+1]} (\mathbf{1}_{\phi_S^{-1}(B)} \cdot (\lambda \circ \phi_S))(a_{[r]} + k\epsilon_j) \\ &\leq 2(2UN + 1)^{r-n} \sum_{\substack{\alpha \in \mathcal{Z}(\mathbf{v}, N) \\ k \in [2rUN]}} \prod_{s \in S} (\mathbf{1}_B \cdot \lambda)(\alpha + ks) \\ &= 2(2UN + 1)^{r-n} \sum_{\substack{\alpha \in \mathcal{Z}(\mathbf{v}, N) \\ k \in [N]}} \prod_{s \in S} (\mathbf{1}_B \cdot \lambda)(\alpha + ks). \end{aligned}$$

The last equality holds because the summand can be non-zero only when $\alpha + kS \subseteq B \subseteq \mathcal{Z}(\mathbf{v}, N)$ and because $S = -S$. Therefore we conclude

$$\mathbb{E} \left(\prod_{s \in S} (\mathbf{1}_B \cdot \lambda)(\alpha + ks) \mid (\alpha, k) \in \mathcal{Z}(\mathbf{v}, N) \times [N] \right) > \left(\frac{2UN + 1}{2N + 1} \right)^n \cdot \frac{2rUN + 1}{N} \cdot \frac{\gamma}{2} \geq \gamma.$$

This completes the proof of Theorems 5.4 and 5.5. \square

A slight modification of the argument in the proof above yields the following variant, Theorem 5.15. It estimates a weighted expectation in the situation where the shape S is not assumed to satisfy the condition ‘ $S = -S$ ’ but instead the scaling factor is allowed to be negative. This theorem enables us to allow the length k of arithmetic progression in Theorem 9.2 to be even as well.

Theorem 5.15. *In the setting of Theorem 5.4, instead of assuming S is a standard shape, we only assume that a finite subset $S \subseteq \mathcal{Z}$ generates \mathcal{Z} as a \mathbb{Z} -module, and that $0 \in S$. Then we have that*

$$\mathbb{E} \left(\prod_{s \in S} (\mathbf{1}_B \cdot \lambda)(\alpha + ks) \mid (\alpha, k) \in \mathcal{Z}(\mathbf{v}, N) \times ([-2N, 2N] \setminus \{0\}) \right) > \frac{\gamma}{2}.$$

Proof. Almost all parts of the proof of Theorem 5.5 remain to work under the current weaker assumptions on S . However, since the condition ‘ $S = -S$ ’ is dropped, the estimate of the left-hand side of (5.14) may not hold in the original form. This is the only point to be modified in the present proof; the modification can be done in the following manner.

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{L.H.S. of (5.14)} &\leq \sum_{\substack{a_{[r]} \in [-UN, UN]^r \\ k \in [-2rUN, 2rUN] \setminus \{0\}}} \prod_{j \in [r+1]} (\mathbf{1}_{\phi_S^{-1}(B)} \cdot (\lambda \circ \phi_S))(\alpha_{[r]} + k\epsilon_j) \\
&\leq (2UN + 1)^{r-n} \sum_{\substack{\alpha \in \mathcal{Z}(\mathbf{v}, N) \\ k \in [-2rUN, 2rUN] \setminus \{0\}}} \prod_{s \in S} (\mathbf{1}_B \cdot \lambda)(\alpha + ks) \\
&= (2UN + 1)^{r-n} \sum_{\substack{\alpha \in \mathcal{Z}(\mathbf{v}, N) \\ k \in [-2N, 2N] \setminus \{0\}}} \prod_{s \in S} (\mathbf{1}_B \cdot \lambda)(\alpha + ks).
\end{aligned}$$

This provides the desired estimate. □

6 Goldston–Yıldırım type asymptotic formula

The main result in this section is a Goldston–Yıldırım type asymptotic formula (Theorem 6.2). It essentially shows the pseudorandomness of the weight function $\tilde{\lambda}$ in the ‘ N -world,’ which is required in Step 4 of the strategy in Subsection 2.3. Recall that the notion of pseudorandomness of a weight function is formulated in Definition 5.3, and $\tilde{\lambda}$ will be constructed in Definition 7.3.

The presence of the factor W in our formulation of Theorem 6.2 is related to our use of the W -trick. If we tried to use the relative multidimensional Szemerédi theorem (Theorem 5.4) directly in the ‘ M -world,’ then we would need to prove an asymptotic formula without W -trick. Unfortunately, this seems to be an extremely hard task. For this reason, we need to transfer the setting in the ‘ M -world’ to that in the ‘ N -world.’ In this transition, the fact that the choices of b_1, \dots, b_m are rather flexible in Theorem 6.2 will play a significant role.

6.1 Von Mangoldt function and its variants

For a number field K , recall symbols such as Ideals_K and $|\text{Spec}(\mathcal{O}_K)|$ from Subsection 3.1. Let us recall that the von Mangoldt function Λ ($= \Lambda_K$) for K is defined by

$$\Lambda(\mathfrak{a}) := \begin{cases} \log \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{p}) & \text{(if } \mathfrak{a} \text{ is a non-trivial power of a prime ideal } \mathfrak{p}), \\ 0 & \text{(otherwise)} \end{cases}$$

for each non-zero ideal $\mathfrak{a} \in \text{Ideals}_K$.

Recall that the norm \mathbf{N} is multiplicative by Lemma 3.7. Hence, by considering the decomposition of an ideal \mathfrak{a} into prime ideals we have $\sum_{\mathfrak{b}|\mathfrak{a}} \Lambda(\mathfrak{b}) = \log \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{a})$. The Möbius

inversion formula (Proposition 3.11) implies

$$\Lambda(\mathfrak{a}) = \sum_{\mathfrak{b}|\mathfrak{a}} \mu(\mathfrak{b}) \log \left(\frac{\mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{a})}{\mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{b})} \right) = \log \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{a}) \cdot \sum_{\mathfrak{b}|\mathfrak{a}} \mu(\mathfrak{b}) \left(1 - \frac{\log \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{b})}{\log \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{a})} \right),$$

where $\mu := \mu_K$. Next we consider an analog of the Goldston–Yıldırım truncated divisor sum. More precisely we take a sufficiently large $R > 0$ and consider the sum over the ideals \mathfrak{b} with $\mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{b}) \leq R$. Moreover we replace $\log \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{a})$ with $\log R$:

$$\log R \cdot \sum_{\mathfrak{b}|\mathfrak{a}, \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{b}) \leq R} \mu(\mathfrak{b}) \left(1 - \frac{\log \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{b})}{\log R} \right).$$

This is a version of the Goldston–Yıldırım truncated divisor sum for K . Following the method of Tao [Tao06], we first regard $1 - \log \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{b})/\log R$ as the function obtained by substituting $\log \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{b})/\log R$ for x in $\max\{1 - |x|, 0\}$. This makes the condition ‘ $\mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{b}) \leq R$ ’ under the summation symbol redundant. Secondly, we replace the function $\max\{1 - |x|, 0\}$ with a non-negative C^∞ -function χ whose support is contained in $[-1, 1]_{\mathbb{R}}$. Note nonetheless that the values of χ on $[-1, 0)_{\mathbb{R}}$ do not influence the sum. Thus we are led to the following definition.

Definition 6.1. Let R be a real number greater than 1, and fix a non-negative C^∞ -function χ whose support is contained in $[-1, 1]_{\mathbb{R}}$. For convenience of later calculation, we assume that $\chi(0) = 1$ and $\chi(x) \leq 1$ for all x . Then the (R, χ) -von Mangoldt function $\Lambda_{R,\chi}: \text{Ideals}_K \cup \{(0)\} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is defined to be

$$\Lambda_{R,\chi}(\mathfrak{a}) := \log R \cdot \sum_{\mathfrak{b} \in \text{Ideals}_K \text{ with } \mathfrak{b}|\mathfrak{a}} \mu(\mathfrak{b}) \chi \left(\frac{\log \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{b})}{\log R} \right). \tag{6.1}$$

By abuse of notation, we write for each $\alpha \in \mathcal{O}_K$,

$$\Lambda_{R,\chi}(\alpha) := \Lambda_{R,\chi}(\alpha \mathcal{O}_K).$$

Let c_χ be the positive real number defined by

$$c_\chi := \int_0^\infty \chi'(x)^2 dx, \tag{6.2}$$

where χ' is the derivative of χ .

Note that $\Lambda_{R,\chi}(0)$ is well-defined because the right-hand side of (6.1) is a finite sum by the assumption on $\text{supp}(\chi)$ and Proposition 3.20.

6.2 Statement of Goldston–Yıldırım type asymptotic formula

The following asymptotic formula implies that the measure constructed in Definition 7.3 satisfies the linear forms condition (Definition 5.3). The main challenge here is finding an appropriate formula for a general number field. Once it is successfully done, the proof can be carried out by following strategies in [Tao06, Section 9] and [CFZ14, Section 10]. Recall that κ is the positive real number in Theorem 3.19, c_χ is the positive real number in (6.2) determined by χ , and φ_K is the totient function (Definition 3.8).

Theorem 6.2 (Goldston–Yıldırım type asymptotic formula). *Let K be a number field of degree n . Let m and t be positive integers, and $\psi_1, \dots, \psi_m: \mathbb{Z}^t \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_K$ be \mathbb{Z} -module homomorphisms. Let w be a positive real number, and W a positive integer of which the set of prime divisors is $\mathcal{P}_{\leq w} = \{p \in \mathcal{P} : p \leq w\}$. Let b_1, \dots, b_m be elements in \mathcal{O}_K each of which is prime to W , and define affine transformations $\theta_1, \dots, \theta_m: \mathbb{Z}^t \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_K$ as*

$$\theta_j(x) := \text{Aff}_{W, b_j}(\psi_j(x)) = W\psi_j(x) + b_j.$$

Let R be a positive real number, and $I_1, \dots, I_t \subseteq \mathbb{Z}$ intervals of lengths at least R^{4m+1} . Set $\mathcal{B} := I_1 \times \dots \times I_t \subseteq \mathbb{Z}^t$. Fix a C^∞ -function $\chi: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow [0, 1]_{\mathbb{R}}$ which satisfies $\chi(0) = 1$ and $\text{supp}(\chi) \subseteq [-1, 1]_{\mathbb{R}}$. Assume that

$$\text{all coker}(\psi_j) \text{ are finite, and for all } i, j \in [m], \ker(\psi_j) \subseteq \ker(\psi_i) \text{ implies } i = j. \quad (6.3)$$

Then there exist positive real numbers $R_0 = R_0(m, K)$, $F_0 = F_0(m, n)$ and $w_0 = w_0((\psi_j)_{j \in [m]})$ such that if $R \geq R_0$, $w \geq w_0$ and $\log w \leq F_0 \cdot \sqrt{\log R}$, then

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}(\Lambda_{R, \chi}(\theta_1(x))^2 \cdots \Lambda_{R, \chi}(\theta_m(x))^2 \mid x \in \mathcal{B}) \\ &= \left(1 + O_{\chi, m, n} \left(\frac{1}{w \log w}\right) + O_{\chi, m, t, K} \left(\frac{\log w}{\sqrt{\log R}}\right)\right) \cdot \left(\frac{W^n c_\chi \log R}{\varphi_K(W) \cdot \kappa}\right)^m \end{aligned} \quad (6.4)$$

holds true. In particular, the error terms $O_{\chi, m, n} \left(\frac{1}{w \log w}\right)$ and $O_{\chi, m, t, K} \left(\frac{\log w}{\sqrt{\log R}}\right)$ are bounded uniformly on W and $(b_j)_{j \in [m]}$.

The rest of this section is devoted to the proof of this theorem.

In this section, we use ‘Propositions’ to rewrite the expectation on the left-hand side of (6.4); during the rewriting processes, we describe partial estimates as ‘Lemmas.’ We divide this section into subsections according to the particular aspect of estimate we focus on, such as p -parts of ideals. We clarify our setting as ‘Setting’ at the beginning of each subsection.

Recall the symbols and definitions given in ‘Notation’ at the end of Subsections 2.3 and 3.3. In particular, the following symbols are frequently used:

- the set \mathcal{P} of all prime numbers, and subsets of form $\mathcal{P}_{\leq x}$ and $\mathcal{P}_{> x}$,
- the set $\text{Ideals}_K^{(p)}$ of all p -ideals of \mathcal{O}_K ,
- and the set $|\text{Spec}(\mathcal{O}_K)|^{(p)}$ of all prime p -ideals of \mathcal{O}_K .

Under Setting 6.3 below, we transform the following expectation

$$\mathbb{E} \left(\prod_{j \in [m]} (\Lambda_{R, \chi} \circ \theta_j)^2 \mid \mathcal{B} \right), \quad (6.5)$$

which appears on the left-hand side of (6.4).

Setting 6.3. Assume the setting in Theorem 6.2. In addition, we assume $R > 1$.

Proposition 6.4. *Expectation (6.5) is equal to*

$$(\log R)^{2m} \sum_{(\mathbf{a}_j, \mathbf{b}_j)_{j \in [m]} \in \text{Ideals}_K^{2m}} \Pi_{R, \chi}((\mathbf{a}_j, \mathbf{b}_j)_{j \in [m]}) \cdot \mathbb{E} \left(\prod_{j \in [m]} (\mathbf{1}_{\mathbf{a}_j \cap \mathbf{b}_j} \circ \theta_j) \mid \mathcal{B} \right), \quad (6.6)$$

where

$$\Pi_{R, \chi}((\mathbf{a}_j, \mathbf{b}_j)_{j \in [m]}) := \prod_{j \in [m]} \mu(\mathbf{a}_j) \mu(\mathbf{b}_j) \chi \left(\frac{\log \mathbf{N}(\mathbf{a}_j)}{\log R} \right) \chi \left(\frac{\log \mathbf{N}(\mathbf{b}_j)}{\log R} \right).$$

Proof. Let $x \in \mathcal{B}$. Substituting (6.1) for $\Lambda_{R, \chi}(\theta_j(x))$ in (6.5) and expanding it, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & (\log R)^{-2m} \prod_{j \in [m]} \Lambda_{R, \chi}(\theta_j(x))^2 \\ &= \sum_{\substack{(\mathbf{a}_j, \mathbf{b}_j)_{j \in [m]} \in \text{Ideals}_K^{2m} \\ \theta_j(x) \in \mathbf{a}_j \cap \mathbf{b}_j \ (\forall j \in [m])}} \prod_{j \in [m]} \mu(\mathbf{a}_j) \mu(\mathbf{b}_j) \chi \left(\frac{\log \mathbf{N}(\mathbf{a}_j)}{\log R} \right) \chi \left(\frac{\log \mathbf{N}(\mathbf{b}_j)}{\log R} \right) \\ &= \sum_{(\mathbf{a}_j, \mathbf{b}_j)_{j \in [m]} \in \text{Ideals}_K^{2m}} \left(\prod_{j \in [m]} \mathbf{1}_{\mathbf{a}_j \cap \mathbf{b}_j}(\theta_j(x)) \right) \cdot \Pi_{R, \chi}((\mathbf{a}_j, \mathbf{b}_j)_{j \in [m]}). \end{aligned}$$

Only the characteristic functions $\prod_{j \in [m]} \mathbf{1}_{\mathbf{a}_j \cap \mathbf{b}_j}(\theta_j(x))$ depend on $x \in \mathcal{B}$, and hence the desired result holds. \square

Next we focus on the expectation in (6.6). Although a statement similar to the following lemma might be standard in this research area, we write down a proof for the convenience of the reader.

Lemma 6.5. *Let $(\mathbf{a}_j, \mathbf{b}_j)_{j \in [m]} \in \text{Ideals}_K^{2m}$, and define the positive integer $D = D((\mathbf{a}_j, \mathbf{b}_j)_{j \in [m]})$ by*

$$D\mathbb{Z} = \mathbb{Z} \cap \left(\bigcap_{j \in [m]} (\mathbf{a}_j \cap \mathbf{b}_j) \right). \quad (6.7)$$

If $\mathbf{N}(\mathbf{a}_j), \mathbf{N}(\mathbf{b}_j) \leq R$ holds for every $j \in [m]$, then the following hold.

- (1) $D \leq R^{2m}$.
- (2) *We have*

$$\mathbb{E} \left(\prod_{j \in [m]} (\mathbf{1}_{\mathbf{a}_j \cap \mathbf{b}_j} \circ \theta_j) \mid \mathcal{B} \right) = \mathbb{E} \left(\prod_{j \in [m]} (\mathbf{1}_{\mathbf{a}_j \cap \mathbf{b}_j} \circ \theta_j) \mid (\mathbb{Z}/D\mathbb{Z})^t \right) + O_t(R^{-2m-1}).$$

Note that for every $x \in (\mathbb{Z}/D\mathbb{Z})^t$, the value $\mathbf{1}_{\mathfrak{a}_j \cap \mathfrak{b}_j}(\theta_j(x)) \in \{0, 1\}$ is well-defined.

Proof. First we prove (1). For each $\mathfrak{a} \in \{\mathfrak{a}_j, \mathfrak{b}_j\}_{j \in [m]}$, the injection $\mathbb{Z}/(\mathbb{Z} \cap \mathfrak{a}) \hookrightarrow \mathcal{O}_K/\mathfrak{a}$ shows $\#(\mathbb{Z}/(\mathbb{Z} \cap \mathfrak{a})) \leq \#(\mathcal{O}_K/\mathfrak{a}) = \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{a}) \leq R$. This together with

$$D\mathbb{Z} = \bigcap_{j \in [m]} ((\mathbb{Z} \cap \mathfrak{a}_j) \cap (\mathbb{Z} \cap \mathfrak{b}_j)) \supseteq \prod_{j \in [m]} ((\mathbb{Z} \cap \mathfrak{a}_j) \cdot (\mathbb{Z} \cap \mathfrak{b}_j))$$

implies that

$$D = \#(\mathbb{Z}/D\mathbb{Z}) \leq \prod_{j \in [m]} (\#(\mathbb{Z}/\mathbb{Z} \cap \mathfrak{a}_j) \cdot \#(\mathbb{Z}/\mathbb{Z} \cap \mathfrak{b}_j)) \leq R^{2m}.$$

Next we prove (2). Since \mathcal{B} contains pairwise disjoint $\prod_{i \in [t]} \lfloor \frac{\#I_i}{D} \rfloor$ translates of $[D]^t$ in \mathbb{Z}^t , we see that

$$\begin{aligned} \#\mathcal{B} \cdot \mathbb{E} \left(\prod_{j \in [m]} (\mathbf{1}_{\mathfrak{a}_j \cap \mathfrak{b}_j} \circ \theta_j) \mid \mathcal{B} \right) &= \left(\prod_{i \in [t]} \left\lfloor \frac{\#I_i}{D} \right\rfloor \right) \cdot D^t \cdot \mathbb{E} \left(\prod_{j \in [m]} (\mathbf{1}_{\mathfrak{a}_j \cap \mathfrak{b}_j} \circ \theta_j) \mid (\mathbb{Z}/D\mathbb{Z})^t \right) \\ &\quad + O \left(\#\mathcal{B} - \left(\prod_{i \in [t]} \left\lfloor \frac{\#I_i}{D} \right\rfloor \right) \cdot D^t \right). \end{aligned} \quad (6.8)$$

Since $\lfloor \frac{\#I_i}{D} \rfloor \cdot D > \#I_i - D$, we have

$$\frac{1}{\#\mathcal{B}} \left(\#\mathcal{B} - \left(\prod_{i \in [t]} \left\lfloor \frac{\#I_i}{D} \right\rfloor \right) \cdot D^t \right) < 1 - \frac{1}{\#\mathcal{B}} \prod_{i \in [t]} (\#I_i - D) = 1 - \prod_{i \in [t]} \left(1 - \frac{D}{\#I_i} \right).$$

Note that $D/\#I_i \leq R^{2m}/R^{4m+1} = R^{-2m-1}$ follows from (1). By Bernoulli's inequality $(1-x)^t \geq 1-tx$ for every $x \leq 1$, we conclude that

$$1 - \prod_{i \in [t]} \left(1 - \frac{D}{\#I_i} \right) \leq 1 - (1 - R^{-2m-1})^t \leq tR^{-2m-1}.$$

Furthermore,

$$\frac{1}{\#\mathcal{B}} \cdot \left(\prod_{i \in [t]} \left\lfloor \frac{\#I_i}{D} \right\rfloor \right) \cdot D^t = 1 + O_t(R^{-2m-1})$$

follows, and we derive the desired equality. \square

We write for short the following expectation

$$\mathbf{e}((\mathfrak{a}_j, \mathfrak{b}_j)_{j \in [m]}) = \mathbf{e}((\mathfrak{a}_j, \mathfrak{b}_j)_{j \in [m]}; (\theta_j)_{j \in [m]}) := \mathbb{E} \left(\prod_{j \in [m]} (\mathbf{1}_{\mathfrak{a}_j \cap \mathfrak{b}_j} \circ \theta_j) \mid (\mathbb{Z}/D\mathbb{Z})^t \right), \quad (6.9)$$

which depends on $(\theta_j)_{j \in [m]}$ and $(\mathfrak{a}_j, \mathfrak{b}_j)_{j \in [m]}$. Here the positive integer $D = D((\mathfrak{a}_j, \mathfrak{b}_j)_{j \in [m]})$ is taken as in Lemma 6.5. In what follows, we prove the multiplicativity of \mathbf{e} in Lemma 6.8 and the estimates in Lemma 6.12. Once these two properties are established, we will no longer need the definition of \mathbf{e} for the proof of Theorem 6.2.

Proposition 6.6. *Expectation (6.6) equals*

$$(\log R)^{2m} \sum_{(\mathfrak{a}_j, \mathfrak{b}_j)_{j \in [m]} \in (\text{Ideals}_K)^{2m}} \Pi_{R, \chi}((\mathfrak{a}_j, \mathfrak{b}_j)_{j \in [m]}) \cdot \mathbf{e}((\mathfrak{a}_j, \mathfrak{b}_j)_{j \in [m]}) \quad (6.10)$$

with an additive error term $O_{m,t,K}\left(\frac{(\log R)^{2m}}{R}\right)$, where $\Pi_{R, \chi}((\mathfrak{a}_j, \mathfrak{b}_j)_{j \in [m]})$ is defined in Proposition 6.4.

Proof. By Lemma 6.5 (2), $\text{supp}(\chi) \subseteq [-1, 1]_{\mathbb{R}}$ and $|\Pi_{R, \chi}((\mathfrak{a}_j, \mathfrak{b}_j)_{j \in [m]})| \leq 1$, the absolute value of the difference between (6.6) and (6.10) is estimated as

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| (\log R)^{2m} \sum_{(\mathfrak{a}_j, \mathfrak{b}_j)_{j \in [m]} \in (\text{Ideals}_K)^{2m}} \Pi_{R, \chi}((\mathfrak{a}_j, \mathfrak{b}_j)_{j \in [m]}) \cdot O_t(R^{-2m-1}) \right| \\ & \leq (\log R)^{2m} \sum_{\substack{(\mathfrak{a}_j, \mathfrak{b}_j)_{j \in [m]} \in (\text{Ideals}_K)^{2m} \\ \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{a}_j), \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{b}_j) \leq R \text{ for all } j \in [m]}} O_t(R^{-2m-1}). \end{aligned}$$

Since Proposition 3.20 implies that the number of summands in the right-hand side is $O_{m,K}(R^{2m})$, the assertion follows. \square

It will turn out that the contribution of the error term in Proposition 6.6 is permissible in the proof of Theorem 6.2 as well as all the other error terms that appear below. Next we focus on the expectation $\mathbf{e}((\mathfrak{a}_j, \mathfrak{b}_j)_{j \in [m]})$ in (6.10).

6.3 The expectation of the characteristic function

In this subsection, we assume the following setting:

Setting 6.7. Assume Setting 6.3. Fix a tuple $(\mathfrak{a}_j, \mathfrak{b}_j)_{j \in [m]}$ of arbitrary non-zero ideals of \mathcal{O}_K each of which is not necessary of norm at most R , and write $\mathfrak{c}_j := \mathfrak{a}_j \cap \mathfrak{b}_j$ for short. Note that $\mathfrak{c}_j^{(p)} = \mathfrak{a}_j^{(p)} \cap \mathfrak{b}_j^{(p)}$ (see Subsection 3.3 where p -parts are defined). Let D be the positive integer defined in Lemma 6.5. Then note that $D\mathbb{Z} = \mathbb{Z} \cap (\bigcap_{j \in [m]} \mathfrak{c}_j)$ and $D^{(p)}\mathbb{Z} = \mathbb{Z} \cap (\bigcap_{j \in [m]} \mathfrak{c}_j^{(p)})$.

The following symbols and easy equality are helpful to estimate (6.9). We consider the \mathbb{Z} -module homomorphisms and affine transformations

$$\overline{\psi}_j, \overline{\theta}_j : (\mathbb{Z}/D\mathbb{Z})^t \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_K/\mathfrak{c}_j$$

induced by ψ_j and θ_j , respectively. Let

$$\bar{\psi}, \bar{\theta}: (\mathbb{Z}/D\mathbb{Z})^t \rightarrow \prod_{j \in [m]} \mathcal{O}_K/\mathfrak{c}_j$$

be the two maps defined by $\bar{\psi}(x) = (\bar{\psi}_1(x), \dots, \bar{\psi}_m(x))$ and $\bar{\theta}(x) = (\bar{\theta}_1(x), \dots, \bar{\theta}_m(x))$. Then we see that

$$\mathbf{e}((\mathbf{a}_j, \mathbf{b}_j)_{j \in [m]}) = \mathbb{E} \left(\prod_{j \in [m]} (\mathbf{1}_{\mathfrak{c}_j} \circ \theta_j) \mid (\mathbb{Z}/D\mathbb{Z})^t \right) = \mathbb{E} (\mathbf{1}_{\{0\}} \circ \bar{\theta} \mid (\mathbb{Z}/D\mathbb{Z})^t). \quad (6.11)$$

Lemma 6.8. *The expectation $\mathbf{e}((\mathbf{a}_j, \mathbf{b}_j)_{j \in [m]})$ is decomposed into its p -parts. Namely,*

$$\mathbf{e}((\mathbf{a}_j, \mathbf{b}_j)_{j \in [m]}) = \prod_{p \in \mathcal{P}} \mathbf{e}((\mathbf{a}_j^{(p)}, \mathbf{b}_j^{(p)})_{j \in [m]}).$$

Proof. Recall the definition of \mathbf{e} from (6.9) or (6.11). It suffices to prove that

$$\mathbb{E} \left(\prod_{j \in [m]} (\mathbf{1}_{\mathfrak{c}_j} \circ \theta_j) \mid (\mathbb{Z}/D\mathbb{Z})^t \right) = \prod_{p \in \mathcal{P}} \mathbb{E} \left(\prod_{j \in [m]} (\mathbf{1}_{\mathfrak{c}_j^{(p)}} \circ \theta_j) \mid (\mathbb{Z}/D^{(p)}\mathbb{Z})^t \right).$$

By the Chinese remainder theorem (Lemma 3.14), the \mathbb{Z} -module homomorphism $\bar{\psi}$ equals the product of its restrictions $\bar{\psi}^{(p)}$ to $(\mathbb{Z}/D^{(p)}\mathbb{Z})^t$, that means

$$\bar{\psi} = \prod_{p \in \mathcal{P}} \bar{\psi}^{(p)}: \prod_{p \in \mathcal{P}} (\mathbb{Z}/D^{(p)}\mathbb{Z})^t \rightarrow \prod_{p \in \mathcal{P}} \left(\prod_{j \in [m]} \mathcal{O}_K/\mathfrak{c}_j^{(p)} \right).$$

Hence the affine transformation $\bar{\theta}$ is the product of the restrictions

$$\bar{\theta}^{(p)}: (\mathbb{Z}/D^{(p)}\mathbb{Z})^t \rightarrow \prod_{j \in [m]} \mathcal{O}_K/\mathfrak{c}_j^{(p)}.$$

Applying (6.11) to the ideals $(\mathfrak{c}_j)_{j \in [m]}$ and $(\mathfrak{c}_j^{(p)})_{j \in [m]}$, we see that it suffices to prove

$$\mathbb{E} (\mathbf{1}_{\{0\}} \circ \bar{\theta} \mid (\mathbb{Z}/D\mathbb{Z})^t) = \prod_{p \in \mathcal{P}} \mathbb{E} (\mathbf{1}_{\{0\}} \circ \bar{\theta}^{(p)} \mid (\mathbb{Z}/D^{(p)}\mathbb{Z})^t). \quad (6.12)$$

Since $\mathfrak{c}_j = \prod_{p \in \mathcal{P}} \mathfrak{c}_j^{(p)} = \bigcap_{p \in \mathcal{P}} \mathfrak{c}_j^{(p)}$, for each element

$$x = (x_p)_{p \in \mathcal{P}} \in \prod_{p \in \mathcal{P}} (\mathbb{Z}/D^{(p)}\mathbb{Z})^t,$$

we have $\bar{\theta}(x) = 0$ if and only if $\bar{\theta}^{(p)}(x_p) = 0$ holds for every $p \in \mathcal{P}$. Hence

$$\mathbb{E} (\mathbf{1}_{\{0\}}(\bar{\theta}(x)) \mid x \in (\mathbb{Z}/D\mathbb{Z})^t) = \mathbb{E} \left(\prod_{p \in \mathcal{P}} \mathbf{1}_{\{0\}}(\bar{\theta}^{(p)}(x_p)) \mid (x_p)_{p \in \mathcal{P}} \in \prod_{p \in \mathcal{P}} (\mathbb{Z}/D^{(p)}\mathbb{Z})^t \right).$$

This coincides with the right-hand side of (6.12) by a Fubini-type argument. \square

By this lemma, in the next subsection, we may restrict our attention to a tuple of p -ideals for each rational prime number p .

6.4 The expectation of the characteristic function for p -ideals

In this subsection, we assume the following setting. We use Greek symbols such as α_j , β_j and γ_j for p -ideals.

Setting 6.9. Let $K, n, t, m, (\psi_j)_{j \in [m]}$ be as in Theorem 6.2; we assume (6.3). In addition, we take $w, W, (\theta_j)_{j \in [m]}$ as in Theorem 6.2. Let $(\alpha_j, \beta_j)_{j \in [m]} \in (\text{Ideals}_K^{(p)})^{2m}$ be a tuple of p -ideals for some prime number p . Write $\gamma_j := \alpha_j \cap \beta_j$. Let D be the positive integer such that $D\mathbb{Z} = \mathbb{Z} \cap \left(\bigcap_{j \in [m]} \gamma_j \right)$. Then the ideals γ_j are p -ideals, and D is a power of p . The two maps $\bar{\psi}, \bar{\theta}: (\mathbb{Z}/D\mathbb{Z})^t \rightarrow \prod_{j \in [m]} \mathcal{O}_K/\gamma_j$ are defined in Subsection 6.3.

Setting 6.10. Assume that w is at least w'_0 and w''_0 , which are defined as follows:

- (1) For every $j \in [m]$, the cardinality of $\text{coker}(\psi_j)$ is finite by assumption (6.3). We let w'_0 be the largest prime factor of $\prod_{j \in [m]} \# \text{coker}(\psi_j)$.
- (2) By assumption (6.3), for each $(j, k) \in [m]^2$ with $j \neq k$, we may take $x_{jk} \in \ker(\psi_j) \setminus \ker(\psi_k)$. Then let

$$w''_0 := \max \left\{ \ell \in \mathcal{P} : \exists \mathfrak{p} \in |\text{Spec } \mathcal{O}_K|^{(\ell)}, \mathfrak{p} \mid \prod_{(j,k) \in [m]^2, j \neq k} \psi_k(x_{jk}) \right\}.$$

We take the elements x_{jk} which minimizes w''_0 , so that w''_0 depends only on $(\psi_j)_{j \in [m]}$.

Below we estimate the expectation

$$\mathbf{e}((\alpha_j, \beta_j)_{j \in [m]}) = \mathbb{E} \left(\prod_{j \in [m]} (\mathbf{1}_{\gamma_j} \circ \theta_j) \mid (\mathbb{Z}/D\mathbb{Z})^t \right) = \mathbb{E} (\mathbf{1}_{\{0\}} \circ \bar{\theta} \mid (\mathbb{Z}/D\mathbb{Z})^t).$$

We prove the following without assuming Setting 6.10.

Lemma 6.11. *If $p > w$, then*

$$\mathbf{e}((\alpha_j, \beta_j)_{j \in [m]}) = \begin{cases} (\#\text{Im}(\bar{\psi}))^{-1} & \text{if } 0 \in \text{Im}(\bar{\theta}), \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Proof. In general, for an affine transformation $\theta: Z \rightarrow Z'$ between two finite abelian groups Z and Z' , we have

$$\mathbb{E} (\mathbf{1}_{\{0\}} \circ \theta \mid Z) = \begin{cases} (\#\text{Im}(\theta))^{-1} & \text{if } 0 \in \text{Im}(\theta), \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

By applying this to $\bar{\theta}: (\mathbb{Z}/D\mathbb{Z})^t \rightarrow \prod_{j \in [m]} \mathcal{O}_K/\gamma_j$, we see that the expectation $\mathbf{e}((\alpha_j, \beta_j)_{j \in [m]})$ equals $(\#\text{Im}(\bar{\theta}))^{-1}$ if $0 \in \text{Im}(\bar{\theta})$, and 0 otherwise. Consider the first case. By $p > w$, W and p are coprime. Since the order of each \mathcal{O}_K/γ_j is a power of p , this implies that the multiplication by W on $\prod_{j \in [m]} \mathcal{O}_K/\gamma_j$ is an automorphism. Therefore $\#\text{Im}(\bar{\theta}) = \#\text{Im}(\bar{\psi})$ follows. \square

Only the following lemma and its consequences exploit assumption (6.3).

Lemma 6.12. *For each prime number p and each tuple $(\alpha_j, \beta_j)_{j \in [m]}$ of p -ideals, the following hold:*

- (1) *If $\gamma_j = \mathcal{O}_K$ holds for every $j \in [m]$, then $\mathbf{e}((\alpha_j, \beta_j)_{j \in [m]}) = 1$.*
- (2) *Suppose that $p \leq w$ and there exists $j_0 \in [m]$ such that $\gamma_{j_0} \subsetneq \mathcal{O}_K$. Then $\mathbf{e}((\alpha_j, \beta_j)_{j \in [m]}) = 0$.*
- (3) *Suppose that $p > w$ and there exists $j_0 \in [m]$ such that $\gamma_{j_0} \subsetneq \mathcal{O}_K$ and $\gamma_j = \mathcal{O}_K$ for all $j \in [m] \setminus \{j_0\}$. Then $\mathbf{e}((\alpha_j, \beta_j)_{j \in [m]}) = 1/\mathbf{N}(\gamma_{j_0})$.*
- (4) *Suppose that $p > w$ and there exist two distinct j_1 and $j_2 \in [m]$ such that $\gamma_{j_1}, \gamma_{j_2} \subsetneq \mathcal{O}_K$. Then $\mathbf{e}((\alpha_j, \beta_j)_{j \in [m]}) \leq 1/p^2$.*

Proof. First we prove (1). If $\gamma_j = \mathcal{O}_K$ for every $j \in [m]$, then $\prod_{j \in [m]} (\mathbf{1}_{\gamma_j} \circ \theta_j)$ is identical with the constant function 1, and hence $\mathbf{e}((\alpha_j, \beta_j)_{j \in [m]}) = 1$.

Secondly, we prove (2). It suffices to show that for all $x \in (\mathbb{Z}/D\mathbb{Z})^t$, $\theta_{j_0}(x) = W\psi_{j_0}(x) + b_{j_0} \notin \gamma_{j_0}$. Let \mathfrak{p} be an arbitrary prime ideal $\mathfrak{p} \supseteq \gamma_{j_0}$. Since γ_{j_0} is a p -ideal, we have $\mathfrak{p} \cap \mathbb{Z} = p\mathbb{Z}$. From $p \leq w$, p divides W , and hence $W \in \mathfrak{p}$ follows. In addition, the assumption $b_{j_0}\mathcal{O}_K + W\mathcal{O}_K = \mathcal{O}_K$ implies that $b_{j_0} \notin \mathfrak{p}$. Hence we see that for all $x \in \mathbb{Z}^t$, $\theta_{j_0}(x) = W\psi_{j_0}(x) + b_{j_0} \notin \mathfrak{p}$. This together with $\gamma_{j_0} \subseteq \mathfrak{p}$ implies that $\theta_{j_0}(x) \notin \gamma_{j_0}$, as desired.

Thirdly, we prove (3). Set $C_{j_0} := \#\text{coker}(\psi_{j_0})$. Note that for every $x \in \mathcal{O}_K$, $C_{j_0} \cdot x$ is contained in the image of ψ_{j_0} . By Setting 6.10 (1), p and C_{j_0} are coprime. Since the order of $\mathcal{O}_K/\gamma_{j_0}$ is a power of p , this implies that the multiplication by C_{j_0} on $\mathcal{O}_K/\gamma_{j_0}$ is an automorphism. Hence we see that $\overline{\psi_{j_0}}: (\mathbb{Z}/D\mathbb{Z})^t \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_K/\gamma_{j_0}$ is surjective. Since W and p are coprime, the map $\overline{\theta_{j_0}} = \text{Aff}_{W, b_{j_0}} \circ \overline{\psi_{j_0}}: (\mathbb{Z}/D\mathbb{Z})^t \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_K/\gamma_{j_0}$ is also surjective. Then Lemma 6.11 yields that $\mathbf{e}((\alpha_j, \beta_j)_{j \in [m]}) = (\#\text{Im}(\bar{\psi}))^{-1}$; recall that $\gamma_j = \mathcal{O}_K$ for all $j \in [m] \setminus \{j_0\}$. We have

$$\#\text{Im}(\bar{\psi}) = \#\text{Im}(\overline{\psi_{j_0}}) = \#(\mathcal{O}_K/\gamma_{j_0}) = \mathbf{N}(\gamma_{j_0}).$$

This is the desired result.

Finally we prove (4). By Lemma 6.11, it suffices to show that $\#\text{Im}(\bar{\psi}) \geq p^2$. Without loss of generality, we may assume that $\gamma_1, \gamma_2 \subsetneq \mathcal{O}_K$. Recall that two elements x_{12} and x_{21} are chosen in Setting 6.10 (2). Since $p > w \geq w'_0$, both $\psi_2(x_{12})$ and $\psi_1(x_{21})$ are prime to all p -ideals. We focus on the mapping $(\overline{\psi_1}, \overline{\psi_2})$, which is defined as

$$\begin{aligned} (\overline{\psi_1}, \overline{\psi_2}): (\mathbb{Z}/D\mathbb{Z})^t &\rightarrow \mathcal{O}_K/\gamma_1 \times \mathcal{O}_K/\gamma_2 \\ x &\mapsto (\overline{\psi_1}(x), \overline{\psi_2}(x)). \end{aligned}$$

This maps x_{12} and x_{21} to non-zero elements $(0, \overline{\psi_2}(x_{12}))$ and $(\overline{\psi_1}(x_{21}), 0)$, respectively. The order of the linear span of these two images is at least p^2 . Hence

$$p^2 \leq \#\text{Im}(\overline{\psi_1}, \overline{\psi_2}) \leq \#\text{Im}(\overline{\psi}),$$

and (4) follows. \square

6.5 Estimate for the error by a change of domain of integration

In this subsection, we estimate expectation (6.5). Its main term is equal to (6.10) by Proposition 6.6. In this subsection, we prove Proposition 6.14, which provides an integral representation of the main term.

First, we use the Fourier transform to derive an integral representation of χ . Recall that χ is the smooth compactly supported function which was chosen in the setting of Theorem 6.2. Let $\widehat{\chi}$ be the inverse Fourier transform of the function $x \mapsto e^x \chi(x)$. Here we normalize it to satisfy

$$e^x \chi(x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} \widehat{\chi}(\xi) e^{-x\xi\sqrt{-1}} d\xi, \quad \text{or equivalently,} \quad \chi(x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} \widehat{\chi}(\xi) e^{-x(1+\xi\sqrt{-1})} d\xi. \quad (6.13)$$

Then for all $\mathfrak{c} \in \text{Ideals}_K$ and $R > 1$, we have

$$\chi\left(\frac{\log \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{c})}{\log R}\right) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} \widehat{\chi}(\xi) \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{c})^{-(1+\xi\sqrt{-1})/\log R} d\xi. \quad (6.14)$$

Assume the following:

Setting 6.13. Assume the setting in Theorem 6.2. In addition, assume that $R \geq e$ and $w \geq \max\{4^{mn}, w'_0, w''_0\}$, where w'_0 and w''_0 are defined in Setting 6.10. Recall that $\mathbf{e}((\mathbf{a}_j, \mathbf{b}_j)_{j \in [m]})$ is defined as (6.9). Let $I = I(R) := [-\sqrt{\log R}, +\sqrt{\log R}]_{\mathbb{R}}$, and ξ_j and η_j be variables of integration. Let us use shorthand symbols $d\underline{\xi} = d\xi_1 \cdots d\xi_m$ and $d\underline{\eta} = d\eta_1 \cdots d\eta_m$. Let

$$z_j := \frac{1 + \xi_j \sqrt{-1}}{\log R}, \quad w_j := \frac{1 + \eta_j \sqrt{-1}}{\log R}.$$

The goal in this subsection is to prove the following. We define $E = E((\xi_j, \eta_j)_{j \in [m]}; R)$, depending also on $(\theta_j)_{j \in [m]}$, by

$$E := \sum_{(\mathbf{a}_j, \mathbf{b}_j)_{j \in [m]} \in \text{Ideals}_K^{2m}} \left(\prod_{j \in [m]} \{\mu(\mathbf{a}_j) \mu(\mathbf{b}_j) \mathbf{N}(\mathbf{a}_j)^{-z_j} \mathbf{N}(\mathbf{b}_j)^{-w_j}\} \right) \mathbf{e}((\mathbf{a}_j, \mathbf{b}_j)_{j \in [m]}). \quad (6.15)$$

Proposition 6.14. *The series $E = E((\xi_j, \eta_j)_{j \in [m]}; R)$ converges uniformly on $(\xi_j, \eta_j)_{j \in [m]} \in I^{2m}$. Furthermore, for every positive real number A , (6.10) is equal to*

$$(\log R)^{2m} \int_{I^{2m}} d\underline{\xi} d\underline{\eta} \left[\left(\prod_{j \in [m]} \widehat{\chi}(\xi_j) \widehat{\chi}(\eta_j) \right) \cdot E((\xi_j, \eta_j)_{j \in [m]}; R) \right] \quad (6.16)$$

with an additive error term $O_{A, \chi, m, n}((\log R)^{-A})$.

The proof of this proposition will proceed in several steps:

- Substitute for χ in (6.10) its integral representation over \mathbb{R} to obtain a summation of integrals over \mathbb{R}^{2m} .
- Replace these integrals by ones over I^{2m} up to small additive errors.
- Show the uniform (and absolute) convergence of E to interchange summation and integration. We end up with an integral over I^{2m} of a certain summation, which turns out to be the desired expression.

Each term of the series (6.10) has $\chi(\log \mathbf{N}(\cdot)/\log R)$ as a factor. Hence it suffices to consider this series over $(\mathbf{a}_j, \mathbf{b}_j)_{j \in [m]}$ all of whose entries have norm at most R . Hence it is a finite series. However, the term represented by the integral in Lemma 6.17 should be considered over all $(\mathbf{a}_j, \mathbf{b}_j)_{j \in [m]}$, and hence E defined in (6.15) is an infinite series over all $(\mathbf{a}_j, \mathbf{b}_j)_{j \in [m]}$. This causes a subtlety in interchanging summation and integration unless we prove that E converges absolutely and uniformly.

We begin by estimating the error caused by the change of the domain of integration from \mathbb{R}^{2m} to I^{2m} . First we recall the following estimate in Fourier analysis; we write down a proof for the convenience of the reader.

Lemma 6.15. *For every real-valued C^N -function f with compact support, we have*

$$\mathcal{F}^*(f)(x) := \int_{\mathbb{R}} f(\xi) e^{x\xi\sqrt{-1}} d\xi = O_{N,f}((1+|x|)^{-N}),$$

where $\mathcal{F}^*(f)$ denotes the inverse Fourier transform of f .

Proof. Since the support of f is compact, $f \in L^1(\mathbb{R})$ holds, and then $\|\mathcal{F}^*(f)\|_{\infty} \leq \|f\|_1 < \infty$ follows. For every $k \in [0, N]$, since the k th derivative of f has a compact support, there exists a real number $C_{N,f}$ such that $\|\mathcal{F}^*(f^{(k)})\|_{\infty} \leq C_{N,f}$. By integration by parts, we have $\mathcal{F}^*(f')(x) = -\sqrt{-1}x\mathcal{F}^*(f)(x)$. Applying this repeatedly, we see that for all $k \in [0, N]$, $|\mathcal{F}^*(f^{(k)})(x)| = |x|^k |\mathcal{F}^*(f)(x)|$. Hence

$$|\mathcal{F}^*(f)(x)| \sum_{k \in [0, N]} |x|^k = \sum_{k \in [0, N]} |\mathcal{F}^*(f^{(k)})(x)| \leq (N+1)C_{N,f} =: C'_{N,f}.$$

By the binomial theorem, there exists $c_N > 0$ such that $c_N(1+|x|)^N \leq \sum_{k \in [0, N]} |x|^k$. Therefore we obtain the desired estimate $|\mathcal{F}^*(f)(x)| \leq \frac{C'_{N,f}}{c_N}(1+|x|)^{-N}$. \square

Corollary 6.16. *The integral $\int_{\mathbb{R}} |\widehat{\chi}(\xi)| d\xi$ is a finite value. In other words*

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} |\widehat{\chi}(\xi)| d\xi = O_{\chi}(1). \quad (6.17)$$

In addition, for all positive real numbers b and A , we have

$$\int_b^{\infty} |\widehat{\chi}(\xi)| d\xi = O_{A,\chi}(b^{-A}) \quad \text{and} \quad \int_{-\infty}^{-b} |\widehat{\chi}(\xi)| d\xi = O_{A,\chi}(b^{-A}). \quad (6.18)$$

Proof. The C^∞ -function χ has a compact support. Applying Lemma 6.15 with $f(x) = e^x \chi(x)$, we have $\widehat{\chi}(\xi) = O_{B,\chi}((1+|\xi|)^{-B})$ for all $B \geq 0$. Let $b \geq 0$, $B = A + 1$, and $I_b = [b, \infty]_{\mathbb{R}}$ or $[-\infty, -b]_{\mathbb{R}}$. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{I_b} |\widehat{\chi}(\xi)| d\xi &= \int_{I_b} O_{B,\chi}((1+|\xi|)^{-B}) d\xi = O_{B,\chi} \left(\int_b^\infty (1+\xi)^{-B} d\xi \right) \\ &= O_{B,\chi} \left(\frac{1}{B-1} (1+b)^{1-B} \right) = \begin{cases} O_{A,\chi}(b^{-A}) & \text{if } b > 0, \\ O_{A,\chi}(1) & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

□

Lemma 6.17. *For every positive real number A and every tuple $(\mathbf{a}_j, \mathbf{b}_j)_{j \in [m]} \in \text{Ideals}_K^{2m}$, we have*

$$\begin{aligned} \prod_{j \in [m]} \chi \left(\frac{\log \mathbf{N}(\mathbf{a}_j)}{\log R} \right) \chi \left(\frac{\log \mathbf{N}(\mathbf{b}_j)}{\log R} \right) &= \int_{I^{2m}} d\underline{\xi} d\underline{\eta} \left[\prod_{j \in [m]} \mathbf{N}(\mathbf{a}_j)^{-z_j} \mathbf{N}(\mathbf{b}_j)^{-w_j} \widehat{\chi}(\xi_j) \widehat{\chi}(\eta_j) \right] \\ &\quad + O_{A,\chi,m} \left((\log R)^{-A} \prod_{j \in [m]} \mathbf{N}(\mathbf{a}_j)^{-\frac{1}{\log R}} \mathbf{N}(\mathbf{b}_j)^{-\frac{1}{\log R}} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Proof. Let $\mathbf{c} \in \text{Ideals}_K$. Integral representation (6.14) of χ is decomposed as

$$\chi \left(\frac{\log \mathbf{N}(\mathbf{c})}{\log R} \right) = \int_I \widehat{\chi}(\xi) \mathbf{N}(\mathbf{c})^{-(1+\xi\sqrt{-1})/\log R} d\xi + \int_{\mathbb{R} \setminus I} \widehat{\chi}(\xi) \mathbf{N}(\mathbf{c})^{-(1+\xi\sqrt{-1})/\log R} d\xi. \quad (6.19)$$

The two terms on the right-hand side are estimated in the following manner: the first estimate (6.17) in Corollary 6.16 implies that

$$\left| \int_I \widehat{\chi}(\xi) \mathbf{N}(\mathbf{c})^{-(1+\xi\sqrt{-1})/\log R} d\xi \right| \leq \mathbf{N}(\mathbf{c})^{-1/\log R} \int_I |\widehat{\chi}(\xi)| d\xi = O_{A,\chi}(\mathbf{N}(\mathbf{c})^{-1/\log R}).$$

Similarly, the second estimate (6.18) in Corollary 6.16 implies that

$$\left| \int_{\mathbb{R} \setminus I} \widehat{\chi}(\xi) \mathbf{N}(\mathbf{c})^{-(1+\xi\sqrt{-1})/\log R} d\xi \right| = O_{A,\chi}(\mathbf{N}(\mathbf{c})^{-1/\log R} (\log R)^{-A}). \quad (6.20)$$

Note that $O_{A,\chi}(\mathbf{N}(\mathbf{c})^{-1/\log R} (\log R)^{-A}) = O_{A,\chi}(\mathbf{N}(\mathbf{c})^{-1/\log R})$ by $R \geq e$. We decompose each of the $2m$ factors of

$$\prod_{j \in [m]} \chi \left(\frac{\log \mathbf{N}(\mathbf{a}_j)}{\log R} \right) \chi \left(\frac{\log \mathbf{N}(\mathbf{b}_j)}{\log R} \right)$$

as (6.19), and expand this product. As a result, this product is expressed as the sum of the main term whose domain of integration is I^{2m} and other $2^{2m} - 1$ error terms. Each error term is the product of $2m$ factors. We apply (6.20) to one of the factors whose domain of integration is $\mathbb{R} \setminus I$ to conclude that it is expressed as $O_{A,\chi}(\mathbf{N}(\mathbf{c})^{-1/\log R} (\log R)^{-A})$. The other factors can be estimated as $O_{A,\chi}(\mathbf{N}(\mathbf{c})^{-1/\log R})$. Hence the desired conclusion follows. □

In the rest of this subsection, we mainly show that the error caused by application of Lemma 6.17 is small enough. A rough estimate of the error suffices here; however we prepare a precise lemma for the estimation of the main term that comes later.

For each prime number $p \in \mathcal{P}$, we define

$$\begin{aligned} E_p &= E_p((\xi_j, \eta_j)_{j \in [m]}; R) \\ &:= \sum_{(\alpha_j, \beta_j)_{j \in [m]} \in (\text{Ideals}_K^{(p)})^{2m}} \left(\prod_{j \in [m]} \{ \mu(\alpha_j) \mu(\beta_j) \mathbf{N}(\alpha_j)^{-z_j} \mathbf{N}(\beta_j)^{-w_j} \} \right) \mathbf{e}((\alpha_j, \beta_j)_{j \in [m]}). \end{aligned} \quad (6.21)$$

Since each summand of this sum contains $\mu(\alpha_j) \mu(\beta_j)$ as a factor, it suffices to consider the sum over the tuples $(\alpha_j, \beta_j)_{j \in [m]}$ consisting of square free p -ideals. The number of such tuples is at most 4^{mn} by Lemma 3.15. The absolute value of the summand labeled by $(\alpha_j, \beta_j)_{j \in [m]} \neq (\mathcal{O}_K, \dots, \mathcal{O}_K)$ is at most $1/p$ by Lemma 6.12. Hence for every prime number p greater than w ($\geq 4^{mn}$), E_p is a non-zero finite value. We will need the following more precise result.

Lemma 6.18. *For every prime number p greater than w , we have*

$$E_p = 1 - \Sigma_p((\xi_j, \eta_j)_{j \in [m]}; R) + O(4^{mn}/p^2), \quad (6.22)$$

where

$$\Sigma_p((\xi_j, \eta_j)_{j \in [m]}; R) := \sum_{j \in [m]} \sum_{\mathfrak{p} \in |\text{Spec}(\mathcal{O}_K)|^{(p)}} (\mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{p})^{-1-z_j} + \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{p})^{-1-w_j} - \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{p})^{-1-z_j-w_j}).$$

The infinite series E defined by (6.15) and the infinite product $\prod_{p \in \mathcal{P}_{>w}} E_p$ converge absolutely and uniformly on $(\xi_j, \eta_j)_{j \in [m]} \in I^{2m}$. Furthermore, they coincide, that is,

$$E = \prod_{p \in \mathcal{P}_{>w}} E_p. \quad (6.23)$$

Proof. Let p be a prime number greater than w . Consider the case of Lemma 6.12 (3), namely, there exists $j_0 \in [m]$ such that $\mathfrak{p} := \alpha_{j_0} \cap \beta_{j_0} \in |\text{Spec}(\mathcal{O}_K)|^{(p)}$ and $\alpha_j = \beta_j = \mathcal{O}_K$ for all $j \in [m] \setminus \{j_0\}$. Then Lemma 6.12 asserts that $\mathbf{e}((\alpha_j, \beta_j)_{j \in [m]}) = \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{p})^{-1}$. Moreover we have

$$(\alpha_{j_0}, \beta_{j_0}) \in \{(\mathfrak{p}, \mathcal{O}_K), (\mathcal{O}_K, \mathfrak{p}), (\mathfrak{p}, \mathfrak{p})\}.$$

Hence (6.22) follows from Lemma 6.12.

Let \tilde{E} be the sum of the absolute values of the summands of E , and for each prime number p , let \tilde{E}_p be that of E_p . Applying Lemma 6.12 to the summands of \tilde{E}_p , we have

$$\tilde{E}_p = \begin{cases} 1 + O_{m,n} \left(p^{-1 - \frac{1}{\log R}} \right) & \text{if } p > w, \\ 1 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

and

$$\prod_{p \in \mathcal{P}} \tilde{E}_p = \prod_{p \in \mathcal{P}_{>w}} \left(1 + O_{m,n} \left(p^{-1 - \frac{1}{\log R}} \right) \right). \quad (6.24)$$

Since

$$\sum_{p \in \mathcal{P}_{>w}} O_{m,n} \left(p^{-1 - \frac{1}{\log R}} \right) = O_{m,n} \left(\zeta \left(1 + \frac{1}{\log R} \right) \right) < \infty,$$

we see that product (6.24) converges uniformly on $(\xi_j, \eta_j)_{j \in [m]} \in I^{2m}$ (with R fixed). This implies that $\prod_{p \in \mathcal{P}_{>w}} E_p$ converges absolutely and uniformly.

By the multiplicativity of the Möbius function, norm (Lemma 3.7) and \mathbf{e} (Lemma 6.8), we see that for each $(\mathbf{a}_j, \mathbf{b}_j)_{j \in [m]} \in \text{Ideals}_K^{2m}$ the following value decomposes into its p -parts:

$$\begin{aligned} & \left(\prod_{j \in [m]} \left\{ \mu(\mathbf{a}_j) \mu(\mathbf{b}_j) \mathbf{N}(\mathbf{a}_j)^{-z_j} \mathbf{N}(\mathbf{b}_j)^{-w_j} \right\} \right) \mathbf{e} \left((\mathbf{a}_j, \mathbf{b}_j)_{j \in [m]} \right) \\ &= \prod_{p \in \mathcal{P}} \left[\left(\prod_{j \in [m]} \left\{ \mu(\mathbf{a}_j^{(p)}) \mu(\mathbf{b}_j^{(p)}) \mathbf{N}(\mathbf{a}_j^{(p)})^{-z_j} \mathbf{N}(\mathbf{b}_j^{(p)})^{-w_j} \right\} \right) \mathbf{e} \left((\mathbf{a}_j^{(p)}, \mathbf{b}_j^{(p)})_{j \in [m]} \right) \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Hence we have equalities of infinite series, the latter ones of which have been shown to converge:

$$\tilde{E} = \prod_{p \in \mathcal{P}} \tilde{E}_p = \prod_{p \in \mathcal{P}_{>w}} \tilde{E}_p.$$

Therefore E converges absolutely and uniformly on $(\mathbf{a}_j, \mathbf{b}_j)_{j \in [m]} \in \text{Ideals}_K^{2m}$, and we have $E = \prod_{p \in \mathcal{P}_{>w}} E_p$. \square

The following lemma provides a further estimate of (6.24).

Lemma 6.19. *Let C be a positive real number. Then for each positive real number w , we have*

$$\prod_{p \in \mathcal{P}_{>w}} \left(1 + C \cdot p^{-1 - \frac{1}{\log R}} \right) \leq (\log R + O(1))^C.$$

Proof. It suffices to prove this lemma in the case of $w = 1$. By the inequality $1 - Cx \leq (1 + x)^{-C}$ for every $x > -1$, we have

$$1 + C \cdot p^{-1 - \frac{1}{\log R}} \leq \left(1 - p^{-1 - \frac{1}{\log R}} \right)^{-C}.$$

Hence

$$\prod_{p \in \mathcal{P}} \left(1 + C \cdot p^{-1 - \frac{1}{\log R}} \right) \leq \prod_{p \in \mathcal{P}} \left(1 - p^{-1 - \frac{1}{\log R}} \right)^{-C} = \zeta \left(1 + \frac{1}{\log R} \right)^C.$$

The Riemann zeta function ζ satisfies $|\zeta(s) - \frac{1}{s-1}| \leq 1$ for every $s > 1$. It follows that $\zeta \left(1 + \frac{1}{\log R} \right) = \log R + O(1)$ and the desired result follows. \square

We will prove Proposition 6.14 by combination of the above lemmas.

Proof of Proposition 6.14. We apply Lemma 6.17 to $\prod_{j \in [m]} \chi \left(\frac{\log \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{a}_j)}{\log R} \right) \chi \left(\frac{\log \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{b}_j)}{\log R} \right)$ in (6.10), and then (6.10) is decomposed into the main term represented by integrals and the error term $O_{A,\chi,m} \left((\log R)^{2m-A} \cdot \tilde{E} \right)$. Since E converges absolutely and uniformly by Lemma 6.18, we can interchange integration and summation in the main term. Then it turns out that the main term is equal to (6.16). Next we estimate the error term. By applying Lemma 6.19 to $\tilde{E} = \prod_{p \in \mathcal{P}_{>w}} \tilde{E}_p$ with (6.24), we can rewrite the error term as

$$O_{A,\chi,m} \left((\log R)^{2m-A} (\log R + O(1))^{O_{m,n}(1)} \right). \quad (6.25)$$

By replacing A with some sufficiently large A depending on m and n , we may rewrite this error as $O_{A,\chi,m,n} \left((\log R)^{-A} \right)$. \square

6.6 Calculation of the main term

In this subsection, we continue the calculation of the main term singled out in Proposition 6.14. Recall from (6.21) the definition of $E_p = E_p((\xi_j, \eta_j)_{j \in [m]}; R)$.

Proposition 6.20. *Assume Setting 6.13. Let A be a positive real number. Then (6.10) equals*

$$(\log R)^{2m} \int_{I^{2m}} d\underline{\xi} d\underline{\eta} \left[\left(\prod_{j \in [m]} \hat{\chi}(\xi_j) \hat{\chi}(\eta_j) \right) \cdot \prod_{p \in \mathcal{P}_{>w}} E_p \right] \quad (6.26)$$

with an additive error term $O_{A,\chi,m,n}((\log R)^{-A})$.

In this subsection, we assume the following setting, which determines the choice of the three parameters w_0 , R_0 and F_0 in Theorem 6.2 up to c_1 , c_K and c_2 , respectively.

Setting 6.21. Assume the setting in Theorem 6.2, and fix χ as in Definition 6.1. Set the positive real numbers w_0 , R_0 and F_0 in Theorem 6.2 in the following manner:

- (1) $w_0 = w_0((\psi_j)_{j \in [m]}) := \max\{c_1 4^{mn}, w'_0, w''_0\}$, where c_1 is a sufficiently large absolute constant. Both w'_0 and w''_0 are given in Setting 6.10.
- (2) $R_0 = R_0(m, K) := e^{c_K m^2}$, where c_K is a sufficiently large constant depending only on K .
- (3) $F_0 = F_0(m, n) := c_2(mn)^{-1}$, where c_2 is a sufficiently small absolute constant.

Assume that w and R are positive real numbers such that $w \geq w_0$, $R \geq R_0$ and $\log w \leq F_0 \cdot \sqrt{\log R}$.

Here c_1 will be determined in the proofs of Lemmas 6.23 and 6.24, c_K will be determined in Lemma 6.25, and c_2 will be determined by Lemma 6.26. Since their actual values are not important for our purpose, we will not specify them.

We continue to use the symbols as in Subsection 6.5. Let $I = I(R) := [-\sqrt{\log R}, +\sqrt{\log R}]_{\mathbb{R}}$, and ξ_j and η_j be variables of integration. We use shorthand symbols $d\underline{\xi} = d\xi_1 \cdots d\xi_m$ and $d\underline{\eta} = d\eta_1 \cdots d\eta_m$. Let $z_j = \frac{1+\xi_j\sqrt{-1}}{\log R}$ and $w_j = \frac{1+\eta_j\sqrt{-1}}{\log R}$. The function $\widehat{\chi}$ is the inverse Fourier transform of the function $x \mapsto e^x \chi(x)$. For each $(\xi_j, \eta_j)_{j \in [m]} \in I^{2m}$ and prime number $p \in \mathcal{P}$, define $E'_p = E'_p((\xi_j, \eta_j)_{j \in [m]}; R)$ by

$$E'_p := \prod_{j \in [m]} \prod_{\mathfrak{p} \in |\text{Spec}(\mathcal{O}_K)|^{(p)}} \frac{(1 - \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{p})^{-1-z_j})(1 - \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{p})^{-1-w_j})}{(1 - \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{p})^{-1-z_j-w_j})}.$$

We first show estimates for E_p and E'_p and their relation. The following lemma provides elementary estimates.

Lemma 6.22. *The following estimates hold.*

(1) *For every complex number ε with $|\varepsilon| \leq 1/2$, we have*

$$\begin{aligned} \log(1 + \varepsilon) &= O(|\varepsilon|), \\ \frac{1}{1 - \varepsilon} &= 1 + \varepsilon + O(|\varepsilon|^2) = 1 + O(|\varepsilon|). \end{aligned}$$

(2) *For every complex number ε with $|\varepsilon| \leq 1$, we have*

$$e^\varepsilon = 1 + O(|\varepsilon|).$$

(3) *For every positive integer k and all complex numbers $\varepsilon_1, \dots, \varepsilon_k$ with $|\varepsilon_1|, \dots, |\varepsilon_k| \leq 1/k$, we have*

$$\prod_{i \in [k]} (1 + \varepsilon_i) = 1 + \sum_{i \in [k]} \varepsilon_i + O\left(k^2 \cdot \max_{i \in [k]} |\varepsilon_i|^2\right) = 1 + O\left(k \cdot \max_{i \in [k]} |\varepsilon_i|\right).$$

Proof. (1) and (2) follow from the Taylor expansions. Next (3) follows from

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \prod_{i \in [k]} (1 + \varepsilon_i) - \left(1 + \sum_{i \in [k]} \varepsilon_i\right) \right| &\leq \sum_{j \in [2, k]} \binom{k}{j} \max_{i \in [k]} |\varepsilon_i|^j \leq k^2 \cdot \max_{i \in [k]} |\varepsilon_i|^2 \sum_{j \in [2, k]} \binom{k}{j} \frac{1}{k^j} \\ &\leq e \cdot k^2 \cdot \max_{i \in [k]} |\varepsilon_i|^2. \end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof. \square

Lemma 6.23. *For every tuple $(\xi_j, \eta_j)_{j \in [m]} \in I^{2m}$ and prime number p greater than w , we have*

$$\frac{E_p}{E'_p} = 1 + O(4^{mn}/p^2).$$

Proof. By Lemma 6.22 (1), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{E'_p} &= \prod_{j \in [m]} \prod_{\mathfrak{p} \in |\text{Spec}(\mathcal{O}_K)|^{(p)}} \frac{(1 - \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{p})^{-1-z_j-w_j})}{(1 - \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{p})^{-1-z_j})(1 - \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{p})^{-1-w_j})} \\ &= \prod_{j \in [m]} \prod_{\mathfrak{p} \in |\text{Spec}(\mathcal{O}_K)|^{(p)}} (1 + \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{p})^{-1-z_j} + O(1/p^2)) \\ &\quad \cdot (1 + \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{p})^{-1-w_j} + O(1/p^2)) (1 - \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{p})^{-1-z_j-w_j}). \end{aligned}$$

Since the number of prime p -ideals is at most $n = [K : \mathbb{Q}]$ by Lemma 3.15, the product above consists of at most $3mn$ factors. In addition, the difference between 1 and each factor is at most $2/p$. Hence, in the case of $p > w$ ($\geq 6mn$), we may apply Lemma 6.22 (3) to the product, and then obtain

$$1/E'_p = 1 + \Sigma_p((\xi_j, \eta_j)_{j \in [m]}; R) + O(m^2 n^2 / p^2).$$

Recall that $\Sigma_p = \Sigma_p((\xi_j, \eta_j)_{k \in [m]}; R)$ is given by

$$\Sigma_p = \sum_{j \in [m]} \sum_{\mathfrak{p} \in |\text{Spec}(\mathcal{O}_K)|^{(p)}} (\mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{p})^{-1-z_j} + \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{p})^{-1-w_j} - \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{p})^{-1-z_j-w_j}).$$

Note that $|\Sigma_p| \leq 3mn/p$ holds. Recall from (6.22) in Lemma 6.18 that

$$E_p = 1 - \Sigma_p((\xi_j, \eta_j)_{j \in [m]}; R) + O(4^{mn}/p^2).$$

We set

$$\varepsilon_1 = 1/E'_p - 1 = \Sigma_p + O(m^2 n^2 / p^2), \quad \varepsilon_2 = E_p - 1 = -\Sigma_p + O(4^{mn}/p^2). \quad (6.27)$$

If c_1 is large enough to match the implied constants in the two big- O terms in (6.27), then we have $|\varepsilon_1|, |\varepsilon_2| \leq (3mn + 1)/p \leq 1/2$ for every $p > c_1 4^{mn}$ ($\geq 6mn + 1$). Hence Lemma 6.22 (3) can be applied to (6.27), and then the desired result follows. \square

Lemma 6.24. *We have*

$$\prod_{p \in \mathcal{P}_{>w}} E_p = \left(1 + O\left(\frac{4^{mn}}{w \log w}\right)\right) \cdot \prod_{p \in \mathcal{P}_{>w}} E'_p.$$

Proof. By Lemma 6.23, we have

$$\prod_{p \in \mathcal{P}_{>w}} E_p = \prod_{p \in \mathcal{P}_{>w}} (1 + O(4^{mn}/p^2)) \cdot \prod_{p \in \mathcal{P}_{>w}} E'_p.$$

If c_1 is large enough to match the implied constant in the $O(4^{mn}/p^2)$ above, then for every $p > w$ ($> c_1 2^{mn}$), the $O(4^{mn}/p^2)$ can be bounded by $1/2$ from above. Hence, by Lemma 6.22 (1)

and Lemma 3.23, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \log \left(\prod_{p \in \mathcal{P}_{>w}} E_p \right) - \log \left(\prod_{p \in \mathcal{P}_{>w}} E'_p \right) &= \log \left(\prod_{p \in \mathcal{P}_{>w}} (1 + O(4^{mn}/p^2)) \right) \\ &= \sum_{p \in \mathcal{P}_{>w}} \log (1 + O(4^{mn}/p^2)) \\ &= \sum_{p \in \mathcal{P}_{>w}} O(4^{mn}/p^2) = O \left(\frac{4^{mn}}{w \log w} \right). \end{aligned}$$

If the constant c_1 is chosen large enough to match the implied constant in this last $O(4^{mn}/(w \log w))$, then the inequality $w \log w \geq w \geq c_1 4^{mn}$ implies that the value of this O -term is at most 1. Hence by Lemma 6.22 (2), we derive the desired estimate

$$\frac{\prod_{p \in \mathcal{P}_{>w}} E_p}{\prod_{p \in \mathcal{P}_{>w}} E'_p} = e^{O(\frac{4^{mn}}{w \log w})} = 1 + O \left(\frac{4^{mn}}{w \log w} \right).$$

The above requirements finalize our choice of c_1 . \square

By this lemma, the calculation of $\prod_{p \in \mathcal{P}_{>w}} E_p$ is reduced to that of $\prod_{p \in \mathcal{P}_{>w}} E'_p$. We do this by calculating the numerator and the denominator of

$$\prod_{p \in \mathcal{P}_{>w}} E'_p = \frac{\prod_{p \in \mathcal{P}} E'_p}{\prod_{p \in \mathcal{P}_{\leq w}} E'_p}.$$

Lemma 6.25. *We have*

$$\prod_{p \in \mathcal{P}} E'_p = \prod_{j \in [m]} \frac{\zeta_K(1 + z_j + w_j)}{\zeta_K(1 + z_j) \zeta_K(1 + w_j)} = \left(1 + O_K \left(\frac{m}{\sqrt{\log R}} \right) \right) \cdot \prod_{j \in [m]} \frac{1}{\kappa} \cdot \frac{z_j w_j}{z_j + w_j}.$$

Proof. Recall the definition of E'_p from (6.21) and the Euler product of Dedekind zeta function from Proposition 3.18. We see that

$$\prod_{p \in \mathcal{P}} E'_p = \prod_{j \in [m]} \frac{\zeta_K(1 + z_j + w_j)}{\zeta_K(1 + z_j) \zeta_K(1 + w_j)}.$$

Let j be an arbitrary integer in $[m]$. Since $\xi_j, \eta_j \in I = [-\sqrt{\log R}, \sqrt{\log R}]_{\mathbb{R}}$, we have

$$|z_j|, |w_j| \leq \frac{\sqrt{1 + \log R}}{\log R} \leq \sqrt{\frac{2}{\log R}}.$$

Theorem 3.19 implies that, for all complex numbers ε with $0 < |\varepsilon| \leq 1$,

$$\zeta_K(1 + \varepsilon) = \frac{\kappa}{\varepsilon} (1 + O_K(|\varepsilon|)). \quad (6.28)$$

Since $R \geq R_0$ ($\geq c_K$), if c_K is sufficiently large depending on K , then the absolute value of $O_K(1/\sqrt{\log R})$ term below is at most $1/2$. Lemma 6.22 (1) and (6.28) imply that for $\varepsilon = z_j$ or w_j ,

$$\frac{1}{\zeta_K(1+\varepsilon)} = \frac{\varepsilon}{\kappa} \cdot \frac{1}{1 + O_K(1/\sqrt{\log R})} = \frac{\varepsilon}{\kappa} \left(1 + O_K\left(1/\sqrt{\log R}\right)\right).$$

Similarly, it follows from (6.28) that

$$\zeta_K(1+z_j+w_j) = \frac{\kappa}{z_j+w_k} \left(1 + O_K\left(1/\sqrt{\log R}\right)\right).$$

Hence applying Lemma 6.22 (3) (by assuming c_K is even larger if necessary) to the product of these three functions, we obtain

$$\frac{\zeta_K(1+z_j+w_j)}{\zeta_K(1+z_j)\zeta_K(1+w_j)} = \frac{1}{\kappa} \cdot \frac{z_j w_j}{z_j + w_j} \cdot \left(1 + O_K\left(1/\sqrt{\log R}\right)\right).$$

These estimates for all $j \in [m]$ together with Lemma 6.22 (3) (with c_K assumed to be even larger if necessary) provide the desired estimate. \square

Lemma 6.26. *We have*

$$\prod_{p \in \mathcal{P}_{\leq w}} E'_p = \left(1 + O\left(\frac{mn \log w}{\sqrt{\log R}}\right)\right) \cdot \left(\frac{\varphi_K(W)}{\mathbf{N}(W)}\right)^m.$$

Proof. Let p be a prime number at most w , and $\mathfrak{p} \in |\text{Spec}(\mathcal{O}_K)|^{(p)}$ a prime p -ideal. Let $j \in [m]$, and suppose that $\varepsilon = z_j$ or w_j . Note that $\varepsilon = O(1/\sqrt{\log R})$, $\mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{p}) \leq p^n$ and $\log w/\sqrt{\log R} \leq F_0$ ($\leq c_2 n^{-1}$). As a result we have $|\varepsilon \log \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{p})| = O(n \log w/\sqrt{\log R})$ and it is at most 1 if c_2 is small enough. Therefore we have

$$\begin{aligned} 1 - \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{p})^{-1-\varepsilon} &= 1 - \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{p})^{-1} \exp(-\varepsilon \log \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{p})) \\ &= 1 - \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{p})^{-1} \left(1 + O\left(\frac{\log \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{p})}{\sqrt{\log R}}\right)\right) && \text{(by Lemma 6.22 (2))} \\ &= (1 - \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{p})^{-1}) \left(1 + O\left(\frac{\log \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{p})}{\mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{p})\sqrt{\log R}}\right)\right) \\ &= (1 - \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{p})^{-1}) \left(1 + O\left(\frac{\log p}{p\sqrt{\log R}}\right)\right), \end{aligned}$$

where the last estimate follows from the general fact $\frac{\log(p^d)}{p^d} \leq \frac{\log p}{p}$ for integers $p, d \geq 2$. Similarly, we have

$$\frac{1}{1 - \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{p})^{-1-z_j-w_j}} = \frac{1}{1 - \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{p})^{-1}} \left(1 + O\left(\frac{\log p}{p\sqrt{\log R}}\right)\right).$$

Under our assumptions $p \leq w$ and $\log w/\sqrt{\log R} \leq F_0 = c_2/(mn)$, we have a crude estimate

$$\frac{\log p}{p\sqrt{\log R}} \leq \frac{c_2}{mn}.$$

Hence if c_2 is small enough, the absolute values of all $O\left(\frac{\log p}{p\sqrt{\log R}}\right)$ above are at most $1/(3mn)$ (where $3mn$ is the maximum possible number of terms in the expression to come). This together with Lemma 6.22 (3) implies that

$$\begin{aligned} E'_p &= \prod_{j \in [m]} \prod_{\mathfrak{p} \in |\text{Spec}(\mathcal{O}_K)|^{(p)}} \frac{(1 - \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{p})^{-1-z_j})(1 - \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{p})^{-1-w_j})}{(1 - \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{p})^{-1-z_j-w_j})} \\ &= \left(1 + O\left(\frac{mn \log p}{p\sqrt{\log R}}\right)\right) \cdot \prod_{j \in [m]} \prod_{\mathfrak{p} \in |\text{Spec}(\mathcal{O}_K)|^{(p)}} (1 - \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{p})^{-1}). \end{aligned}$$

Recall that the set of prime divisors of W equals $\mathcal{P}_{\leq w}$. It follows from Proposition 3.9 that

$$\prod_{p \in \mathcal{P}_{\leq w}} \prod_{\mathfrak{p} \in |\text{Spec}(\mathcal{O}_K)|^{(p)}} (1 - \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{p})^{-1}) = \frac{\varphi_K(W)}{\mathbf{N}(W)}.$$

Therefore, we have

$$\prod_{p \in \mathcal{P}_{\leq w}} E'_p = \left(\prod_{p \in \mathcal{P}_{\leq w}} \left(1 + O\left(\frac{mn \log p}{p\sqrt{\log R}}\right)\right) \right) \cdot \left(\frac{\varphi_K(W)}{\mathbf{N}(W)}\right)^m.$$

Below we estimate the product over $\mathcal{P}_{\leq w}$ on this right-hand side under the assumption $\log w/\sqrt{\log R} \leq F_0 (= c_2(mn)^{-1})$. By Lemma 6.22 (1) and Proposition 3.24, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \log \left(\prod_{p \in \mathcal{P}_{\leq w}} E'_p \right) - \log \left(\left(\frac{\varphi_K(W)}{\mathbf{N}(W)}\right)^m \right) &= \log \left(\prod_{p \in \mathcal{P}_{\leq w}} \left(1 + O\left(\frac{mn \log p}{p\sqrt{\log R}}\right)\right) \right) \\ &= \sum_{p \in \mathcal{P}_{\leq w}} \log \left(1 + O\left(\frac{mn \log p}{p\sqrt{\log R}}\right)\right) \\ &= \sum_{p \in \mathcal{P}_{\leq w}} O\left(\frac{mn \log p}{p\sqrt{\log R}}\right) = O\left(\frac{mn \log w}{\sqrt{\log R}}\right). \end{aligned}$$

This together with Lemma 6.22 (2) implies that

$$\frac{\prod_{p \in \mathcal{P}_{\leq w}} E'_p}{(\varphi_K(W)/\mathbf{N}(W))^m} = e^{O\left(\frac{mn \log w}{\sqrt{\log R}}\right)} = 1 + O\left(\frac{mn \log w}{\sqrt{\log R}}\right),$$

and this completes the proof. \square

By combining Lemmas 6.24, 6.25 and 6.26, and using Lemma 6.22, we obtain

$$\prod_{p \in \mathcal{P}_{> w}} E_p = \left(1 + O\left(\frac{4^{mn}}{w \log w}\right) + O_K\left(\frac{m \log w}{\sqrt{\log R}}\right)\right) \cdot \left(\frac{W^n}{\varphi_K(W) \cdot \kappa}\right)^m \prod_{j \in [m]} \frac{z_j w_j}{z_j + w_j}. \quad (6.29)$$

This concludes an estimate for every fixed $(\xi_j, \eta_j)_{j \in [m]} \in I^{2m}$. Now we integrate over $(\xi_j, \eta_j)_{j \in [m]} \in I^{2m}$; we will use the following estimates.

Proposition 6.27. (1) *For every positive real number A , we have*

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{I^{2m}} d\underline{\xi} d\underline{\eta} \left[\prod_{j \in [m]} \widehat{\chi}(\xi_j) \widehat{\chi}(\eta_j) \frac{z_j w_j}{z_j + w_j} \right] \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2m}} d\underline{\xi} d\underline{\eta} \left[\prod_{j \in [m]} \widehat{\chi}(\xi_j) \widehat{\chi}(\eta_j) \frac{z_j w_j}{z_j + w_j} \right] + O_{A, \chi, m} ((\log R)^{-m-A}). \end{aligned}$$

(2) *We have*

$$\int_{I^{2m}} d\underline{\xi} d\underline{\eta} \left| \prod_{j \in [m]} \widehat{\chi}(\xi_j) \widehat{\chi}(\eta_j) \frac{z_j w_j}{z_j + w_j} \right| = O_{\chi, m} ((\log R)^{-m}).$$

Proof. For (1), we decompose the integral as $\int_{I^{2m}} = \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2m}} - \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2m} \setminus I^{2m}}$, and estimate $\int_{\mathbb{R}^{2m} \setminus I^{2m}}$. For every $(\xi_j, \eta_j)_{j \in [m]} \in \mathbb{R}^{2m}$, we have

$$\frac{z_j w_j}{z_j + w_j} = O((\log R)^{-1} (1 + |\xi_j|)(1 + |\eta_j|)).$$

By Lemma 6.15, for all $B \geq 0$, it follows that

$$\prod_{j \in [m]} \widehat{\chi}(\xi_j) \widehat{\chi}(\eta_j) \frac{z_j w_j}{z_j + w_j} = O_{B, \chi, m} \left((\log R)^{-m} \prod_{j \in [m]} (1 + |\xi_j|)^{-B} (1 + |\eta_j|)^{-B} \right).$$

We let $B = 2A + 1$ and note that the following:

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} (1 + |\xi|)^{-B} d\xi = O_A(1) \quad \text{and} \quad \int_{\mathbb{R} \setminus I} (1 + |\xi|)^{-B} d\xi = O_A((\log R)^{-A}).$$

In an argument similar to that of the proof of Lemma 6.17, we see that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R} \setminus I^{2m}} d\underline{\xi} d\underline{\eta} \left[\prod_{j \in [m]} \widehat{\chi}(\xi_j) \widehat{\chi}(\eta_j) \frac{z_j w_j}{z_j + w_j} \right] = O_{A, \chi, m} ((\log R)^{-m-A}).$$

Hence (1) follows.

For (2), we obtain

$$\int_{I^{2m}} d\underline{\xi} d\underline{\eta} \left| \prod_{j \in [m]} \widehat{\chi}(\xi_j) \widehat{\chi}(\eta_j) \frac{z_j w_j}{z_j + w_j} \right| \leq (\log R)^{-m} \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |\widehat{\chi}(\xi) \widehat{\chi}(\eta)| (1 + |\xi|)(1 + |\eta|) d\xi d\eta \right)^m.$$

Here the integral in the right-hand side is a constant depending on χ . □

Our estimate of (6.26) is stated as follows.

Proposition 6.28. *Let $A > 0$. Then the main term (6.26) is equal to*

$$(\log R)^{2m} \left(\frac{W^n}{\varphi_K(W) \cdot \kappa} \right)^m \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2m}} d\underline{\xi} d\underline{\eta} \left[\prod_{j \in [m]} \widehat{\chi}(\xi_j) \widehat{\chi}(\eta_j) \frac{z_j w_j}{z_j + w_j} \right] \quad (6.30)$$

with an additive error

$$\left(O_{A,\chi,m} ((\log R)^{-A}) + O_{\chi,m} \left(\frac{4^{mn}}{w \log w} \right) + O_{\chi,m,K} \left(\frac{\log w}{\sqrt{\log R}} \right) \right) \left(\frac{W^n \log R}{\varphi_K(W) \cdot \kappa} \right)^m.$$

Proof. This follows from (6.29) and Proposition 6.27. \square

We write down a proof of the following lemma for the convenience of the reader.

Lemma 6.29 (See also [CFZ14, (38)] or [Tao06, p.170]). *We have*

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} d\xi d\eta \left[\widehat{\chi}(\xi) \widehat{\chi}(\eta) \frac{(1 + \xi\sqrt{-1})(1 + \eta\sqrt{-1})}{2 + (\xi + \eta)\sqrt{-1}} \right] = c_\chi. \quad (6.31)$$

Proof. Since

$$\frac{1}{2 + (\xi + \eta)\sqrt{-1}} = \int_0^\infty e^{-x(1+\xi\sqrt{-1})} e^{-x(1+\eta\sqrt{-1})} dx,$$

the left-hand side of (6.31) equals

$$\int_0^\infty \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}} \widehat{\chi}(\xi) (1 + \xi\sqrt{-1}) e^{-x(1+\xi\sqrt{-1})} d\xi \right)^2 dx.$$

Then the integral over $\xi \in \mathbb{R}$ is equal to $-\chi'(x)$ by the integral representation (6.13) of χ . Since c_χ is defined in (6.2) as $c_\chi = \int_0^\infty \chi'(x)^2 dx$, it ends the proof. \square

Now we are ready to complete the proof of Theorem 6.2.

Proof of Theorem 6.2. First, note that by Lemma 6.29, the main term is calculated as follows

$$(\log R)^{2m} \left(\frac{W^n}{\varphi_K(W) \cdot \kappa} \right)^m \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2m}} d\underline{\xi} d\underline{\eta} \left[\prod_{j \in [m]} \widehat{\chi}(\xi_j) \widehat{\chi}(\eta_j) \frac{z_j w_j}{z_j + w_j} \right] = \left(\frac{W^n c_\chi \log R}{\varphi_K(W) \cdot \kappa} \right)^m. \quad (6.32)$$

Combining Propositions 6.4, 6.6, 6.20, 6.28 and (6.32), we have for all $A > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left(\prod_{j \in [m]} (\Lambda_{R,\chi} \circ \theta_j)^2 \mid \mathcal{B} \right) \\ &= \left(1 + O_{A,\chi,m} ((\log R)^{-A}) + O_{\chi,m} \left(\frac{4^{mn}}{w \log w} \right) + O_{\chi,m,K} \left(\frac{\log w}{\sqrt{\log R}} \right) \right) \cdot \left(\frac{W^n c_\chi \log R}{\varphi_K(W) \cdot \kappa} \right)^m \\ & \quad + O_{A,\chi,m,n} ((\log R)^{-A}) + O_{m,t,K} \left(\frac{(\log R)^{2m}}{R} \right). \end{aligned}$$

We write the first, second and third term of the right-hand side of the equality above, respectively, as \mathcal{E}_1 , \mathcal{E}_2 and \mathcal{E}_3 . By setting $A = 1/2$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}_1 \cdot \left(\frac{W^n c_\chi \log R}{\varphi_K(W) \cdot \kappa} \right)^{-m} &= 1 + O_{\chi, m} \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{\log R}} \right) + O_{\chi, m} \left(\frac{4^{mn}}{w \log w} \right) + O_{\chi, m, K} \left(\frac{\log w}{\sqrt{\log R}} \right) \\ &= 1 + O_{\chi, m, n} \left(\frac{1}{w \log w} \right) + O_{\chi, m, K} \left(\frac{\log w}{\sqrt{\log R}} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Since $\varphi_K(W) \leq W^n$, we in addition have

$$\mathcal{E}_2 + \mathcal{E}_3 = O_{\chi, m, n} \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{\log R}} \right) + O_{m, t, K} \left(\frac{(\log R)^{2m}}{R} \right) = O_{\chi, m, t, K} \left(\frac{\log w}{\sqrt{\log R}} \right) \cdot \left(\frac{W^n c_\chi \log R}{\varphi_K(W) \cdot \kappa} \right)^m.$$

Thus the proof is completed. \square

We remark that, by replacing the definition of $I = [-\sqrt{\log R}, \sqrt{\log R}]_{\mathbb{R}}$ with $[-(\log R)^\varepsilon, (\log R)^\varepsilon]_{\mathbb{R}}$, $1/\sqrt{\log R}$ in the second big- O term in (6.4) can be improved to $1/(\log R)^{1-\varepsilon}$.

In the remaining part of this subsection, we summarize differences from the previous work on Goldston–Yıldırım type estimates in this research field.

Remark 6.30. Assumption (6.3) in Theorem 6.2 is stronger than the corresponding assumption in [Tao06, Proposition 9.1]. However, this condition is always fulfilled in our applications. Furthermore, one of the great advantages of Theorem 6.2 is that it applies to *all* number fields K , including those where K/\mathbb{Q} is *not* Galois.

The assumption that ψ_j has finite cokernel can be probably dropped in view of the fact that for asymptotically almost all prime elements π the residue field $\mathcal{O}_K/\pi\mathcal{O}_K$ is a prime field, see Lemma 10.40. In implementing this, we might modify the definition of $\Lambda_{R, \chi}$ and the normalizing coefficient in (6.35) slightly, see [Tao06, (49) on page 147 and Lemma 10.5].

Remark 6.31. The condition ‘ $\#I_i \geq R^{4m+1}$ ’ in Theorem 6.2 corresponds to ‘ $\#I_i \geq R^{5m}$ ’ in [Tao06, Proposition 9.1], and to ‘ $\#I_i \geq R^{10m}$ ’ in [CFZ14, Proposition 8.3]. Here note that the convention in [Tao06] is slightly different from ours; Tao bounded ideal norms from above by R^2 , not by R . In the present paper, we do not optimize the order of this bound on $\#I_i$; the proof of Theorem 6.2 remains to work, provided that $\#I_i \geq R^{4m} \cdot (\log R)^{2m} \cdot \frac{\sqrt{\log R}}{\log w}$.

Remark 6.32. We have an upper bound of $w_0((\psi_j)_{j \in [m]})$ in terms of the sizes of the coefficients of ψ_j 's. Fix a \mathbb{Z} -basis $\boldsymbol{\omega}$ of \mathcal{O}_K and suppose that the coefficients of the matrix M_j representing the \mathbb{Z} -linear maps $\psi_j: \mathbb{Z}^t \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_K \cong \mathbb{Z}^n$ are bounded by a positive number $L > 0$ from above. By the theory of Smith normal forms, we know

$$\# \text{coker}(\psi_j) = \gcd\{n \times n \text{ minors of } M_j\} \leq n!L^n.$$

This implies that $w'_0 = O_n(L^n)$ in Setting 6.10.

Also, by standard algorithms we can find $x_{jk} \in \ker(\psi_j) \setminus \ker(\psi_k)$ such that all of its components are estimated as $O_{t, n}(L^{O_{t, n}(1)})$. It follows that all of the components of $\psi_k(x_{jk})$ are

estimated as $tL \cdot O_{t,n}(L^{O_{t,n}(1)}) = O_{t,n}(L^{O_{t,n}(1)})$. Hence we have $N(\psi_k(x_{jk})) = O_{\omega,t,n}(L^{n \cdot O_{t,n}(1)})$, and conclude $w_0'' = O_{\omega,t,n}(L^{O_{t,n}(1)})$.

In Setting 6.21, we have set $w_0((\psi_j)_{j \in [m]}) := \max\{c_1 4^{mn}, w_0', w_0''\}$. Therefore we have an estimate

$$w_0((\psi_j)_{j \in [m]}) = O_{\omega,t,n}(L^{O_{t,n}(1)}) + c_1 4^{mn}.$$

6.7 Goldston–Yıldırım type asymptotic formula for ideals

In this subsection, we present a generalization of Theorem 6.2 to the setting where the target \mathcal{O}_K is replaced by an ideal. The result, Theorem 6.33, will be employed in Section 10 in order to establish Theorem C. The reader who is interested in the proofs of results before Theorem C, such as Theorem A and Theorem B, may skip this subsection.

Let \mathfrak{a} be a non-zero ideal of \mathcal{O}_K . Then $\mathfrak{a}^{-1} = \{x \in K : x\mathfrak{a} \subseteq \mathcal{O}_K\}$ is a non-zero fractional ideal; recall the discussion before Theorem 3.3. Let χ be a function as in Theorem 6.2 and let $R \geq 1$. From the (R, χ) -von Mangoldt function $\Lambda_{R,\chi} : \text{Ideals}_K \cup \{(0)\} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, we construct a new function $\Lambda_{R,\chi}^{\mathfrak{a}} : \mathfrak{a} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ in the following manner:

$$\Lambda_{R,\chi}^{\mathfrak{a}}(\alpha) := \Lambda_{R,\chi}(\alpha\mathfrak{a}^{-1}) \quad \text{for all } \alpha \in \mathfrak{a}. \quad (6.33)$$

Here, note that $\alpha\mathfrak{a}^{-1} \in \text{Ideals}_K \cup \{(0)\}$ holds true. Also, note that unless \mathfrak{a} is principal or $\alpha = 0$, the ideal $\alpha\mathfrak{a}^{-1}$ is *not* principal.

Theorem 6.33 (Goldston–Yıldırım type asymptotic formula for ideals). *Let K be a number field of degree n . Let $\mathfrak{a} \in \text{Ideals}_K$. Let m and t be positive integers, and $\psi_1, \dots, \psi_m : \mathbb{Z}^t \rightarrow \mathfrak{a}$ be \mathbb{Z} -module homomorphisms. Let w be a positive real number, and W a positive integer of which the set of prime divisors is $\mathcal{P}_{\leq w}$. Let b_1, \dots, b_m be elements in \mathfrak{a} such that*

$$b_i \mathcal{O}_K + W\mathfrak{a} = \mathfrak{a} \quad \text{for all } i \in [m]. \quad (6.34)$$

Define affine transformations $\theta_1, \dots, \theta_m : \mathbb{Z}^t \rightarrow \mathfrak{a}$ as

$$\theta_j(x) := \text{Aff}_{W, b_j}(\psi_j(x)) = W\psi_j(x) + b_j.$$

Let R be a positive real number, and $I_1, \dots, I_t \subseteq \mathbb{Z}$ intervals of lengths at least R^{4m+1} . Set $\mathcal{B} := I_1 \times \dots \times I_t \subseteq \mathbb{Z}^t$. Fix a C^∞ -function $\chi : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow [0, 1]_{\mathbb{R}}$ which satisfies $\chi(0) = 1$ and $\text{supp}(\chi) \subseteq [-1, 1]_{\mathbb{R}}$. Assume (6.3). Then there exist positive real numbers $R_0 = R_0(m, K)$, $F_0 = F_0(m, n)$ and $w_0 = w_0((\psi_j)_{j \in [m]})$ such that if $R \geq R_0$, $w \geq w_0$ and $\log w \leq F_0 \cdot \sqrt{\log R}$, then

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}(\Lambda_{R,\chi}^{\mathfrak{a}}(\theta_1(x))^2 \cdots \Lambda_{R,\chi}^{\mathfrak{a}}(\theta_m(x))^2 \mid x \in \mathcal{B}) \\ &= \left(1 + O_{\chi,m,n} \left(\frac{1}{w \log w} \right) + O_{\chi,m,t,K} \left(\frac{\log w}{\sqrt{\log R}} \right) \right) \cdot \left(\frac{W^n c_\chi \log R}{\varphi_K(W) \cdot \kappa} \right)^m \end{aligned} \quad (6.35)$$

holds true. In particular, the error terms $O_{\chi,m,n} \left(\frac{1}{w \log w} \right)$ and $O_{\chi,m,t,K} \left(\frac{\log w}{\sqrt{\log R}} \right)$ are bounded uniformly on W and $(b_j)_{j \in [m]}$.

We remark that condition (6.34) is the counterpart of the coprime condition imposed on b_1, \dots, b_m in Theorem 6.2; see Section 8, more specifically, Lemma 8.5, for more details.

In the rest of this subsection, we prove Theorem 6.33 under the setting of Theorem 6.33.

Proposition 6.34. *Expectation (6.35) is equal to*

$$(\log R)^{2m} \sum_{(\mathbf{a}_j, \mathbf{b}_j)_{j \in [m]} \in \text{Ideals}_K^{2m}} \Pi_{R, \chi}((\mathbf{a}_j, \mathbf{b}_j)_{j \in [m]}) \cdot \mathbb{E} \left(\prod_{j \in [m]} (\mathbf{1}_{\mathbf{a}_j \cap \mathbf{b}_j} \circ \theta_j) \mid \mathcal{B} \right), \quad (6.36)$$

where

$$\Pi_{R, \chi}((\mathbf{a}_j, \mathbf{b}_j)_{j \in [m]}) = \prod_{j \in [m]} \mu(\mathbf{a}_j) \mu(\mathbf{b}_j) \chi \left(\frac{\log \mathbf{N}(\mathbf{a}_j)}{\log R} \right) \chi \left(\frac{\log \mathbf{N}(\mathbf{b}_j)}{\log R} \right).$$

Proof. Let $x \in \mathcal{B}$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} & (\log R)^{-2m} \prod_{j \in [m]} \Lambda_{R, \chi}^{\mathbf{a}_j}(\theta_j(x))^2 \\ &= \sum_{\substack{(\mathbf{a}_j, \mathbf{b}_j)_{j \in [m]} \in \text{Ideals}_K^{2m} \\ \theta_j(x) \in \mathbf{a}_j \cap \mathbf{b}_j \ (\forall j \in [m])}} \prod_{j \in [m]} \mu(\mathbf{a}_j) \mu(\mathbf{b}_j) \chi \left(\frac{\log \mathbf{N}(\mathbf{a}_j)}{\log R} \right) \chi \left(\frac{\log \mathbf{N}(\mathbf{b}_j)}{\log R} \right) \\ &= \sum_{(\mathbf{a}_j, \mathbf{b}_j)_{j \in [m]} \in \text{Ideals}_K^{2m}} \left(\prod_{j \in [m]} \mathbf{1}_{\mathbf{a}_j \cap \mathbf{b}_j}(\theta_j(x)) \right) \cdot \Pi_{R, \chi}((\mathbf{a}_j, \mathbf{b}_j)_{j \in [m]}). \end{aligned}$$

Only the characteristic functions $\prod_{j \in [m]} \mathbf{1}_{\mathbf{a}_j \cap \mathbf{b}_j}(\theta_j(x))$ depend on $x \in \mathcal{B}$, and hence the desired result holds. \square

The following lemma is verified in the same way as the proof of Lemma 6.5. Indeed, observe that for every $x \in (\mathbb{Z}/D\mathbb{Z})^t$, the value $\mathbf{1}_{\mathbf{a}_j \cap \mathbf{b}_j}(\theta_j(x)) \in \{0, 1\}$ is well-defined.

Lemma 6.35. *Let $(\mathbf{a}_j, \mathbf{b}_j)_{j \in [m]} \in \text{Ideals}_K^{2m}$. Let $D = D((\mathbf{a}_j, \mathbf{b}_j)_{j \in [m]})$ be the positive integer defined in (6.7). If $\mathbf{N}(\mathbf{a}_j), \mathbf{N}(\mathbf{b}_j) \leq R$ holds for every $j \in [m]$, then the following hold true:*

$$\mathbb{E} \left(\prod_{j \in [m]} (\mathbf{1}_{\mathbf{a}_j \cap \mathbf{b}_j} \circ \theta_j) \mid \mathcal{B} \right) = \mathbb{E} \left(\prod_{j \in [m]} (\mathbf{1}_{\mathbf{a}_j \cap \mathbf{b}_j} \circ \theta_j) \mid (\mathbb{Z}/D\mathbb{Z})^t \right) + O_t(R^{-2m-1}).$$

As in (6.9), we write for short the following expectation

$$\mathbf{e}^{\mathbf{a}}((\mathbf{a}_j, \mathbf{b}_j)_{j \in [m]}) = \mathbf{e}^{\mathbf{a}}((\mathbf{a}_j, \mathbf{b}_j)_{j \in [m]}; (\theta_j)_{j \in [m]}) := \mathbb{E} \left(\prod_{j \in [m]} (\mathbf{1}_{\mathbf{a}_j \cap \mathbf{b}_j} \circ \theta_j) \mid (\mathbb{Z}/D\mathbb{Z})^t \right), \quad (6.37)$$

which depends on $(\theta_j)_{j \in [m]}$, $(\mathbf{a}_j, \mathbf{b}_j)_{j \in [m]}$ and \mathbf{a} . Here a positive integer $D = D((\mathbf{a}_j, \mathbf{b}_j)_{j \in [m]})$ is taken as in Lemma 6.35. Then we derive the following proposition in the same way as the proof of Proposition 6.6.

Proposition 6.36. *Expectation (6.36) equals*

$$(\log R)^{2m} \sum_{(\mathfrak{a}_j, \mathfrak{b}_j)_{j \in [m]} \in (\text{Ideals}_K)^{2m}} \Pi_{R, \chi} \left((\mathfrak{a}_j, \mathfrak{b}_j)_{j \in [m]} \right) \cdot \mathbf{e}^{\mathfrak{a}} \left((\mathfrak{a}_j, \mathfrak{b}_j)_{j \in [m]} \right) \quad (6.38)$$

with an additive error term $O_{m,t,K} \left(\frac{(\log R)^{2m}}{R} \right)$.

Recall that (6.4) and (6.35) equal (6.10) and (6.38), respectively. In addition, the properties of \mathbf{e} required in the proof of Theorem 6.2 are the multiplicativity of \mathbf{e} as in Lemma 6.8 and the estimates as in Lemma 6.12 for \mathbf{e} . Hence, in order to show Theorem 6.33, it suffices to prove that $\mathbf{e}^{\mathfrak{a}}$ has the same properties of \mathbf{e} . Namely, we show Lemmas 6.37 and 6.40 below.

Lemma 6.37. *Let $(\mathfrak{a}_j, \mathfrak{b}_j)_{j \in [m]}$ be a tuple of arbitrary non-zero ideals of \mathcal{O}_K . Then Lemma 6.8 with \mathbf{e} replaced by $\mathbf{e}^{\mathfrak{a}}$ holds. Namely, we have*

$$\mathbf{e}^{\mathfrak{a}} \left((\mathfrak{a}_j, \mathfrak{b}_j)_{j \in [m]} \right) = \prod_{p \in \mathcal{P}} \mathbf{e}^{\mathfrak{a}} \left((\mathfrak{a}_j^{(p)}, \mathfrak{b}_j^{(p)})_{j \in [m]} \right).$$

Proof. We write $\mathfrak{c}_j := \mathfrak{a}_j \cap \mathfrak{b}_j$ for short, and then we have $D\mathbb{Z} = \mathbb{Z} \cap (\bigcap_{j \in [m]} \mathfrak{c}_j)$. Note that $\mathfrak{c}_j^{(p)} = \mathfrak{a}_j^{(p)} \cap \mathfrak{b}_j^{(p)}$ and $D^{(p)}\mathbb{Z} = \mathbb{Z} \cap (\bigcap_{j \in [m]} \mathfrak{c}_j^{(p)})$. We consider the \mathbb{Z} -module homomorphisms and affine transformations $\overline{\psi}_j, \overline{\theta}_j: (\mathbb{Z}/D\mathbb{Z})^t \rightarrow \mathfrak{a}/\mathfrak{a}\mathfrak{c}_j$ induced by ψ_j and θ_j , respectively. Let

$$\overline{\psi}, \overline{\theta}: (\mathbb{Z}/D\mathbb{Z})^t \rightarrow \prod_{j \in [m]} \mathfrak{a}/\mathfrak{a}\mathfrak{c}_j$$

be the two maps defined by $\overline{\psi}(x) = (\overline{\psi}_1(x), \dots, \overline{\psi}_m(x))$ and $\overline{\theta}(x) = (\overline{\theta}_1(x), \dots, \overline{\theta}_m(x))$. Then we see that

$$\mathbf{e}^{\mathfrak{a}} \left((\mathfrak{a}_j, \mathfrak{b}_j)_{j \in [m]} \right) = \mathbb{E} \left(\prod_{j \in [m]} (\mathbf{1}_{\mathfrak{a}\mathfrak{c}_j} \circ \theta_j) \mid (\mathbb{Z}/D\mathbb{Z})^t \right) = \mathbb{E} (\mathbf{1}_{\{0\}} \circ \overline{\theta} \mid (\mathbb{Z}/D\mathbb{Z})^t). \quad (6.39)$$

By Lemma 3.16, the \mathbb{Z} -module homomorphism $\overline{\psi}$ equals the product of its restrictions $\overline{\psi}^{(p)}$ to $(\mathbb{Z}/D^{(p)}\mathbb{Z})^t$, that means

$$\overline{\psi} = \prod_{p \in \mathcal{P}} \overline{\psi}^{(p)}: \prod_{p \in \mathcal{P}} (\mathbb{Z}/D^{(p)}\mathbb{Z})^t \rightarrow \prod_{p \in \mathcal{P}} \left(\prod_{j \in [m]} \mathfrak{a}/\mathfrak{a}\mathfrak{c}_j^{(p)} \right).$$

Hence the affine transformation $\overline{\theta}$ is the product of the restrictions

$$\overline{\theta}^{(p)}: (\mathbb{Z}/D^{(p)}\mathbb{Z})^t \rightarrow \prod_{j \in [m]} \mathfrak{a}/\mathfrak{a}\mathfrak{c}_j^{(p)}.$$

Therefore, by (6.39), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{e}^{\mathbf{a}}((\mathbf{a}_j, \mathbf{b}_j)_{j \in [m]}) &= \mathbb{E}(\mathbf{1}_{\{0\}} \circ \bar{\theta} \mid (\mathbb{Z}/D\mathbb{Z})^t) = \prod_{p \in \mathcal{P}} \mathbb{E}(\mathbf{1}_{\{0\}} \circ \bar{\theta}^{(p)} \mid (\mathbb{Z}/D^{(p)}\mathbb{Z})^t) \\ &= \prod_{p \in \mathcal{P}} \mathbf{e}^{\mathbf{a}}((\mathbf{a}_j^{(p)}, \mathbf{b}_j^{(p)})_{j \in [m]}). \end{aligned}$$

This is the desired conclusion. \square

In what follows, we assume the following setting.

Setting 6.38. Let $(\alpha_j, \beta_j)_{j \in [m]} \in (\text{Ideals}_K^{(p)})^{2m}$ be a tuple of p -ideals for some prime number p . Write $\gamma_j := \alpha_j \cap \beta_j$. Let D be the positive integer such that $D\mathbb{Z} = \mathbb{Z} \cap \left(\bigcap_{j \in [m]} \gamma_j\right)$. Let $\bar{\psi}_j, \bar{\theta}_j: (\mathbb{Z}/D\mathbb{Z})^t \rightarrow \mathbf{a}/\mathbf{a}\gamma_j$ be the \mathbb{Z} -module homomorphisms induced by ψ_j and θ_j , respectively. Let $\bar{\psi}, \bar{\theta}: (\mathbb{Z}/D\mathbb{Z})^t \rightarrow \prod_{j \in [m]} \mathbf{a}/\mathbf{a}\gamma_j$ be the two maps defined by $\bar{\psi}(x) = (\bar{\psi}_1(x), \dots, \bar{\psi}_m(x))$ and $\bar{\theta}(x) = (\bar{\theta}_1(x), \dots, \bar{\theta}_m(x))$.

Note the equality $\mathbf{N}(\gamma) = \#(\mathbf{a}/\mathbf{a}\gamma)$ for all ideal $\gamma \in \text{Ideals}_K$. The arguments in the proof of Lemma 6.11 hence shows the following lemma.

Lemma 6.39. *Under Setting 6.38, Lemma 6.11 with \mathbf{e} replaced by $\mathbf{e}^{\mathbf{a}}$ holds.*

Although the next lemma is also verified by following the proof of Lemma 6.12, we write down a proof for the convenience of the reader.

Lemma 6.40. *Under Settings 6.10 and 6.38, Lemma 6.12 with \mathbf{e} replaced by $\mathbf{e}^{\mathbf{a}}$ holds.*

Proof. First we prove (1). If $\gamma_j = \mathcal{O}_K$ for every $j \in [m]$, then $\prod_{j \in [m]} (\mathbf{1}_{\mathbf{a}\gamma_j} \circ \theta_j)$ is identical with the constant function 1, and hence $\mathbf{e}^{\mathbf{a}}((\alpha_j, \beta_j)_{j \in [m]}) = 1$.

Secondly, we prove (2). It suffices to show the non-membership of $\theta_{j_0}(x) = W\psi_{j_0}(x) + b_{j_0}$ in $\mathbf{a}\gamma_{j_0}$ for all $x \in (\mathbb{Z}/D\mathbb{Z})^t$. Let \mathfrak{p} be an arbitrary prime ideal $\mathfrak{p} \supseteq \gamma_{j_0}$. Since γ_{j_0} is a p -ideal, we have $\mathfrak{p} \cap \mathbb{Z} = p\mathbb{Z}$. From $p \leq w$, p divides W , and hence $W \in \mathfrak{p}$ follows. In addition, the assumption $b_{j_0}\mathcal{O}_K + W\mathbf{a} = \mathbf{a}$ implies that $b_{j_0} \notin \mathfrak{a}\mathfrak{p}$. Hence we see that for all $x \in \mathbb{Z}^t$, $\theta_{j_0}(x) = W\psi_{j_0}(x) + b_{j_0} \notin \mathfrak{a}\mathfrak{p}$. This together with $\gamma_{j_0} \subseteq \mathfrak{p}$ implies that $\theta_{j_0}(x) \notin \mathbf{a}\gamma_{j_0}$, as desired.

Thirdly, we prove (3). Set $C_{j_0} := \# \text{coker}(\psi_{j_0})$. Note that for every $x \in \mathbf{a}$, the element $C_{j_0} \cdot x$ is contained in the image of ψ_{j_0} . By Setting 6.10 (1), p and C_{j_0} are coprime. Since the order of $\mathbf{a}/\mathbf{a}\gamma_{j_0}$ is a power of p , this implies that the multiplication by C_{j_0} on $\mathbf{a}/\mathbf{a}\gamma_{j_0}$ is an automorphism. Hence we see that $\bar{\psi}_{j_0}: (\mathbb{Z}/D\mathbb{Z})^t \rightarrow \mathbf{a}/\mathbf{a}\gamma_{j_0}$ is surjective. Since W and p are coprime, the map $\bar{\theta}_{j_0} = \text{Aff}_{W, b_{j_0}} \circ \bar{\psi}_{j_0}: (\mathbb{Z}/D\mathbb{Z})^t \rightarrow \mathbf{a}/\mathbf{a}\gamma_{j_0}$ is also surjective. Then Lemma 6.11 yields that $\mathbf{e}^{\mathbf{a}}((\alpha_j, \beta_j)_{j \in [m]}) = (\#\text{Im}(\bar{\psi}))^{-1}$; recall that $\gamma_j = \mathcal{O}_K$ for all $j \in [m] \setminus \{j_0\}$. We have

$$\#\text{Im}(\bar{\psi}) = \#\text{Im}(\bar{\psi}_{j_0}) = \#(\mathbf{a}/\mathbf{a}\gamma_{j_0}) = \mathbf{N}(\gamma_{j_0}).$$

This is the desired result.

Finally we prove (4). By Lemma 6.11, it suffices to show that $\#\text{Im}(\overline{\psi}) \geq p^2$. Without loss of generality, we may assume that $\gamma_1, \gamma_2 \subsetneq \mathcal{O}_K$. Recall that two elements x_{12} and x_{21} are chosen in Setting 6.10 (2). Since $p > w \geq w_0''$, both $\psi_2(x_{12}) \notin \mathfrak{a}\gamma_2$ and $\psi_1(x_{21}) \notin \mathfrak{a}\gamma_1$ hold. We focus on the mapping $(\overline{\psi}_1, \overline{\psi}_2)$, which is defined as

$$\begin{aligned} (\overline{\psi}_1, \overline{\psi}_2): (\mathbb{Z}/D\mathbb{Z})^t &\rightarrow \mathfrak{a}/\mathfrak{a}\gamma_1 \times \mathfrak{a}/\mathfrak{a}\gamma_2 \\ x &\mapsto (\overline{\psi}_1(x), \overline{\psi}_2(x)). \end{aligned}$$

This maps x_{12} and x_{21} to non-zero elements $(0, \overline{\psi}_2(x_{12}))$ and $(\overline{\psi}_1(x_{21}), 0)$, respectively. The order of the linear span of these two images is at least p^2 . Hence

$$p^2 \leq \#\text{Im}(\overline{\psi}_1, \overline{\psi}_2) \leq \#\text{Im}(\overline{\psi}),$$

and (4) follows. □

This provides the desired estimate for e^a , and the proof of Theorem 6.33 is completed.

7 Construction of pseudorandom measures and estimates of weighted densities

In the present section, we will prove our first goal Theorem 2.8, as mentioned in Subsection 2.2. The main argument in this section consists of two parts: switching our ‘worlds,’ which treat \mathcal{O}_K , among the three worlds appearing in Steps 1–4 in Subsection 2.3, and estimations of weighted densities corresponding to these switches. Let us recall the three worlds above.

- *The N -world* $(\mathcal{O}_K, \|\cdot\|_{\infty, \omega}, N)$: it is an auxiliary world to apply the relative multi-dimensional Szemerédi theorem (Theorem 5.4). We use the ℓ_∞ -length scale and the parameter N . Starting from a set A in the M -world, we choose appropriate $W \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $b \in \mathcal{O}_K$, and connect the M -world (range) and the N -world (domain) via the affine transformation

$$\text{Aff}_{W,b}: \mathcal{O}_K \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_K; \quad \beta \mapsto W\beta + b.$$

Then we construct a set B from A in this N -world; we will apply Theorem 5.4 to this set B .

- *The M -world* $(\mathcal{O}_K, \|\cdot\|_{\infty, \omega}, M)$: this is the world where the set A in the setting of Theorem 2.8 lives. We use the ℓ_∞ -length scale and the parameter $M \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 1}$. We choose the parameter N above appropriately depending on M .
- *The L -world* $(\mathcal{O}_K, \mathbf{N}, L)$: the underlying space is the same as that of the M -world. The differences between these two worlds are the scales we take: in the L -world, we consider the (ideal) norm \mathbf{N} . We use the parameter $L \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 1}$. We appeal to Theorem 3.21 (2) for counting elements in a given set A with respect to a certain scale; since Theorem 3.21 (2) is stated in terms of ideals, this L -world is suited for this counting procedure.

We assume the following setting throughout the current section.

Setting 7.1. Let K be a number field of degree n and ω an integral basis of K . Let \mathcal{D} be an NL-compatible \mathcal{O}_K^\times -fundamental domain; recall Definitions 2.6 and 2.7. Let $C = C(\omega, \mathcal{D}) > 0$ and $C' = C'(\omega) > 0$, respectively, be constants which satisfy (NLC). Let S be a finite subset of \mathcal{O}_K . We moreover assume that S is a standard shape; recall Definition 2.3. As mentioned after Theorem A, we may assume this without loss of generality. Set $r := \#S - 1$.

In this section and Sections 8 and 9, we use the following convention on cosets without mentioning it: each element of $\mathcal{O}_K/W\mathcal{O}_K$ may be seen as a subset of \mathcal{O}_K . In particular, if $b \in \mathcal{O}_K$ is sent to $\bar{b} \in \mathcal{O}_K/W\mathcal{O}_K$ by the natural projection, then we may express it as ‘ $b \in \bar{b}$.’ Thus we frequently regard $\bar{b} \in \mathcal{O}_K/W\mathcal{O}_K$ as a subset of \mathcal{O}_K . In our arguments in these sections, we often take $\bar{b} \in \mathcal{O}_K/W\mathcal{O}_K$ first, and then choose b in \bar{b} .

7.1 Outline of the proof of Theorem A

Let $\delta > 0$. Assume that for a sufficiently large real number M , $A \subseteq \mathcal{P}_K \cap \mathcal{D} \cap \mathcal{O}_K(\omega, M)$ satisfies

$$\#A \geq \delta \cdot \#(\mathcal{P}_K \cap \mathcal{D} \cap \mathcal{O}_K(\omega, M)).$$

The goal is to show that A contains an S -constellation. Here we outline the argument to achieve this goal.

- Choose a parameter w , which arises from the W -trick employed in the proof of the Goldston–Yıldırım type asymptotic formula (Theorem 6.2).
- For the parameter w and the main parameter M , determine three auxiliary parameters $W = W_w$, $R = R_{M,r}$ and $N = N_{w,M}$ appropriately in order to apply Theorem 5.4.
- Under the condition that w and M are sufficiently large depending on a given $\rho > 0$, construct a pseudorandom measure $\tilde{\lambda}: \mathcal{O}_K \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, meaning that $\tilde{\lambda}$ satisfies the (ρ, N, S) -linear forms condition in the sense of Definition 5.3.

The exact argument will be presented in Subsection 7.2. The proof of pseudorandomness of $\tilde{\lambda}$ is based on Theorem 6.2. Here, one of the keys to the proof is that the error term of Theorem 6.2 decomposes into two parts: one is of the form $o_{w \rightarrow \infty}(1)$, depending only on w out of w and M ; the other is of the form $o_{M \rightarrow \infty}(1)$, as long as w is fixed. To switch from the M -world to the N -world, we need to take $b \in \mathcal{O}_K$ as well as $W \in \mathbb{N}$. Although in Subsection 7.2 we argue with an arbitrarily taken b which is prime to W , we will eventually choose b according to the given set A .

In Subsection 7.3, we prove Proposition 7.7, which describes the switch between the L -world and the M -world in the setting of the infinitary version of Theorem 2.8 (Corollary 2.10). Next, we proceed to the following two steps:

- trim A by removing an ‘exceptional set’ to obtain A' , choose an appropriate $b \in \mathcal{O}_K$ according to A' ,

- and set $B \subseteq \mathcal{O}_K(\omega, N)$ as $B := (\text{Aff}_{W,b})^{-1}(A) \cap \mathcal{O}_K(\omega, N)$, and establish the following estimate of the weighted density of B ,

$$\mathbb{E} \left(\mathbf{1}_B \cdot \tilde{\lambda} \mid \mathcal{O}_K(\omega, N) \right) \geq \tilde{\delta},$$

provided that M is sufficiently large. Here, $\tilde{\delta}$ is a strictly positive constant depending on $\delta, \omega, \mathcal{D}$ and S .




Figure 4: Switching among the three worlds

In Subsection 7.4, these two steps will be implemented by switching among the three worlds. Figure 4 illustrates the switchings; see Proposition 7.10 for the precise statement. To define the measure $\tilde{\lambda}$, we also need to choose χ as in Setting 7.2. Since the choice of χ can be fixed throughout the paper, in what follows we sometimes omit to write the dependence on χ explicitly.

Finally, in Subsection 7.5, we choose the parameter w in the W -trick appropriately. We determine this w depending only on $\omega, \mathcal{D}, \delta$ and S , but independently of the main parameter M . Then $W = W_w$ is also fixed. We will deduce from previous arguments that Theorem 5.4 applies to our case, provided that M is sufficiently large depending on $\omega, \mathcal{D}, \delta$ and S ; here we also confirm the remaining condition (ii) (the smallness condition). This will allow us to verify that B contains an S -constellation. As we explained in Remark 5.7, we then conclude that A contains an S -constellation. For the estimate of $\mathcal{N}_S(A)$, we appeal to Theorem 5.5. This will complete the proof of Theorem 2.8.

7.2 Construction of the pseudorandom measure

To construct the pseudorandom measure mentioned in Subsection 7.1, we first choose the parameter w , arising from the W -trick in the Goldston–Yıldırım type asymptotic formula. Then, assume that the main parameter $M \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 1}$ is sufficiently large depending on this w .

We choose parameters W , R and N according to these two parameters w and M , and a function χ in the following manner.

Setting 7.2 (The choice of the parameters). Assume that two parameters $w \geq 2$ and $M \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 1}$ satisfy that $M \geq e^{2w}$. Under this assumption, set $W = W_w \in \mathbb{N}$ and $R = R_{M;r} \in \mathbb{R}$ as follows:

$$W := \prod_{p \in \mathcal{P}_{\leq w}} p, \quad \text{and} \quad R := M^{\frac{1}{17(r+1)2^r}}. \quad (7.1)$$

Also, set $N = N_{w,M} \in \mathbb{N}$ as

$$N := \left\lceil \frac{M}{W} \right\rceil. \quad (7.2)$$

Fix a C^∞ -function $\chi: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ which satisfies the conditions $\chi(0) = 1$, $\text{supp}(\chi) \subseteq [-1, 1]_{\mathbb{R}}$, and $\chi(x) \leq 1$ for every $x \in \mathbb{R}$. Let $c_\chi := \int_0^\infty \chi'(x)^2 dx$.

We note that

$$W \leq M^{\log 2} \quad (7.3)$$

holds true. Indeed, this follows from the definition of W , $M \geq e^{2w}$, and (3.7) in Proposition 3.25.

Here is the construction of the pseudorandom measure $\tilde{\lambda}$, which plays a key role in the proof of the main theorems in the present paper.

Definition 7.3 (The pseudorandom measure $\tilde{\lambda}$). We use Settings 7.1 and 7.2. Let $\kappa = \kappa_K > 0$ be the constant as in Theorem 3.19. Let φ_K be the totient function of K (Definition 3.8) and $\Lambda_{R,\chi}$ be the (R, χ) -von Mangoldt function (Definition 6.1). Then, define a function $\lambda = \lambda_{M;\chi,r,K}: \mathcal{O}_K \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ by

$$\lambda(\alpha) := \frac{\kappa \cdot \Lambda_{R,\chi}(\alpha)^2}{c_\chi \log R}. \quad (7.4)$$

For a fixed $b \in \mathcal{O}_K$, define a function $\tilde{\lambda} = \tilde{\lambda}_{w,M;\chi,r,K,b}: \mathcal{O}_K \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ by

$$\tilde{\lambda}(\beta) := \frac{\varphi_K(W)}{W^n} (\lambda \circ \text{Aff}_{W,b})(\beta). \quad (7.5)$$

We will deduce from the Goldston–Yıldırım type asymptotic formula (Theorem 6.2) that the function $\tilde{\lambda}$ indeed satisfies the linear forms condition. For this purpose, we rewrite the assertion of the asymptotic formula in the following manner.

Theorem 7.4. *Let $K, n, m, t, (\psi_j)_{j \in [m]}$, χ be as in Theorem 6.2. Then there exist positive numbers $w_0 = w_0((\psi_j)_{j \in [m]})$, $R_0 = R_0(m, K)$ and $F_0 = F_0(m, n)$ such that the following hold true. Let $w \geq w_0$ and $W \in \mathbb{N}$ such that the set of prime factors of W coincides with $\mathcal{P}_{\leq w} = \{p \in \mathcal{P} : p \leq w\}$. Let $b_1, \dots, b_m \in \mathcal{O}_K$ be coprime with W . Define affine transformations $\theta_1, \dots, \theta_m: \mathbb{Z}^t \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_K$ by $\theta_j(x) := \text{Aff}_{W,b_j}(\psi_j(x)) = W\psi_j(x) + b_j$. Let $R \geq R_0$, $I_1, \dots, I_t \subseteq \mathbb{Z}$ be intervals with lengths at least R^{4m+1} , and $\mathcal{B} := I_1 \times \dots \times I_t \subseteq \mathbb{Z}^t$. Then, under the assumption that $\log w \leq F_0 \cdot \sqrt{\log R}$, there exist a positive constant $c_{\text{GY};m,n}^{(1)}$, depending*

only on χ , m and n , and a positive constant $c_{\text{GY};\chi,m,t,K}^{(2)}$, depending only on χ, m, t and K , such that for

$$\rho_{\text{GY};\chi,m,n}^{(1)}(w) := \frac{c_{\text{GY};\chi,m,n}^{(1)}}{w \log w}, \quad \rho_{\text{GY};\chi,m,t,K}^{(2)}(w, R) := c_{\text{GY};\chi,m,t,K}^{(2)} \cdot \frac{\log w}{\sqrt{\log R}}, \quad (7.6)$$

we have

$$\left| \left(\frac{\varphi_K(W) \cdot \kappa}{W^n c_\chi \log R} \right)^m \cdot \mathbb{E}(\Lambda_{R,\chi}(\theta_1(x))^2 \cdots \Lambda_{R,\chi}(\theta_m(x))^2 \mid x \in \mathcal{B}) - 1 \right| \leq \rho_{\text{GY};\chi,m,n}^{(1)}(w) + \rho_{\text{GY};\chi,m,t,K}^{(2)}(w, R). \quad (7.7)$$

Theorem 7.5 (Pseudorandomness of $\tilde{\lambda}$). *Assume Settings 7.1 and 7.2. Fix $\rho > 0$. Then there exist real numbers $w_{\text{PR}}(\rho, \chi, S)$, depending only on ρ, χ and S , and $M_{\text{PR}}(w, \rho, \chi, S)$, depending only on w, ρ, χ and S , such that the following holds: if $w \geq w_{\text{PR}}(\rho, \chi, S)$, $M \geq M_{\text{PR}}(w, \rho, \chi, S)$, and $b \in \mathcal{O}_K$ is coprime with W , then $\tilde{\lambda} = \tilde{\lambda}_{w,M;\chi,r,K,b}$, constructed in Definition 7.3, is a (ρ, N, S) -pseudorandom measure.*

Proof. We will check that the conditions of Theorem 7.4 are fulfilled. Let $t = 2r + 2$. Take an arbitrary non-empty subset \mathcal{J} of $\bigsqcup_{j \in [r+1]} \{0, 1\}^{e_j}$, and let $m := \#\mathcal{J}$. Here for each $j \in [r+1]$, $e_j = [r+1] \setminus \{j\}$. Write S as $S = \{s_1, \dots, s_r\} \sqcup \{0\}$. Then for each $\omega \in \mathcal{J}$, define a homomorphism $\psi_S^{(\omega)}: \mathbb{Z}^t \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_K$ of \mathbb{Z} -modules by (5.1) and (5.2) in Definition 5.3. (Thus we consider m homomorphisms in total for a fixed \mathcal{J} .) Since S is assumed to be a standard shape, these $\psi_S^{(\omega)}$ are all surjective. Hence, by Lemma 5.8, condition (6.3) holds for $(\psi_S^{(\omega)})_{\omega \in \mathcal{J}}$.

Take $R_0(m, K)$, $F_0(m, n)$ and $w_0((\psi_S^{(\omega)})_{\omega \in \mathcal{J}})$ as in Theorem 7.4. Set the maximums and minimum over all non-empty \mathcal{J} as

$$\begin{aligned} R_1(r, K) &:= \max_{m \in [(r+1)2^r]} R_0(m, K), \\ F_1(r, n) &:= \min_{m \in [(r+1)2^r]} F_0(m, n), \\ w_1(S) &:= \max_{\emptyset \neq \mathcal{J} \subseteq \bigsqcup_{j \in [r+1]} \{0, 1\}^{e_j}} w_0((\psi_S^{(\omega)})_{\omega \in \mathcal{J}}). \end{aligned} \quad (7.8)$$

Under the assumption of $w \geq w_1(S)$, set

$$\rho_{\text{PR};\chi,r,n}^{(1)}(w) := \max_{m \in [(r+1)2^r]} \rho_{\text{GY};\chi,m,n}^{(1)}(w).$$

Under the assumptions of $R \geq R_1(r, K)$ and $\log w \leq F_1(r, n) \cdot \sqrt{\log R}$, set

$$\rho_{\text{PR};\chi,r,K}^{(2)}(w, M) := \max_{m \in [(r+1)2^r]} \rho_{\text{GY};\chi,m,t,K}^{(2)}(w, R).$$

Here recall that R is determined from M and r by (7.1).

By (7.6), if $w \geq w_1(S)$ is sufficiently large depending on χ, r, n and ρ , then we have

$$\rho_{\text{PR};\chi,r,n}^{(1)}(w) \leq \frac{1}{2}\rho. \quad (7.9)$$

Take $w_{\text{PR}}(\rho, \chi, S)$ with $w_{\text{PR}}(\rho, \chi, S) \geq w_1(S)$ in such a way that the condition $w \geq w_{\text{PR}}(\rho, \chi, S)$ implies (7.9). Let $w \geq w_{\text{PR}}(\rho, \chi, S)$. Then, choose $M_{\text{PR}}(w, \rho, \chi, S)$ with $M_{\text{PR}}(w, \rho, \chi, S) \geq e^{2w}$ in such a way that if $M \geq M_{\text{PR}}(w, \rho, \chi, S)$, then the following three conditions

$$\rho_{\text{PR};\chi,r,K}^{(2)}(w, M) \leq \frac{1}{2}\rho, \quad (7.10)$$

$R \geq R_1$, and $\log w \leq F_1 \cdot \sqrt{\log R}$ all hold true.

Take an arbitrary subset \mathcal{B} of \mathbb{Z}^{r+1} which is the product of intervals of lengths at least N . By (7.3), the choice of R in (7.1) and that of N in (7.2), we have $N \geq M^{\frac{5}{17}} \geq R^{4m+1}$. Here, recall that $m \leq (r+1)2^r$. Hence, $\mathcal{B} \times \mathcal{B} \subseteq \mathbb{Z}^t$ is the product of intervals of lengths at least R^{4m+1} . Therefore, for every $b \in \mathcal{O}_K$ coprime with W , we may appeal to Theorem 7.4. By (7.7), (7.9) and (7.10), we conclude that $\tilde{\lambda}$ satisfies the (ρ, N, S) -linear forms condition as in Definition 5.3, provided that $w \geq w_{\text{PR}}(\rho, \chi, S)$ and that $M \geq M_{\text{PR}}(w, \rho, \chi, S)$. \square

7.3 Comparison between counts with the norm scale and with the ℓ_∞ -length scale

In Subsection 7.4, we will estimate the weighted density of the set B appearing in Subsection 7.1. Before that, in this subsection, for a subset of $\mathcal{P}_K \cap \mathcal{D}$, we make a comparison of the relative upper asymptotic density measured by norm and that measured by ℓ_∞ -length; see Proposition 7.7. This relates to Corollary 2.10, which is the infinitary version of Theorem 2.8. The key to this comparison is the following lemma for an NL-compatible \mathcal{O}_K^\times -fundamental domain \mathcal{D} .

Lemma 7.6. *Let \mathcal{D} , C and C' be as in Setting 7.1. Then the following hold true.*

(1) For $L, M \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ with $L \leq CM^n$,

$$\mathcal{D} \cap \mathcal{O}_K(L) \subseteq \mathcal{D} \cap \mathcal{O}_K(\omega, M).$$

(2) For $L, M \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ with $L \geq C'M^n$,

$$\mathcal{D} \cap \mathcal{O}_K(\omega, M) \subseteq \mathcal{D} \cap \mathcal{O}_K(L).$$

Proof. By the assumptoin, we have the following inequality (which is (NLC))

$$C\|\alpha\|_{\infty,\omega}^n \leq \mathbf{N}(\alpha) \leq C'\|\alpha\|_{\infty,\omega}^n$$

for all $\alpha \in \mathcal{D}$. Both items easily follow from this. \square

We will derive the following proposition from Lemma 7.6 and Theorem 3.21 (2). Recall the definition of the relative upper asymptotic densities from Definition 2.9.

Proposition 7.7. *Assume Setting 7.1. Then for every $A \subseteq \mathcal{P}_K \cap \mathcal{D}$, the density $\bar{d}_{\mathcal{P}_K \cap \mathcal{D}}(A)$ is strictly positive if and only if $\bar{d}_{\mathcal{P}_K \cap \mathcal{D}, \omega}(A)$ is strictly positive.*

Proof. Since \mathcal{D} is an \mathcal{O}_K^\times -fundamental domain, the following holds true: for a finite subset $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \text{Ideals}_K$ consisting of principal ideals, we have

$$\#\{\alpha \in \mathcal{D} : (\alpha) \in \mathcal{A}\} = \#\mathcal{A}. \quad (7.11)$$

Apply (7.11) to $\mathcal{A} = \{\mathfrak{p} \in |\text{Spec}(\mathcal{O}_K)|^{\text{Pl}} : \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{p}) \leq L\}$. Then by the Chebotarev density theorem (Theorem 3.21 (2)), for a sufficiently large L , we obtain

$$\frac{1}{2h} \cdot \frac{L}{\log L} \leq \#(\mathcal{P}_K \cap \mathcal{D} \cap \mathcal{O}_K(L)) \leq \frac{2}{h} \cdot \frac{L}{\log L}. \quad (7.12)$$

Here $h = h_K$ denotes the class number of K .

First, we will prove $\bar{d}_{\mathcal{P}_K \cap \mathcal{D}, \omega}(A) > 0$ if $\bar{d}_{\mathcal{P}_K \cap \mathcal{D}}(A) > 0$. Let $\delta := \bar{d}_{\mathcal{P}_K \cap \mathcal{D}}(A) > 0$. Then there exists a strictly increasing real sequence $(L_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ with $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} L_k = \infty$ such that for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\#(A \cap \mathcal{O}_K(L_k)) \geq \frac{\delta}{2} \cdot \#(\mathcal{P}_K \cap \mathcal{D} \cap \mathcal{O}_K(L_k))$$

holds. By (7.12), if k is sufficiently large, then we have

$$\#(A \cap \mathcal{O}_K(L_k)) \geq \delta \cdot \frac{1}{4h} \cdot \frac{L_k}{\log L_k}.$$

Now set $M_k := (L_k/C)^{1/n}$. Then $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} M_k = \infty$ holds. By Lemma 7.6 (1), for a sufficiently large k ,

$$\#(A \cap \mathcal{O}_K(\omega, M_k)) \geq \delta \cdot \frac{1}{4h} \cdot \frac{CM_k^n}{\log(CM_k^n)}$$

holds. In addition, by Lemma 7.6 (2) and by (7.12), we have

$$\#(\mathcal{P}_K \cap \mathcal{D} \cap \mathcal{O}_K(\omega, M_k)) \leq \frac{2}{h} \cdot \frac{C'M_k^n}{\log(C'M_k^n)}.$$

By combining them, we have for a sufficiently large k ,

$$\frac{\#(A \cap \mathcal{O}_K(\omega, M_k))}{\#(\mathcal{P}_K \cap \mathcal{D} \cap \mathcal{O}_K(\omega, M_k))} \geq \frac{C}{8C'} \delta;$$

here recall that $C' \geq C$. This implies that

$$\bar{d}_{\mathcal{P}_K \cap \mathcal{D}, \omega}(A) \geq \frac{C}{8C'} \cdot \bar{d}_{\mathcal{P}_K \cap \mathcal{D}}(A).$$

Since the right-hand side is assumed to be positive, we conclude that $\bar{d}_{\mathcal{P}_K \cap \mathcal{D}, \omega}(A) > 0$.

Finally, we will prove $\bar{d}_{\mathcal{P}_K \cap \mathcal{D}}(A) > 0$ if $\bar{d}_{\mathcal{P}_K \cap \mathcal{D}, \omega}(A) > 0$. We reset δ as $\delta := \bar{d}_{\mathcal{P}_K \cap \mathcal{D}, \omega}(A) > 0$. By the definition of $\bar{d}_{\mathcal{P}_K \cap \mathcal{D}, \omega}(A)$, there exists a strictly increasing real sequence $(M_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ with $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} M_k = \infty$ such that for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\#(A \cap \mathcal{O}_K(\omega, M_k)) \geq \frac{\delta}{2} \cdot \#(\mathcal{P}_K \cap \mathcal{D} \cap \mathcal{O}_K(\omega, M_k))$$

holds. Set $L_k := C'M_k^n$. Then $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} L_k = \infty$. By Lemma 7.6 and (7.12), if k is sufficiently large, then we have

$$\begin{aligned} \#(A \cap \mathcal{O}_K(L_k)) &\geq \#(A \cap \mathcal{O}_K(\omega, M_k)) \\ &\geq \frac{\delta}{2} \cdot \#(\mathcal{P}_K \cap \mathcal{D} \cap \mathcal{O}_K(\omega, M_k)) \\ &\geq \frac{\delta}{2} \cdot \#(\mathcal{P}_K \cap \mathcal{D} \cap \mathcal{O}_K(CM_k^n)) \geq \delta \cdot \frac{1}{4h} \cdot \frac{CM_k^n}{\log(CM_k^n)}. \end{aligned}$$

Again by (7.12), for a sufficiently large k , we obtain

$$\frac{\#(A \cap \mathcal{O}_K(L_k))}{\#(\mathcal{P}_K \cap \mathcal{D} \cap \mathcal{O}_K(L_k))} \geq \delta \cdot \frac{1}{4h} \cdot \frac{CM_k^n}{\log(CM_k^n)} \cdot \frac{h}{2} \cdot \frac{\log L_k}{L_k} \geq \frac{C}{8C'} \delta.$$

This implies that

$$\bar{d}_{\mathcal{P}_K \cap \mathcal{D}}(A) \geq \frac{C}{8C'} \cdot \bar{d}_{\mathcal{P}_K \cap \mathcal{D}, \omega}(A)$$

and hence that $\bar{d}_{\mathcal{P}_K \cap \mathcal{D}}(A) > 0$. □

We remark that in the above proof of Proposition 7.7, the multiplicative constant $\frac{C}{8C'}$, appearing twice, may be improved to $\frac{C}{C'}$. Indeed, for every $\varepsilon > 0$, take L and k both sufficiently large according to ε , and improve the factors $\frac{1}{2h}$, $\frac{2}{h}$ and $\frac{\delta}{2}$ in the proof to $\frac{1-\varepsilon}{h}$, $\frac{1+\varepsilon}{h}$ and $(1-\varepsilon)\delta$, respectively. Finally, let $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$.

The following counting result will be employed in Subsection 7.4.

Proposition 7.8. *Under Setting 7.1, we have*

$$\liminf_{M \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\#(\mathcal{P}_K \cap \mathcal{D} \cap \mathcal{O}_K(\omega, M))}{M^n (\log M)^{-1}} \geq \frac{C}{(n+1)h},$$

where h is the class number of K .

Proof. Use the estimate from below in (7.12) (with a finer constant $(1-\varepsilon)/h$ for each $\varepsilon > 0$ and for a sufficiently large L depending on ε) with $L = CM^n$. Then, the desired result follows from Lemma 7.6 (1) and $CM^n \leq M^{n+1}$, which is valid for $M \geq C$. □

7.4 Estimates of weighted densities

Let A be a subset of \mathcal{O}_K in which we hope to find an S -constellation. In Subsection 7.2, we have constructed a pseudorandom measure $\tilde{\lambda}$ corresponding to suitable parameters and for a (yet unspecified) $b \in \mathcal{O}_K$ prime to W . In this subsection, we specify a suitable b and make an estimation of the weighted density of B , whose construction is outlined in Subsection 7.1, with respect to the weight $\tilde{\lambda}$. As mentioned in Subsection 7.1, to construct B from A , we will trim A by removing an exceptional set T , which behaves badly in our proof. The following lemma collects the properties of the exceptional set T employed in this section.

Lemma 7.9 (Exceptional set). *Assume Settings 7.1 and 7.2. Let $A \subseteq \mathcal{P}_K \cap \mathcal{D} \cap \mathcal{O}_K(\omega, M)$. Then*

$$T := A \cap \mathcal{O}_K(R) \tag{7.13}$$

satisfies the following, provided that M is sufficiently large depending on r and K :

(1) $\#T \leq M^{\frac{1}{16}}$,

(2) *for every $\alpha \in A \setminus T$,*

$$\lambda(\alpha) = \frac{\kappa}{17(r+1)2^r c_\chi} \cdot \log M,$$

(3) *every $\alpha \in A \setminus T$ is prime to W .*

Proof. First, we will prove (1). By Proposition 3.20, if M is sufficiently large depending on r , then the number of ideals whose ideal norms are at most R does not exceed $2\kappa R$. By (7.11), $\#T \leq 2\kappa R$ holds. From the choice of R , if M is sufficiently large depending on K , then $R \leq \frac{1}{2\kappa} M^{\frac{1}{16}}$ holds.

Secondly, we will prove (2). Here note that for every $\alpha \in A \setminus T$, we have $\mathbf{N}(\alpha) > R$ and α is a prime element. Since $\chi(0) = 1$ and $\text{supp}(\chi) \subseteq [-1, 1]_{\mathbb{R}}$, we have

$$\sum_{\mathfrak{b}|\alpha\mathcal{O}_K} \mu(\mathfrak{b})\chi\left(\frac{\log \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{b})}{\log R}\right) = 1,$$

which ensures (2).

Finally, we will prove (3). Since $w \leq \frac{1}{2} \log M$, for a sufficiently large M depending on r and K , we have $w^n \leq R$. Hence, every $\alpha \in A \setminus T$ satisfies that $\mathbf{N}(\alpha) > w^n$. Let p be the characteristic of the residue field $\mathcal{O}_K/\alpha\mathcal{O}_K$. Since it is a field extension of \mathbb{F}_p of degree at most n , we have $p^n \geq \mathbf{N}(\alpha)$ and hence $p > w$. This implies that p is not a factor of W . Since $p \in \alpha\mathcal{O}_K$, it follows that α and W are coprime in \mathcal{O}_K . \square

The next proposition is the goal of the present subsection.

Proposition 7.10 (Estimate of the weighted density with respect to the weight $\tilde{\lambda}$). *Assume Settings 7.1 and 7.2. Then there exist a positive real number $M_{\text{DS}} = M_{\text{DS}}(\omega, \mathcal{D}, \delta, r)$, depending only on ω , \mathcal{D} , δ and r , and a positive real number $u = u_{\text{DS}}(\omega, \mathcal{D}, \chi, r) > 0$, depending*

only on ω , \mathcal{D} , χ and r , such that the following holds true: let $\delta > 0$ and $M \geq M_{\text{DS}}$. Assume that a set $A \subseteq \mathcal{P}_K \cap \mathcal{D} \cap \mathcal{O}_K(\omega, M)$ satisfies

$$\#A \geq \delta \cdot \#(\mathcal{P}_K \cap \mathcal{D} \cap \mathcal{O}_K(\omega, M)). \quad (7.14)$$

Let $A' := A \setminus T$, where T is the exceptional set defined in (7.13). Then there exists $b \in \mathcal{O}_K$ such that b is prime to W and that for

$$B := (\text{Aff}_{W,b})^{-1}(A') \cap \mathcal{O}_K(\omega, N), \quad (7.15)$$

the following estimate

$$\mathbb{E} \left(\mathbf{1}_B \cdot \tilde{\lambda} \mid \mathcal{O}_K(\omega, N) \right) \geq \tilde{\delta}$$

of the weighted density of B with respect to the weight $\tilde{\lambda} = \tilde{\lambda}_{\omega, M; \chi, r, K, b}$, which is defined in (7.5), holds true. Here, $\tilde{\delta} := u \cdot \delta$.

An important point here is that not all $b \in \mathcal{O}_K$ prime to W satisfy the estimate of the weighted density in Proposition 7.10, whereas Theorem 7.5 holds true for all $b \in \mathcal{O}_K$ prime to W . We will go back to this point in Section 9 in more detail. In the proof of Proposition 7.10 below, note that $C = C(\omega, \mathcal{D})$ only depends on ω and \mathcal{D} .

Proof. By Proposition 7.8, for a sufficiently large M depending on ω , \mathcal{D} and δ , we have

$$\#A \geq \frac{C}{2(n+1)h} \delta \cdot \frac{M^n}{\log M}.$$

Since $M^{\frac{1}{16}} = o_{M \rightarrow \infty} \left(\frac{M^n}{\log M} \right)$, Lemma 7.9 (1) implies that for a sufficiently large M depending on ω , \mathcal{D} and δ ,

$$\#A' \geq \frac{C}{3(n+1)h} \delta \cdot \frac{M^n}{\log M} \quad (7.16)$$

holds true.

Next, we will choose an appropriate $b \in \mathcal{O}_K$. By Lemma 7.9 (3), if M is sufficiently large depending on r and K , then the image of A' by the natural projection $\mathcal{O}_K \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_K/W\mathcal{O}_K$ is a subset of $(\mathcal{O}_K/W\mathcal{O}_K)^\times$. Hence A' is partitioned as

$$A' = \bigsqcup_{\bar{c} \in (\mathcal{O}_K/W\mathcal{O}_K)^\times} (A' \cap \bar{c}); \quad (7.17)$$

here, we regard \bar{c} as a subset $\bar{c} \subseteq \mathcal{O}_K$ as mentioned at the beginning of the current section. Apply the pigeonhole principle to (7.17). Then (7.16) implies that there exists $\bar{b} \in (\mathcal{O}_K/W\mathcal{O}_K)^\times$ such that

$$\#(A' \cap \bar{b}) \geq \frac{1}{\varphi_K(W)} \cdot \frac{C}{3(n+1)h} \delta \cdot \frac{M^n}{\log M} \quad (7.18)$$

holds. Fix such a coset $\bar{b} \in \mathcal{O}_K/W\mathcal{O}_K$, and choose $b \in \bar{b}$ which satisfies

$$\|b\|_{\infty, \omega} < W. \quad (7.19)$$

We set $\tilde{\lambda} = \tilde{\lambda}_{\omega, M; \chi, r, K, b}$ corresponding to this b .

In what follows, we will make estimates of weight densities in the N -world. Define B by (7.15), corresponding to the element b above. Since $\text{Aff}_{W,b}: \mathcal{O}_K \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_K$ is injective,

$$\mathbb{E}(\mathbf{1}_B \cdot \tilde{\lambda} \mid \mathcal{O}_K(\omega, N)) = \frac{\varphi_K(W)}{W^n} \cdot \mathbb{E}(\mathbf{1}_{\text{Aff}_{W,b}(B)} \cdot \lambda \mid \text{Aff}_{W,b}(\mathcal{O}_K(\omega, N)))$$

holds true. Note that $\text{Aff}_{W,b}(B) = A' \cap \text{Aff}_{W,b}(\mathcal{O}_K(\omega, N))$. Hence, by Lemma 7.9 (2), we have

$$\mathbb{E}(\mathbf{1}_B \cdot \tilde{\lambda} \mid \mathcal{O}_K(\omega, N)) \geq \frac{\varphi_K(W)}{W^n} \cdot \frac{\kappa}{17(r+1)2^r c_\chi} \cdot \frac{\#(A' \cap \text{Aff}_{W,b}(\mathcal{O}_K(\omega, N)))}{(2N+1)^n} \cdot \log M. \quad (7.20)$$

Here observe by the choice of N in (7.2), (7.19) and by the triangle inequality for $\|\cdot\|_{\infty, \omega}$,

$$\text{Aff}_{W,b}(\mathcal{O}_K(\omega, N)) \supseteq \mathcal{O}_K(\omega, M) \cap (W\mathcal{O}_K + b)$$

holds true; indeed, our choice (7.2) of N is made in such a way that the inclusion above is satisfied.

Therefore, by (7.18) and (7.20), we conclude that

$$\mathbb{E}(\mathbf{1}_B \cdot \tilde{\lambda} \mid \mathcal{O}_K(\omega, N)) \geq \frac{\kappa}{17(r+1)2^r c_\chi} \cdot \frac{C}{3(n+1)h} \delta \cdot \frac{M^n}{W^n(2N+1)^n}.$$

Finally, since $N \leq \frac{2M}{W}$ and $(2N+1)^n \leq 3^n N^n$, we obtain

$$\mathbb{E}(\mathbf{1}_B \cdot \tilde{\lambda} \mid \mathcal{O}_K(\omega, N)) \geq \frac{\kappa}{51h(n+1)6^n(r+1)2^r c_\chi} \cdot \frac{C}{(r+1)2^r c_\chi} \cdot \delta. \quad (7.21)$$

Hence we can take $u = \frac{\kappa C}{51h(n+1)6^n(r+1)2^r c_\chi}$. □

7.5 Proof of Theorem 2.8

In this subsection, we present the proof of Theorem 2.8, which is the first goal of the present paper. Here, we restate Theorem 2.8.

Theorem 7.11 (Theorem 2.8, restated). *Assume Setting 7.1. Let $\delta > 0$. Then, there exists a positive integer $M_{\text{PES}} = M_{\text{PES}}(\omega, \mathcal{D}, \delta, S)$ depending on ω , \mathcal{D} , δ and S such that the following holds true: assume that $M \geq M_{\text{PES}}$ and that a subset A of $\mathcal{P}_K \cap \mathcal{D} \cap \mathcal{O}_K(\omega, M)$ satisfies*

$$\#A \geq \delta \cdot \#(\mathcal{P}_K \cap \mathcal{D} \cap \mathcal{O}_K(\omega, M)).$$

Then there exists an S -constellation in A . Moreover, there exists a positive real number $\gamma = \gamma_{\text{PES}}(\omega, \mathcal{D}, \delta, S)$ depending only on ω , \mathcal{D} , δ and S such that in the setting above,

$$\mathcal{N}_S(A) \geq \gamma \cdot \frac{M^{n+1}}{(\log M)^{\#S}}$$

holds true.

Proof. We use Setting 7.2. First, we will prove the former asrtion. For A in the assumption, let A' be as in Proposition 7.10 and let $\tilde{\delta}$ as in (7.21). Here, note that $\tilde{\delta}$ depends only on $\boldsymbol{\omega}, \mathcal{D}, \delta, \chi$ and r . Take $\gamma' = \gamma_{\text{RMS}}(\boldsymbol{\omega}, \tilde{\delta}, S)$ and $\rho = \rho_{\text{RMS}}(\boldsymbol{\omega}, \tilde{\delta}, S)$, which are determined from the relative multidimensional Szemerédi theorem (Theorem 5.4); note that we here substitute $\tilde{\delta}$ for δ . For this ρ , set $w = w_{\text{PES}}(\boldsymbol{\omega}, \mathcal{D}, \delta, \chi, S)$ as $w := w_{\text{PR}}(\rho, \chi, S)$; set W from w by (7.1). Take $b, B, \tilde{\lambda} = \tilde{\lambda}_{w, M; \chi, r, K, b}$ as in the statement of Proposition 7.10. Then, we set the lower bound of the main parameter M in the following manner:

- (Pseudorandomness) Define $M_{\text{PES}}^{(1)} = M_{\text{PES}}^{(1)}(\boldsymbol{\omega}, \mathcal{D}, \delta, \chi, S)$ by $M_{\text{PES}}^{(1)} := M_{\text{PR}}(w, \rho, \chi, S)$. Then by Theorem 7.5, if $M \geq M_{\text{PES}}^{(1)}$, then $\tilde{\lambda}$ is a (ρ, N, S) -pseudorandom measure.
- (Weighted density) Define $M_{\text{PES}}^{(2)} := M_{\text{DS}}(\boldsymbol{\omega}, \mathcal{D}, \delta, r)$. By Proposition 7.10, if $M \geq M_{\text{PES}}^{(2)}$, then the weighted density condition

$$\mathbb{E}(\mathbf{1}_B \cdot \tilde{\lambda} \mid \mathcal{O}_K(\boldsymbol{\omega}, N)) \geq \tilde{\delta}$$

is fulfilled.

- (Smallness) By Lemma 7.9 (2), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}(\mathbf{1}_B \cdot \tilde{\lambda}^{r+1} \mid \mathcal{O}_K(\boldsymbol{\omega}, N)) &\leq \mathbb{E}(\mathbf{1}_{A'} \cdot \lambda^{r+1} \mid \text{Aff}_{W,b}(\mathcal{O}_K(\boldsymbol{\omega}, N))) \\ &\leq \left(\frac{\kappa}{17(r+1)2^r c_\chi} \right)^{r+1} (\log M)^{r+1}. \end{aligned}$$

It then follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{N} \cdot \mathbb{E}(\mathbf{1}_B \cdot \tilde{\lambda}^{r+1} \mid \mathcal{O}_K(\boldsymbol{\omega}, N)) &\leq W \cdot \left(\frac{\kappa}{17(r+1)2^r c_\chi} \right)^{r+1} \frac{(\log M)^{r+1}}{M} \\ &= o_{M \rightarrow \infty; \boldsymbol{\omega}, \mathcal{D}, \delta, \chi, S}(1). \end{aligned}$$

Hence, there exists $M_{\text{PES}}^{(3)} = M_{\text{PES}}^{(3)}(\boldsymbol{\omega}, \mathcal{D}, \delta, \chi, S)$ such that the following holds: if $M \geq M_{\text{PES}}^{(3)}$, then the smallness condition

$$\mathbb{E}(\mathbf{1}_B \cdot \tilde{\lambda}^{r+1} \mid \mathcal{O}_K(\boldsymbol{\omega}, N)) \leq \gamma' \cdot N$$

is fulfilled.

Finally, set $M'_{\text{PES}} = M'_{\text{PES}}(\boldsymbol{\omega}, \mathcal{D}, \delta, \chi, S)$ as $M'_{\text{PES}} := \max\{M_{\text{PES}}^{(1)}, M_{\text{PES}}^{(2)}, M_{\text{PES}}^{(3)}\}$. Then, for every M with $M \geq M'_{\text{PES}}$, Theorem 5.4 applies to the set B above. This implies that there exists an S -constellation in B . By sending it by $\text{Aff}_{W,b}$, we obtain an S -constellation in A' ; recall Remark 5.7. Since $A' \subseteq A$, in particular, there exists an S -constellation in A , as desired.

On dependence on parameters, observe that χ is taken in order to construct $\tilde{\lambda}$; it does not appear in the setting itself of Theorem 7.11. Hence, we may set

$$M_{\text{PES}} := \min_{\chi} \lceil M'_{\text{PES}}(\boldsymbol{\omega}, \mathcal{D}, \delta, \chi, S) \rceil.$$

Then M_{PES} only depends on $\boldsymbol{\omega}$, \mathcal{D} , δ and S . This ends the proof of the former assertion.

Next, we prove the latter assertion on $\mathcal{N}_S(A)$. Fix χ with $M_{\text{PES}} = \lceil M'_{\text{PES}}(\boldsymbol{\omega}, \mathcal{D}, \delta, \chi, S) \rceil$. For this χ , take w and W as in the proof of the former assertion. In what follows, let $M \geq M_{\text{PES}}$. By Theorem 5.5, we have for $\gamma' = \gamma_{\text{RMS}}(\boldsymbol{\omega}, \tilde{\delta}, S) > 0$ that

$$\frac{\mathcal{N}_S(B) \times \left(\frac{\kappa}{17(r+1)2^r c_{\chi}} \log M \right)^{r+1}}{N(2N+1)^n} \geq \gamma'.$$

Indeed, since $\frac{\varphi_K(W)}{W^n} \leq 1$, for every S -constellation \mathcal{S} , the value of $\prod_{s' \in \mathcal{S}} (\mathbf{1}_B \cdot \tilde{\lambda})(s')$ does not exceed $\left(\frac{\kappa}{17(r+1)2^r c_{\chi}} \log M \right)^{r+1}$ by Lemma 7.9 (2). Also note that $\mathcal{N}_S(B) \leq \mathcal{N}_S(A) \leq \mathcal{N}_S(A)$ from the argument in the last part of the proof of the former assertion. Together with (7.2), we have

$$\mathcal{N}_S(A) \geq \left(\frac{\gamma' \cdot (17(r+1)2^r c_{\chi})^{r+1} 2^n}{\kappa^{r+1} \cdot W^{n+1}} \right) \cdot \frac{M^{n+1}}{(\log M)^{r+1}}.$$

Recall that our W depends only on the data $\boldsymbol{\omega}, \mathcal{D}, \delta, \chi$ and S . Set $\gamma = \gamma_{\text{PES}}(\boldsymbol{\omega}, \mathcal{D}, \delta, S)$ as

$$\gamma := \frac{(17(r+1)2^r c_{\chi})^{r+1} 2^n}{\kappa^{r+1} \cdot W^{n+1}} \cdot \gamma';$$

here we do not indicate the dependence on χ since χ is already fixed. Therefore, for $M \geq M_{\text{PES}}$, we obtain the desired estimate of $\mathcal{N}_S(A)$. This completes the proof of Theorem 7.11. \square

Proof of Corollary 2.10. Note that Proposition 7.7 implies that the two conditions in Corollary 2.10 are equivalent to each other. Take an arbitrary finite subset S of \mathcal{O}_K . Assume that $\bar{d}_{\mathcal{P}_K \cap \mathcal{D}, \boldsymbol{\omega}}(A) > \delta > 0$. Then there exists a sequence $M_1 < M_2 < M_3 < \dots$ of positive real numbers with $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} M_n = \infty$ such that for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, the set $A \cap \mathcal{O}_K(\boldsymbol{\omega}, M_n)$ witnesses the relative density at least δ . There exists m such that $M_m \geq M_{\text{PES}}(\boldsymbol{\omega}, \mathcal{D}, \delta, S)$. Apply Theorem 7.11 to $A \cap \mathcal{O}_K(\boldsymbol{\omega}, M_m)$ with the parameter M_m with such m , we can find an S -constellation in $A \cap \mathcal{O}_K(\boldsymbol{\omega}, M_m) (\subseteq A)$. Since S is arbitrarily taken, this completes the proof; note that m itself does depend on S but $A \supseteq A \cap \mathcal{O}_K(\boldsymbol{\omega}, M_n)$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. \square

Proof of Corollary 1.5. Proposition 4.11 ensures the existence of an NL-compatible \mathcal{O}_K^{\times} -fundamental domain \mathcal{D} . Apply Corollary 2.10 with $A = \mathcal{P}_K \cap \mathcal{D}$; since \mathcal{D} is an \mathcal{O}_K^{\times} -fundamental domain, \mathcal{D} itself admits no associate pairs. \square

Remark 7.12 (On the choice of W). On the estimate of $\mathcal{N}_S(A)$ in Theorem 2.8, the important observation is that we can take w , and hence also W , independent of M as long as M is sufficiently large. This observation is based on [GT08, footnote 20].

8 Szemerédi-type theorems in prime elements of number fields

In the proof of Theorem 2.8 in Section 7, the first key was the existence of a suitable pseudo-random measure. Once this was ensured, the main part of the rest of the proof was counting arguments of elements. We will *axiomatize* such processes and establish Theorem A.

We will have two types of *axiomatized constellation theorems*:

- (i) Axiomatized constellation theorems of type 1: Theorem 8.9, Theorem 8.10, Corollary 8.12.
- (ii) Axiomatized constellation theorems of type 2: Theorem 8.23, Theorem 8.24, Corollary 8.25.

Here, by constellation theorems *of type 1*, we mean those that guarantee the mere existence of constellations; constellation theorems *of type 2* those that guarantee the existence of constellations *without associate pairs*. As the cost of this stronger conclusion, constellation theorems of type 2 require an additional hypothesis. More specifically, whereas we assume a certain condition on counts from below of elements in both types, in type 2 we furthermore impose a certain condition on counts *from above*.

Theorem A in Introduction will be deduced from the axiomatic Theorem 8.23 applied to the number field situation. For this, the required estimates of the number of prime elements, Propositions 8.14 and 8.17, will be verified using the materials in Sections 4 in addition to the Chebotarev density theorem.

We collect the setting in this section.

Setting 8.1. Let K be a number field, and n the degree. Let φ_K be the totient function of K (Definition 3.8). Let $\mathfrak{a} \subseteq \mathcal{O}_K$ be a non-zero ideal of \mathcal{O}_K . Then \mathfrak{a} is a free module of rank n as a \mathbb{Z} -module; we fix a \mathbb{Z} -basis \mathbf{v} of \mathfrak{a} .

In Section 5, the (ρ, N, S) -pseudorandom condition on measures (Definition 5.3) is stated for a non-negative integer parameter N . Hereafter, we relax the range of the parameter N and consider N to be a non-negative real parameter. More precisely, for a non-negative real number N , we define the (ρ, N, S) -pseudorandom condition as the $(\rho, \lceil N \rceil, S)$ -pseudorandom condition in the original sense. This relaxation enables us to avoid inessential issues caused by the integrality of the parameters. In the present paper, when we express dependences of constants, we omit writing that on K if the constant depends on \mathbf{v} . This is because K equals the \mathbb{Q} -span of \mathbf{v} , and hence \mathbf{v} remembers K .

8.1 Preliminaries to the axiomatized constellation theorems

In this subsection and Subsection 8.2, we will axiomatize the arguments in Section 7. At the same time, we extend the setting to a more general case; more precisely, we consider a general ideal \mathfrak{a} rather than the whole \mathcal{O}_K . The case $\mathfrak{a} = \mathcal{O}_K$ suffices for the proofs of Theorem A

and Theorem B; however, to establish Theorem C in the full generality, we will need results for a general non-zero ideal \mathfrak{a} . This generalization does not require additional work.

Recall from Section 5 the symbol $\mathfrak{a}(\mathbf{v}, M) = \{\sum_{i \in [n]} a_i v_i : a_i \in [-M, M] \text{ for all } i \in [n]\}$. In our axiomatic formulation, the sufficient condition for the existence of S -constellations in $A \subseteq \mathfrak{a}(\mathbf{v}, M)$ with $\#A \geq \delta \cdot \frac{M^n}{\log M}$ (for a large enough M) is formulated as the (ρ, M, \mathbf{v}, S) -condition. The counterpart in the infinitary version is described as the family $S\Psi_{\log}(\mathfrak{a})$ of subsets of \mathfrak{a} . These two notions will be introduced in Definitions 8.2 and 8.4 below.

Definition 8.2 ($(\rho, W, M, \mathbf{v}, S)$ -condition). Assume Setting 8.1. Let $S \subseteq \mathfrak{a}$ be a standard shape. Let $\rho > 0$, $M \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 1}$, $D_1, D_2 > 0$, and $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)_{\mathbb{R}}$. Let $W \in \mathbb{N}$ be a natural number with $W \leq M^\varepsilon$. Then $A \subseteq \mathfrak{a}$ is said to satisfy the $(\rho, W, M, \mathbf{v}, S)$ -condition with parameters (D_1, D_2, ε) if $A \subseteq \mathfrak{a}(\mathbf{v}, M)$ and if there exists $\lambda: \mathfrak{a} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ such that the following hold.

- (1) For every $b \in \mathfrak{a}$ with $b\mathcal{O}_K + W\mathfrak{a} = \mathfrak{a}$, the function $\beta \mapsto \frac{\varphi_K(W)}{W^n}(\lambda \circ \text{Aff}_{W,b})(\beta)$ on \mathfrak{a} is a $(\rho, \frac{M}{W}, S)$ -pseudorandom measure.
- (2) There exists $T \subseteq A$ with $\#T \leq M^{\varepsilon n}$ such that, for every $\alpha \in A \setminus T$,

$$D_1 \cdot \log M \leq \lambda(\alpha) \leq D_2 \cdot \log M$$

holds.

- (3) For the subset T in (2) and for every $\alpha \in A \setminus T$, the equality $\alpha\mathcal{O}_K + W\mathfrak{a} = \mathfrak{a}$ holds.

Definition 8.3 ((ρ, M, \mathbf{v}, S) -condition). Assume Setting 8.1. Let $S \subseteq \mathfrak{a}$ be a standard shape. Let $\rho > 0$, $M \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 1}$, and take $D_1, D_2 > 0$ and $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)_{\mathbb{R}}$. Then $A \subseteq \mathfrak{a}$ is said to satisfy the (ρ, M, \mathbf{v}, S) -condition with parameters (D_1, D_2, ε) if there exists a natural number $W \in \mathbb{N}$ with $W \leq M^\varepsilon$ such that A satisfies the $(\rho, W, M, \mathbf{v}, S)$ -condition with parameters (D_1, D_2, ε) .

In the three conditions in Definition 8.2, (1) corresponds to Theorem 7.5 in the proof of Theorem 2.8 in Section 7; (2) and (3) correspond to Lemma 7.9.

To formulate the infinitary version of the (ρ, M, \mathbf{v}, S) -condition, dependence between M and ρ is of importance. However, on the data (D_1, D_2, ε) , the only requirement is that they exist without depending on M ; we do not care the exact values of them. For this reason, in Definition 8.2, we divide the seven data into two classes, (ρ, M, \mathbf{v}, S) and (D_1, D_2, ε) , and use the terminology of ‘the (ρ, M, \mathbf{v}, S) -condition with parameters (D_1, D_2, ε) .’ Note also that \mathbf{v} and S are given data.

Definition 8.4 (The family $S\Psi_{\log}(\mathfrak{a})$). Under Setting 8.1, we define a family $S\Psi_{\log}(\mathfrak{a})$ of subsets of \mathfrak{a} as follows. For $A \subseteq \mathfrak{a}$, we declare that $A \in S\Psi_{\log}(\mathfrak{a})$ if for every standard shape $S \subseteq \mathfrak{a}$, there exist $D_1, D_2 > 0$ and $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)_{\mathbb{R}}$ such that the following holds true: for every $\rho > 0$, there exists $M(\rho) = M(\rho, S) \in \mathbb{R}$ such that, for every $M \geq M(\rho)$, $A \cap \mathfrak{a}(\mathbf{v}, M)$ satisfies the (ρ, M, \mathbf{v}, S) -condition with parameters (D_1, D_2, ε) .

In the symbol ‘ $S\Psi_{\log}(\mathfrak{a})$ ’ above, ‘ S ’, ‘ Ψ ’ and ‘ \log ’, respectively, stand for *subset*, *pseudorandom*, and *having the sparsity of order $1/\log$* ; here, we will show in Lemma 8.6 (2) that the

family $S\Psi_{\log}(\mathfrak{a})$ is closed under taking subsets. The condition of $A \in S\Psi_{\log}(\mathfrak{a})$ is formulated for a fixed \mathbb{Z} -basis \mathbf{v} ; however, it may be easily seen that this condition does not depend on the choice of \mathbf{v} .

When $\mathfrak{a} = \mathcal{O}_K$, the condition ' $b\mathcal{O}_K + W\mathfrak{a} = \mathfrak{a}$ ' in conditions (1) and (3) in Definition 8.2 is equivalent to saying that b is prime to W . Also note the following fact.

Lemma 8.5. *Let $\mathfrak{a} \in \text{Ideals}_K$ and let $W \in \mathbb{N}$. Then the image of the set $\{b \in \mathfrak{a} : b\mathcal{O}_K + W\mathfrak{a} = \mathfrak{a}\}$ under the natural projection $\mathfrak{a} \rightarrow \mathfrak{a}/W\mathfrak{a}$ has cardinality $\varphi_K(W)$.*

Proof. Apply Lemma 3.12 with $\mathfrak{b} = W\mathcal{O}_K$; this yields an isomorphism $\mathfrak{a}/W\mathfrak{a} \simeq \mathcal{O}_K/W\mathcal{O}_K$ as \mathcal{O}_K -modules. An element $\gamma \in \mathcal{O}_K/W\mathcal{O}_K$ belongs to $(\mathcal{O}_K/W\mathcal{O}_K)^\times$ if and only if it generates $\mathcal{O}_K/W\mathcal{O}_K$ as an \mathcal{O}_K -module. For $b \in \mathfrak{a}$, the equality $b\mathcal{O}_K + W\mathfrak{a} = \mathfrak{a}$ holds if and only if \bar{b} generates $\mathfrak{a}/W\mathfrak{a}$ as an \mathcal{O}_K -module, where \bar{b} is the image of b under $\mathfrak{a} \rightarrow \mathfrak{a}/W\mathfrak{a}$. Combination of these observations ends the proof. \square

Lemma 8.6 (Hereditiy to subsets). *The following statements hold true.*

- (1) *If $A \subseteq \mathfrak{a}(\mathbf{v}, M)$ satisfies the $(\rho, W, M, \mathbf{v}, S)$ -condition with parameters (D_1, D_2, ε) , and $A_1 \subseteq A$, then A_1 satisfies the $(\rho, W, M, \mathbf{v}, S)$ -condition with parameters (D_1, D_2, ε) .*
- (2) *If $A \in S\Psi_{\log}(\mathfrak{a})$ and $A_1 \subseteq A$, then $A_1 \in S\Psi_{\log}(\mathfrak{a})$.*

Proof. First we will prove (1). We use the same measure λ . Let λ and T be the measure and exceptional set (a set satisfying (2) and (3) of Definition 8.4) for A . Then $T_1 := T \cap A_1$ works as an exceptional set for A_1 . Hence (1) holds. Item (2) immediately follows from (1). \square

The following theorem provides a motivating example of a member of the family $S\Psi_{\log}(\mathcal{O}_K)$.

Theorem 8.7. *The set \mathcal{P}_K of prime elements of a number field K satisfies that $\mathcal{P}_K \in S\Psi_{\log}(\mathcal{O}_K)$. Furthermore, for every integer $r \geq [K : \mathbb{Q}]$, there exist $D_1, D_2 > 0$ and $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)_{\mathbb{R}}$ such that the following holds true. Let $S \subseteq \mathcal{O}_K$ be a standard shape with $\#S = r + 1$, and $\boldsymbol{\omega}$ an integral basis of K . Let $\rho > 0$. Then there exist a natural number $W = W_{\mathcal{P}_K, S\Psi_{\log}}(\rho, S)$ and a positive real number $M_{\mathcal{P}_K, S\Psi_{\log}}(\rho, \boldsymbol{\omega}, S)$ such that for every $M \geq M_{\mathcal{P}_K, S\Psi_{\log}}(\rho, \boldsymbol{\omega}, S)$, the set $\mathcal{P}_K \cap \mathcal{O}_K(\boldsymbol{\omega}, M)$ satisfies the $(\rho, W, M, \boldsymbol{\omega}, S)$ -condition with parameters (D_1, D_2, ε) .*

Theorem 7.5 works for the proof of the pseudorandomness required in Theorem 8.7. Nevertheless, prior to the proof of Theorem 8.7, we prove the following theorem, which treats a more general setting. This is because similar arguments to Theorem 8.8 will be needed in Sections 9 and 10.

Theorem 8.8. *Let K be a number field of degree n , $S \subseteq \mathcal{O}_K$ a finite subset such that $0 \in S$ and that S generates \mathcal{O}_K as a \mathbb{Z} -module. Let χ and c_χ be as in Setting 7.2. Let $\rho > 0$, $u > 0$ and $a \in (0, 1]_{\mathbb{R}}$. Then there exist positive real numbers $w_{\text{PRSI}}(\rho, \chi, S)$, depending only on ρ , χ and S , and $M_{\text{PRSI}}(w, \rho, u, \chi, S, a)$, depending only on w, ρ, u, χ, S and a , such that the following holds true. Assume that $w \geq w_{\text{PRSI}}(\rho, \chi, S)$ and $M \geq M_{\text{PRSI}}(w, \rho, u, \chi, S, a)$. Define $W = W_w$ by (7.1), and set $R = R_{M; r, a}$ as*

$$R := M^{\frac{a}{17(r+1)2^r}}. \tag{8.1}$$

Define a function $\lambda = \lambda_{M;\chi,r,a,K}: \mathcal{O}_K \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ by

$$\lambda(\alpha) := \frac{\kappa \cdot \Lambda_{R,\chi}(\alpha)^2}{c_\chi \log R}.$$

Here, $\kappa = \kappa_K > 0$ is the constant appearing in Theorem 3.19, φ_K is the totient function of K (Definition 3.8), and $\Lambda_{R,\chi}$ is the (R, χ) -von Mangoldt function (Definition 6.1). For $b \in \mathcal{O}_K$ coprime with W , define $\tilde{\lambda} = \tilde{\lambda}_{w,M;\chi,r,a,K,b}: \mathcal{O}_K \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ by

$$\tilde{\lambda}(\beta) := \frac{\varphi_K(W)}{W^n} (\lambda \circ \text{Aff}_{W,b})(\beta).$$

Then, $w \leq \frac{a}{2} \log M$ holds, and $\tilde{\lambda}$ is a $(\rho, \frac{uM^a}{W}, S)$ -pseudorandom measure.

In the assertion of Theorem 8.8, by $w \leq \frac{a}{2} \log M$ and (3.7), we in particular have

$$W \leq M^{(\log 2)^a}. \quad (8.2)$$

Proof. We prove Theorem 8.8 by generalizing the proof of Theorem 7.5. Let $t = 2r + 2$. Take an arbitrary non-empty subset \mathcal{J} of $\bigsqcup_{j \in [r+1]} \{0, 1\}^{e_j}$, and let $m := \#\mathcal{J}$. Here, $e_j = [r+1] \setminus \{j\}$. Write $S = \{s_1, \dots, s_r\} \sqcup \{0\}$. Then for each $\omega \in \mathcal{J}$, the homomorphism $\psi_S^{(\omega)}: \mathbb{Z}^t \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_K$ of \mathbb{Z} -modules is defined by Definition 5.3 (5.1) and (5.2). By the assumptions of S , these maps are all surjective.

Take $R_0(m, K)$, $F_0(m, n)$ and $w_0((\psi_S^{(\omega)})_{\omega \in \mathcal{J}})$ as in Theorem 7.4. Set $R_1(r, K)$, $F_1(r, n)$ and $w_1(S)$ in the same manner as (7.8). Recall $\rho_{\text{GY};\chi,m,n}^{(1)}(w)$ and $\rho_{\text{GY};\chi,m,t,K}^{(2)}(w, R)$ from Theorem 7.4. For $w \geq w_1(S)$, set

$$\rho_{\text{PRSI};\chi,r,n}^{(1)}(w) := \max_{m \in [(r+1)2^r]} \rho_{\text{GY};\chi,m,n}^{(1)}(w),$$

and under the conditions that $R \geq R_1(r, K)$ and $\log w \leq F_1(r, n) \cdot \sqrt{\log R}$, set

$$\rho_{\text{PRSI};\chi,r,K}^{(2)}(w, M, a) := \max_{m \in [(r+1)2^r]} \rho_{\text{GY};\chi,m,t,K}^{(2)}(w, R).$$

Here recall that R is defined from M, r and a by (8.1).

For $w \geq w_1(S)$, it follows from (7.6) that if w is sufficiently large depending on χ, r, n and ρ , then $\rho_{\text{PRSI};\chi,r,n}^{(1)}(w) \leq \rho/2$ holds. Set $w_{\text{PRSI}}(\rho, \chi, S)$ with $w_{\text{PRSI}}(\rho, \chi, S) \geq w_1(S)$ in such a way that $w \geq w_{\text{PRSI}}(\rho, \chi, S)$ implies $\rho_{\text{PRSI};\chi,r,n}^{(1)}(w) \leq \rho/2$. Let $w \geq w_{\text{PRSI}}(\rho, \chi, S)$. Then, choose $M_{\text{PRSI}}(w, \rho, u, \chi, S, a)$ with $M_{\text{PRSI}}(w, \rho, u, \chi, S, a) \geq e^{2w/a}$ such that if $M \geq M_{\text{PRSI}}(w, \rho, u, \chi, S, a)$, then the following four inequalities

$$\begin{aligned} R &\geq R_1, \\ \log w &\leq F_1 \cdot \sqrt{\log R}, \\ M^{(\frac{12}{17} - \log 2)a} &\geq \frac{1}{u}, \\ \rho_{\text{PRSI};\chi,r,K}^{(2)}(w, M, a) &\leq \frac{\rho}{2} \end{aligned}$$

are all satisfied. Then since $M \geq e^{2w/a}$, we in particular have $w \leq \frac{a}{2} \log M$.

Take an arbitrary subset \mathcal{B} of \mathbb{Z}^{r+1} which may be written as the product of intervals of lengths at least $\frac{uM^a}{W}$. Since $m \leq (r+1)2^r$, we have $R^{4m+1} \leq R^{5(r+1)2^r}$. It follows from $M^{a((12/17)-\log 2)} \geq u^{-1}$ that $R^{4m+1} \leq \frac{uM^a}{W}$. Hence, $\mathcal{B} \times \mathcal{B} \subseteq \mathbb{Z}^t$ is the product of intervals of lengths at least R^{4m+1} . Therefore, we may appeal to Theorem 7.4 and conclude the following: if $w \geq w_{\text{PRSI}}(\rho, \chi, S)$ and if $M \geq M_{\text{PRSI}}(w, \rho, u, \chi, S, a)$, then $\tilde{\lambda}$ satisfies the $(\rho, \frac{uM^a}{W}, S)$ -linear forms condition. \square

Proof of Theorem 8.7. The proof goes along the same line as the arguments in Section 7, except one on the bound of $\#T$. For the reader's convenience, we go into details of the proof. Let $W = W_{\mathcal{P}_K, S\Psi_{\log}}(\rho, \chi, S)$ be the positive integer determined from $w = w_{\text{PRSI}}(\rho, \chi, S)$ by (7.1). Let M be a parameter with $M \geq M_{\text{PRSI}}(w_{\text{PRSI}}(\rho, \chi, S), \rho, 1, \chi, S, 1)$, and take the function $\lambda = \lambda_{M; \chi, r, 1, K}: \mathcal{O}_K \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ defined in Theorem 8.8. In particular, we set $R = M^{\frac{1}{17(r+1)2^r}}$. Now apply Theorem 8.8 for $(a, u) = (1, 1)$. Then we conclude that for every $b \in \mathcal{O}_K$ coprime with W , the function $\frac{\varphi_K(W)}{W^n}(\lambda \circ \text{Aff}_{W,b})$ is a $(\rho, M/W, S)$ -pseudorandom measure. In addition, by (8.2), we have $W \leq M^{\log 2} \leq M^{\frac{3}{4}}$.

We define the exceptional set $T \subseteq \mathcal{P}_K \cap \mathcal{O}_K(\omega, M)$ by $T := \mathcal{P}_K \cap \mathcal{O}_K(\omega, M) \cap \mathcal{O}_K(R)$. Now, recall the proof of Lemma 7.9. The arguments for (2) and (3) still work in the current setting. More precisely, the following holds: if M is sufficiently large depending on r and K , then (3) in the $(\rho, W, M, \mathbf{v}, S)$ -condition is fulfilled and $\lambda(\alpha) = \frac{\kappa}{17(r+1)2^r \cdot c_\chi} \cdot \log M$ holds for every $\alpha \in A \setminus T$.

Therefore, what remains is the estimate of $\#T$; this part is more involved than the proof of Lemma 7.9 (1). Proposition 3.20 implies that if M is sufficiently large depending on r , then the number of ideals of \mathcal{O}_K whose ideal norms are at most R does not exceed $2\kappa R$. In particular, the same estimate holds for the number of principal ideals with the same condition. For each such a principal ideal \mathfrak{a} , consider $\alpha \in \mathcal{O}_K(\omega, M)$ which is sent to \mathfrak{a} by the map $\alpha \mapsto \alpha\mathcal{O}_K$. For every \mathfrak{a} above, the number of such α does not exceed of $\Xi' \cdot (\log M)^{n-1}$; here $\Xi' = \Xi'(\omega) > 0$ is the constant appearing in Lemma 4.14 (2). Indeed, observe that $r_1 + r_2 \leq n$, where r_1 and r_2 are as in Setting 4.1. Hence, we conclude that

$$\#T \leq \Xi' \cdot (\log M)^{n-1} \cdot (2\kappa R). \quad (8.3)$$

For sufficiently large M depending on ω , we have $R \leq \frac{1}{2\kappa\Xi'} \cdot \frac{M^{\frac{1}{16}}}{(\log M)^{n-1}}$; in this case, we obtain

$$\#T \leq M^{\frac{1}{16}} \leq M^{\frac{3}{4}n}.$$

Therefore, by setting $M_{\mathcal{P}_K, S\Psi_{\log}}(\rho, \omega, \chi, S)$ as the minimum of integers for which the arguments above work, we conclude the following: if $M \geq M_{\mathcal{P}_K, S\Psi_{\log}}(\rho, \omega, \chi, S)$, then $\mathcal{P}_K \cap \mathcal{O}_K(\omega, M)$ satisfies the (ρ, W, M, ω, S) -condition with parameters

$$(D_1, D_2, \varepsilon) = \left(\frac{\kappa}{17(r+1)2^r \cdot c_\chi}, \frac{\kappa}{17(r+1)2^r \cdot c_\chi}, \frac{3}{4} \right).$$

This ends the proof of the latter assertion of Theorem 8.7. Here, by fixing χ , we omit to write dependences of $W_{\mathcal{P}_K, S\Psi_{\log}}(\rho, \omega, \chi, S)$ and $M_{\mathcal{P}_K, S\Psi_{\log}}(\rho, \omega, \chi, S)$ on χ . Thus, we write

$W_{\mathcal{P}_K, \mathcal{S}\Psi_{\log}}(\rho, \boldsymbol{\omega}, S)$ and $M_{\mathcal{P}_K, \mathcal{S}\Psi_{\log}}(\rho, \boldsymbol{\omega}, S)$ for short. Then the former assertion immediately follows. \square

As in the proof above, in the case where A is not inside an \mathcal{O}_K^\times -fundamental domain, then the map $A \ni \alpha \mapsto \alpha \mathcal{O}_K \in \text{Ideals}_K$ is not injective in general. Then, we need to take into account the contribution of the action of the group of units in order to transfer ideal counts to element counts. To treat this, Lemma 4.14 is a key tool, as we have seen in the deduction of (8.3) in the above proof.

8.2 Axiomatized constellation theorems of type 1

In this subsection, we establish axiomatized constellation theorems of type 1 with the aid of the (ρ, M, \mathbf{v}, S) -condition and $\mathcal{S}\Psi_{\log}(\mathfrak{a})$ introduced in Subsection 8.1. Here exhibit the two statements: one is the finitary version and the other is the infinitary version. Recall the definition of $\mathcal{N}_S(A)$ from Definition 2.3 (2).

Theorem 8.9. *Assume Setting 8.1. Let $S \subseteq \mathfrak{a}$ be a standard shape. Let $\delta > 0$, $D_1, D_2 > 0$ and $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)_{\mathbb{R}}$. Then there exist $\rho = \rho_1(D_1, \mathbf{v}, \delta, S) > 0$ and $M_1 = M_1(D_1, D_2, \varepsilon, \mathbf{v}, \delta, S) \in \mathbb{N}$ such that the following holds true. Assume that $M \in \mathbb{N}$ with $M \geq M_1$ and $A \subseteq \mathfrak{a}$ with*

$$A \subseteq \mathfrak{a}(\mathbf{v}, M) \tag{8.4}$$

satisfies the following two conditions:

(i) *the cardinality $\#A$ satisfies*

$$\#A \geq \delta \cdot \frac{M^n}{\log M}, \tag{8.5}$$

(ii) *A satisfies the (ρ, M, \mathbf{v}, S) -condition with parameters (D_1, D_2, ε) .*

Then A contains an S -constellation. Furthermore, there exists $\gamma = \gamma_1(D_1, D_2, \mathbf{v}, \delta, S) > 0$ such that

$$\mathcal{N}_S(A) \geq \gamma W^{-(n+1)} \cdot \frac{M^{n+1}}{(\log M)^{\#S}} \tag{8.6}$$

holds. Here, W is an integer appearing in the (ρ, M, \mathbf{v}, S) -condition, which comes from condition (ii).

Theorem 8.10. *Assume Setting 8.1. Assume that a subset $A \subseteq \mathfrak{a}$ satisfies the following two conditions:*

(i) *the inequality*

$$\limsup_{M \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\#(A \cap \mathfrak{a}(\mathbf{v}, M))}{M^n (\log M)^{-1}} > 0 \tag{8.7}$$

holds,

(ii) *$A \in \mathcal{S}\Psi_{\log}(\mathfrak{a})$.*

Then for every finite subset $S \subseteq \mathfrak{a}$, there exists an S -constellation in A .

In Theorem 8.9, the first condition is a condition on counts, and the second condition is a condition which inherits to subsets; recall Lemma 8.6. The same holds true for the two conditions in Theorem 8.10. The existence of a constellation no way inherits to subsets. Nevertheless, in the proof of constellation theorems, we can decompose our criteria into the following two parts: conditions on mere counts, and conditions related to pseudorandomness, which inherit to subsets. In this manner, we may have a clear description of the proofs. For instance, Theorem 8.10 yields the following relative Szemerédi-type theorem. To state it, we extend the definition of the relative asymptotic density in Definition 2.9 (2) in the following manner.

Definition 8.11. Let \mathcal{Z} be a free \mathbb{Z} -module of finite rank and \mathbf{v} a \mathbb{Z} -basis. For a non-empty set $X \subseteq \mathcal{Z}$ and a subset $A \subseteq X$, define the *relative upper asymptotic density of A in X measured by $\|\cdot\|_{\infty, \mathbf{v}}$* as

$$\bar{d}_{X, \mathbf{v}}(A) := \limsup_{M \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\#(A \cap \mathcal{Z}(\mathbf{v}, M))}{\#(X \cap \mathcal{Z}(\mathbf{v}, M))}.$$

The *relative lower asymptotic density of A in X measured by $\|\cdot\|_{\infty, \mathbf{v}}$* is also defined as

$$\underline{d}_{X, \mathbf{v}}(A) := \liminf_{M \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\#(A \cap \mathcal{Z}(\mathbf{v}, M))}{\#(X \cap \mathcal{Z}(\mathbf{v}, M))}.$$

Corollary 8.12. *Assume Setting 8.1. Assume that a subset $A \subseteq \mathfrak{a}$ satisfies the following two conditions:*

(i) *the inequality*

$$\liminf_{M \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\#(A \cap \mathfrak{a}(\mathbf{v}, M))}{M^n (\log M)^{-1}} > 0 \tag{8.8}$$

holds,

(ii) $A \in \text{S}\Psi_{\log}(\mathfrak{a})$.

Then for every subset $A' \subseteq A$ with $\bar{d}_{A, \mathbf{v}}(A') > 0$, the following holds: for every finite subset S , A' contains an S -constellation.

Proof of “Theorem 8.10 \implies Corollary 8.12”. Suppose $A' \subseteq A$ and $\bar{d}_{A, \mathbf{v}}(A') > 0$. By Lemma 8.6 (ii), we have $A' \in \text{S}\Psi_{\log}(\mathfrak{a})$. The set A' satisfies (8.7) with A replaced by A' . Therefore, we can apply Theorem 8.10 with replacing A by A' . \square

Theorem 8.10 is deduced from Theorem 8.9 in the following manner.

Proof of “Theorem 8.9 \implies Theorem 8.10”. Let $A \subseteq \mathfrak{a}$ be a subset fulfilling the two conditions in Theorem 8.10. Take an arbitrary standard shape $S \subseteq \mathfrak{a}$. Since $A \in \text{S}\Psi_{\log}(\mathfrak{a})$, we can take parameters (D_1, D_2, ε) associated with S . Set $\delta > 0$ as the left-hand side of (8.7); if the left-hand side is $+\infty$, then set $\delta = 2$. By Theorem 8.9, there exist $\rho = \rho_1(D_1, \mathbf{v}, \delta/2, S) > 0$ and $M_1 = M_1(D_1, D_2, \varepsilon, \mathbf{v}, \delta/2, S) \in \mathbb{N}$. Then since $A \in \text{S}\Psi_{\log}(\mathfrak{a})$, there exist $M(\rho, \mathbf{v}, S)$ as

in Definition 8.4 and a positive integer M at least M_I such that the following hold true: we have

$$\#(A \cap \mathfrak{a}(\mathbf{v}, M)) \geq \frac{\delta}{2} \cdot \frac{M^n}{\log M},$$

and $A \cap \mathfrak{a}(\mathbf{v}, M)$ satisfies the (ρ, M, \mathbf{v}, S) -condition with parameters (D_1, D_2, ε) . Therefore, Theorem 8.9 applies to $A \cap \mathfrak{a}(\mathbf{v}, M)$, and we can find an S -constellation in A . As S is arbitrarily taken, this ends our proof. \square

It remains to prove Theorem 8.9. The following proof is motivated by the proofs of Proposition 7.10 and Theorem 7.11.

Proof of Theorem 8.9. Let S , δ , D_1 , D_2 and ε be as in the statement. Let M be a real parameter; we will take it sufficiently large. Take an arbitrary $\rho > 0$.

Let $A \subseteq \mathfrak{a}(\mathbf{v}, M)$ be a set which satisfies (8.5) and which fulfills the $(\rho, W, M, \mathbf{v}, S)$ -condition with parameters (D_1, D_2, ε) ; here $W \leq M^\varepsilon$ holds. Take $\lambda: \mathfrak{a} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ and $T \subseteq A$ associated with A . Trim A as $A' := A \setminus T$. First, we count A' from below. For a sufficiently large M depending on ε and δ , we have

$$\#T \leq M^{\varepsilon n} \leq \frac{\delta}{2} \cdot \frac{M^n}{\log M}.$$

Hence by (8.5) the inequality

$$\#A' \geq \frac{\delta}{2} \cdot \frac{M^n}{\log M} \tag{8.9}$$

holds.

In what follows, we will verify that Theorem 5.4 applies to A' , provided that M is sufficiently large. By the $(\rho, W, M, \mathbf{v}, S)$ -condition (3) and by Lemma 8.5, the cardinality of the image of A' under the natural projection $\mathfrak{a} \rightarrow \mathfrak{a}/W\mathfrak{a}$ is at most $\varphi_K(W)$. The pigeonhole principle tells us that there exists $\bar{b} \in \mathfrak{a}/W\mathfrak{a}$ such that

$$\#(A' \cap \bar{b}) \geq \frac{1}{\varphi_K(W)} \cdot \#A'$$

holds. Here we regard \bar{b} as a subset of \mathfrak{a} . Combine this with (8.9), and obtain

$$\#(A' \cap \bar{b}) \geq \frac{1}{2\varphi_K(W)} \delta \cdot \frac{M^n}{\log M}. \tag{8.10}$$

Set a positive integer N from M and W by $N := \lceil \frac{M}{W} \rceil$. Since $W \leq M^\varepsilon$, we have

$$M^{1-\varepsilon} \leq N \leq \frac{2M}{W}. \tag{8.11}$$

Choose a representative $b \in \bar{b}$ in such a way that $\|b\|_{\infty, \mathbf{v}} < W$. Since $A' \cap \bar{b} \neq \emptyset$, we have $b\mathcal{O}_K + W\mathfrak{a} = \mathfrak{a}$ by the $(\rho, W, M, \mathbf{v}, S)$ -condition (3). By the definition of N and by the triangle inequality, we have

$$\text{Aff}_{W,b}(\mathfrak{a}(\mathbf{v}, N)) \supseteq \mathfrak{a}(\mathbf{v}, M) \cap (W\mathfrak{a} + b) \supseteq A' \cap \bar{b}.$$

This implies that $B := \text{Aff}_{W,b}^{-1}(A' \cap \bar{b})$ is a subset of $\mathfrak{a}(\mathbf{v}, N)$. For this B , by (8.10), we have

$$\#B \geq \frac{1}{2\varphi_K(W)} \delta \cdot \frac{M^n}{\log M}. \quad (8.12)$$

Define $\tilde{\lambda}: \mathfrak{a} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ by $\tilde{\lambda} := \frac{\varphi_K(W)}{W^n}(\lambda \circ \text{Aff}_{W,b})$. By the $(\rho, W, M, \mathbf{v}, S)$ -condition (1), this $\tilde{\lambda}$ is a (ρ, N, S) -pseudorandom measure. Furthermore, by the estimate from below in the $(\rho, W, M, \mathbf{v}, S)$ -condition (2) and by (8.12) and (8.11), we have the following estimate of the weighted density:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}(\mathbf{1}_B \cdot \tilde{\lambda} \mid \mathfrak{a}(\mathbf{v}, N)) &\geq \left(\frac{1}{2\varphi_K(W)} \delta \cdot \frac{M^n}{\log M} \right) \cdot \left(\frac{\varphi_K(W)}{W^n} D_1 \cdot \log M \right) \cdot (2N+1)^{-n} \\ &\geq \frac{D_1 \delta}{2} \cdot \left(\frac{M}{3WN} \right)^n \geq \frac{D_1}{2 \cdot 6^n} \cdot \delta; \end{aligned} \quad (8.13)$$

it ensures the weighted density condition in the relative multidimensional Szemerédi theorem. On the smallness condition, we employ (8.11) and the estimate from above in the $(\rho, W, M, \mathbf{v}, S)$ -condition (2). Then, we have

$$\frac{1}{N} \cdot \mathbb{E}(\mathbf{1}_B \cdot \tilde{\lambda}^{r+1} \mid \mathfrak{a}(\mathbf{v}, N)) \leq D_2^{r+1} \cdot \frac{(\log M)^{r+1}}{M^{1-\varepsilon}}, \quad (8.14)$$

where $r := \#S - 1$.

Finally, we specify $\rho > 0$ and M_I so as to activate Theorem 5.4. We set $\rho = \rho_I(D_1, \mathbf{v}, \delta, S) := \rho_{\text{RMS}}(\mathbf{v}, \frac{D_1}{2 \cdot 6^n} \delta, S)$. Also, set $\gamma'_I = \gamma'_I(D_1, \mathbf{v}, \delta, S) > 0$ as $\gamma'_I := \gamma_{\text{RMS}}(\mathbf{v}, \frac{D_1}{2 \cdot 6^n} \delta, S)$. The arguments in the current proof up to this point work for a sufficiently large M depending on ε and δ ; if necessary, we replace M with a larger number depending on $D_1, D_2, \varepsilon, \mathbf{v}, \delta$ and S in such a way that

$$D_2^{r+1} \cdot (\log M)^{r+1} \leq \gamma'_I \cdot M^{1-\varepsilon}$$

holds true. Set M_I as the smallest positive integer which satisfies the inequality above.

Then, we may appeal to the relative multidimensional Szemerédi Theorem (Theorem 5.4); indeed, by (8.13) and (8.14), if $M \geq M_I$, then it applies to $B \subseteq \mathfrak{a}(\mathbf{v}, N)$. Therefore, there exists an S -constellation in B . Since $\text{Aff}_{W,b}(B) \subseteq A' \subseteq A$, we can find an S -constellation in A .

Finally, we make an estimate of $\mathcal{N}_S(A)$. By Theorem 5.5 and the estimate from above in the $(\rho, W, M, \mathbf{v}, S)$ -condition (2), we have

$$\frac{1}{N(2N+1)^n} \cdot \mathcal{N}_S(B) \cdot (D_2 \log M)^{r+1} \geq \gamma'_I.$$

Hence, by setting $\gamma_I = \gamma_I(D_1, D_2, S, \delta, \mathbf{v})$ as $\gamma_I := 2^n D_2^{-(r+1)} \gamma'_I$, we obtain

$$\mathcal{N}_S(B) \geq \gamma_I \cdot N^{n+1} (\log M)^{-(r+1)} \geq \gamma_I W^{-(n+1)} \cdot \frac{M^{n+1}}{(\log M)^{r+1}}.$$

Since $\mathcal{N}_S(B) \leq \mathcal{N}_S(A') \leq \mathcal{N}_S(A)$, this ends our proof. \square

Remark 8.13. Condition (2) in the definition of the $(\rho, W, M, \mathbf{v}, S)$ -condition involved a bound from above $\lambda(\alpha) \leq D_2 \cdot \log M$. If we only need to prove the existence part of Theorem 8.9, we may relax it to $o_{M \rightarrow \infty}(M^{\frac{1-\varepsilon}{r+1}})$, where ε is the constant appearing in the assumption $W \leq M^\varepsilon$. However, this makes the estimate of $\mathcal{N}_S(A)$ in Theorem 8.9 worse. Examples in this paper all obey estimates of the form $\lambda(\alpha) \leq D_2 \cdot \log M$.

In the last part of this subsection, we will prove Theorem 8.15 below as an application of Theorem 8.9. For the proof, we employ the following estimate from below.

Proposition 8.14. *Let $\boldsymbol{\omega}$ be an integral basis of K . Then there exist $C_{\mathcal{P}_K, \mathbf{I}}(\boldsymbol{\omega}) > 0$ and a positive integer $M_{\mathcal{P}_K, \mathbf{I}}(\boldsymbol{\omega})$ such that for every $M \geq M_{\mathcal{P}_K, \mathbf{I}}(\boldsymbol{\omega})$, the inequality*

$$\#(\mathcal{P}_K \cap \mathcal{O}_K(\boldsymbol{\omega}, M)) \geq C_{\mathcal{P}_K, \mathbf{I}}(\boldsymbol{\omega}) \cdot \frac{M^n}{\log M} \quad (8.15)$$

holds. In particular, for $\mathfrak{a} = \mathcal{O}_K$, the set $A = \mathcal{P}_K$ fulfills the two conditions (i), (ii) of Corollary 8.12.

Proof. First we will show (8.15). Take an NL-compatible \mathcal{O}_K^\times -fundamental domain \mathcal{D} ; such a \mathcal{D} exists by Proposition 4.11. Proposition 7.8 provides a constant $\tilde{C} = \tilde{C}(\boldsymbol{\omega}, \mathcal{D}) > 0$ depending on $\boldsymbol{\omega}$ and \mathcal{D} such that for sufficiently large M , the inequality

$$\#(\mathcal{P}_K \cap \mathcal{D} \cap \mathcal{O}_K(\boldsymbol{\omega}, M)) \geq \tilde{C} \cdot \frac{M^n}{\log M}$$

holds. Then we obtain (8.15) by observing that $\mathcal{P}_K \cap \mathcal{D} \subseteq \mathcal{P}_K$. The rest of the statement of Proposition 8.14 now immediately follows from (8.15) and Theorem 8.7. \square

Theorem 8.15 is a type 1 version of Theorem A, that means, we do not go into the point whether an S -constellation admits an associate pair. We will present the full proof of Theorem A in the latter part of the present section; for this, we will develop an axiomatic framework for constellation theorems of type 2. Note that, by Proposition 8.14, Corollary 8.12 implies the infinitary version of Theorem 8.15. For the reader's convenience, we sketch the proof of Theorem 8.15 itself.

Theorem 8.15. *Let K be a number field of degree n , and $\boldsymbol{\omega}$ an integral basis of K . Let $S \subseteq \mathcal{O}_K$ be a standard shape. Let $\delta > 0$. Then there exists a positive integer $M_{\text{PES}, \mathbf{I}} = M_{\text{PES}, \mathbf{I}}(\boldsymbol{\omega}, \delta, S)$ depending only on $\boldsymbol{\omega}$, δ and S such that the following holds true: if $M \geq M_{\text{PES}, \mathbf{I}}$ and if a subset A of $\mathcal{P}_K \cap \mathcal{O}_K(\boldsymbol{\omega}, M)$ satisfies*

$$\#A \geq \delta \cdot \#(\mathcal{P}_K \cap \mathcal{O}_K(\boldsymbol{\omega}, M)),$$

then there exists an S -constellation in A . Furthermore, there exist a constant $\gamma = \gamma_{\text{PES}, \mathbf{I}}(\boldsymbol{\omega}, \delta, S) > 0$, depending only on $\boldsymbol{\omega}$, δ and S , such that in the setting above,

$$\mathcal{N}_S(A) \geq \gamma \cdot \frac{M^{n+1}}{(\log M)^{\#S}}$$

holds.

Proof. Recall that we have fixed χ to obtain $M_{\mathcal{P}_K, S\Psi_{\log}}(\rho, \boldsymbol{\omega}, S) = M_{\mathcal{P}_K, S\Psi_{\log}}(\rho, \boldsymbol{\omega}, \chi, S)$ in the proof of Theorem 8.7. Set $D := \kappa \cdot (17(r+1)2^r \cdot c_\chi)^{-1}$. Set $\rho := \rho_{\mathbb{I}}(D, \boldsymbol{\omega}, \delta \cdot C_{\mathcal{P}_K, \mathbb{I}}(\boldsymbol{\omega}), S)$. Define

$$M_{\mathcal{P}_K, \mathbb{I}} := \max\{M_{\mathcal{P}_K, \mathbb{I}}(\boldsymbol{\omega}), M_{\mathcal{P}_K, S\Psi_{\log}}(\rho, \boldsymbol{\omega}, S), M_{\mathbb{I}}(D, D, 3/4, \boldsymbol{\omega}, \delta \cdot C_{\mathcal{P}_K, \mathbb{I}}(\boldsymbol{\omega}), S)\}.$$

Then, for $M \geq M_{\mathcal{P}_K, \mathbb{I}}$ and for $A \subseteq \mathcal{P}_K \cap \mathcal{O}_K(\boldsymbol{\omega}, M)$ with $\#A \geq \delta \cdot \#(\mathcal{P}_K \cap \mathcal{O}_K(\boldsymbol{\omega}, M))$, Proposition 8.14 implies that

$$\#A \geq \delta \cdot C_{\mathcal{P}_K, \mathbb{I}}(\boldsymbol{\omega}) \cdot \frac{M^n}{\log M}.$$

Hence by Theorem 8.7 and Lemma 8.6 (1), A satisfies the $(\rho, W, M, \boldsymbol{\omega}, S)$ -condition with parameters $(D, D, 3/4)$, where $W = W_{\mathcal{P}_K, S\Psi_{\log}}(\rho, S)$. Therefore, Theorem 8.9 applies to A , and we can find an S -constellation in A . Observing that W is independent of M , we obtain the desired estimate of $\mathcal{N}_S(A)$. \square

Remark 8.16. In the seminal work [BS20], Bloom and Sisask have proved the existence of an absolute constant $c > 0$ such that every $A \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ with

$$\limsup_{M \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\#(A \cap [M])}{M(\log M)^{-(1+c)}} > 0$$

contains infinitely many 3-APs. Hence, in the case where $K = \mathbb{Q}$ and $S = \{-1, 0, 1\}$ is fixed, condition (ii) in Theorem 8.10 is redundant.

8.3 Counting prime elements from above

In Subsection 8.4, we will upgrade Theorem 8.15 to its type 2 version, Theorem A. The key to this upgrading is counting prime elements from above. In this subsection, as a prototype of this counting, we will make an estimate of $\#(\mathcal{P}_K \cap \mathcal{O}_K(\boldsymbol{\omega}, M))$ from above; see also Remark 8.19.

Proposition 8.17. *Let $\boldsymbol{\omega}$ be an integral basis of K . Then there exist a constant $C_{\mathcal{P}_K, \mathbb{II}}(\boldsymbol{\omega}) > 0$ and a positive integer $M_{\mathcal{P}_K, \mathbb{II}}(\boldsymbol{\omega})$ such that for every $M \geq M_{\mathcal{P}_K, \mathbb{II}}(\boldsymbol{\omega})$, the inequality*

$$\#(\mathcal{P}_K \cap \mathcal{O}_K(\boldsymbol{\omega}, M)) \leq C_{\mathcal{P}_K, \mathbb{II}}(\boldsymbol{\omega}) \cdot \frac{M^n}{\log M}$$

holds true.

Recall the definition of the logarithmic integral Li :

$$\text{Li}(L) := \int_2^L \frac{dt}{\log t} = (1 + o_{L \rightarrow \infty}(1)) \cdot \frac{L}{\log L}. \quad (8.16)$$

The following lemma will be employed in the proof of Proposition 8.17.

Lemma 8.18. *For every $k \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$, there exists a constant $C_{\text{Li}}(k) > 0$ such that for every $L, \eta \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 2}$, the inequalities*

$$\int_2^L \frac{1}{\log t} \left\{ \log \left(\frac{\eta L}{t} \right) \right\}^k dt \leq C_{\text{Li}}(k) \cdot (\log \eta)^k \cdot \frac{L}{\log L} \quad (8.17)$$

and

$$\int_2^L \frac{1}{\log t} \left\{ \log \left(\frac{L}{t} \right) \right\}^k dt \leq C_{\text{Li}}(k) \cdot \frac{L}{\log L} \quad (8.18)$$

hold true.

Proof. First, we will prove (8.17) by induction on k . For $k = 0$, this follows from (8.16). Now we proceed to the induction step. We will reduce the assertion for $k \geq 1$ to that for $k - 1$. By integration by parts, we have

$$\int_2^L \frac{1}{\log t} \left\{ \log \left(\frac{\eta L}{t} \right) \right\}^k dt = \text{Li}(L) \cdot (\log \eta)^k + k \cdot \int_2^L \frac{\text{Li}(t)}{t} \left\{ \log \left(\frac{\eta L}{t} \right) \right\}^{k-1} dt.$$

By noting that $(\log \eta)^k \geq (\log 2)(\log \eta)^{k-1}$, we can make the desired reduction; recall also (8.16). Therefore, (8.17) holds.

Next we will prove (8.18). Apply (8.17) with $\eta = e > 2$, and obtain

$$\int_2^L \frac{1}{\log t} \left\{ \log \left(\frac{eL}{t} \right) \right\}^k dt \leq C_{\text{Li}}(k) \cdot \frac{L}{\log L}.$$

Since $\int_2^L \frac{1}{\log t} \left\{ \log \left(\frac{eL}{t} \right) \right\}^k dt \geq \int_2^L \frac{1}{\log t} \left\{ \log \left(\frac{L}{t} \right) \right\}^k dt$, we conclude (8.18). \square

Proof of Proposition 8.17. Let r_1 and r_2 be the numbers, respectively, of real embeddings and of imaginary embeddings. Let $k := r_1 + r_2 - 1$. Take the constant $\Xi = \Xi(\boldsymbol{\omega}) > 0$ as in Lemma 4.14 (1) in such a way that $C' \leq \Xi$, where $C' = C'(\boldsymbol{\omega})$ is as in (NLC). In particular, for every $\pi \in \mathcal{P}_K \cap \mathcal{O}_K(\boldsymbol{\omega}, M)$, we have $\mathbf{N}(\pi) \in [2, \Xi M^n]_{\mathbb{R}} \cap \mathbb{Z}$. For each $t \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 2}$, set

$$p_K(t) := \#\{\mathfrak{p} \in |\text{Spec}(\mathcal{O}_K)|^{\text{PI}} : \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{p}) = t\},$$

and for every $L \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 2}$, define

$$P_K(L) := \sum_{t \in [2, L]_{\mathbb{R}} \cap \mathbb{Z}} p_K(t).$$

By Theorem 3.21 (1), there exists $C_{\text{Lan}} = C_{\text{Lan}}(K) > 0$ such that for every $L \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 2}$,

$$P_K(L) \leq C_{\text{Lan}} \cdot \frac{L}{\log L} \quad (8.19)$$

holds true; this rough estimate suffices for the present proof. If $k = 0$, in other words, if $\#(\mathcal{O}_K^\times) < \infty$, then (8.19) already provides the desired estimate. In what follows, we treat the case where $k \geq 1$.

Focus on the map $\mathcal{P}_K \cap \mathcal{O}_K(\boldsymbol{\omega}, M) \ni \pi \mapsto \pi \mathcal{O}_K \in |\text{Spec}(\mathcal{O}_K)|^{\text{PI}}$. By considering the multiplicities of this map, we derive the following inequality from Lemma 4.14 (1):

$$\#(\mathcal{P}_K \cap \mathcal{O}_K(\boldsymbol{\omega}, M)) \leq \Xi \cdot \sum_{t \in [2, \Xi M^n]_{\mathbb{R}} \cap \mathbb{Z}} p_K(t) \left\{ \log \left(\frac{\Xi M^n}{t} \right) \right\}^k.$$

By Abel's summation formula (see [HW08, Theorem 421]), this implies that

$$\#(\mathcal{P}_K \cap \mathcal{O}_K(\boldsymbol{\omega}, M)) \leq k\Xi \cdot \int_2^{\Xi M^n} \frac{P_K(t)}{t} \left\{ \log \left(\frac{\Xi M^n}{t} \right) \right\}^{k-1} dt.$$

Recall (8.19), and apply (8.18) with k replaced by $k-1$ and with $L = \Xi M^n$. Then, we obtain the desired estimate for the case of $k \geq 1$. It completes our proof. \square

Remark 8.19. Proposition 8.14 and Proposition 8.17 assert that

$$0 < \liminf_{M \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\#(\mathcal{P}_K \cap \mathcal{O}_K(\boldsymbol{\omega}, M))}{M^n (\log M)^{-1}} \quad \text{and} \quad \limsup_{M \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\#(\mathcal{P}_K \cap \mathcal{O}_K(\boldsymbol{\omega}, M))}{M^n (\log M)^{-1}} < \infty$$

for a fixed $\boldsymbol{\omega}$. Mitsui's generalized prime number theorem [Mit56, Corollary on p.35] implies that the limit infimum and limit supremum coincide and the common limit is equal to $2^n/\kappa$ (where 2^n reflects the count $\#\mathcal{O}_K(\boldsymbol{\omega}, M) = (2M+1)^n$). See [KRE20, Theorem 2, 3] for the details of this deduction. However, we chose not to use Mitsui's theorem partly because its proof is considerably more involved than the total effort needed to establish the inequalities above.

8.4 Reduction to the case of a fixed fundamental domain

In this subsection, we present our axiomatic framework for constellation theorems *of type 2*, i.e., constellation theorems that ensure the existence of constellations *without associate pairs*. Recall that two non-zero elements in an ideal \mathfrak{a} are said to be *associate* if they are in the same orbit of the multiplication action $\mathcal{O}_K^\times \curvearrowright \mathfrak{a} \setminus \{0\}$.

The technical key here is Theorem 8.22; the main results are Theorem 8.23 (finitary version) and Theorem 8.24 (infinitary version).

With the aid of them, Theorem A and Theorem 1.4 will be established.

Lemma 8.20. *Assume Setting 8.1. Let $\Omega > 0$ and $M \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 1}$. Assume that $A \subseteq \mathfrak{a}(\mathbf{v}, M) \setminus \{0\}$ satisfies*

$$\#(A \setminus \mathcal{O}_K(\Omega M^n)) \geq \frac{1}{2} \cdot \#A. \quad (8.20)$$

Then there exist a constant $c_{\Omega, \mathbf{v}} \in (0, 1]_{\mathbb{R}}$, depending only on Ω , \mathbf{v} , and a subset $A_0 \subseteq A \setminus \mathcal{O}_K(\Omega M^n)$ such that the following hold true:

- (1) $\#A_0 \geq c_{\Omega, \mathbf{v}} \cdot \#A$,
- (2) *the subset A_0 admits no associate pairs.*

Proof. Let $k := r_1 + r_2 - 1$ be the rank of $\overline{\mathcal{O}_K^\times}$. Take $\Xi = \Xi(\mathbf{v}) > 0$ as in Corollary 4.16 (1). Then, for every $\alpha \in \mathfrak{a}(\mathbf{v}, M) \setminus (\{0\} \cup \mathcal{O}_K(\Omega M^n))$, there exist at most $\Xi \cdot \left\{ \log \left(\frac{\Xi}{\Omega} \right) \right\}^k$ elements in $\mathfrak{a}(\mathbf{v}, M) \setminus \{0\}$ which are associate to α . Set

$$c_{\Omega, \mathbf{v}} := \frac{1}{2\Xi} \cdot \left\{ \log \left(\frac{\Xi}{\Omega} \right) \right\}^{-k}.$$

Consider the quotient set of $A \setminus \mathcal{O}_K(\Omega M^n)$ by the equivalence relation of being associate. Take a complete system of representatives for this, and write A_0 for it. Then, under (8.20), we have (1) with the constant $c_{\Omega, \mathbf{v}}$ as defined above. By construction of A_0 , (2) also holds. \square

We remark that Lemma 8.20 (2) may be rephrased as follows: there exists a fundamental domain \mathcal{D} for the action $\mathcal{O}_K^\times \curvearrowright \mathfrak{a} \setminus \{0\}$ such that $A_0 \subseteq A \cap \mathcal{D}$ holds. Also (1) asserts that the counting in A is comparable to that in A_0 , as long as Ω is fixed. Hence, in order to reduce the general case of A to that of fixing a fundamental domain, it suffices to find $\Omega > 0$ for A in a certain controlled way.

The following proposition provides a criterion on A for which such a controlled constant $\Omega > 0$ exists.

Proposition 8.21. *Assume Setting 8.1. Let $\delta > 0$ and $\Delta > 0$. Then, there exist a constant $\Omega = \Omega_{\text{red}}(\mathbf{v}, \delta, \Delta) > 0$ and a positive integer $M_{\text{red}} = M_{\text{red}}(\mathbf{v}, \delta, \Delta)$ such that for all $M \geq M_{\text{red}}$, the following holds true: if $A \subseteq \mathfrak{a}(\mathbf{v}, M) \setminus \{0\}$ satisfies that*

$$\text{for all } L \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 2}, \quad \#\{\alpha \mathcal{O}_K \in \text{Ideals}_K : \alpha \in A \cap \mathcal{O}_K(L)\} \leq \Delta \cdot \frac{L}{\log L}, \quad (8.21)$$

then we have

$$\#(A \cap \mathcal{O}_K(\Omega M^n)) \leq \delta \cdot \frac{M^n}{\log M}. \quad (8.22)$$

Note that in the count in (8.21), we count *ideals* instead of the elements themselves.

Proof. Let $k := r_1 + r_2 - 1$ be the rank of $\overline{\mathcal{O}_K^\times}$. For $k = 0$, we can set

$$\Omega := \frac{\delta n}{2\#\mu(K) \cdot \Delta}.$$

Indeed, (8.21) directly ensures (8.22); note that for a sufficiently large M depending on δ , Δ and K , we have $\Omega M^n \geq M^{n/2}$.

Hence, in what follows, we focus on the case of $k \geq 1$; in particular, we have $n \geq 2$ in this case. We will generalize the argument of the proof of Proposition 8.17 in the following manner. For each $t \in \mathbb{N}$, define $h_A(t) := \#\{\alpha \mathcal{O}_K \in \text{Ideals}_K : \alpha \in A, \mathbf{N}(\alpha) = t\}$, and for each $L \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 1}$, set $H_A(L) := \sum_{t \in [1, L]_{\mathbb{R}} \cap \mathbb{Z}} h_A(t)$. Then, assumption (8.21) is equivalent to saying that

$$\text{for all } L \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 2}, \quad H_A(L) \leq \Delta \cdot \frac{L}{\log L}. \quad (8.23)$$

Take a constant $\Xi = \Xi(\mathbf{v})$ as in Corollary 4.16 (1) with $\Xi \geq 2$. Take a parameter $\theta \in (0, 1)_{\mathbb{R}}$; we will indicate its value later. Then, Corollary 4.16 (1) implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \#(A \cap \mathcal{O}_K(\theta M^n)) &\leq \Xi \cdot \sum_{t \in [1, \theta M^n]_{\mathbb{R}} \cap \mathbb{Z}} h_A(t) \left\{ \log \left(\frac{\Xi M^n}{t} \right) \right\}^k \\ &\leq \Xi \cdot \left(\left\{ \log(\Xi M^n) \right\}^k + \sum_{t \in [2, \theta M^n]_{\mathbb{R}} \cap \mathbb{Z}} h_A(t) \left\{ \log \left(\frac{\Xi M^n}{t} \right) \right\}^k \right). \end{aligned} \quad (8.24)$$

Indeed, note that $h_A(1) \leq 1$. Since $\{\log(\Xi M^n)\}^k$, as a function of M , has a smaller order than $M^n / \log M$, we have for a sufficiently large M depending on \mathbf{v} ,

$$\Xi \cdot \{\log(\Xi M^n)\}^k \leq \frac{1}{2} \delta \cdot \frac{M^n}{\log M}. \quad (8.25)$$

In what follows, we will make estimates of $\sum_{t \in [2, \theta M^n]_{\mathbb{R}} \cap \mathbb{Z}} h_A(t) \left\{ \log \left(\frac{\Xi M^n}{t} \right) \right\}^k$ appearing in (8.24).

By Abel's summation formula, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{t \in [2, \theta M^n]_{\mathbb{R}} \cap \mathbb{Z}} h_A(t) \left\{ \log \left(\frac{\Xi M^n}{t} \right) \right\}^k \\ &\leq H_A(\theta M^n) \left\{ \log \left(\frac{\Xi}{\theta} \right) \right\}^k + k \cdot \int_2^{\theta M^n} \frac{H_A(t)}{t} \left\{ \log \left(\frac{\Xi M^n}{t} \right) \right\}^{k-1} dt. \end{aligned}$$

By assumption (8.23), the value $\sum_{t \in [2, \theta M^n]_{\mathbb{R}} \cap \mathbb{Z}} h_A(t) \left\{ \log \left(\frac{\Xi M^n}{t} \right) \right\}^k$ does not exceed the following:

$$\Delta \cdot \frac{\theta M^n}{\log(\theta M^n)} \left\{ \log \left(\frac{\Xi}{\theta} \right) \right\}^k + k \Delta \cdot \int_2^{\theta M^n} \frac{1}{\log t} \left\{ \log \left(\frac{\Xi M^n}{t} \right) \right\}^{k-1} dt.$$

The second term is estimated as follows: apply (8.17) with k replaced by $k - 1$ and with $\eta = \Xi/\theta$ and $L = \theta M^n$. Then, with the constant $C = k C_{\text{Li}}(k - 1)$, we have

$$k \Delta \cdot \int_2^{\theta M^n} \frac{1}{\log t} \left\{ \log \left(\frac{\Xi M^n}{t} \right) \right\}^{k-1} dt \leq C \Delta \cdot \frac{\theta M^n}{\log(\theta M^n)} \left\{ \log \left(\frac{\Xi}{\theta} \right) \right\}^{k-1}.$$

Hence, if $M \geq 1/\theta$, then we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{t \in [2, \theta M^n]_{\mathbb{R}} \cap \mathbb{Z}} h_A(t) \left\{ \log \left(\frac{\Xi M^n}{t} \right) \right\}^k \\ &\leq \frac{\theta \Delta}{n + \frac{\log \theta}{\log M}} \left(\left\{ \log \left(\frac{\Xi}{\theta} \right) \right\}^k + C \left\{ \log \left(\frac{\Xi}{\theta} \right) \right\}^{k-1} \right) \cdot \frac{M^n}{\log M} \\ &\leq \frac{\theta \Delta}{n - 1} \left(\left\{ \log \left(\frac{\Xi}{\theta} \right) \right\}^k + C \left\{ \log \left(\frac{\Xi}{\theta} \right) \right\}^{k-1} \right) \cdot \frac{M^n}{\log M}. \end{aligned}$$

There exists a real number $\theta \in (0, 1]_{\mathbb{R}}$, depending on δ , Δ and \mathbf{v} , such that

$$\frac{\theta\Delta}{n-1} \left(\left\{ \log \left(\frac{\Xi}{\theta} \right) \right\}^k + C \left\{ \log \left(\frac{\Xi}{\theta} \right) \right\}^{k-1} \right) \leq \frac{\delta}{2\Xi};$$

we take such a small θ , and write Ω for it. Take $M_{\text{red}} \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $M_{\text{red}} \geq 1/\Omega$ and that for all $M \geq M_{\text{red}}$, (8.25) holds. Then, by (8.24) and the arguments after this, we conclude that for every $M \geq M_{\text{red}}$,

$$\frac{\#(A \cap \mathcal{O}_K(\Omega M^n))}{M^n (\log M)^{-1}} \leq \frac{1}{2}\delta + \frac{1}{2}\delta = \delta;$$

this is the desired estimate. It completes our proof. \square

Proposition 8.21 together with Lemma 8.20 derives the following theorem.

Theorem 8.22 (Reduction to the case of fixing a fundamental domain). *Assume Setting 8.1. Let $\delta > 0$ and $\Delta > 0$. Then there exist $\delta' = \delta'_{\text{red}}(\mathbf{v}, \delta, \Delta) > 0$, $\Omega' = \Omega'_{\text{red}}(\mathbf{v}, \delta, \Delta) > 0$ and $M'_{\text{red}} = M'_{\text{red}}(\mathbf{v}, \delta, \Delta) \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for every $M \geq M'_{\text{red}}$, the following holds true. Let $A \subseteq \mathfrak{a}(\mathbf{v}, M) \setminus \{0\}$ be a set that satisfies (8.5) and (8.21). Then, there exist a fundamental domain \mathcal{D} for $\mathcal{O}_K^\times \curvearrowright (\mathfrak{a} \setminus \{0\})$ and a subset $A_0 \subseteq \mathcal{D}$ such that*

$$\#A_0 \geq \delta' \cdot \frac{M^n}{\log M} \tag{8.26}$$

and

$$A_0 \subseteq A \setminus \mathcal{O}_K(\Omega' M^n) \tag{8.27}$$

hold true.

Proof. Take $\Omega' = \Omega'_{\text{red}}(\mathbf{v}, \delta, \Delta) := \Omega_{\text{red}}(\mathbf{v}, \delta/2, \Delta)$ and $M'_{\text{red}}(\mathbf{v}, \delta, \Delta) := M_{\text{red}}(\mathbf{v}, \delta/2, \Delta)$. Let $A \subseteq \mathfrak{a}(\mathbf{v}, M) \setminus \{0\}$ be the set in the assertion of the theorem. Then, by assumption (8.21), Proposition 8.21 implies that

$$\#(A \cap \mathcal{O}_K(\Omega' M^n)) \leq \frac{\delta}{2} \cdot \frac{M^n}{\log M}.$$

By combining this with assumption (8.5), we have

$$\#(A \setminus \mathcal{O}_K(\Omega' M^n)) \geq \frac{1}{2} \cdot \#A.$$

Therefore, we can apply Lemma 8.20. This provides a subset $A_0 \subseteq A \setminus \mathcal{O}_K(\Omega' M^n)$ with $\#A_0 \geq c_\Omega \cdot \#A$ such that A_0 admits no associate pairs. This A_0 satisfies (8.27). Finally, to ensure (8.26), take an arbitrary fundamental domain \mathcal{D} for the \mathcal{O}_K^\times -action in such a way that $A_0 \subseteq \mathcal{D}$ holds. Then, set $\delta' := c_{\Omega', \mathbf{v}} \cdot \delta$. \square

Theorem 8.22 enables us to upgrade axiomatized constellation theorems of type 1 to those of type 2 in the following manner. Recall here that we have three axiomatized constellation theorems of type 1: Theorem 8.9, Theorem 8.10 and Corollary 8.12.

Theorem 8.23. *Assume Setting 8.1. Let $S \subseteq \mathfrak{a}$ be a standard shape. Let $\delta > 0$, $\Delta > 0$, $D_1, D_2 > 0$, and $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)_{\mathbb{R}}$. Then, there exist a positive real number $\rho = \rho_{\text{II}}(D_1, \mathbf{v}, \delta, \Delta, S) > 0$ and a positive integer $M_{\text{II}} = M_{\text{II}}(D_1, D_2, \varepsilon, \mathbf{v}, \delta, \Delta, S) \in \mathbb{N}$ such that the following holds true. Assume that $M \geq M_{\text{II}}$ and a set $A \subseteq \mathfrak{a}(\mathbf{v}, M) \setminus \{0\}$ fulfill the following three conditions:*

(i) *the inequality*

$$\#A \geq \delta \cdot \frac{M^n}{\log M}$$

holds,

(ii) *for every $L \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 2}$,*

$$\#\{\alpha \mathcal{O}_K \in \text{Ideals}_K : \alpha \in A \cap \mathcal{O}_K(L)\} \leq \Delta \cdot \frac{L}{\log L}$$

holds,

(iii) *A satisfies the (ρ, M, \mathbf{v}, S) -condition with parameters (D_1, D_2, ε) .*

Then, there exists an S -constellation without associate pairs in A . Furthermore, there exists $\gamma = \gamma_{\text{II}}(D_1, D_2, \mathbf{v}, \delta, \Delta, S) > 0$ such that

$$\mathcal{N}_S^\#(A) \geq \gamma W^{-(n+1)} \cdot \frac{M^{n+1}}{(\log M)^{\#S}}$$

holds true. Here, W is an integer appearing in the (ρ, M, \mathbf{v}, S) -condition, which comes from condition (iii).

Theorem 8.24. *Assume Setting 8.1. Assume that $A \subseteq \mathfrak{a} \setminus \{0\}$ fulfills the following three conditions:*

(i) *the inequality*

$$\limsup_{M \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\#(A \cap \mathfrak{a}(\mathbf{v}, M))}{M^n (\log M)^{-1}} > 0$$

holds,

(ii) *there exists $\Delta > 0$ such that for every $L \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 2}$,*

$$\#\{\alpha \mathcal{O}_K \in \text{Ideals}_K : \alpha \in A \cap \mathcal{O}_K(L)\} \leq \Delta \cdot \frac{L}{\log L}$$

holds,

(iii) *$A \in \text{S}\Psi_{\log}(\mathfrak{a})$.*

Then, for every finite subset $S \subseteq \mathfrak{a}$, there exists an S -constellation with no associate pairs in A .

Corollary 8.25. *Assume Setting 8.1. Assume that $A \subseteq \mathfrak{a} \setminus \{0\}$ fulfills the following three conditions:*

(i) *the inequality*

$$\liminf_{M \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\#(A \cap \mathfrak{a}(\mathbf{v}, M))}{M^n (\log M)^{-1}} > 0$$

holds,

(ii) *condition (ii) in Theorem 8.24 is satisfied,*

(iii) $A \in \mathcal{S}\Psi_{\log}(\mathfrak{a})$.

Then, for every $A' \subseteq A$ with $\bar{d}_{A, \mathbf{v}}(A') > 0$, the following holds true: for every finite subset $S \subseteq \mathfrak{a}$, there exists an S -constellation with no associate pairs in A' .

Remark 8.26. In the statement of Theorem 8.24, (ii) implies that the limit suprimum in (i) is finite. To verify this, run an argument similar to that of the proof of Proposition 8.17; examine also the proof of Proposition 8.21.

Proofs of Theorem 8.23, Theorem 8.24 and Corollary 8.25. First, we will prove Theorem 8.23. Set

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_{\text{II}}(D_1, \mathbf{v}, \delta, \Delta, S) &:= \rho_{\text{I}}(D_1, \mathbf{v}, \delta', S), \\ M_{\text{II}}(D_1, D_2, \varepsilon, \mathbf{v}, \delta, \Delta, S) &:= M_{\text{I}}(D_1, D_2, \varepsilon, \mathbf{v}, \delta', S), \\ \gamma_{\text{II}}(D_1, D_2, \mathbf{v}, \delta, \Delta, S) &:= \gamma_{\text{I}}(D_1, D_2, \mathbf{v}, \delta', S); \end{aligned}$$

here $\delta' = \delta'_{\text{red}}(\mathbf{v}, \delta, \Delta)$ is the one as in Theorem 8.22. Consider a set A that fulfills the three conditions of Theorem 8.23. Take an integer W appearing in an (ρ, M, \mathbf{v}, S) -condition, which comes from condition (iii). By assumptions (i) and (ii), Theorem 8.22 applies. Hence, there exist a fundamental domain \mathcal{D} for the \mathcal{O}_K^\times -action and a set $A_0 \subseteq \mathcal{D}$ such that (8.26) holds. Then, by Lemma 8.6 (1), A_0 satisfies the $(\rho, W, M, \mathbf{v}, S)$ -condition with parameters (D_1, D_2, ε) . Therefore, we can apply Theorem 8.9 to this A_0 and δ' , thus proving Theorem 8.23. Here, recall that since $A_0 \subseteq \mathcal{D}$, we have $\mathcal{N}_S^\#(A_0) = \mathcal{N}_S(A_0)$.

In a similar manner to the deduction of Theorem 8.10 from Theorem 8.9, we can deduce Theorem 8.24 from Theorem 8.23. We can also derive Corollary 8.25 from Theorem 8.24 in a way similar to the deduction of Corollary 8.12 from Theorem 8.10. Here, observe that assumption (ii) in Corollary 8.25 on A inherits to subsets. \square

Proposition 8.27. *For a number field K , $\mathcal{P}_K \subseteq \mathcal{O}_K \setminus \{0\}$ satisfies the three conditions in Corollary 8.25.*

Proof. We have already proved in Proposition 8.14 that \mathcal{P}_K satisfies assumptions (i) and (iii). By Theorem 3.21 (1), \mathcal{P}_K satisfies assumption (ii) as well. \square

Now we are ready to complete the proofs of Theorem A and Theorem 1.4.

Proofs of Theorem A and Theorem 1.4. Theorem 1.4 immediately follows from Proposition 8.27 and Corollary 8.25. Recall that we have shown Theorem 8.15 from Proposition 8.14, Theorem 8.7 and Theorem 8.9. In a manner similar to this, we can deduce Theorem A from Proposition 8.27 by replacing Theorem 8.9 with Theorem 8.23. Here, for the estimate of $\mathcal{N}_S^\sharp(A)$, recall that we can take W independently of M by Theorem 8.7. \square

In the last part of this subsection, we will prove the following theorem; it may be regarded as the infinitary version of Theorem 8.22.

Theorem 8.28 (Reduction to the case of fixing a fundamental domain, infinitary version). *Assume Setting 8.1. Assume that $A \subseteq \mathfrak{a} \setminus \{0\}$ satisfies condition (ii) of Theorem 8.24. Then the following hold true.*

- (1) *Assume that A satisfies condition (i) of Theorem 8.24. Then there exists an NL-compatible fundamental domain $\mathcal{D} = \mathcal{D}(A, \mathbf{v})$ for the action $\mathcal{O}_K^\times \curvearrowright (\mathfrak{a} \setminus \{0\})$ such that*

$$\limsup_{M \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\#(A \cap \mathcal{D} \cap \mathfrak{a}(\mathbf{v}, M))}{M^n (\log M)^{-1}} > 0 \quad (8.28)$$

holds true.

- (2) *Assume that A satisfies condition (i) in Corollary 8.25. Then there exists an NL-compatible fundamental domain $\mathcal{D}' = \mathcal{D}'(A, \mathbf{v})$ for the action $\mathcal{O}_K^\times \curvearrowright (\mathfrak{a} \setminus \{0\})$ such that*

$$\liminf_{M \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\#(A \cap \mathcal{D}' \cap \mathfrak{a}(\mathbf{v}, M))}{M^n (\log M)^{-1}} > 0 \quad (8.29)$$

holds true.

Note that the notion of the NL-compatibility is defined for subsets of \mathcal{O}_K ; in particular, it is defined for a subset of \mathfrak{a} . Also recall that for a fixed integral basis $\boldsymbol{\omega}$ of K , the restriction of $\|\cdot\|_{\infty, \boldsymbol{\omega}}$ on \mathfrak{a} is bi-Lipschitz equivalent to $\|\cdot\|_{\infty, \mathbf{v}}$.

Proof. There exists a constant $C' > 0$ depending only on \mathbf{v} such that for every $\alpha \in \mathfrak{a} \setminus \{0\}$, $\mathbf{N}(\alpha) \leq C' \|\alpha\|_{\infty, \mathbf{v}}^n$ holds. Indeed, this can be verified in a similar manner to the proof of Lemma 4.8. We fix such $C' > 0$ in the present proof.

First, we will prove (1). Since condition (i) in Theorem 8.24 is fulfilled, there exist a strictly increasing positive real sequence $(M_l)_{l \in \mathbb{N}}$ with $\lim_{l \rightarrow \infty} M_l = \infty$ and $\delta > 0$ such that for every $l \in \mathbb{N}$, the inequality

$$\frac{\#(A \cap \mathfrak{a}(\mathbf{v}, M_l))}{M_l^n (\log M_l)^{-1}} \geq \delta$$

holds. Take constants $\delta' = \delta'_{\text{red}}(\mathbf{v}, \delta, \Delta) > 0$, $\Omega' = \Omega'_{\text{red}}(\mathbf{v}, \delta, \Delta) > 0$ and $M'_{\text{red}} = M'_{\text{red}}(\mathbf{v}, \delta, \Delta) \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ as in Theorem 8.22 associated with δ and with Δ appearing in condition (ii) of Theorem 8.24. By passing to a subsequence of $(M_l)_{l \in \mathbb{N}}$ if necessary, we may assume that $M_1 \geq M'_{\text{red}}$

and that for every $l \in \mathbb{N}$, the inequality

$$M_{l+1} \geq \left(\frac{C'}{\Omega'} \right)^{\frac{1}{n}} M_l \tag{8.30}$$

holds. Note that (8.30) implies that

$$\Omega' M_1^n < C' M_1^n \leq \Omega' M_2^n \leq C' M_2^n \leq \Omega' M_3^n \leq C' M_3^n \leq \Omega' M_4^n \leq \dots \tag{8.31}$$

Let $l \in \mathbb{N}$. Apply Theorem 8.22 to $A \cap \mathfrak{a}(\mathbf{v}, M_l)$; then we can find $A_0^{(l)} \subseteq A \cap \mathfrak{a}(\mathbf{v}, M_l)$ which admits no associate pairs such that

$$\#A_0^{(l)} \geq \delta' \cdot \frac{M_l^n}{\log M_l} \tag{8.32}$$

and that for every $\alpha \in A_0^{(l)}$, the inequality

$$\Omega' M_l^n < \mathbf{N}(\alpha) \leq C' M_l^n \tag{8.33}$$

holds. Thus, we obtain a family of sets $(A_0^{(l)})_{l \in \mathbb{N}}$. Set

$$A_0 := \bigsqcup_{l \in \mathbb{N}} A_0^{(l)}. \tag{8.34}$$

Here, we can show that the union in the right-hand side of (8.34) is indeed a disjoint union in the following manner: by (8.33) and (8.31), for distinct $l_1, l_2 \in \mathbb{N}$, the intersection of $\mathbf{N}(A_0^{(l_1)})$ and $\mathbf{N}(A_0^{(l_2)})$ is empty. This argument, furthermore, implies that A_0 admits no associate pairs. By (8.33), A_0 is NL-compatible; recall the remark after the statement of Theorem 8.28. Take an NL-compatible \mathcal{O}_K^\times -fundamental domain $\mathcal{D}_0 \subseteq \mathcal{O}_K \setminus \{0\}$ with the aid of Proposition 4.11. Set $\mathcal{D}_1 := (\mathcal{D}_0 \cap \mathfrak{a}) \setminus (\mathcal{O}_K^\times \cdot A_0)$ and $\mathcal{D} := A_0 \sqcup \mathcal{D}_1$. Then since A_0 does not admit an associate pair, by construction of \mathcal{D} , this \mathcal{D} is a fundamental domain for the action $\mathcal{O}_K^\times \curvearrowright \mathfrak{a} \setminus \{0\}$. Moreover, \mathcal{D} is NL-compatible: indeed, it is the union of two NL-compatible sets A_0 and \mathcal{D}_1 . By (8.32) and (8.34), we have (8.28). Therefore, we have proved (1).

Secondly, we will show (2). By condition (i) in Corollary 8.25, there exists $\delta > 0$ such that for every sufficiently large M , the inequality

$$\frac{\#(A \cap \mathfrak{a}(\mathbf{v}, M))}{M^n (\log M)^{-1}} \geq \delta \tag{8.35}$$

holds. Take constants $\delta' = \delta'_{\text{red}}(\mathbf{v}, \delta, \Delta) > 0$, $\Omega' = \Omega'_{\text{red}}(\mathbf{v}, \delta, \Delta) > 0$ and $M'_0 = M'_{\text{red}}(\mathbf{v}, \delta, \Delta) \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ as in Theorem 8.22 associated with this δ and Δ appearing in condition (ii) of Theorem 8.24. By replacing M'_0 with a bigger number if necessary, we may assume that for every $M \geq M'_0$, (8.35) holds. Now, define a sequence $(M_l)_{l \in \mathbb{N}}$ inductively as follows: set $M_1 := M'_0$ and for each $l \in \mathbb{N}$, set

$$M_{l+1} := \left(\frac{C'}{\Omega'} \right)^{\frac{1}{n}} M_l. \tag{8.36}$$

Note that (8.31) holds by construction.

From this sequence $(M_l)_{l \in \mathbb{N}}$, construct $(A_0^{(l)})_{l \in \mathbb{N}}$ and an NL-compatible fundamental domain \mathcal{D}' for $\mathcal{O}_K^\times \curvearrowright \mathfrak{a} \setminus \{0\}$ in the same manner as in the proof of (1). What remains to verify is that \mathcal{D}' fulfills (8.29). Take an arbitrary $M \geq M'_0$. Then by (8.36), there exists $l \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$M_l \leq M < \left(\frac{C'}{\Omega'}\right)^{\frac{1}{n}} M_l \quad (8.37)$$

holds. For this $l \in \mathbb{N}$, we note that $A \cap \mathcal{D}' \cap \mathfrak{a}(\mathbf{v}, M) \supseteq A_0^{(l)}$. Hence by (8.35), the definition of δ' and (8.37), we conclude that

$$\frac{\#(A \cap \mathcal{D}' \cap \mathfrak{a}(\mathbf{v}, M))}{M^n (\log M)^{-1}} \geq \left(\frac{M_l}{M}\right)^n \cdot \frac{\log M}{\log M_l} \cdot \delta' \geq \frac{\Omega'}{C'} \cdot \delta',$$

thus proving (8.29). It completes our proof. \square

Here we state the reduction theorem again, which was mentioned as Theorem 2.11 in Section 2.

Corollary 8.29 (Theorem 2.11, restated). *Let K be a number field and ω an integral basis. Assume that $A \subseteq \mathcal{P}_K$ satisfies $\bar{d}_{\mathcal{P}_K, \omega}(A) > 0$. Then there exists an NL-compatible \mathcal{O}_K^\times -fundamental domain $\mathcal{D} = \mathcal{D}(A, \omega)$ such that*

$$\bar{d}_{\mathcal{P}_K \cap \mathcal{D}, \omega}(A \cap \mathcal{D}) > 0$$

holds.

Proof. Recall that we have estimates of the number of prime elements, both from above and below, from Proposition 7.8 and Proposition 8.17. Then, apply Theorem 8.28 (1) to A . \square

Remark 8.30. By Propositions 7.8, 8.17 and Corollary 8.29, constellation theorems in a given NL-compatible fundamental domain and ones without mention of NL-compatible domains are in fact equivalent.

9 Szemerédi-type theorems for short intervals

The main goal of this section is to prove the finitary version of the Szemerédi-type theorem for short intervals in prime elements of number fields (Theorem B). For the rational field \mathbb{Q} , a stronger form of the Green–Tao theorem for short intervals is proved; see Theorem 9.3 and Theorem 9.4.

In Subsection 9.2, we first prove a stronger form of the Green–Tao theorem for short intervals, and later in Subsection 9.5, Theorem B will be established. A notable difference between the proof of Theorem B and that of Theorem 9.3, which arises when $[K : \mathbb{Q}] \geq 2$, is overcome by sophisticated use of the pigeonhole principle. This technique is commonly used in combinatorics; we call this the *slide trick*, and present it in Subsection 9.3. In Subsection 9.6, we prove Theorem 9.22 as an application of our constellation theorems for short intervals; Theorem 9.22 plays a key role in Section 10.

9.1 Statements of the theorems for short intervals

Setting 9.1. Let K be a number field of degree n . Let ω be an integral basis of K .

Recall from Definition 2.5 that the ℓ_∞ -interval $\mathcal{O}_K(\omega, x, M)$ for $x \in \mathcal{O}_K$ and $M \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ is defined as

$$\mathcal{O}_K(\omega, x, M) := \{\alpha \in \mathcal{O}_K : \|\alpha - x\|_{\infty, \omega} \leq M\}.$$

We say this $\mathcal{O}_K(\omega, x, M)$ is a ‘short interval’ if M is sufficiently small compared to $\|x\|_{\infty, \omega}$. Our concern in this section is to prove the existence of a constellation in short intervals in the sense above. Informally speaking, this amounts to proving the following statements (I) and (II). Note that, it is possible to formulate Szemerédi-type theorems after suitable modifications. We state, however, as constellation theorems for the set \mathcal{P}_K for brevity. Let $f: \mathbb{R}_{>0} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ be a monotonically non-decreasing function which diverges to infinity slower than the identity function $t \mapsto t$.

- (I) For every finite set $S \subseteq \mathcal{O}_K$, there exists a sequence $(y_l)_{l \in \mathbb{N}}$ in \mathcal{O}_K with $\|y_l\|_{\infty, \omega} \rightarrow \infty$ such that, for each $l \in \mathbb{N}$, there exists an S -constellation in $\mathcal{P}_K \cap \mathcal{O}_K(\omega, y_l, f(\|y_l\|_{\infty, \omega}))$.
- (II) For every finite set $S \subseteq \mathcal{O}_K$, there exists $M \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ such that, for each $x \in \mathcal{O}_K$ with $\|x\|_{\infty, \omega} \geq M$, there exists an S -constellation in $\mathcal{P}_K \cap \mathcal{O}_K(\omega, x, f(\|x\|_{\infty, \omega}))$.

We refer to (II) the *strong form* for short intervals, because the assertion (II) implies (I).

For the case $K = \mathbb{Q}$, we prove the strong form (II), as follows.

Theorem 9.2 (The Green–Tao theorem for short intervals: strong version). *Let $a \in (0, 1)_{\mathbb{R}}$, and assume that there exists $\delta > 0$ such that, for a sufficiently large $M > 0$,*

$$\#(\mathcal{P} \cap [M, M + M^a]_{\mathbb{R}}) \geq \delta \cdot \frac{M^a}{\log M} \tag{9.1}$$

holds. Then we have the following, where k is an integer with $k \geq 3$.

- (1) *There exists $M_{\text{GTSI}} = M_{\text{GTSI}}(a, \delta, k) \in \mathbb{N}$ depending only on a, δ and k such that, for every $M \in \mathbb{R}$ with $M \geq M_{\text{GTSI}}$, $\mathcal{P} \cap [M, M + M^a]_{\mathbb{R}}$ contains an arithmetic progression of length k .*
- (2) *Moreover, there exists $\gamma = \gamma_{\text{GTSI}}(a, \delta, k) > 0$, depending only on a, δ and k , such that for every $M \in \mathbb{R}$ with $M \geq M_{\text{GTSI}}$,*

$$\mathcal{N}_k(\mathcal{P} \cap [M, M + M^a]_{\mathbb{R}}) \geq \gamma \cdot \frac{M^{2a}}{(\log M)^k}$$

holds. Here, for a finite subset $X \subseteq \mathbb{Z}$, $\mathcal{N}_k(X)$ denotes the number of arithmetic progressions (as sets) of length k in X .

We prove Theorem 9.2 in Subsection 9.2. As for the possible values of a in (9.1), that is, ‘prime number theorem in short intervals,’ a number of results are known; see [BHP01] and references therein. Among those, we mention the celebrated result of Baker–Harman–Pintz.

Theorem 9.3 ([BHP01, p.562]). *For a sufficiently large real number M , we have*

$$\#(\mathcal{P} \cap [M, M + M^{0.525}]_{\mathbb{R}}) \geq \frac{9}{100} \cdot \frac{M^{0.525}}{\log M}.$$

This theorem implies the following unconditional result:

Theorem 9.4. *Assertions (1) and (2) of Theorem 9.2 hold for $a = 0.525$ and $\delta = 0.09$.*

The strong form for short version, that is, the assertion of Theorem 9.2 makes sense only for real numbers a satisfying (9.1). This requires deep results in the theory of distribution of primes. Under the Riemann hypothesis, we can ensure (9.1) for the range $a > \frac{1}{2}$.

For a general number field K , we are content with the assertion (I), which is weaker than the strong form (II). While no results are needed from the theory of distribution of primes, we need an additional argument beyond those done in Section 8, namely, the slide trick.

Theorem 9.5 (Theorem B, restated). *Let K be a number field and ω an integral basis of K . Let δ be a positive real number and S a finite subset of \mathcal{O}_K . Take a real number a with $0 < a < 1$. Then the following hold.*

- (1) *There exist a positive integer $M_{\text{PESSI}} = M_{\text{PESSI}}(\omega, \delta, S, a)$, depending on ω, δ, S and a , and a positive real number $\eta = \eta_{\text{PESSI}}(\omega, \delta) > 0$, depending only on ω and δ , such that the following holds: if $M \geq M_{\text{PESSI}}$ and a subset A of $\mathcal{P}_K \cap \mathcal{O}_K(\omega, M)$ satisfies*

$$\#A \geq \delta \cdot \#(\mathcal{P}_K \cap \mathcal{O}_K(\omega, M)), \quad (9.2)$$

then there exists $x \in A$ with

$$\eta M \leq \|x\|_{\infty, \omega} \leq M \quad (9.3)$$

such that $A \cap \mathcal{O}_K(\omega, x, \|x\|_{\infty, \omega}^a)$ contains an S -constellation without associate pairs.

- (2) *If S is a standard shape, then there exists a constant $\gamma = \gamma_{\text{PESSI}}(\omega, \delta, S, a) > 0$, depending on ω, δ, S and a , such that the following holds: if $M \geq M_{\text{PESSI}}$ and a subset A of $\mathcal{P}_K \cap \mathcal{O}_K(\omega, M)$ satisfies (9.2), then there exists $x \in A$ with (9.3) which satisfies*

$$\mathcal{N}_S^\#(A \cap \mathcal{O}_K(\omega, x, \|x\|_{\infty, \omega}^a)) \geq \gamma \cdot \frac{M^{a(n+1)}}{(\log M)^{\#S}}.$$

The following corollary is an infinitary version of Theorem B (= Theorem 9.5).

Corollary 9.6. *Let K be a number field, and let ω be an integral basis of K . If a subset $A \subseteq \mathcal{P}_K$ satisfies*

$$\bar{d}_{\mathcal{P}_K, \omega}(A) > 0,$$

then there exists a sequence $(y_l)_{l \in \mathbb{N}}$ in A satisfying the following: for every $a \in (0, 1)_{\mathbb{R}}$ and every finite set $S \subseteq A$, there exists a finite subset $L \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ such that for all $l \in \mathbb{N} \setminus L$, the set $A \cap \mathcal{O}_K(\omega, y_l, \|y_l\|_{\infty, \omega}^a)$ contains an S -constellation consisting of pairwise non-associate elements.

The proofs of Theorem 9.5 and of Corollary 9.6 will be presented in Subsection 9.5.

Remark 9.7. The statement of the form (I) for the case $K = \mathbb{Q}$ in terms of upper density can be found in [TZ08, Remark 2.4], as follows. Let k be an integer with $k \geq 3$. If $A \subseteq \mathcal{P}$ satisfies $\bar{d}_{\mathcal{P}}(A) > 0$, then for every $a > 0$, there is a sequence of real numbers $(M_l)_{l \in \mathbb{N}}$ tending to ∞ such that, $A \cap [M_l, M_l + M_l^a]_{\mathbb{R}}$ contains an arithmetic progression of length k .

9.2 Strong form for the case $K = \mathbb{Q}$

In this subsection, we prove Theorem 9.2, which is the strong form for a short interval version for the case $K = \mathbb{Q}$, along the lines of the axiomatic framework given in Section 8.

Proposition 9.8. *Let $a \in (0, 1)_{\mathbb{R}}$. Let k be an integer at least 3, and set $S_k := \{0, 1, \dots, k - 1\}$. Then, for every $\rho > 0$, there exist positive integers $W = W_{\mathcal{P}, S_{\Psi_{\log}^{\text{SI}}}(\rho, k)}$ and $M_{\mathcal{P}, S_{\Psi_{\log}^{\text{SI}}}(\rho, k, a)}$ such that for every $M \in \mathbb{R}$ with $M \geq M_{\mathcal{P}, S_{\Psi_{\log}^{\text{SI}}}(\rho, k, a)}$, there exists a function $\lambda: \mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ which fulfills the following three conditions.*

- (1) *For every $b \in \mathbb{Z}$ coprime with W , $\tilde{\lambda}_b := \frac{\varphi(W)}{W}(\lambda \circ \text{Aff}_{W,b})$ is a $(\rho, \frac{M^a}{W}, S_k)$ -pseudorandom measure. Here, $\varphi = \varphi_{\mathbb{Q}}$ is the Euler totient function.*
- (2) *For every $q \in \mathcal{P} \cap [M, M + M^a]_{\mathbb{R}}$,*

$$\lambda(q) = \frac{a}{17k \cdot 2^{k-1} c_{\chi}} \cdot \log M$$

holds true.

- (3) *For every $q \in \mathcal{P} \cap [M, M + M^a]_{\mathbb{R}}$, q is coprime with W .*

Notice that conclusions (1), (2) and (3) are slightly different from conditions (1), (2) and (3) of Definition 8.2. First, the width of the interval for the pseudorandomness is M^a/W instead of M/W ; secondly, there is no exceptional set T in (2) or (3). The first difference comes from the fact that the width of the interval $[M, M + M^a]_{\mathbb{R}}$ is M^a ; the absence of T means that we may take $T = \emptyset$.

Proof. Set χ in a similar manner to Setting 7.2, and fix it. Apply Theorem 8.8 for $K = \mathbb{Q}$, $S = S_k$, and $u = 1$; recall the definitions of w_{PRSI} and M_{PRSI} . Let $W = W_{\mathcal{P}, S_{\Psi_{\log}^{\text{SI}}}(\rho, \chi, k)}$ be the positive integer determined by (7.1) with $w = w_{\text{PRSI}}(\rho, \chi, S_k)$. Set $M_{\mathcal{P}, S_{\Psi_{\log}^{\text{SI}}}(\rho, \chi, k, a)} := M_{\text{PRSI}}(w_{\text{PRSI}}(\rho, \chi, S_k), \rho, 1, \chi, S_k, a)$. For $M \geq M_{\mathcal{P}, S_{\Psi_{\log}^{\text{SI}}}(\rho, \chi, k, a)}$, take $\lambda: \mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ as in Theorem 8.8 in the current setting; note here that $\kappa = \kappa_{\mathbb{Q}} = 1$. Then, Theorem 8.8 implies that $\tilde{\lambda}_b$ in (1) is a $(\rho, \frac{M^a}{W}, S_k)$ -pseudorandom measure. For (2), by the construction of λ and by $R < M$, we have for all $q \in \mathcal{P} \cap [M, M + M^a]_{\mathbb{R}}$,

$$\lambda(q) = \frac{1}{c_{\chi}} \log R = \frac{a}{17k \cdot 2^{k-1} c_{\chi}} \cdot \log M.$$

Since $w_{\text{PRSI}}(\rho, \chi, S_k) \leq \frac{a}{2} \log M < M$, we also obtain (3). Since we have fixed a function χ , we omit to write dependences of $M_{\mathcal{P}, S_{\Psi_{\log}^{\text{SI}}}(\rho, \chi, k, a)}$ and $W_{\mathcal{P}, S_{\Psi_{\log}^{\text{SI}}}(\rho, \chi, k)}$ on χ . Thus we write $M_{\mathcal{P}, S_{\Psi_{\log}^{\text{SI}}}(\rho, k, a)}$ and $W_{\mathcal{P}, S_{\Psi_{\log}^{\text{SI}}}(\rho, k)}$ for short. This completes the proof. \square

Proof of Theorem 9.2. Let $S_k := \{0, 1, \dots, k-1\} \subseteq \mathbb{Z}$. Despite that this set S_k is not a standard shape, it meets all the requirements in Definition 2.3 except ‘ $S = -S$.’ We will prove the theorem along the same lines of Theorem 8.9, using Proposition 9.8. Let $a \in (0, 1)_{\mathbb{R}}$, and define $D := a \cdot (17k \cdot 2^{k-1} c_{\chi})^{-1}$. We will take $\rho > 0$, depending only on a, δ and k , in what follows; for this ρ , let $W := W_{\mathcal{P}, S\Psi_{\log}^{\text{SI}}}(\rho, k)$. Let M be sufficiently large; we will specify later. Let

$$X_M := \mathcal{P} \cap [M, M + M^a]_{\mathbb{R}}.$$

By assumption, there exists $\delta > 0$ such that (9.1) holds. If M is taken to be sufficiently large depending on a and δ , then

$$\#X_M \geq \delta \cdot \frac{M^a}{\log M}$$

holds. By the pigeonhole principle, Proposition 9.8 (3) implies that there exists $\bar{b} \in (\mathbb{Z}/W\mathbb{Z})^{\times}$ with

$$\#(X_M \cap \bar{b}) \geq \frac{1}{\varphi(W)} \delta \cdot \frac{M^a}{\log M}. \quad (9.4)$$

Set $N := \lceil \frac{M^a}{W} \rceil$. Then,

$$\frac{M^a}{W} \leq N \leq \frac{2M^a}{W} \quad (9.5)$$

holds true. Let $b \in \bar{b}$ be the largest element of \bar{b} with $b \leq M$. Then, by definition and by the triangle inequality, we have $\text{Aff}_{W,b}([-N, N]) \supseteq X_M \cap \bar{b}$. Hence for $B := \text{Aff}_{W,b}^{-1}(X_M \cap \bar{b})$, we obtain $B \subseteq [-N, N]$. By (9.4),

$$\#B \geq \frac{1}{\varphi(W)} \delta \cdot \frac{M^a}{\log M} \quad (9.6)$$

holds. Next, let $\lambda: \mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ be the function as in Proposition 9.8, and set $\tilde{\lambda}: \mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ as $\tilde{\lambda} := \frac{\varphi(W)}{W}(\lambda \circ \text{Aff}_{W,b})$. Then, by Proposition 9.8 (1), if $M \geq M_{\mathcal{P}, S\Psi_{\log}^{\text{SI}}}(\rho, k, a)$, then $\tilde{\lambda}$ is a (ρ, N, S_k) -pseudorandom measure. By Proposition 9.8 (2), (9.6) and (9.5), we have

$$\mathbb{E}(\mathbf{1}_B \cdot \tilde{\lambda} \mid [-N, N]) \geq D \cdot \delta \cdot \frac{M^a}{W \cdot (2N + 1)} \geq \frac{D}{6} \cdot \delta$$

and

$$\frac{1}{N} \cdot \mathbb{E}(\mathbf{1}_B \cdot \tilde{\lambda}^k \mid [-N, N]) \leq D^k W \cdot \frac{(\log M)^k}{M^a}.$$

Now we define $\rho := \rho_{\text{RMS}}(\boldsymbol{\omega}, \frac{D}{6}\delta, S_k)$ and $\gamma' := \gamma_{\text{RMS}}(\boldsymbol{\omega}, \frac{D}{6}\delta, S_k)$, where $\boldsymbol{\omega} = (\omega)$ with $\omega = 1$. Choose M_{GTSI} in such a way that $M \geq M_{\text{GTSI}}$ satisfies all the previous arguments, and that $D^k W \cdot (\log M)^k \leq \gamma' \cdot M^a$ holds. Then for $M \geq M_{\text{GTSI}}$, we can apply the relative Szemerédi theorem ($n = 1$ in Theorem 5.4) to $B \subseteq [-N, N]$. It follows that B contains an S_k -constellation. Applying the transformation $\text{Aff}_{W,b}$, we obtain an S_k -constellation in $X_M = \mathcal{P} \cap [M, M + M^a]_{\mathbb{R}}$.

Finally, we prove (2). Theorem 5.15 and Proposition 9.8 (2) imply

$$\frac{1}{4N(2N+1)} \cdot (\mathcal{N}_{S_k}(B) + \mathcal{N}_{-S_k}(B)) \cdot (D_2 \log M)^k \geq \frac{\gamma'}{2}.$$

Since $\mathcal{N}_{S_k}(B) + \mathcal{N}_{-S_k}(B) = 2\mathcal{N}_k(B)$, we have

$$\mathcal{N}_k(X_M) \geq \mathcal{N}_k(B) \geq \frac{2D^{-k}\gamma'}{W^2} \cdot \frac{M^{2a}}{(\log M)^k}.$$

Therefore, by setting $\gamma = \gamma_{\text{GTSI}}(a, \delta, k) := \frac{2D^{-k}}{W^2} \cdot \gamma'$, we obtain the desired estimate of $\mathcal{N}_k(X_M)$. \square

9.3 Slide trick

In this subsection, we present a technique necessary in proving constellation theorems of the form (I). More precisely, we first describe the difficulty which arises when $[K : \mathbb{Q}] \geq 2$, and then present the technique called a slide trick to overcome this difficulty.

Note that the Chebotarev density theorem (Theorem 3.21 (2)) provides an estimate of the number of prime elements in the domain of the form $\mathcal{O}_K(\boldsymbol{\omega}, [M_1, M'_1])$. Here, we define, for a free \mathbb{Z} -module \mathcal{Z} , its \mathbb{Z} -basis \mathbf{v} , and $M_1, M'_1 \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ with $M_1 \leq M'_1$,

$$\mathcal{Z}(\mathbf{v}, [M_1, M'_1]) := \{\alpha \in \mathcal{Z} : \|\alpha\|_{\infty, \mathbf{v}} \in [M_1, M'_1]_{\mathbb{R}}\}. \tag{9.7}$$

We suppose that M'_1 is reasonably close to M_1 . If $n = 1$, that is, if $K = \mathbb{Q}$, then with respect to its basis $\boldsymbol{\omega} = (\omega)$, where $\omega = 1$, we have

$$\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{Q}}(\boldsymbol{\omega}, [M_1, M'_1]) = ([-M'_1, -M_1]_{\mathbb{R}} \cap \mathbb{Z}) \cup ([M_1, M'_1]_{\mathbb{R}} \cap \mathbb{Z}).$$

Since $\mathcal{P}_{\mathbb{Q}} = \mathcal{P} \sqcup (-\mathcal{P})$, this amounts to considering the single interval $[M_1, M'_1]_{\mathbb{R}} \cap \mathbb{Z}$. If $n \geq 2$, then there is a significant difference between $\mathcal{O}_K(\boldsymbol{\omega}, [M_1, M'_1])$ and a short interval $\mathcal{O}_K(\boldsymbol{\omega}, x, M)$. The former is an n -dimensional cube with a smaller n -dimensional cube removed, while the latter is just a small n -dimensional cube. In order to apply the relative multidimensional Szemerédi theorem (Theorem 5.4), it is necessary to transfer the estimate in the former to the latter. This is an extra step which arises when $n \geq 2$. The transfer is possible if we can guarantee the density of prime elements is large in the latter, provided that the density of prime elements is large in the former. This assertion can be proved using the pigeonhole principle, which we formulate explicitly as the slide trick. In the setting of Szemerédi-type theorems of finitary version, the slide trick can be thought of taking a better representative $b \in \bar{b}$ of $\bar{b} \in (\mathcal{O}_K/W\mathcal{O}_K)^\times$ in the proof; retaking a representative is nothing but ‘sliding’ it by an element of $W\mathcal{O}_K$, hence the name. We remark that this argument already appeared in the proof of Theorem 9.2 when a representative $b \in \bar{b}$ was chosen. The reason why the slide trick is useful in our application is that the assertion of the Goldston–Yıldırım type asymptotic formula (Theorem 6.2) is strong enough that $b \in \mathcal{O}_K$ can be arbitrary as long as $b\mathcal{O}_K + W\mathcal{O}_K = \mathcal{O}_K$.

We now describe the slide trick. This can be formulated in the following general setting. Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Suppose that the additive group \mathbb{Z}^n acts on a non-empty set \mathbb{L} and that this

action is simply transitive. This means that, for all $l, l' \in \mathbb{L}$, there exists a unique $z \in \mathbb{Z}^n$ such that $l' = z \cdot l$. In this case, for a non-empty subset P of \mathbb{L} , the set of the form $z \cdot P$, where $z \in \mathbb{Z}^n$, is called a *translate* of P . The following is the fundamental lemma for the slide trick.

Lemma 9.9. *Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$, and let $\mathbb{Z}^n \curvearrowright \mathbb{L}$ be a simply transitive action. Let $P, X \subseteq \mathbb{L}$ be finite non-empty sets, and let \mathcal{Q} be the family of all translates Q of P satisfying $Q \cap X \neq \emptyset$. Then there exists $Q_X \in \mathcal{Q}$ such that*

$$\frac{\#(Q_X \cap X)}{\#Q_X} \geq \frac{\#X}{\#\mathcal{Q}}$$

holds.

Proof. Since the action is simply transitive, the number of $Q \in \mathcal{Q}$ containing a given $x \in X$ is exactly $\#P$. This implies

$$\sum_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}} \#(Q \cap X) = \#\{(x, Q) \in X \times \mathcal{Q} \mid x \in Q\} = \sum_{x \in X} \#\{Q \in \mathcal{Q} \mid x \in Q\} = \#X \cdot \#P,$$

and hence

$$\mathbb{E} \left(\frac{\#(Q \cap X)}{\#Q} \mid Q \in \mathcal{Q} \right) = \frac{1}{\#\mathcal{Q}} \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}} \frac{\#(Q \cap X)}{\#Q} = \frac{1}{(\#\mathcal{Q}) \cdot (\#P)} \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}} \#(Q \cap X) = \frac{\#X}{\#\mathcal{Q}}.$$

The result then follows by the pigeonhole principle. \square

Remark 9.10. The above lemma can be generalized as follows. Let $f: \mathbb{L} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ be a function which is 0 on $\mathbb{L} \setminus X$. Then there exists a translate Q_f of P such that

$$\mathbb{E}(f \mid Q_f) \geq \frac{\#X}{\#\mathcal{Q}} \cdot \mathbb{E}(f \mid X)$$

holds. Lemma 9.9 is exactly the case where $f = \mathbf{1}_X$.

If the subset $P \subseteq \mathbb{L}$ tiles \mathbb{L} , that is, if there exists a subset $Z \subseteq \mathbb{Z}^n$ such that $\mathbb{L} = \bigsqcup_{z \in Z} z \cdot P$, then an analogous statement as Lemma 9.9 can be proved more directly. Lemma 9.9 is used in the proof of Theorem B with P being an n -dimensional cube, and this falls in the above situation. We have, however, stated Lemma 9.9 as a more general statement.

9.4 Axiomatized constellation theorems for short intervals

In this subsection and the next, we use Setting 8.1. In a manner similar to the argument in Section 8, we present axiomatized constellation theorems of both finitary and infinitary versions of the form (I) for short intervals. We present our axiomatized constellation theorems only for type 2, that is, ones for constellations without associate pairs.

Definition 9.11 $((\rho, W, u, M, \mathbf{v}, S, a)$ -condition). Assume Setting 8.1. Let $a \in (0, 1)_{\mathbb{R}}$, and let $S \subseteq \mathfrak{a}$ be a standard shape. Let $\rho > 0$, $u > 0$, $D_1, D_2 > 0$, $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)_{\mathbb{R}}$ and let $M \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 1}$. Let $W \in \mathbb{N}$ be a natural number with $W \leq M^{\varepsilon a}$. A subset $A \subseteq \mathfrak{a}$ is said to satisfy the $(\rho, W, u, M, \mathbf{v}, S, a)$ -condition with parameters (D_1, D_2, ε) , if $A \subseteq \mathfrak{a}(\mathbf{v}, M)$, and the following holds: there exists $\lambda: \mathfrak{a} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ such that the following conditions are fulfilled.

- (1) For every $b \in \mathfrak{a}$ satisfying $b\mathcal{O}_K + W\mathfrak{a} = \mathfrak{a}$, the mapping $\beta \mapsto \frac{\varphi_K(W)}{W^n}(\lambda \circ \text{Aff}_{W,b})(\beta)$ on \mathfrak{a} is a $(\rho, \frac{uM^a}{W}, S)$ -pseudorandom measure.
- (2) There exists $T \subseteq A$ with $\#T \leq M^{\varepsilon a n}$ such that, for every $\alpha \in A \setminus T$,

$$D_1 \cdot \log M \leq \lambda(\alpha) \leq D_2 \cdot \log M$$

holds.

- (3) For the subset T in (2) and $\alpha \in A \setminus T$, $\alpha\mathcal{O}_K + W\mathfrak{a} = \mathfrak{a}$ holds.

Definition 9.12 $((\rho, u, M, \mathbf{v}, S, a)$ -condition). Assume Setting 8.1. Let $a \in (0, 1)_{\mathbb{R}}$, and $S \subseteq \mathfrak{a}$ a standard shape. Let $\rho > 0$, $u > 0$, $M \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 1}$, $D_1, D_2 > 0$, and $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)_{\mathbb{R}}$. A subset $A \subseteq \mathfrak{a}$ is said to satisfy the $(\rho, u, M, \mathbf{v}, S, a)$ -condition with parameters (D_1, D_2, ε) if there exists $W \in \mathbb{N}$ with $W \leq M^{\varepsilon a}$ such that A satisfies the $(\rho, W, u, M, \mathbf{v}, S, a)$ -condition with parameters (D_1, D_2, ε) .

The difference of Definition 9.11 from Definition 8.2 is that the appearance of a in the exponent for the upper bound on W , and the lower bound on the width of the interval for the pseudorandom condition in (1) is changed from $\frac{M}{W}$ to $\frac{uM^a}{W}$. The reason for the change is similar to the situation in Proposition 9.8; the width of the interval is M^a instead of M . The factor u is needed for the proof of Theorem 9.16. The role of the exponent a in the upper bound on the size of an exceptional set T in (2) and (3) is a minor issue. It is placed so as to force the containment of the set $S\Psi_{\log}^{\text{SI}}(\mathfrak{a})$ in $S\Psi_{\log}(\mathfrak{a})$; the former will be defined in Definition 9.13. The removal of an exceptional set T is necessary even in the weak form of the short interval version. Indeed, it cannot be avoided unless \mathcal{O}_K^\times is finite; see the proof of Theorem 9.15. This is in contrast to Proposition 9.8, where no exceptional set was needed.

Definition 9.13 (The family $S\Psi_{\log}^{\text{SI}}(\mathfrak{a})$). We define a family $S\Psi_{\log}^{\text{SI}}(\mathfrak{a})$ of subsets of \mathfrak{a} as follows: we declare $A \in S\Psi_{\log}^{\text{SI}}(\mathfrak{a})$ if and only if, for every $a \in (0, 1)_{\mathbb{R}}$ and for every standard shape $S \subseteq \mathfrak{a}$, there exist $D_1, D_2 > 0$ and $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)_{\mathbb{R}}$ such that the following holds: for every $\rho > 0$ and for every $u > 0$, there exists $M(\rho, u) = M(\rho, u, \mathbf{v}, S, a) \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ such that, for all $M \geq M(\rho, u)$, $A \cap \mathfrak{a}(\mathbf{v}, M)$ satisfies the $(\rho, u, M, \mathbf{v}, S, a)$ -condition with parameters (D_1, D_2, ε) .

We chose to attach symbols ‘SI’ in $S\Psi_{\log}^{\text{SI}}(\mathfrak{a})$ to signify ‘short interval.’

Lemma 9.14. *The following statements hold true.*

- (1) *If $A \subseteq \mathfrak{a}$ satisfies the $(\rho, W, u, M, \mathbf{v}, S, a)$ -condition with parameters (D_1, D_2, ε) , then so do its subsets.*

(2) If $A \in \mathcal{S}\Psi_{\log}^{\text{SI}}(\mathfrak{a})$, $A_1 \subseteq A$, then $A_1 \in \mathcal{S}\Psi_{\log}^{\text{SI}}(\mathfrak{a})$.

(3) $\mathcal{S}\Psi_{\log}^{\text{SI}}(\mathfrak{a}) \subseteq \mathcal{S}\Psi_{\log}(\mathfrak{a})$.

Proof. Items (1) and (2) can be proved in a manner similar to that of Lemma 8.6.

We prove (3). Let $A \in \mathcal{S}\Psi_{\log}^{\text{SI}}(\mathfrak{a})$. Let $S \subseteq \mathfrak{a}$ be a standard shape, and fix $a \in (0, 1)_{\mathbb{R}}$ arbitrarily. Then there exist $D_1, D_2 > 0$ and $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)_{\mathbb{R}}$ as described in Definition 9.13. Take $\rho > 0$ and let $u = 1$. Let $M > 0$ be a real number satisfying $M^{1/a} \geq M(\rho, 1, \mathbf{v}, S, a)$. Since $A \in \mathcal{S}\Psi_{\log}^{\text{SI}}(\mathfrak{a})$, the set $A \cap \mathfrak{a}(\mathbf{v}, M^{1/a})$ satisfies the $(\rho, 1, M^{1/a}, \mathbf{v}, S, a)$ -condition with parameters (D_1, D_2, ε) . It follows from (1) that $A \cap \mathfrak{a}(\mathbf{v}, M)$ satisfies the $(\rho, 1, M^{1/a}, \mathbf{v}, S, a)$ -condition with parameters (D_1, D_2, ε) . By Definition 9.11, this means that there exist $W \in \mathbb{N}$ with $W \leq M^\varepsilon$, $\lambda: \mathfrak{a} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ and an exceptional set $T \subseteq \mathfrak{a}(\mathbf{v}, M)$ with $\#T \leq M^{\varepsilon n}$ such that conditions (1)–(3) of Definition 9.11 hold. Then we see that $A \cap \mathfrak{a}(\mathbf{v}, M)$ satisfies the (ρ, M, \mathbf{v}, S) -condition with parameters $(D_1/a, D_2/a, \varepsilon)$. Therefore, $A \in \mathcal{S}\Psi_{\log}(\mathfrak{a})$. \square

Theorem 9.15. *For a number field K , we have $\mathcal{P}_K \in \mathcal{S}\Psi_{\log}^{\text{SI}}(\mathcal{O}_K)$. Furthermore, for every $a \in (0, 1)_{\mathbb{R}}$ and every integer r at least $[K : \mathbb{Q}]$, there exist $D_1, D_2 > 0$ and $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)_{\mathbb{R}}$ such that the following holds: let $S \subseteq \mathcal{O}_K$ be a standard shape with $\#S = r + 1$, and $\boldsymbol{\omega}$ be an integral basis of K . Let $\rho > 0$ and $u > 0$. Then, there exist integers $W = W_{\mathcal{P}_K, \mathcal{S}\Psi_{\log}^{\text{SI}}}(\rho, S)$ and $M_{\mathcal{P}_K, \mathcal{S}\Psi_{\log}^{\text{SI}}}(\rho, u, \boldsymbol{\omega}, S, a)$ such that if $M \geq M_{\mathcal{P}_K, \mathcal{S}\Psi_{\log}^{\text{SI}}}(\rho, u, \boldsymbol{\omega}, S, a)$, then $\mathcal{P}_K \cap \mathcal{O}_K(\boldsymbol{\omega}, M)$ satisfies the $(\rho, u, W, M, \boldsymbol{\omega}, S, a)$ -condition with parameters (D_1, D_2, ε) .*

Proof. The proof proceeds along the same lines of that of Proposition 9.8 except the treatment of an exceptional set T . Let $a \in (0, 1)_{\mathbb{R}}$ be arbitrary. Recall w_{PRSI} and M_{PRSI} from Theorem 8.8. Define the positive integer $W = W_{\mathcal{P}_K, \mathcal{S}\Psi_{\log}^{\text{SI}}}(\rho, \chi, S)$ by (7.1) with $w = w_{\text{PRSI}}(\rho, \chi, S)$. Let M be a parameter with $M \geq M_{\text{PRSI}}(w_{\text{PRSI}}(\rho, \chi, S), \rho, u, \chi, S, a)$, and take the function $\lambda = \lambda_{M; \chi, r, a, K}: \mathcal{O}_K \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ as in Theorem 8.8. Then, by Theorem 8.8, the condition of Definition 9.11 (1) is satisfied for $\mathfrak{a} = \mathcal{O}_K$. Moreover, by (8.2), we have $W \leq M^{(\log 2)^a} \leq M^{\frac{3}{4}a}$.

Define an exceptional set $T \subseteq \mathcal{P}_K \cap \mathcal{O}_K(\boldsymbol{\omega}, M)$ by $T := \mathcal{P}_K \cap \mathcal{O}_K(\boldsymbol{\omega}, M) \cap \mathcal{O}_K(R)$. As in the proof of Lemma 7.9, if M is sufficiently large depending on r, K and a , then every $\alpha \in \mathcal{P}_K \setminus T$ is prime to W , and $\lambda(\alpha) = \frac{\kappa a}{17(r+1)2^r \cdot c_\chi} \cdot \log M$ holds. Moreover, if M is sufficiently large depending on $\boldsymbol{\omega}$ and a , then by (8.3), we obtain $\#T \leq M^{\frac{a}{16}}$. Therefore, for every $\rho > 0$ and for every $u > 0$, if M is sufficiently large depending on $\rho, u, \boldsymbol{\omega}, S$ and a , the $\mathcal{P}_K \cap \mathcal{O}_K(\boldsymbol{\omega}, M)$ satisfies the $(\rho, u, W, M, \boldsymbol{\omega}, S, a)$ -condition with parameters

$$(D_1, D_2, \varepsilon) = \left(\frac{\kappa a}{17(r+1)2^r \cdot c_\chi}, \frac{\kappa a}{17(r+1)2^r \cdot c_\chi}, \frac{3}{4} \right).$$

Define $M_{\mathcal{P}_K, \mathcal{S}\Psi_{\log}^{\text{SI}}}(\rho, u, \boldsymbol{\omega}, \chi, S, a)$ as the smallest integer for which all of the arguments above work. This ends the proof of the latter assertion. Here, since we have fixed a function χ , we omit to write dependences of $W_{\mathcal{P}_K, \mathcal{S}\Psi_{\log}^{\text{SI}}}(\rho, \chi, S)$ and $M_{\mathcal{P}_K, \mathcal{S}\Psi_{\log}^{\text{SI}}}(\rho, u, \boldsymbol{\omega}, \chi, S, a)$ on χ . Thus we write $W_{\mathcal{P}_K, \mathcal{S}\Psi_{\log}^{\text{SI}}}(\rho, S)$ and $M_{\mathcal{P}_K, \mathcal{S}\Psi_{\log}^{\text{SI}}}(\rho, u, \boldsymbol{\omega}, S, a)$ for short. In particular, we conclude that $\mathcal{P}_K \in \mathcal{S}\Psi_{\log}^{\text{SI}}(\mathcal{O}_K)$. This completes the proof. \square

The following two theorems are the short interval versions of Theorem 8.23 and Theorem 8.24, respectively. Recall Definition 2.5.

Theorem 9.16. *We use Setting 8.1. Let $a \in (0, 1)_{\mathbb{R}}$, and let $S \subseteq \mathfrak{a}$ be a standard shape. Let $\delta, \Delta, D_1, D_2 > 0$ and $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)_{\mathbb{R}}$. Then there exist $\rho = \rho_{\text{SI}}(D_1, \mathbf{v}, \delta, \Delta, S) > 0$, $u = u_{\text{SI}}(\mathbf{v}, \delta, \Delta, a) > 0$, $\eta = \eta_{\text{SI}}(\mathbf{v}, \delta, \Delta) > 0$ and $M_{\text{SI}} = M_{\text{SI}}(D_1, D_2, \varepsilon, \mathbf{v}, \delta, \Delta, S, a) \in \mathbb{N}$ such that the following holds. Assume an integer $M \geq M_{\text{SI}}$ and a set $A \subseteq \mathfrak{a}(\mathbf{v}, M) \setminus \{0\}$ satisfy the following three conditions:*

(i) *the inequality*

$$\#A \geq \delta \cdot \frac{M^n}{\log M}$$

holds,

(ii) *for every $L \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 2}$,*

$$\#\{\alpha \mathcal{O}_K \in \text{Ideals}_K : \alpha \in A \cap \mathcal{O}_K(L)\} \leq \Delta \cdot \frac{L}{\log L}$$

holds,

(iii) *the set A satisfies the $(\rho, u, M, \mathbf{v}, S, a)$ -condition with parameters (D_1, D_2, ε) .*

Then there exists $x \in A$ satisfying

$$\eta M \leq \|x\|_{\infty, \mathbf{v}} \leq M \tag{9.8}$$

such that $A \cap \mathfrak{a}(\mathbf{v}, x, \|x\|_{\infty, \mathbf{v}}^a)$ contains an S -constellation without associate pairs. Moreover, there exists $\gamma = \gamma_{\text{SI}}(D_1, D_2, \mathbf{v}, \delta, \Delta, S, a) > 0$ such that the above $x \in A$ can be taken in such a way that

$$\mathcal{N}_S^\#(A \cap \mathfrak{a}(\mathbf{v}, x, \|x\|_{\infty, \mathbf{v}}^a)) \geq \gamma W^{-(n+1)} \cdot \frac{M^{a(n+1)}}{(\log M)^{\#S}}$$

holds. Here, W is an integer appearing in the $(\rho, u, M, \mathbf{v}, S, a)$ -condition, which comes from condition (iii).

Theorem 9.17. *We use Setting 8.1. Assume that a subset $A \subseteq \mathfrak{a} \setminus \{0\}$ satisfies the following three conditions:*

(i) *the inequality*

$$\limsup_{M \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\#(A \cap \mathfrak{a}(\mathbf{v}, M))}{M^n (\log M)^{-1}} > 0$$

holds,

(ii) *there exists $\Delta > 0$ such that for every $L \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 2}$,*

$$\#\{\alpha \mathcal{O}_K \in \text{Ideals}_K : \alpha \in A \cap \mathcal{O}_K(L)\} \leq \Delta \cdot \frac{L}{\log L} \tag{9.9}$$

holds,

(iii) $A \in \text{S}\Psi_{\log}^{\text{SI}}(\mathfrak{a})$.

Then, there exists a sequence $(y_l)_{l \in \mathbb{N}}$ in A satisfying the following: for every $a \in (0, 1)_{\mathbb{R}}$ and every finite set $S \subseteq \mathfrak{a}$, there exists a finite subset $L \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ such that for all $l \in \mathbb{N} \setminus L$, $A \cap \mathfrak{a}(\mathbf{v}, y_l, \|y_l\|_{\infty, \mathbf{v}}^a)$ contains an S -constellation consisting of pairwise non-associate elements.

We prove Theorem 9.16 in Subsection 9.5, and then deduce Theorem 9.17 from Theorem 9.16.

We obtain the following corollary from Theorem 9.17 and Lemma 9.14.

Corollary 9.18. *We use Setting 8.1. Assume that a subset $A \subseteq \mathfrak{a} \setminus \{0\}$ satisfies the following three conditions:*

(i) *the inequality*

$$\liminf_{M \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\#(A \cap \mathfrak{a}(\mathbf{v}, M))}{M^n (\log M)^{-1}} > 0$$

holds,

(ii) *condition (ii) of Theorem 9.17 is satisfied,*

(iii) $A \in \text{S}\Psi_{\log}^{\text{SI}}(\mathfrak{a})$.

Then for every $A' \subseteq A$ satisfying $\bar{d}_{A, \mathbf{v}}(A') > 0$, there exists a sequence $(y_l)_{l \in \mathbb{N}}$ in A' satisfying the following: for every $a \in (0, 1)_{\mathbb{R}}$ and every finite set $S \subseteq \mathfrak{a}$, there exists a finite subset $L \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ such that for all $l \in \mathbb{N} \setminus L$, $A' \cap \mathfrak{a}(\mathbf{v}, y_l, \|y_l\|_{\infty, \mathbf{v}}^a)$ contains an S -constellation consisting of pairwise non-associate elements.

Proof of Theorem 9.17 \implies Corollary 9.18. This is analogous to the deduction of Corollary 8.25 from Theorem 8.24. \square

We note that the sequence $(y_l)_{l \in \mathbb{N}}$ can be found independent of the choice of a and S in Theorem 9.17 and Corollary 9.18.

9.5 Proofs of Theorems 9.16 and 9.17

In this subsection, we prove Theorems 9.16 and 9.17, and using these theorems, we prove Theorem 9.5 and Corollary 9.6.

Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Define the ℓ_{∞} -length $\|\cdot\|_{\infty}$ on \mathbb{Z}^n with respect to the standard basis. For $M_1, M_2 \in \mathbb{R}$ with $0 \leq M_1 \leq M_2$, let $\mathbb{Z}^n([M_1, M_2]) := \{x \in \mathbb{Z}^n : \|x\|_{\infty} \in [M_1, M_2]_{\mathbb{R}}\}$.

Lemma 9.19. *Let M_0, M and $a \in (0, 1)_{\mathbb{R}}$ be real numbers with $0 < M_0 \leq M$. Then, for every $A \subseteq \mathbb{Z}^n([M_0, M])$, there exists $M_1 \in [M_0, M]_{\mathbb{R}}$ such that*

$$\#(A \cap \mathbb{Z}^n([M_1, M_1 + M_1^a])) \geq \frac{1}{2^n} \cdot \frac{(M_1 + M_1^a)^n - M_1^n}{M_1^n} \cdot \#A$$

Proof. We define a finite sequence m_1, m_2, \dots of real numbers as follows. We first set $m_0 := M_0$. Assuming m_i has been defined, we stop constructing the sequence if $m_i \geq M$, and otherwise define $m_{i+1} := m_i + m_i^a$. This process terminates because we continue to have $m_{i+1} \geq m_i + M_0^a$. Let m_l be the last term of this sequence. Then there exists $l_A \in [0, l-1]$ such that

$$\#(A \cap \mathbb{Z}^n([m_{l_A}, m_{l_A+1}])) \geq \frac{1}{2^n} \cdot \frac{m_{l_A+1}^n - m_{l_A}^n}{M^n} \cdot \#A$$

holds. Indeed, otherwise, taking the summation from $i = 0$ to $l-1$ gives

$$\#A < \frac{1}{2^n} \cdot \frac{m_l^n - m_0^n}{M^n} \cdot \#A \leq \frac{1}{2^n} \cdot \frac{(M + M^a)^n - M_0^n}{M^n} \cdot \#A \leq \#A,$$

which is a contradiction. The desired inequality holds by setting $M_1 := m_{l_A}$. \square

Lemma 9.20. Assume Setting 8.1. Let $\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_n$ be the embeddings of K into \mathbb{C} . Let $\Omega > 0$. Then, there exist $D(\mathbf{v}, \Omega), D'(\mathbf{v}, \Omega) > 0$, depending on \mathbf{v} and Ω , such that the following holds true: for $M \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 1}$, if $\alpha \in \mathfrak{a}(\mathbf{v}, M)$ satisfies $\mathbf{N}(\alpha) \geq \Omega M^n$, then

$$\min_{i \in [n]} |\sigma_i(\alpha)| \geq D(\mathbf{v}, \Omega) \cdot M \quad \text{and} \quad \|\alpha\|_{\infty, \mathbf{v}} \geq D'(\mathbf{v}, \Omega) \cdot M$$

holds.

Proof. For $\mathbf{v} = (v_1, \dots, v_n)$, set $C'(\mathbf{v}) := \max_{i \in [n]} \sum_{j \in [n]} |\sigma_i(v_j)|$. Then for all $k \in [n]$, we have $|\sigma_k(\alpha)| \leq C'(\mathbf{v})M$. Since $\mathbf{N}(\alpha) = |\sigma_i(\alpha)| \cdot \prod_{k \in [n] \setminus \{i\}} |\sigma_k(\alpha)|$ by Lemma 3.5, we have

$$\min_{i \in [n]} |\sigma_i(\alpha)| \geq \frac{\Omega}{(C'(\mathbf{v}))^{n-1}} \cdot M.$$

Similarly, since for every $k \in [n]$, $|\sigma_k(\alpha)| \leq C'(\mathbf{v})\|\alpha\|_{\infty, \mathbf{v}}$, we obtain

$$\|\alpha\|_{\infty, \mathbf{v}} \geq \frac{\sqrt[n]{\Omega}}{C'(\mathbf{v})} \cdot M.$$

Therefore, $D(\mathbf{v}, \Omega) := \frac{\Omega}{(C'(\mathbf{v}))^{n-1}}$ and $D'(\mathbf{v}, \Omega) := \frac{\sqrt[n]{\Omega}}{C'(\mathbf{v})}$ work. \square

Proof of Theorem 9.16. Let $a, \delta, \Delta, D_1, D_2$ and ε be as in the statement of the theorem. We let M be a sufficiently large real number, to be determined exactly later. We also take $\rho > 0$ and $u > 0$ arbitrarily at this point. Let $A \subseteq \mathfrak{a}(\mathbf{v}, M) \setminus \{0\}$ be a subset satisfying conditions (1), (2) and (3) of the theorem. Thus we can take an integer $W \leq M^{\varepsilon a}$, a function $\lambda: \mathfrak{a} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ and an exceptional set $T \subseteq A$ as in these conditions. For real numbers M_1 and M_2 with $0 \leq M_1 \leq M_2$, define $\mathfrak{a}(\mathbf{v}, [M_1, M_2])$ by setting $\mathcal{Z} = \mathfrak{a}$ in (9.7).

Take $M'_{\text{red}}(\mathbf{v}, \delta, \Delta) \in \mathbb{N}$, $\delta' = \delta'_{\text{red}}(\mathbf{v}, \delta, \Delta) > 0$ and $\Omega' = \Omega'_{\text{red}}(\mathbf{v}, \delta, \Delta) > 0$ as in Theorem 8.22. Now assume that $M \geq M'_{\text{red}}(\mathbf{v}, \delta, \Delta)$. Then we can apply Theorem 8.22 to the set A . This implies that there exist a fundamental domain \mathcal{D} for the action $\mathcal{O}_K^\times \curvearrowright \mathfrak{a} \setminus \{0\}$ and a subset $A_0 \subseteq A \cap \mathcal{D}$ such that

$$\#A_0 \geq \delta' \cdot \frac{M^n}{\log M} \tag{9.10}$$

holds. In addition (8.27) holds, that is, for $\alpha \in A_0$, we have $\mathbf{N}(\alpha) > \Omega' M^n$. Let $D'(\mathbf{v}, \Omega') > 0$ be the constant in Lemma 9.20. Set

$$M_b := D'(\mathbf{v}, \Omega') M. \quad (9.11)$$

Then, we have

$$A_0 \subseteq \mathbf{a}(\mathbf{v}, [M_b, M]). \quad (9.12)$$

Let $A'_0 := A_0 \setminus T$. If M is sufficiently large depending on $\varepsilon, \mathbf{v}, \delta, \Delta$ and a , it follows from the upper bound $\#T \leq M^{\varepsilon a n}$ and (9.10) that

$$\#A'_0 \geq \frac{1}{2} \delta' \cdot \frac{M^n}{\log M} \quad (9.13)$$

holds. Under the isometry $(\mathbf{a}, \|\cdot\|_{\infty, \mathbf{v}}) \simeq (\mathbb{Z}^n, \|\cdot\|_{\infty})$, we may regard A'_0 as a subset of $\mathbb{Z}^n([M_b, M])$ by (9.12). We can thus apply Lemma 9.19 by setting $M_0 = M_b$, $A = A'_0$. This, together with (9.13), implies that there exists $M_{\natural} \in [M_b, M]_{\mathbb{R}}$ such that

$$\#A''_0 \geq \frac{1}{2^{n+1}} \delta' \cdot \frac{(M_{\natural} + M_{\natural}^a)^n - M_{\natural}^n}{\log M} \quad (9.14)$$

holds, where $A''_0 := A'_0 \cap \mathbf{a}(\mathbf{v}, [M_{\natural}, M_{\natural} + M_{\natural}^a])$.

Next we apply Lemma 8.5 to A''_0 , noting that condition (3) holds by the $(\rho, W, u, M, \mathbf{v}, S, a)$ -condition. By (9.14), we see that there exists $\bar{b} \in \mathbf{a}/W\mathbf{a}$ such that

$$\#(A''_0 \cap \bar{b}) \geq \frac{1}{2^{n+1} \varphi_K(W)} \delta' \cdot \frac{(M_{\natural} + M_{\natural}^a)^n - M_{\natural}^n}{\log M} \quad (9.15)$$

holds. Note that the set $A''_0 \cap \bar{b}$ is not located inside an n -dimensional cube with a small diameter for which the relative multidimensional Szemerédi theorem applies.

We will determine the center $x \in A$ of a short interval by suitably choosing a representative $b \in \bar{b}$ using the slide trick, in such a way that we can apply the relative multidimensional Szemerédi theorem. Let $N := 2 \left\lceil \frac{M_{\natural}^a}{8W} \right\rceil$. Since $W \leq M^{\varepsilon a}$ and $M_b \leq M_{\natural}$, for a sufficiently large M depending on $\varepsilon, \mathbf{v}, \delta, \Delta$ and a , we have

$$\frac{M_{\natural}^a}{4W} \leq N \leq \frac{M_{\natural}^a}{3W}. \quad (9.16)$$

Observe that the additive group $\mathbf{a} \simeq \mathbb{Z}^n$ acts simply transitively on \bar{b} by $\beta \cdot x := x + W\beta$. Fix an arbitrary $b_0 \in \bar{b}$. We aim to apply Lemma 9.9 by setting $P = W\mathbf{a}(\mathbf{v}, N/2) + b_0$ and $X = A''_0 \cap \bar{b}$. The size of the set \mathcal{Q} in Lemma 9.9 for this setting can be estimated by considering the location of the ‘upper left’ corner of $W\mathbf{a}(\mathbf{v}, N/2) + b$, a translate of P , as follows.

$$\begin{aligned} \#\mathcal{Q} &\leq \left(\frac{2M_{\natural} + 2M_{\natural}^a + WN + 1}{W} + 1 \right)^n - \left(\frac{2M_{\natural} - WN}{W} - 1 \right)^n \\ &\leq \frac{(2M_{\natural} + 3M_{\natural}^a)^n - (2M_{\natural} - M_{\natural}^a)^n}{W^n}. \end{aligned}$$

We use the following general inequalities: for $t, t' \geq 0$ with t'/t small enough depending on n ,

$$t^n + nt^{n-1}t' \leq (t + t')^n \leq t^n + 2nt^{n-1}t'$$

holds. In addition, Bernoulli's inequality implies $(t - t')^n \geq t^n - nt^{n-1}t'$. Since $a \in (0, 1)_{\mathbb{R}}$, for a sufficiently large M depending on a and n , we have

$$(2M_{\mathfrak{h}} + 3M_{\mathfrak{h}}^a)^n - (2M_{\mathfrak{h}} - M_{\mathfrak{h}}^a)^n \leq 2^{n+2}((M_{\mathfrak{h}} + M_{\mathfrak{h}}^a)^n - M_{\mathfrak{h}}^n).$$

Therefore,

$$\#\mathcal{Q} \leq \frac{2^{n+2}}{W^n} \cdot ((M_{\mathfrak{h}} + M_{\mathfrak{h}}^a)^n - M_{\mathfrak{h}}^n). \quad (9.17)$$

It follows from Lemma 9.9, (9.15) and (9.17) that, there exists a representative $b \in \bar{b}$ such that the following holds:

$$\begin{aligned} & \#(A_0'' \cap \text{Aff}_{W,b}(\mathbf{a}(\mathbf{v}, N/2))) \\ & \geq \frac{\#X}{\#\mathcal{Q}} \cdot \#P \\ & \geq \left(\frac{1}{2^{n+1}\varphi_K(W)} \delta' \cdot \frac{(M_{\mathfrak{h}} + M_{\mathfrak{h}}^a)^n - M_{\mathfrak{h}}^n}{\log M} \right) \cdot \left(\frac{2^{n+2}}{W^n} \cdot ((M_{\mathfrak{h}} + M_{\mathfrak{h}}^a)^n - M_{\mathfrak{h}}^n) \right)^{-1} \cdot (N+1)^n. \end{aligned}$$

In other words,

$$\#(A_0'' \cap \text{Aff}_{W,b}(\mathbf{a}(\mathbf{v}, N/2))) \geq \frac{W^n}{\varphi_K(W)} \cdot \frac{1}{2^{2n+3}} \delta' \cdot \frac{(N+1)^n}{\log M}. \quad (9.18)$$

We fix such a representative b . Since $A_0'' \cap \text{Aff}_{W,b}(\mathbf{a}(\mathbf{v}, N/2)) \neq \emptyset$, we can choose $x \in A_0'' \cap \text{Aff}_{W,b}(\mathbf{a}(\mathbf{v}, N/2))$, which will also be fixed for the rest of the proof. Note, in particular, that $x \in A$. By (9.12), we have $\|b\|_{\infty, \mathbf{v}} - WN/2 \leq \|x\|_{\infty, \mathbf{v}} \leq M$ and $\|b\|_{\infty, \mathbf{v}} \geq M_b - WN/2$. Thus, if M is sufficiently large depending on a , we see that (9.8) holds.

We now define $\tilde{\lambda} := \frac{\varphi_K(W)}{W^n}(\lambda \circ \text{Aff}_{W,x})$ and $B := \text{Aff}_{W,x}^{-1}(A_0'') \cap \mathbf{a}(\mathbf{v}, N)$. By (9.16) and the assumption on λ , the function $\tilde{\lambda}$ is a $(\rho, \frac{uM^a}{W}, S)$ -pseudorandom measure. By (9.16), we have $WN \leq \frac{M_{\mathfrak{h}}^a}{3}$. Since $x \in A_0''$, we have $\|x\|_{\infty, \mathbf{v}} \geq M_{\mathfrak{h}}$. Thus $3WN \leq \|x\|_{\infty, \mathbf{v}}^a$ holds. In particular,

$$A_0'' \cap \text{Aff}_{W,b}(\mathbf{a}(\mathbf{v}, N/2)) \subseteq A_0'' \cap \text{Aff}_{W,x}(\mathbf{a}(\mathbf{v}, N)) \subseteq A_0'' \cap \mathbf{a}(\mathbf{v}, x, \|x\|_{\infty, \mathbf{v}}^a) \quad (9.19)$$

holds. It follows from the first containment in (9.19) and (9.18) that

$$\#B \geq \frac{W^n}{\varphi_K(W)} \cdot \frac{1}{2^{2n+3}} \delta' \cdot \frac{(N+1)^n}{\log M} \quad (9.20)$$

holds. We now treat the weighted density and smallness conditions. By (9.20) and the lower bound in (2) in the $(\rho, W, u, M, \mathbf{v}, S, a)$ -condition, we obtain

$$\mathbb{E}(\mathbf{1}_B \cdot \tilde{\lambda} \mid \mathbf{a}(\mathbf{v}, N)) \geq \frac{D_1}{2^{3n+3}} \cdot \delta'. \quad (9.21)$$

By (9.16), $W \leq M^{\varepsilon a}$ and $M_b \leq M_{\natural}$, if M is sufficiently large depending on $\varepsilon, \mathbf{v}, \delta, \Delta$ and a , then $N \geq M^{\frac{1-\varepsilon}{2}a}$ holds. This, together with the upper bound in (2) in the $(\rho, W, u, M, \mathbf{v}, S, a)$ -condition, we obtain

$$\frac{1}{N} \cdot \mathbb{E}(\mathbf{1}_B \cdot \tilde{\lambda}^{r+1} \mid \mathbf{a}(\mathbf{v}, N)) \leq D_2^{r+1} \cdot \frac{(\log M)^{r+1}}{M^{\frac{1-\varepsilon}{2}a}}, \quad (9.22)$$

where $r := \#S - 1$.

In what follows, we will specify ρ, u, η and M_{SI} according to the arguments above. First, we define $\rho = \rho_{\text{SI}}(D_1, \mathbf{v}, \delta, \Delta, S) := \rho_{\text{RMS}}(\mathbf{v}, \frac{D_1}{2^{3n+3}}\delta', S)$. Secondly, we define $u = u_{\text{SI}}(\mathbf{v}, \delta, \Delta, a) := (D'(\mathbf{v}, \Omega'))^a/4$ and $\eta = \eta_{\text{SI}}(\mathbf{v}, \delta, \Delta) := D'(\mathbf{v}, \Omega')$. Before defining M_{SI} , we need some preparations. Let $\gamma' = \gamma'_{\text{SI}}(D_1, \mathbf{v}, \delta, \Delta, S) > 0$ be $\gamma' := \gamma_{\text{RMS}}(\mathbf{v}, \frac{D_1}{2^{3n+3}}\delta', S)$. Note that M has been assumed to be sufficiently large up to this point. We further make M large enough in such a way that $D_2^{r+1} \cdot (\log M)^{r+1} \leq \gamma' \cdot M^{\frac{1-\varepsilon}{2}a}$ holds, and we set M_{SI} to be the smallest positive integer such that all these requirements hold for as long as $M \geq M_{\text{SI}}$. Note that $\|x\|_{\infty, \mathbf{v}} \geq \eta M$ and $N \geq \frac{uM^a}{W}$ by (9.11) and (9.16). Hence by (9.21) and (9.22), Theorem 5.4 can be applied to $B \subseteq \mathbf{a}(\mathbf{v}, N)$ under the hypothesis $M \geq M_{\text{SI}}$. It follows that there exists an S -constellation in B . Applying $\text{Aff}_{W,x}$, this leads to the existence of an S -constellation in $A''_0 \cap \text{Aff}_{W,x}(\mathbf{a}(\mathbf{v}, N))$. Since $A''_0 \subseteq \mathcal{D}$, such an S -constellation contains no associate pairs. By the second containment in (9.19), this implies the existence of an S -constellation in $A \cap \mathbf{a}(\mathbf{v}, x, \|x\|_{\infty, \mathbf{v}}^a)$ without associate pairs.

Finally, we estimate the number of S -constellations. Since $\mathcal{N}_S(B) \leq \mathcal{N}_S^{\sharp}(A \cap \mathbf{a}(\mathbf{v}, x, \|x\|_{\infty, \mathbf{v}}^a))$, it suffices to give a lower bound on $\mathcal{N}_S(B)$. By Theorem 5.5 and condition (2) in the $(\rho, W, u, M, \mathbf{v}, S, a)$ -condition, we obtain

$$\frac{1}{N(2N+1)^n} \cdot \mathcal{N}_S(B) \cdot (D_2 \log M)^{r+1} \geq \gamma'.$$

Thus, by setting $\gamma = \gamma_{\text{SI}}(D_1, D_2, \mathbf{v}, \delta, \Delta, S, a)$ as $\gamma := 2^n D_2^{-(r+1)} u^{n+1} \gamma'$, we deduce from (9.16) that

$$\mathcal{N}_S(B) \geq \gamma W^{-(n+1)} \cdot \frac{M^{a(n+1)}}{(\log M)^{r+1}}.$$

This provides the desired estimate. \square

Proof of Theorem 9.17. By (i), there exist $\delta > 0$ and an increasing sequence $(M_l)_{l \in \mathbb{N}}$ of real numbers with $\lim_{l \rightarrow \infty} M_l = \infty$ such that, for all $l \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\#(A \cap \mathbf{a}(\mathbf{v}, M_l)) \geq \delta \cdot \frac{M_l^n}{\log M_l} \quad (9.23)$$

holds. By (ii), there exists $\Delta > 0$ such that (9.9) holds.

Fix $a \in (0, 1)_{\mathbb{R}}$ and a standard shape $S \subseteq \mathbf{a}$. By (iii), we can choose $D_1, D_2 > 0$ and $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)_{\mathbb{R}}$ such that the property described in Definition 9.13 holds. Then take $\rho > 0$ and $M_{\text{SI}} \in \mathbb{N}$ such that the conclusion of Theorem 9.16 holds. In order to apply this

conclusion, choose $l \in \mathbb{N}$ in such a way that $M_l \geq \max\{M_{\text{SI}}, M_{A, S \Psi_{\log}^{\text{SI}}}(\rho, \mathbf{v}, S, a)\}$ and set $A' := A \cap \mathbf{a}(\mathbf{v}, M_l)$. Then by (9.23),

$$\#A' \geq \delta \cdot \frac{M_l^n}{\log M_l}$$

holds. This implies that condition (i) of Theorem 9.16 is fulfilled with (A, M) replaced by (A', M_l) . Since (9.9) is valid even if A is replaced by A' , condition (ii) of Theorem 9.16 is fulfilled with A replaced by A' . Finally, since $M_l \geq M_{A, S \Psi_{\log}^{\text{SI}}}(\rho, \mathbf{v}, S, a)$, A' satisfies the $(\rho, M_l, \mathbf{v}, S, a)$ -condition with parameters (D_1, D_2, ε) . This implies that condition (iii) of Theorem 9.16 is fulfilled with (A, M) replaced by (A', M_l) . Thus, by Theorem 9.16, there exists $x_{(a, S)} \in A'$ such that $A' \cap \mathbf{a}(\mathbf{v}, x_{(a, S)}, \|x_{(a, S)}\|_{\infty, \mathbf{v}}^a)$ contains an S -constellation without associate pairs.

In order to complete the proof of the theorem, we employ the diagonal argument. Fix a decreasing sequence $(a_l)_{l \in \mathbb{N}}$ in $(0, 1)_{\mathbb{R}}$ with $\lim_{l \rightarrow \infty} a_l = 0$. Since \mathbf{a} is countable, we can take a sequence $S_1 \subseteq S_2 \subseteq \dots$ of standard shapes in \mathbf{a} such that $\bigcup_{l \in \mathbb{N}} S_l = \mathbf{a}$. Applying the above argument to (a_l, S_l) for each $l \in \mathbb{N}$, we find a sequence $(y_l)_{l \in \mathbb{N}}$ of elements in A' such that $A' \cap \mathbf{a}(\mathbf{v}, y_l, \|y_l\|_{\infty, \mathbf{v}}^{a_l})$ contains an S_l -constellation without associate pairs. It remains to show that the sequence $(y_l)_{l \in \mathbb{N}}$ satisfies the desired property. Indeed, let $a \in (0, 1)_{\mathbb{R}}$ and a standard shape $S \subseteq \mathbf{a}$ be arbitrary. Then there the set $L := \{l \in \mathbb{N} : a < a_l \text{ or } S \not\subseteq S_l\}$ is finite. Then for all $l \in \mathbb{N} \setminus L$, we have $a \geq a_l$ and $S \subseteq S_l$. Since $A' \cap \mathbf{a}(\mathbf{v}, y_l, \|y_l\|_{\infty, \mathbf{v}}^{a_l})$ contains an S_l -constellation without associate pairs, we see that $A \cap \mathbf{a}(\mathbf{v}, y_l, \|y_l\|_{\infty, \mathbf{v}}^a)$ contains an S -constellation without associate pairs. \square

We have completed the necessary axiomatization. The proofs of Theorem 9.5 and Corollary 9.6 are now within reach.

Proposition 9.21. *For a number field K , the set \mathcal{P}_K satisfies all the assumptions of Corollary 9.18.*

Proof. By Proposition 8.14, condition (i) holds. By Theorem 3.21 (1), condition (ii) holds. Finally, by Theorem 9.15, condition (iii) holds. \square

Proof of Theorem 9.5. We may assume without loss of generality that S is a standard shape. Recall that we have fixed χ to obtain $W_{\mathcal{P}_K, S \Psi_{\log}^{\text{SI}}}(\rho, S) = W_{\mathcal{P}_K, S \Psi_{\log}^{\text{SI}}}(\rho, \chi, S)$ and $M_{\mathcal{P}_K, S \Psi_{\log}^{\text{SI}}}(\rho, u, \boldsymbol{\omega}, S, a) = M_{\mathcal{P}_K, S \Psi_{\log}^{\text{SI}}}(\rho, u, \boldsymbol{\omega}, \chi, S, a)$ in the proof of Theorem 9.15. Recall κ from Theorem 3.19. Let $r := \#S - 1$. Set $D = D_{\mathcal{P}_K}(K, r, a) := \kappa a \cdot (17(r+1)2^r \cdot c_{\chi})^{-1}$. Set $\rho := \rho_{\text{SI}}(D, \boldsymbol{\omega}, \delta \cdot C_{\mathcal{P}_K, \text{I}}(\boldsymbol{\omega}), C_{\text{Lan}}, S)$, $u := u_{\text{SI}}(\boldsymbol{\omega}, \delta \cdot C_{\mathcal{P}_K, \text{I}}(\boldsymbol{\omega}), C_{\text{Lan}}, a)$, and $\eta := \eta_{\text{SI}}(\boldsymbol{\omega}, \delta \cdot C_{\mathcal{P}_K, \text{I}}(\boldsymbol{\omega}), C_{\text{Lan}})$. Define $M_{\text{PESSI}}(\boldsymbol{\omega}, \delta, S, a)$ by

$$\begin{aligned} & M_{\text{PESSI}}(\boldsymbol{\omega}, \delta, S, a) \\ & := \max\{M_{\mathcal{P}_K, \text{I}}(\boldsymbol{\omega}), M_{\mathcal{P}_K, S \Psi_{\log}^{\text{SI}}}(\rho, u, \boldsymbol{\omega}, S, a), M_{\text{SI}}(D, D, 3/4, \boldsymbol{\omega}, \delta \cdot C_{\mathcal{P}_K, \text{I}}(\boldsymbol{\omega}), C_{\text{Lan}}, S, a)\}; \end{aligned}$$

by Proposition 8.14, for $M \geq M_{\mathcal{P}_K, \mathbf{I}}(\boldsymbol{\omega})$ and for A with $\#A \geq \delta \cdot \#(\mathcal{P}_K \cap \mathcal{O}_K(\boldsymbol{\omega}, M))$,

$$\#A \geq \delta \cdot C_{\mathcal{P}_K, \mathbf{I}}(\boldsymbol{\omega}) \cdot \frac{M^n}{\log M}$$

holds true. Here, C_{Lan} is as in (8.19). Suppose that $M \geq M_{\text{PESSI}}$. It then follows from the proof of Theorem 9.15 and Lemma 9.14 (1) that A satisfies the $(\rho, u, M, \boldsymbol{\omega}, S, a)$ -condition with parameters $(D, D, 3/4)$. Thus, we can apply Theorem 9.16 with $\Delta = C_{\text{Lan}}$, $D_1 = D_2 = D$ and $\varepsilon = 3/4$ to conclude that there exists $x \in A$ such that $A \cap \mathcal{O}_K(\boldsymbol{\omega}, x, \|x\|_{\infty, \boldsymbol{\omega}}^a)$ contains an S -constellation without associate pairs. This proves (1).

As for (2), employ $W = W_{\mathcal{P}_K, S\Psi_{\log}^{\text{SI}}}(\rho, S)$ as in Theorem 9.15. Let

$$\gamma_{\text{PESSI}}(\boldsymbol{\omega}, \delta, S, a) := \gamma_{\text{SI}}(D, D, \boldsymbol{\omega}, \delta \cdot C_{\mathcal{P}_K, \mathbf{I}}(\boldsymbol{\omega}), C_{\text{Lan}}, S, a) \cdot W^{-(n+1)}.$$

Then, Theorem 9.16 provides the desired estimate of $\mathcal{N}_S^\sharp(A \cap \mathcal{O}_K(\boldsymbol{v}, x, \|x\|_{\infty, \boldsymbol{v}}^a))$. □

Proof of Corollary 9.6. Immediate from Corollary 9.18 and Proposition 9.21. □

9.6 Constellations consisting of elements whose norms are close

In this subsection, we exhibit one application of our constellation theorems for short intervals. For simplicity, we only state the infinitary version.

Theorem 9.22. *We use Setting 8.1. Assume that a subset $A \subseteq \mathfrak{a} \setminus \{0\}$ satisfies the three conditions in Theorem 9.17. Then, there exists a sequence $(\mathcal{J}_l)_{l \in \mathbb{N}}$ of pairwise disjoint finite subsets in A with no associate pairs satisfying the following. For every $a \in (0, 1)_{\mathbb{R}}$, every finite set $S \subseteq \mathfrak{a}$ and every $\eta > 0$, there exists a finite subset $L \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ such that for all $l \in \mathbb{N} \setminus L$, the following hold true.*

(1) *The set \mathcal{J}_l contains an S -constellation.*

(2) *For every $\alpha_1, \alpha_2 \in \mathcal{J}_l$,*

$$\frac{\mathbf{N}(\alpha_2)}{\mathbf{N}(\alpha_1)} \leq 1 + \eta \cdot (\min\{\mathbf{N}(\alpha) : \alpha \in \mathcal{J}_l\})^{\frac{a-1}{n}}$$

holds.

Proof. Let $\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_n$ be the embeddings of K into \mathbb{C} . Recall that there exists a constant $D = D_{\boldsymbol{v}} > 0$, depending only on \boldsymbol{v} , such that for every $\alpha \in \mathfrak{a}$ and for each $i \in [n]$, we have $|\sigma_i(\alpha)| \leq D\|\alpha\|_{\infty, \boldsymbol{v}}$; see Lemma 4.8. Take an arbitrary $\delta > 0$ which is strictly smaller than the limit supremum appearing in condition (i) of Theorem 9.17. Take $\Delta > 0$ as in condition (ii) of Theorem 9.17. From δ and Δ , set $\Omega' = \Omega'_{\text{red}}(\boldsymbol{v}, \delta, \Delta) > 0$ as in Theorem 8.22. Take the constant $D(\boldsymbol{v}, \Omega') > 0$ as in Lemma 9.20 and $C'(\boldsymbol{v}) > 0$ as in its proof.

Consider a sequence $(a_l, S_l, \eta_l)_{l \in \mathbb{N}}$, where $(a_l)_{l \in \mathbb{N}}$ is a decreasing sequence in $(0, 1)_{\mathbb{R}}$ with $\lim_{l \rightarrow \infty} a_l = 0$ and $(\eta_l)_{l \in \mathbb{N}}$ is a decreasing sequence of positive real numbers with $\lim_{l \rightarrow \infty} \eta_l = 0$.

The sequence $(S_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ comes from a filtration $S_1 \subseteq S_2 \subseteq \dots$ of standard shapes of \mathfrak{a} with $\bigcup_{l \in \mathbb{N}} S_l = \mathfrak{a}$.

Apply the proof of Theorem 9.16 to this setting. Then, we obtain a strictly increasing sequence $(M_l)_{l \in \mathbb{N}}$ in $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 1}$ with $\lim_{l \rightarrow \infty} M_l = \infty$, a sequence $(y_l)_{l \in \mathbb{N}}$ in A , and a sequence of sets $(A''_0(M_l))_{l \in \mathbb{N}}$ such that for every $l \in \mathbb{N}$, the following conditions are fulfilled:

- (a) $A''_0(M_l) \subseteq A \cap \mathfrak{a}(\mathbf{v}, M_l) \cap \mathfrak{a}(\mathbf{v}, y_l, \frac{a_l}{2} \|y_l\|_{\infty, \mathbf{v}}^{a_l})$,
- (b) for every $\alpha \in A''_0(M_l)$, $\mathbf{N}(\alpha) \geq \Omega' M_l^n$,
- (c) $A''_0(M_l)$ admits no associate pairs, and it contains an S_l -constellation.

Indeed, for (a), consider $(a_l/2)_{l \in \mathbb{N}}$ instead of $(a_l)_{l \in \mathbb{N}}$, and take sufficiently large M_l to obtain the η_l -factor. Moreover, we can take in such a way that $(A''_0(M_l))_{l \in \mathbb{N}}$ is pairwise disjoint.

Now, for each $l \in \mathbb{N}$, we set $\mathcal{T}_l := A''_0(M_l)$. What remains is to verify (2). Fix $l \in \mathbb{N}$, and take $\alpha \in \mathcal{T}_l$. By Lemma 9.20, we have for each $i \in [n]$

$$|\sigma_i(\alpha)| \geq D(\mathbf{v}, \Omega') \cdot M_l. \tag{9.24}$$

Now take $\alpha_1, \alpha_2 \in \mathcal{T}_l$. Then, since $\|\alpha_1 - \alpha_2\|_{\infty, \mathbf{v}} \leq \eta_l M_l^{a_l}$ by (a), we have for each $i \in [n]$,

$$|\sigma_i(\alpha_1) - \sigma_i(\alpha_2)| \leq \eta_l C'(\mathbf{v}) M_l^{a_l}. \tag{9.25}$$

By combining Lemma 3.5, (9.24) and (9.25), we have

$$\frac{\mathbf{N}(\alpha_2)}{\mathbf{N}(\alpha_1)} \leq \prod_{i \in [n]} \left(1 + \frac{|\sigma_i(\alpha_1) - \sigma_i(\alpha_2)|}{|\sigma_i(\alpha_1)|} \right) \leq \left(1 + \frac{\eta_l C'(\mathbf{v})}{D(\mathbf{v}, \Omega')} \cdot M_l^{a_l-1} \right)^n.$$

By (b), for every $a \in (0, 1)_{\mathbb{R}}$ and $\eta > 0$, if l is sufficiently large depending on \mathbf{v}, A, a and η , then we have for all $\alpha_1, \alpha_2 \in \mathcal{T}_l$,

$$\frac{\mathbf{N}(\alpha_2)}{\mathbf{N}(\alpha_1)} \leq 1 + \eta \cdot \left(\min_{\alpha \in \mathcal{T}_l} \mathbf{N}(\alpha) \right)^{\frac{a-1}{n}}.$$

Hence we confirm (2), and the proof is completed. □

10 Constellations in ideals and quadratic forms

The goal of the present section is to establish Theorem C; we in fact prove its refinement, Theorem 10.1. For a binary quadratic form $F: \mathbb{Z}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}; F(x, y) := ax^2 + bxy + cy^2$ with integral coefficients, recall that F is said to be *primitive* if $\gcd(a, b, c) = 1$, and that D_F denotes the discriminant $b^2 - 4ac$. We say that F is *non-degenerate* if D_F is not a perfect square. If D_F is a perfect square, then F decomposes into the product of two linear polynomials in the polynomial ring $\mathbb{Z}[x, y]$; such a form can take prime values only if one of the two factors is equal to ± 1 , and hence it is not of our interest. Recall also the definition of the relative upper asymptotic density $\bar{d}_{X, \mathbf{v}}(A)$ from Definition 8.11.

Theorem 10.1 (Refinement of Theorem C). *Let $F(x, y) := ax^2 + bxy + cy^2 \in \mathbb{Z}[x, y]$ be a non-degenerate primitive quadratic form. Assume that $a > 0$. Let \mathbf{u} be the standard basis of \mathbb{Z}^2 .*

- (1) *Let $A \subseteq F^{-1}(\mathcal{P})$ be a set with $\bar{d}_{F^{-1}(\mathcal{P}), \mathbf{u}}(A) > 0$. Then, for a finite set $S \subseteq \mathbb{Z}^2$, there exists an S -constellation in A .*
- (2) *Assume that $D_F > 0$. Let $A \subseteq F^{-1}(-\mathcal{P})$ be a set with $\bar{d}_{F^{-1}(-\mathcal{P}), \mathbf{u}}(A) > 0$. Then, for a finite set $S \subseteq \mathbb{Z}^2$, there exists an S -constellation in A .*
- (3) *In both (1) and (2), the following furthermore holds true for A : there exists a sequence of pairwise disjoint finite subsets $(\mathcal{J}_l)_{l \in \mathbb{N}}$ of A which fulfills the following two conditions.*
 - (a) *For every $l \in \mathbb{N}$, $F|_{\mathcal{J}_l}: \mathcal{J}_l \rightarrow \mathcal{P}_{\mathbb{Q}}$ is injective.*
 - (b) *For every $\theta \in (0, 1)_{\mathbb{R}}$, for every finite subset $S \subseteq \mathbb{Z}^2$ and for every $\eta > 0$, there exists a finite subset $L \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ such that for every $l \in \mathbb{N} \setminus L$, the following hold:*
 - (b1) *\mathcal{J}_l contains an S -constellation,*
 - (b2) *for every $p_1, p_2 \in F(\mathcal{J}_l)$,*

$$\frac{|p_2|}{|p_1|} \leq 1 + \eta \cdot (\min\{|p| : p \in F(\mathcal{J}_l)\})^{\frac{\theta-1}{2}}$$

holds.

Remark 10.2. The exponent $\frac{\theta-1}{2}$ in condition (b2) in Theorem 10.1 (3) can *not* be improved to any constant less than $-\frac{1}{2}$ in general. Indeed, consider the case where $F(x, y) = x^2 + y^2$ and $S = \{(0, 0), (1, 0), (0, 1)\}$. Note that if $|x| \geq |y|$ and if $0 < d < |x|$, then

$$\left| \frac{F(x+d, y)}{F(x, y)} - 1 \right| \geq \frac{|d|}{2} \cdot (F(x, y))^{-\frac{1}{2}}.$$

We exhibit key theorems to the proof of Theorem 10.1 in Subsection 10.1, where we describe the organization of the present section.

10.1 Strategy for the proof of Theorem 10.1

In this subsection, we describe the strategy for the proof of Theorem 10.1. The first key to the proof is the following correspondence between primitive quadratic forms and invertible fractional ideals of orders. This is a classical result from the times of Gauss, Dirichlet and Dedekind. In the present paper, we exhibit a proof of Theorem 10.3 in the appendix for the convenience of the reader; see Theorem A.5. See also [Bha04, Subsections 3.2 and 3.3].

Theorem 10.3. *Let $F(x, y) = ax^2 + bxy + cy^2 \in \mathbb{Z}[x, y]$ be a primitive and non-degenerate binary quadratic form. Then there exist an order \mathcal{O} in $K := \mathbb{Q}(\sqrt{D_F})$, an invertible fractional ideal \mathfrak{c} of \mathcal{O} , a basis (γ_1, γ_2) of \mathfrak{c} as a \mathbb{Z} -module, and a sign $\epsilon_c \in \{\pm 1\}$ such that the following identity holds:*

$$F(x, y) = \epsilon_c \cdot \frac{N_{K/\mathbb{Q}}(\gamma_1 x + \gamma_2 y)}{\mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{c})} \quad \text{for all } (x, y) \in \mathbb{Z}^2. \quad (10.1)$$

We will present the definitions of *orders* and *invertible fractional ideals* in Subsection 10.2; for an invertible ideal \mathfrak{c} of an order \mathcal{O} , the definition of the *ideal norm* $\mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{c})$ of \mathfrak{c} will be provided in Subsection 10.3. Throughout this section, we use the symbols \mathfrak{c} and \mathfrak{d} for invertible fractional ideals of an order, and \mathfrak{a} and \mathfrak{b} for non-zero fractional ideals of \mathcal{O}_K .

Inspired by Theorem 10.3, we define the following subsets of fractional ideals of \mathcal{O}_K and \mathcal{O} , which may be regarded as counterparts of the set \mathcal{P}_K of prime elements. Indeed, if $\mathfrak{a} = \mathcal{O}_K$, then the set $\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{O}_K}$ coincides with \mathcal{P}_K .

Definition 10.4. Let K be a number field, and \mathcal{O}_K the ring of integers of K . Let \mathcal{O} be an order in K .

- (1) Let \mathfrak{a} be a non-zero fractional ideal of \mathcal{O}_K . Define the set $\mathcal{P}_{\mathfrak{a}} \subseteq \mathfrak{a}$ by

$$\mathcal{P}_{\mathfrak{a}} := \{\alpha \in \mathfrak{a} : \text{the ideal } \alpha\mathfrak{a}^{-1} \subseteq \mathcal{O}_K \text{ is a prime ideal}\},$$

where \mathfrak{a}^{-1} is the inverse fractional ideal of \mathfrak{a} (see the discussion before Theorem 3.3 for this concept).

- (2) Let \mathfrak{c} be an invertible fractional ideal of \mathcal{O} (Definition 10.8 below). Define the set $\mathcal{P}_{\mathfrak{c}} \subseteq \mathfrak{c}$ by

$$\mathcal{P}_{\mathfrak{c}} := \mathcal{P}_{\mathfrak{c}\mathcal{O}_K} \cap \mathfrak{c},$$

where $\mathfrak{c}\mathcal{O}_K \subseteq K$ denotes the (non-zero) fractional ideal of \mathcal{O}_K generated by \mathfrak{c} .

With these definitions, we will establish the following theorem. As it turns out, this will immediately imply Theorem 10.1.

Theorem 10.5. *Let K be a number field of degree n and \mathcal{O} an order in K . Let \mathfrak{c} be an invertible fractional ideal of \mathcal{O} and \mathbf{w} be a \mathbb{Z} -basis of \mathfrak{c} . Let $\mathcal{P}_{\mathfrak{c}} \subseteq \mathfrak{c}$ be the set defined in Definition 10.4 (2). Assume that $A \subseteq \mathcal{P}_{\mathfrak{c}}$ satisfies that $\overline{d}_{\mathcal{P}_{\mathfrak{c}}, \mathbf{w}}(A) > 0$. Then there exists a sequence of pairwise disjoint finite subsets $(\mathcal{J}_l)_{l \in \mathbb{N}}$ of A such that the following holds: for every $\theta \in (0, 1)_{\mathbb{R}}$, for every finite subset $S \subseteq \mathfrak{c}$, and for every $\eta > 0$, there exists a finite subset $L \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ such that for every $l \in \mathbb{N} \setminus L$, the following hold.*

- (1) \mathcal{J}_l contains an S -constellation,
 (2) for every $\alpha_1, \alpha_2 \in \mathcal{J}_l$,

$$\frac{|N_{K/\mathbb{Q}}(\alpha_2)|}{|N_{K/\mathbb{Q}}(\alpha_1)|} \leq 1 + \eta \cdot (\min\{|N_{K/\mathbb{Q}}(\alpha)| : \alpha \in \mathcal{J}_l\})^{\frac{\theta-1}{n}}$$

holds.

Theorem 10.5, in fact, can derive a result for the norm forms associated with the triple $(\mathcal{O}, \mathfrak{c}, \mathbf{w})$; see Setting 10.35 for the definition of the associated norm form. We will state the precise statement in Theorem 10.36. Elsholtz and Frei [EF19] have studied prime numbers represented by norm forms. See also the work of Maynard [May20]. The novel point of our

work is that we study combinatorics for the *set of tuples* (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n) at which the norm form represents primes.

In Subsections 10.2 and 10.3, we recall basics of the theory of invertible fractional ideals over orders. Proposition 10.21 is the goal in these two subsections. In Subsection 10.4, we prove that $\mathcal{P}_{\mathfrak{a}} \in \text{S}\Psi_{\log}^{\text{SI}}(\mathfrak{a})$ for every $\mathfrak{a} \in \text{Ideals}_K$ with the aid of Theorem 6.33. In Subsection 10.5, we estimate the sizes of certain subsets of $\mathcal{P}_{\mathfrak{c}}$ by employing a version of the Chebotarev density theorem (Theorem 10.28). We prove Theorem 10.5 in Subsection 10.6. Finally, in Subsection 10.7, we establish Theorem 10.1, which in turn implies Theorem C.

10.2 Preliminaries on invertible ideals of orders

Here we review generalities of invertible fractional ideals of orders. The reader with an algebraic background may skip this and the next subsections.

For a number field K of degree n , an *order* \mathcal{O} in K is a subring of \mathcal{O}_K which is isomorphic to \mathbb{Z}^n as a \mathbb{Z} -module. In particular, \mathcal{O}_K itself is an example of an order in K ; this is why it is also called the *maximal order*. One example of a non-maximal order is $\mathbb{Z}[\sqrt{5}]$, where $K = \mathbb{Q}(\sqrt{5})$. For this K , the maximal order \mathcal{O}_K is $\mathbb{Z}[\frac{1+\sqrt{5}}{2}]$. Orders in number fields are always 1-dimensional Noetherian integral domains; see for instance [Neu99, Chapter I, Proposition 12.2]. Recall that an (always associative commutative unital) ring is said to be *Noetherian* if every non-empty set of its ideals has a maximal element with respect to the inclusion relation. For a ring, the condition that it is a 1-dimensional integral domain is equivalent to saying that it is not a field and its only prime ideals are the zero ideal and the non-zero maximal ideals.

Lemma 10.6. *Let \mathcal{O} be a 1-dimensional Noetherian integral domain. For every non-zero ideal $\mathfrak{d} \subseteq \mathcal{O}$, there exist finitely many maximal ideals $\mathfrak{p}_1, \dots, \mathfrak{p}_s$, not necessarily distinct, such that $\mathfrak{p}_1 \cdots \mathfrak{p}_s \subseteq \mathfrak{d}$ holds.*

Proof. Let Φ be the set of non-zero ideals which do not satisfy the claimed property. By way of contradiction, suppose Φ is non-empty. Then by the Noetherian assumption, it has a maximal element. We write \mathfrak{d} for it. Note that \mathfrak{d} is not equal to \mathcal{O} or a maximal ideal because they trivially satisfy the claimed condition. Since \mathcal{O} is a 1-dimensional integral domain, it follows that \mathfrak{d} is not a prime ideal. Hence there exist elements $a, b \in \mathcal{O} \setminus \mathfrak{d}$ with $ab \in \mathfrak{d}$. The two ideals $a\mathcal{O} + \mathfrak{d}$ and $b\mathcal{O} + \mathfrak{d}$ are strictly larger than \mathfrak{d} . By the maximality of \mathfrak{d} , they do not belong to Φ . By the definition of Φ , there exist maximal ideals $\mathfrak{p}_1, \dots, \mathfrak{p}_r, \mathfrak{p}_{r+1}, \dots, \mathfrak{p}_s$ such that $\mathfrak{p}_1 \cdots \mathfrak{p}_r \subseteq a\mathcal{O} + \mathfrak{d}$ and that $\mathfrak{p}_{r+1} \cdots \mathfrak{p}_s \subseteq b\mathcal{O} + \mathfrak{d}$. Take the product of the two inclusions above. The right-hand side of the product is contained in \mathfrak{d} by the relation $ab \in \mathfrak{d}$. Hence we obtain $\mathfrak{p}_1 \cdots \mathfrak{p}_s \subseteq \mathfrak{d}$. This contradicts $\mathfrak{d} \notin \Phi$, and we conclude that Φ is empty. \square

Also recall the following general fact.

Lemma 10.7. *Let \mathfrak{p} and \mathfrak{q} be maximal ideals in a given ring. If there exists a positive integer $e > 0$ such that $\mathfrak{p}^e \subseteq \mathfrak{q}$ holds, then we have $\mathfrak{p} = \mathfrak{q}$.*

Proof. Since \mathfrak{q} is in particular a prime ideal, from the given inclusion we have $\mathfrak{p} \subseteq \mathfrak{q}$. Then by the fact that \mathfrak{p} is maximal, we obtain the equality $\mathfrak{p} = \mathfrak{q}$. \square

Now we recall the definition of invertible fractional ideals of an order.

Definition 10.8. Let K be a number field, and \mathcal{O} an order in K . A non-zero \mathcal{O} -submodule \mathfrak{c} of K is called an *invertible fractional ideal* of \mathcal{O} if there exists a non-zero \mathcal{O} -submodule \mathfrak{d} of K such that $\mathfrak{c}\mathfrak{d} = \mathcal{O}$. Here, the left-hand side is defined to be the \mathcal{O} -submodule of K generated by the set $\{cd : c \in \mathfrak{c}, d \in \mathfrak{d}\}$. Such a \mathfrak{d} is uniquely determined by \mathfrak{c} , and is called the *inverse fractional ideal* of \mathfrak{c} . It is written as \mathfrak{c}^{-1} . If moreover $\mathfrak{c} \subseteq \mathcal{O}$ holds, then we say that \mathfrak{c} is an *invertible ideal* of \mathcal{O} .

In view of Lemma 10.9 (1) below, the use of the adjective ‘fractional’ in the term ‘invertible fractional ideal’ is consistent with Section 3, where fractional ideals of \mathcal{O}_K meant finitely generated \mathcal{O}_K -submodules of K . By [Neu99, Chapter I, Proposition 3.8], every non-zero fractional ideal \mathfrak{a} of \mathcal{O}_K is invertible as was pointed out in the discussion before Theorem 3.3.

Lemma 10.9. *Let K be a number field, \mathcal{O} an order in K . Let \mathfrak{c} be an invertible fractional ideal of \mathcal{O} .*

- (1) *The \mathcal{O} -module \mathfrak{c} is finitely generated.*
- (2) *Let \mathfrak{p} be a maximal ideal. Then there exists an element $c \in \mathfrak{c}$ such that for every ideal \mathfrak{d} containing a power \mathfrak{p}^e of \mathfrak{p} , where $e \in \mathbb{N}$, the multiplication map $\mathcal{O} \ni x \mapsto cx \in \mathfrak{c}$ induces a bijection*

$$\mathcal{O}/\mathfrak{d} \xrightarrow{\cong} \mathfrak{c}/\mathfrak{c}\mathfrak{d}. \tag{10.2}$$

Proof. By $\mathfrak{c} \cdot \mathfrak{c}^{-1} = \mathcal{O}$, there exist elements $c_1, \dots, c_r \in \mathfrak{c}$ and $d_1, \dots, d_r \in \mathfrak{c}^{-1}$ such that we have

$$c_1d_1 + \dots + c_rd_r = 1. \tag{10.3}$$

Multiply this by an arbitrary $c \in \mathfrak{c}$ to get $c_1(d_1c) + \dots + c_r(d_rc) = c$. Since we have $d_ic \in \mathcal{O}$ for all $i \in [r]$, this shows that \mathfrak{c} is generated by the elements c_1, \dots, c_r . This proves (1).

To show (2), in (10.3) note that for all $i \in [r]$, $c_id_i \in \mathcal{O}$ holds. It follows that there exists $i \in [r]$ such that $c_id_i \in \mathcal{O} \setminus \mathfrak{p}$. Fix such i . We claim that $c := c_i$ is an element with the desired property. To prove this claim, first observe the following equality of ideals of \mathcal{O} : $c\mathfrak{c}^{-1} + \mathfrak{d} = \mathcal{O}$. Indeed, suppose that it is not the case. Then, there must exist a maximal ideal \mathfrak{q} of \mathcal{O} containing the left-hand side. Since $cd_i \in c\mathfrak{c}^{-1}$ is not contained in \mathfrak{p} , we have $\mathfrak{q} \neq \mathfrak{p}$. However, by Lemma 10.7, \mathfrak{p} is the only maximal ideal that can contain \mathfrak{d} , a contradiction. Thus we obtain $c\mathfrak{c}^{-1} + \mathfrak{d} = \mathcal{O}$. By multiplying this by \mathfrak{c} , we have $c\mathcal{O} + \mathfrak{c}\mathfrak{d} = \mathfrak{c}$ as an equality of submodules of \mathfrak{c} . This is equivalent to saying that the map (10.2) is surjective.

For the injectivity, apply (3.2) to $c\mathfrak{c}^{-1} + \mathfrak{d} = \mathcal{O}$, and obtain $c\mathfrak{c}^{-1} \cap \mathfrak{d} = c\mathfrak{c}^{-1} \cdot \mathfrak{d}$. Since \mathfrak{c} is an invertible fractional ideal, we have $c\mathcal{O} \cap \mathfrak{c}\mathfrak{d} = \mathfrak{c}\mathfrak{d}$. This implies that if an element of the form cd with $d \in \mathcal{O}$ belongs to $\mathfrak{c}\mathfrak{d}$, then d is necessarily in \mathfrak{d} . It is equivalent to the injectivity of the map (10.2). \square

Proposition 10.10. *Let K be a number field, and \mathcal{O} an order in K . Let \mathfrak{c} be an invertible fractional ideal of \mathcal{O} and $\mathfrak{d} \subseteq \mathcal{O}$ a non-zero ideal. Then the \mathcal{O} -module $\mathfrak{c}/\mathfrak{c}\mathfrak{d}$ is isomorphic to \mathcal{O}/\mathfrak{d} . In particular, it is generated by a single element.*

Proof. Recall that \mathcal{O} is a 1-dimensional Noetherian integral domain. By Lemma 10.6, there exist distinct maximal ideals $\mathfrak{p}_1, \dots, \mathfrak{p}_s$ of \mathcal{O} and an exponent $e \geq 0$ such that $(\mathfrak{p}_1 \cdots \mathfrak{p}_s)^e \subseteq \mathfrak{d}$ holds. For each $i \in [s]$, set $\mathfrak{d}_i := \mathfrak{d} + \mathfrak{p}_i^e$. By Lemma 10.7, the ideals \mathfrak{d}_i , $i \in [s]$, are mutually coprime. Then by (3.2) we have $\bigcap_{i \in [s]} \mathfrak{d}_i = \prod_{i \in [s]} \mathfrak{d}_i$. Since $(\mathfrak{p}_1 \cdots \mathfrak{p}_s)^e \subseteq \mathfrak{d}$, we conclude

$$\bigcap_{i \in [s]} \mathfrak{d}_i = \prod_{i \in [s]} (\mathfrak{d} + \mathfrak{p}_i^e) \subseteq \mathfrak{d}.$$

On the other hand, we trivially have $\mathfrak{d} \subseteq \bigcap_{i \in [s]} \mathfrak{d}_i$. Therefore, $\mathfrak{d} = \bigcap_{i \in [s]} \mathfrak{d}_i$ holds. Hence by the Chinese remainder theorem (formula (3.4)), we have an isomorphism of \mathcal{O} -modules $\mathfrak{c}/\mathfrak{c}\mathfrak{d} \simeq \prod_{i \in [s]} \mathfrak{c}/\mathfrak{c}\mathfrak{d}_i$. By Lemma 10.9, for each $i \in [s]$, the i -th factor on the right-hand side is isomorphic to $\mathcal{O}/\mathfrak{d}_i$. Finally, the product $\prod_{i \in [s]} \mathcal{O}/\mathfrak{d}_i$ is isomorphic to \mathcal{O}/\mathfrak{d} again by the Chinese remainder theorem (formula (3.3)). \square

Proposition 10.10 in particular implies Lemma 3.12, which has been employed in Section 8 in axiomatized constellation theorems.

Corollary 10.11. *Let K be a number field, and \mathcal{O} an order in K . Let \mathfrak{c} be an invertible fractional ideal of \mathcal{O} , and $f \in \mathcal{O} \setminus \{0\}$. Then there exists an element $x \in K^\times$ such that $x\mathfrak{c} + f\mathcal{O} = \mathcal{O}$ holds as an equality of \mathcal{O} -submodules of K . That means, the submodule $x\mathfrak{c}$ is contained in \mathcal{O} and coprime with the given element f .*

Proof. Apply Proposition 10.10 to \mathfrak{c}^{-1} and $\mathfrak{d} = f\mathcal{O}$ to find an element $x \in \mathfrak{c}^{-1} \setminus \{0\}$ such that $x\mathcal{O} + f\mathfrak{c}^{-1} = \mathfrak{c}^{-1}$. By multiplying this by \mathfrak{c} , we obtain the desired equality. \square

10.3 Ideal norms of invertible fractional ideals

The goal of this subsection is to prove Proposition 10.21, which enables us to reduce the setting of an invertible fractional ideal of an order to a non-zero (integral) ideal of \mathcal{O}_K . First we recall the notion of the norm of an invertible fractional ideal in the context of number fields.

Throughout this subsection, we assume the following setting:

Setting 10.12. Let K be a number field of degree n , and \mathcal{O} an order in K . Let f be a positive integer satisfying $f\mathcal{O}_K \subseteq \mathcal{O}$ (for instance, $f := \#(\mathcal{O}_K/\mathcal{O})$, which is finite because \mathcal{O}_K and \mathcal{O} are both isomorphic to \mathbb{Z}^n as \mathbb{Z} -modules).

Definition 10.13. Let \mathfrak{c} be an invertible fractional ideal of \mathcal{O} .

(1) If $\mathfrak{c} \subseteq \mathcal{O}$, we define its *ideal norm* by $\mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{c}) := \#(\mathcal{O}/\mathfrak{c})$.

- (2) In general, we define the *ideal norm* of \mathfrak{c} in the following manner: choose an element $d \in \mathcal{O} \setminus \{0\}$ such that $d\mathfrak{c} \subseteq \mathcal{O}$ (which exists by Lemma 10.9 (1)), and set

$$\mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{c}) := \frac{\mathbf{N}(d\mathfrak{c})}{\mathbf{N}(d\mathcal{O})}. \tag{10.4}$$

Note that in (1), the quotient group \mathcal{O}/\mathfrak{c} is finite because both \mathcal{O} and \mathfrak{c} are free abelian groups of rank n . Also, when $\mathcal{O} = \mathcal{O}_K$, (1) is consistent with the definition of the ideal norm in Section 3. In Proposition 10.16, we will verify that the right-hand side of (10.4) is independent of the choice of d ; in particular, (10.4) is consistent with (1).

Remark 10.14. An invertible fractional ideal \mathfrak{c} of \mathcal{O} can be an \mathcal{O}' -module for several different orders \mathcal{O}' . The absence of the ring \mathcal{O} from the symbol $\mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{c})$ is nonetheless justified by the fact that under the assumption that \mathfrak{c} is an *invertible* fractional ideal of \mathcal{O} , the ring \mathcal{O} can be recovered from $\mathfrak{c} \subseteq K$ as $\mathcal{O} = \{x \in K \mid x\mathfrak{c} \subseteq \mathfrak{c}\}$.

Lemma 10.15. *Let $\mathfrak{c} \subseteq K$ be a subgroup isomorphic to \mathbb{Z}^n and $x \in \mathcal{O}_K \setminus \{0\}$. Assume that $x\mathfrak{c} \subseteq \mathfrak{c}$ as subsets of K . Then we have $\#(\mathfrak{c}/x\mathfrak{c}) = |N_{K/\mathbb{Q}}(x)|$.*

Proof. Choose an arbitrary \mathbb{Z} -basis \mathbf{w} for \mathfrak{c} and let X be the matrix representing the map $\mathfrak{c} \ni c \mapsto xc \in \mathfrak{c}$ with respect to \mathbf{w} . Then by the theory of finitely generated abelian groups, we have $\#(\mathfrak{c}/x\mathfrak{c}) = |\det(X)|$. Recall from Remark 3.6 that the norm $N_{K/\mathbb{Q}}(x)$ equals the determinant of the \mathbb{Q} -linear endomorphism $K \ni y \mapsto xy \in K$. Since \mathbf{w} may be seen as a \mathbb{Q} -basis of K , the result follows. \square

Proposition 10.16. *Let \mathfrak{c} be an invertible fractional ideal of \mathcal{O} .*

- (1) *Assume that $\mathfrak{c} \subseteq \mathcal{O}$, and let $d \in \mathcal{O} \setminus \{0\}$. Then we have*

$$\mathbf{N}(d\mathfrak{c}) = |N_{K/\mathbb{Q}}(d)| \cdot \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{c}). \tag{10.5}$$

- (2) *The ideal norm of \mathfrak{c} in (10.4) is independent of the choice of d . Moreover (10.5) holds for all invertible fractional ideals \mathfrak{c} and all $d \in K^\times$.*

Proof. First, we prove (1). By the filtration $d\mathfrak{c} \subseteq \mathfrak{c} \subseteq \mathcal{O}$, we have

$$\#(\mathcal{O}/d\mathfrak{c}) = \#(\mathcal{O}/\mathfrak{c}) \cdot \#(\mathfrak{c}/d\mathfrak{c}).$$

By Lemma 10.15, we have $\#(\mathfrak{c}/d\mathfrak{c}) = |N_{K/\mathbb{Q}}(d)|$. Therefore, we obtain the desired formula (10.5).

For (2), let $c, d \in \mathcal{O} \setminus \{0\}$ be two elements with $c\mathfrak{c} \subseteq \mathcal{O}$ and $d\mathfrak{c} \subseteq \mathcal{O}$. By (1), we have $\mathbf{N}(cd\mathfrak{c}) = |N_{K/\mathbb{Q}}(c)| \cdot \mathbf{N}(d\mathfrak{c}) = |N_{K/\mathbb{Q}}(d)| \cdot \mathbf{N}(c\mathfrak{c})$. From this, we obtain $\mathbf{N}(d\mathfrak{c})/|N_{K/\mathbb{Q}}(d)| = \mathbf{N}(c\mathfrak{c})/|N_{K/\mathbb{Q}}(c)|$. It ensures that Definition 10.13 (2) is well-defined. Equality (10.5) for the general case follows in a similar manner by repeated application of (1). \square

The following lemma describes a relationship between the ideal norm of an ideal of \mathcal{O} and that of an ideal of \mathcal{O}_K .

Lemma 10.17. *Let $\mathfrak{c} \subseteq \mathcal{O}$ be an invertible ideal satisfying $\mathfrak{c} + f\mathcal{O} = \mathcal{O}$. Then we have $\mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{c}) = \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{c}\mathcal{O}_K)$.*

Proof. Consider the following commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & \mathfrak{c} & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{O} & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{O}/\mathfrak{c} & \longrightarrow & 0 \\ & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow v & & \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & \mathfrak{c}\mathcal{O}_K & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{O}_K & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{O}_K/\mathfrak{c}\mathcal{O}_K & \longrightarrow & 0 \end{array}$$

with exact rows. By the assumption $\mathfrak{c} + f\mathcal{O} = \mathcal{O}$, the integer f is invertible in the rings \mathcal{O}/\mathfrak{c} and $\mathcal{O}_K/\mathfrak{c}\mathcal{O}_K$. By the assumption $f\mathcal{O}_K \subseteq \mathcal{O}$ from Setting 10.12, f acts as zero on the quotient groups $\mathfrak{c}\mathcal{O}_K/\mathfrak{c}$ and $\mathcal{O}_K/\mathcal{O}$. Hence, by the snake lemma, we conclude that on the kernel and cokernel of the vertical map v , the integer f acts as zero and invertibly at the same time. Therefore, $\ker(v)$ and $\operatorname{coker}(v)$ are both zero; in other words, v is bijective. In particular, we obtain

$$\mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{c}) = \#(\mathcal{O}/\mathfrak{c}) = \#(\mathcal{O}_K/\mathfrak{c}\mathcal{O}_K) = \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{c}\mathcal{O}_K),$$

as desired. \square

Proposition 10.18. *Let \mathfrak{c} be an arbitrary invertible fractional ideal of \mathcal{O} . Then we have $\mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{c}) = \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{c}\mathcal{O}_K)$.*

Proof. By Corollary 10.11, there exists an element $x \in K^\times$ such that $x\mathfrak{c} + f\mathcal{O} = \mathcal{O}$ holds. By Lemma 10.17, we have $\mathbf{N}(x\mathfrak{c}) = \mathbf{N}(x\mathfrak{c}\mathcal{O}_K)$. By Proposition 10.16, this then implies that $|N_{K/\mathbb{Q}}(x)| \cdot \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{c}) = |N_{K/\mathbb{Q}}(x)| \cdot \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{c}\mathcal{O}_K)$. Hence, $\mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{c}) = \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{c}\mathcal{O}_K)$. \square

The following reduction result (Proposition 10.21) plays a key role in the proof of Theorem 10.5, as well as in the deduction of Theorem 10.1 from Theorem 10.5. To prove the reduction result, we employ the following concept of sign.

Recall that r_1 is the number of real embeddings of K .

Definition 10.19. Let $\xi \in K^\times$. We define its *sign* $\operatorname{sgn}(\xi)$ to be the tuple

$$\operatorname{sgn}(\xi) := \left(\operatorname{sgn}(\sigma_i(\xi)) \right)_{i \in [r_1]} \in \{\pm 1\}^{r_1}$$

of signs ± 1 .

Lemma 10.20. *For every sign $s \in \{\pm 1\}^{r_1}$ and for every class $\tau \in \mathcal{O}_K/f\mathcal{O}_K$, there exists an element of \mathcal{O}_K whose sign is s and whose residue class is τ .*

Proof. By the approximation theorem ([Neu99, Chapter II, Theorem 3.4]), there exists an element ξ of K^\times such that $\operatorname{sgn}(\xi) = s$. By multiplying by an appropriate positive integer if necessary, we may assume that ξ is an element of \mathcal{O}_K . Let α_0 be a representative of τ and t a positive integer. Set $\alpha := \alpha_0 + ft\xi$. Then α is an element of \mathcal{O}_K , and the residue class of α is τ . Furthermore, since $\sigma_i(\alpha) = \sigma_i(\alpha_0) + ft\sigma_i(\xi)$ for every $i \in [r_1]$, the signs of $\sigma_i(\alpha)$ and $\sigma_i(\xi)$ coincide if t is sufficiently large. \square

For the definitions of the sets $\mathcal{P}_\mathfrak{a}$ and $\mathcal{P}_\mathfrak{c}$ in the following statement, see Definition 10.4.

Proposition 10.21 (Reduction to ideals in maximal orders). *Assume Setting 10.12. Let \mathfrak{c} be an invertible fractional ideal of \mathcal{O} . Then there exists $\xi \in K^\times$ such that the following three hold true. Below, we write $\mathfrak{a} := \xi\mathfrak{c}\mathcal{O}_K$.*

- (1) *The set $\xi\mathfrak{c}$ is an ideal of \mathcal{O} , and it is coprime with f .*
- (2) *The ideal \mathfrak{a} of \mathcal{O}_K is coprime with f .*
- (3) *The multiplication map $\alpha \mapsto \xi\alpha$ in K induces injective maps from \mathfrak{c} to \mathfrak{a} and from $\mathcal{P}_\mathfrak{c}$ to $\mathcal{P}_\mathfrak{a}$.*
- (4) *For every $\alpha \in \mathfrak{c}$, we have*

$$\frac{N_{K/\mathbb{Q}}(\alpha)}{\mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{c})} = \frac{N_{K/\mathbb{Q}}(\xi\alpha)}{\mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{a})}.$$

Note that (2) is implied by (1). We have explicitly stated (2) for later reference.

Proof. Apply Corollary 10.11 to \mathfrak{c} and f . Then, we obtain $\xi \in K^\times$ such that $\xi\mathfrak{c} + f\mathcal{O} = \mathcal{O}$. We claim that ξ can be taken to satisfy $N_{K/\mathbb{Q}}(\xi) > 0$. To show this claim, suppose that the originally taken ξ satisfies $N_{K/\mathbb{Q}}(\xi) < 0$; in this case we necessarily have $r_1 \geq 1$. By Lemma 10.20 with f replaced by f^2 , we can find an element $\alpha \in 1 + f^2\mathcal{O}_K (\subseteq 1 + f\mathcal{O})$ such that $N_{K/\mathbb{Q}}(\alpha) < 0$. Write ξ afresh for $\alpha\xi$. This verifies our claim.

Our task is to verify (3) and (4) for this ξ . First, by definition, we have $\mathcal{P}_\mathfrak{c} \subseteq \mathcal{P}_{\mathfrak{c}\mathcal{O}_K}$. Observe that the multiplication map $\alpha \mapsto \xi\alpha$ induces a bijection from $\mathcal{P}_{\mathfrak{c}\mathcal{O}_K}$ to $\mathcal{P}_\mathfrak{a}$. Indeed, for every $\alpha \in \mathfrak{c}$, we have the equality of fractional ideals $\alpha(\mathfrak{c}\mathcal{O}_K)^{-1} = (\xi\alpha)(\xi\mathfrak{c}\mathcal{O}_K)^{-1}$. Hence, (3) holds.

Next, by Proposition 10.16 (2) and Proposition 10.18 we have (recalling the definition $\mathfrak{a} = \xi\mathfrak{c}\mathcal{O}_K$)

$$\mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{a}) = |N_{K/\mathbb{Q}}(\xi)| \cdot \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{c}\mathcal{O}_K) = N_{K/\mathbb{Q}}(\xi) \cdot \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{c}).$$

Here we used the condition $N_{K/\mathbb{Q}}(\xi) > 0$ as well. Assertion (4) now follows from the multiplicativity of the norm: $N_{K/\mathbb{Q}}(\xi\alpha) = N_{K/\mathbb{Q}}(\xi) \cdot N_{K/\mathbb{Q}}(\alpha)$. \square

Proposition 10.21 explains partly why Theorem 6.33 and our axiomatized constellation theorems in Sections 8 and 9 are formulated for non-zero ideals \mathfrak{a} of \mathcal{O}_K instead of invertible fractional ideals.

10.4 ‘Prime elements’ in ideals and subpseudorandom condition

The goal of this subsection is the following.

Theorem 10.22. *Let K be a number field of degree n and $\mathfrak{a} \in \text{Ideals}_K$. Then $\mathcal{P}_\mathfrak{a}$ is a member of $S\Psi_{\log}^{\text{SI}}(\mathfrak{a})$. Moreover, for every $\theta \in (0, 1)_{\mathbb{R}}$ and for every integer r at least $[K : \mathbb{Q}]$, there exist $D_1, D_2 > 0$ and $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)_{\mathbb{R}}$ such that the following holds true. Let $S \subseteq \mathfrak{a}$ be a standard shape with $\#S = r + 1$, and \mathbf{v} a \mathbb{Z} -basis of \mathfrak{a} . Then, for every $\rho > 0$ and every*

$u > 0$, there exist natural numbers $W = W_{\mathcal{P}_a, S\Psi_{\log}^{\text{SI}}}(\rho, S)$ and $M_{\mathcal{P}_a, S\Psi_{\log}^{\text{SI}}}(\rho, u, \mathbf{v}, S, \theta)$ such that if $M \geq M_{\mathcal{P}_a, S\Psi_{\log}^{\text{SI}}}(\rho, u, \mathbf{v}, S, \theta)$, then $\mathcal{P}_a \cap \mathfrak{a}(\mathbf{v}, M)$ satisfies the $(\rho, u, W, M, \mathbf{v}, S, \theta)$ -condition with parameters (D_1, D_2, ε) .

The key to the proof is the Goldston–Yıldırım type asymptotic formula for ideals, stated in Theorem 6.33. Since we use the symbol a for the coefficient of $F(x, y) = ax^2 + bxy + cy^2$, we use the symbol θ for the ‘parameter $a \in (0, 1)_{\mathbb{R}}$ ’ in the proof.

Proof. We will first prove the latter assertion. Fix a C^∞ -function $\chi: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow [0, 1]_{\mathbb{R}}$ with $\chi(0) = 1$ and $\text{supp}(\chi) \subseteq [-1, 1]_{\mathbb{R}}$. Using Theorem 6.33, we can go along a similar line to the proof of Theorem 8.8 so that we obtain the following: for every $\rho > 0$ and for every $u > 0$, there exist $W = W_{\mathcal{P}_a, S\Psi_{\log}^{\text{SI}}}(\rho, \chi, S)$ and $M'_{\mathcal{P}_a, S\Psi_{\log}^{\text{SI}}} = M'_{\mathcal{P}_a, S\Psi_{\log}^{\text{SI}}}(\rho, u, \chi, S, \theta) \in \mathbb{N}$ with $W \leq (M'_{\mathcal{P}_a, S\Psi_{\log}^{\text{SI}}})^{(\log 2)^\theta}$ such that the following holds. For $M \geq M'_{\mathcal{P}_a, S\Psi_{\log}^{\text{SI}}}$, let $R := M^{\frac{\theta}{17(r+1)2^r}}$ and define $\lambda: \mathfrak{a} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ by

$$\lambda(\alpha) := \frac{\kappa \cdot \Lambda_{R, \chi}^{\mathfrak{a}}(\alpha)^2}{c_\chi \log R}.$$

Here κ is the constant appearing in Theorem 3.19, and $c_\chi := \int_0^\infty \chi'^2(x) dx$; recall the definition of $\Lambda_{R, \chi}^{\mathfrak{a}}$ from (6.33). Then, for every $b \in \mathfrak{a}$ with $b\mathcal{O}_K + W\mathfrak{a} = \mathfrak{a}$, the function $\frac{\varphi_K(W)}{W^n}(\lambda \circ \text{Aff}_{W, b})$ is a $(\rho, \frac{uM^\theta}{W}, S)$ -pseudorandom measure.

Let \mathbf{v} be a \mathbb{Z} -basis of \mathfrak{a} . Define the exceptional set $T \subseteq \mathcal{P}_a \cap \mathfrak{a}(\mathbf{v}, M)$ by $T := \mathcal{P}_a \cap \mathfrak{a}(\mathbf{v}, M) \cap \mathcal{O}_K(\mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{a}) \cdot R)$. We claim that if M is sufficiently large depending on ρ, S and θ , then every $\alpha \in \mathcal{P}_a \setminus T$ satisfies that $\alpha\mathcal{O}_K + W\mathfrak{a} = \mathfrak{a}$. Indeed, since $\alpha \in \mathcal{P}_a$, there exists a prime ideal \mathfrak{p}_α such that $\alpha\mathcal{O}_K = \mathfrak{p}_\alpha\mathfrak{a}$. If M is sufficiently large depending on ρ, S and θ , then the inequality $\mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{p}_\alpha) > R$ implies that \mathfrak{p}_α is prime to W . Hence, $\alpha\mathcal{O}_K + W\mathfrak{a} = \mathfrak{a}$ in this case. This argument in addition shows that for every $\alpha \in \mathcal{P}_a \setminus T$, we have $\lambda(\alpha) = \frac{\kappa\theta}{17(r+1)2^r \cdot c_\chi} \cdot \log M$. Moreover, if M is sufficiently large depending on \mathbf{v} and θ , then by (8.3), we obtain $\#T \leq M^{\frac{\theta}{16}}$.

Define $M_{\mathcal{P}_a, S\Psi_{\log}^{\text{SI}}}(\rho, u, \mathbf{v}, \chi, S, \theta)$ as the minimal integer such that all of the arguments above hold true. Then, for

$$(D_1, D_2, \varepsilon) = \left(\frac{\kappa\theta}{17(r+1)2^r \cdot c_\chi}, \frac{\kappa\theta}{17(r+1)2^r \cdot c_\chi}, \frac{3}{4} \right),$$

we obtain the latter assertion of the theorem. Here, since we have fixed a function χ , we omit to write dependences of $W_{\mathcal{P}_a, S\Psi_{\log}^{\text{SI}}}(\rho, \chi, S)$ and $M_{\mathcal{P}_a, S\Psi_{\log}^{\text{SI}}}(\rho, u, \mathbf{v}, \chi, S, \theta)$ on χ . Thus we write $W_{\mathcal{P}_a, S\Psi_{\log}^{\text{SI}}}(\rho, S)$ and $M_{\mathcal{P}_a, S\Psi_{\log}^{\text{SI}}}(\rho, u, \mathbf{v}, S, \theta)$ for short. In particular, we have the former assertion, $\mathcal{P}_a \in \text{S}\Psi_{\log}^{\text{SI}}(\mathfrak{a})$. \square

10.5 Counting elements by the Chebotarev density theorem

In order to establish Theorem 10.5, we aim to apply Theorem 9.22 to the given set $A \subseteq \mathcal{P}_\mathfrak{c}$, which translates to a subset of $\mathcal{P}_\mathfrak{a}$ for an ideal \mathfrak{a} of \mathcal{O}_K via Proposition 10.21. Since we have

proved $\mathcal{P}_{\mathfrak{a}} \in \text{S}\Psi_{\log}^{\text{SI}}(\mathfrak{a})$ in Theorem 10.22, what remains to be verified is conditions (i) and (ii) in Theorem 8.24. As we will explain in Subsection 10.6, condition (ii) can be confirmed by Landau’s prime ideal theorem. Thus, the main task is the verification of the counting condition (i).

In this subsection, we will perform this counting argument, with the aid of a finer version of the Chebotarev density theorem (Theorem 10.28) than we have been using. See Theorems 10.32 and 10.34 for the final statements of our counts.

Two main differences between the counting argument in this section and that in previous sections are the following: first, we have additional data, such as \mathfrak{a} , \mathcal{O} and \mathfrak{c} . Secondly, since the sign of the norm $N_{K/\mathbb{Q}}(\alpha)$ matters in Theorem 10.1 and Theorem 10.3, we need to count elements *having a prescribed sign*; to count elements with signs, the mere count of ideals does not suffice because as the identity $\mathbf{N}(\alpha\mathcal{O}_K) = |N_{K/\mathbb{Q}}(\alpha)|$ suggests, the ideal generated by a given element does not remember its sign.

Setting 10.23. Let K be a number field of degree n . Let $f \in \mathbb{N}$. Let r_1 be the number of real embeddings of K , and fix real embeddings $\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_{r_1}$ to define the function sgn (Definition 10.19). Let φ_K be the totient function of K (Definition 3.8).

First, we consider the set $\mathcal{P}_{\mathfrak{a}}$ of ‘prime elements’ of an ideal \mathfrak{a} of \mathcal{O}_K . Let us collect some pieces of terminology to state the Chebotarev density theorem 10.28.

Definition 10.24. (1) For $\xi \in K^\times$ and $\alpha \in \mathcal{O}_K$, we write $\xi \equiv \alpha \pmod{f}$, or say ξ is congruent to α modulo f , if there exist $x \in f\mathcal{O}_K$ and $y \in \mathcal{O}_K \setminus \{0\}$ with y prime to f such that $\xi = \alpha + \frac{x}{y}$.

(2) We denote by I_K^f the commutative group of fractional ideals of \mathcal{O}_K coprime with f . (A fractional ideal is said to be *coprime* with f means if it does not share prime factors with f , cf. Theorem 3.3. We have a canonical isomorphism $I_K^f \cong \bigoplus_{\mathfrak{p} \nmid f} \mathbb{Z}$.)

(3) Let K_{f+}^\times be the subgroup of elements of K^\times which are congruent to 1 modulo f and totally positive. Namely, set

$$K_{f+}^\times := \left\{ \xi = 1 + \frac{x}{y} \in K : \begin{array}{l} x \in f\mathcal{O}_K, y \in \mathcal{O}_K \setminus \{0\} \text{ prime to } f, \\ \text{sgn}(\xi) = (+1, \dots, +1) \end{array} \right\}.$$

Then the map $\xi \mapsto \xi\mathcal{O}_K$ gives rise to a homomorphism $K_{f+}^\times \rightarrow I_K^f$.

(4) We define the *ideal class group* Cl_K^f with modulus f as the cokernel of the homomorphism $K_{f+}^\times \rightarrow I_K^f$ above. We define h_f to be the order of Cl_K^f .

(5) Let $\mathcal{O}_{K,f+}^\times$ be the subgroup of \mathcal{O}_K^\times consisting of the elements which are congruent to 1 modulo f and which are totally positive. In other words, $\mathcal{O}_{K,f+}^\times$ is the kernel of the map $\mathcal{O}_K^\times \rightarrow (\mathcal{O}_K/f\mathcal{O}_K)^\times \times \{\pm 1\}^{r_1}; \xi \mapsto (\xi + f\mathcal{O}_K, \text{sgn}(\xi))$. (Since the target is a finite group, we know $\text{rank}(\mathcal{O}_{K,f+}^\times) = \text{rank}(\mathcal{O}_K^\times)$.)

In (4), we followed the sign convention of [Neu99] and [Hei67]. It is well known that h_f is finite; for instance, see [Neu99, Chapter VI, Proposition 1.8 and Proposition 1.9].

Recall that as usual we regard a residue class $\tau \in \mathcal{O}_K/f\mathcal{O}_K$ as a subset of \mathcal{O}_K . From Definition 10.26 to Theorem 10.32, we also use the setting below.

Setting 10.25. Let \mathfrak{a} be a non-zero ideal of \mathcal{O}_K . Assume that \mathfrak{a} is prime to f .

Definition 10.26. Given $\tau \in (\mathcal{O}_K/f\mathcal{O}_K)^\times$ and a sign $s \in \{\pm 1\}^{r_1}$, we define a set $|\mathrm{Spec}(\mathcal{O}_K)|_{\mathfrak{a},\tau,s}$ of prime ideals by

$$|\mathrm{Spec}(\mathcal{O}_K)|_{\mathfrak{a},\tau,s} := \{\mathfrak{p} \in |\mathrm{Spec}(\mathcal{O}_K)| : \mathfrak{p}\mathfrak{a} = \alpha\mathcal{O}_K \text{ for some } \alpha \in \tau \text{ with } \mathrm{sgn}(\alpha) = s\}.$$

Note that $|\mathrm{Spec}(\mathcal{O}_K)|_{\mathfrak{a},\tau,s}$'s are not necessarily disjoint for different (τ, s) 's but this does not cause a problem. In the following lemma, we remark that we can consider the class $[\mathfrak{a}]$ of \mathfrak{a} to be in the ideal class group Cl_K^f under Setting 10.25.

Lemma 10.27. *Let $\tau \in (\mathcal{O}_K/f\mathcal{O}_K)^\times$ and $s \in \{\pm 1\}^{r_1}$. Fix an element $\xi_0 \in \mathcal{O}_K$ with sign s such that $\xi_0 \in \tau$, which exists by Lemma 10.20. Then we have*

$$|\mathrm{Spec}(\mathcal{O}_K)|_{\mathfrak{a},\tau,s} = \{\mathfrak{p} \in |\mathrm{Spec}(\mathcal{O}_K)| : [\mathfrak{p}] = -[\mathfrak{a}] + [\xi_0\mathcal{O}_K] \text{ in } \mathrm{Cl}_K^f\}.$$

We write down the proof of this standard fact for the convenience of the reader.

Proof. Let $\mathfrak{p} \in |\mathrm{Spec}(\mathcal{O}_K)|_{\mathfrak{a},\tau,s}$. This means that there exists $\alpha \in \tau$ with $\mathrm{sgn}(\alpha) = s$ such that $\mathfrak{p}\mathfrak{a} = \alpha\mathcal{O}_K$. Then the element $\xi := \alpha/\xi_0 \in K^\times$ satisfies that $\xi \equiv 1 \pmod{f}$ and $\mathrm{sgn}(\xi) = (+1, \dots, +1)$. Therefore we conclude that $[\alpha\mathcal{O}_K] = [\xi_0\mathcal{O}_K]$ in Cl_K^f , thus proving that \mathfrak{p} satisfies $[\mathfrak{p}] = -[\mathfrak{a}] + [\xi_0\mathcal{O}_K]$.

Conversely, suppose that \mathfrak{p} satisfies $[\mathfrak{p}] + [\mathfrak{a}] = [\xi_0\mathcal{O}_K]$. Then by the definition of Cl_K^f , there exists a totally positive $\eta \in K^\times$ with $\eta \equiv 1 \pmod{f}$ such that $\mathfrak{p}\mathfrak{a} = \xi_0\eta\mathcal{O}_K$. Now $\alpha := \xi_0\eta$ satisfies that $\alpha \in \tau$ and that $\mathrm{sgn}(\alpha) = s$. Moreover, since \mathfrak{p} and \mathfrak{a} are subsets of \mathcal{O}_K , we have $\alpha\mathcal{O}_K \subseteq \mathcal{O}_K$. Therefore, we conclude that $\alpha \in \mathcal{O}_K \setminus \{0\}$, as desired. \square

The Chebotarev density theorem [Hei67, Theorem 4] asserts that for every class $\mu \in \mathrm{Cl}_K^f$, the set $\{\mathfrak{p} \in |\mathrm{Spec}(\mathcal{O}_K)| : [\mathfrak{p}] = \mu \text{ in } \mathrm{Cl}_K^f\}$ has natural asymptotic density $\frac{1}{h_f}$ in $|\mathrm{Spec}(\mathcal{O}_K)|$. This is translated via Lemma 10.27 as follows.

Theorem 10.28 (Chebotarev density theorem, see [Hei67, Theorem 4]). *Let $\tau \in (\mathcal{O}_K/f\mathcal{O}_K)^\times$ and $s \in \{\pm 1\}^{r_1}$. Then, we have*

$$\#\{\mathfrak{p} \in |\mathrm{Spec}(\mathcal{O}_K)|_{\mathfrak{a},\tau,s} : \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{p}) \leq L\} = (1 + o_{L \rightarrow \infty; f, \mathfrak{a}}(1)) \cdot \frac{1}{h_f} \cdot \frac{L}{\log L}.$$

Let us explain how Theorem 3.21 (2) is implied by Theorem 10.28 (or [Hei67, Theorem 4]). Set $f = 1$ for instance. By [Hei67, Theorem 4], for each class $\mu \in \mathrm{Cl}_K^1$ we have the estimate

$$\#\{\mathfrak{p} \in |\mathrm{Spec} \mathcal{O}_K| : [\mathfrak{p}] = \mu \text{ in } \mathrm{Cl}_K^1 \text{ and } \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{p}) \leq L\} = (1 + o_{L \rightarrow \infty}(1)) \cdot \frac{1}{h_1} \cdot \frac{L}{\log L}. \quad (10.6)$$

By [Neu99, Chapter VI, Proposition 1.11] there exists a surjective homomorphism $\text{Cl}_K^1 \rightarrow \text{Cl}_K$ (though the surjectivity is not needed for the purpose achieved by Theorem 3.21 (2)). Summing up (10.6) over all $\mu \in \ker(\text{Cl}_K^1 \rightarrow \text{Cl}_K)$ proves Theorem 3.21 (2).

Now we turn this count of prime ideals into counts of elements.

Definition 10.29. For every $\tau \in \mathcal{O}_K/f\mathcal{O}_K$ and every $s \in \{\pm 1\}^{r_1}$, define a subset $\mathcal{P}_{\mathfrak{a};\tau,s}$ of $\mathcal{P}_{\mathfrak{a}}$ as the set of elements $\alpha \in \mathcal{P}_{\mathfrak{a}} \cap \tau$ with $\text{sgn}(\alpha) = s$.

Lemma 10.30. (1) *The set $\mathcal{P}_{\mathfrak{a}}$ can be partitioned as $\mathcal{P}_{\mathfrak{a}} = \bigsqcup_{(\tau,s)} \mathcal{P}_{\mathfrak{a};\tau,s}$. Here (τ, s) runs over $(\mathcal{O}_K/f\mathcal{O}_K) \times \{\pm 1\}^{r_1}$.*

(2) *For each $(\tau, s) \in (\mathcal{O}_K/f\mathcal{O}_K) \times \{\pm 1\}^{r_1}$, the $\mathcal{O}_{K,f+}^\times$ -action by multiplication leaves $\mathcal{P}_{\mathfrak{a};\tau,s}$ invariant. If $\tau \in \mathcal{O}_K/f\mathcal{O}_K$ is not invertible, then $\#(\mathcal{P}_{\mathfrak{a};\tau,s}/\mathcal{O}_{K,f+}^\times) < \infty$. Here $\mathcal{P}_{\mathfrak{a};\tau,s}/\mathcal{O}_{K,f+}^\times$ means the quotient set by the $\mathcal{O}_{K,f+}^\times$ -action.*

(3) *Let $\mathcal{D}' \subseteq \mathfrak{a} \setminus \{0\}$ be a fundamental domain for the action $\mathcal{O}_{K,f+}^\times \curvearrowright \mathfrak{a} \setminus \{0\}$. If $\tau \in (\mathcal{O}_K/f\mathcal{O}_K)^\times$, then we have a bijection*

$$|\text{Spec}(\mathcal{O}_K)|_{\mathfrak{a},\tau,s} \simeq \mathcal{P}_{\mathfrak{a};\tau,s} \cap \mathcal{D}'. \tag{10.7}$$

Here, a prime ideal $\mathfrak{p} \in |\text{Spec}(\mathcal{O}_K)|_{\mathfrak{a},\tau,s}$ is sent to a unique element $\alpha \in \mathcal{D}'$ which satisfies the following three conditions: $\mathfrak{p}\mathfrak{a} = \alpha\mathcal{O}_K$, $\alpha \in \tau$, and $\text{sgn}(\alpha) = s$.

Proof. Item (1) is trivial. Next we prove (2). For the former assertion, observe that the $\mathcal{O}_{K,f+}^\times$ -action changes neither the modulo f residue class nor the sign of elements of \mathcal{O}_K . For the latter assertion, suppose that $\tau \notin (\mathcal{O}_K/f\mathcal{O}_K)^\times$.

Take an element α of $\mathcal{P}_{\mathfrak{a};\tau,s}$. This in particular means $\alpha \in \tau$ and hence α is not prime to f . Since \mathfrak{a} is prime to f , the prime ideal $\mathfrak{p} = \alpha\mathfrak{a}^{-1}$ is not prime to f ; in other words \mathfrak{p} divides f . We have established an injection

$$\mathcal{P}_{\mathfrak{a};\tau,s} \hookrightarrow \bigsqcup_{\mathfrak{p}|f} \{\alpha \in \mathcal{O}_K : \alpha\mathcal{O}_K = \mathfrak{p}\mathfrak{a}\},$$

where there are only finitely many summands on the right-hand side. Observe that each summand is an \mathcal{O}_K^\times -orbit. Since $\mathcal{O}_{K,f+}^\times$ is a finite index subgroup of \mathcal{O}_K^\times , each summand splits into finitely many $\mathcal{O}_{K,f+}^\times$ -orbits. This proves that $\mathcal{P}_{\mathfrak{a};\tau,s}/\mathcal{O}_{K,f+}^\times$ is finite.

Finally, we prove (3). For a given $\mathfrak{p} \in |\text{Spec}(\mathcal{O}_K)|_{\mathfrak{a},\tau,s}$, by the definition of $|\text{Spec}(\mathcal{O}_K)|_{\mathfrak{a},\tau,s}$, there exists $\alpha \in \mathcal{O}_K \setminus \{0\}$ which fulfills the three conditions in the statement. Such an element α is automatically in $\mathcal{P}_{\mathfrak{a};\tau,s}$ by its definition. We will show that this α is unique modulo the $\mathcal{O}_{K,f+}^\times$ -action. Take two elements α_1 and α_2 satisfying the three conditions. Since they define the same ideal, we have $\xi := \alpha_1/\alpha_2 \in \mathcal{O}_K^\times$. Since $\alpha_1, \alpha_2 \in \tau$ (which is now assumed to be prime to f) and they both have sign s , we in addition know $\xi \equiv 1 \pmod{f}$ and that ξ is totally positive. Therefore $\xi \in \mathcal{O}_{K,f+}^\times$ as desired. This shows that the map $\mathfrak{p} \mapsto \alpha$ is well-defined.

Conversely, suppose that we are given $\alpha \in \mathcal{P}_{\mathfrak{a};\tau,s}$. By Definition 10.4, $\mathfrak{p} := \alpha\mathfrak{a}^{-1}$ is a prime ideal. By Definition 10.26, \mathfrak{p} belongs to $|\text{Spec}(\mathcal{O}_K)|_{\mathfrak{a},\tau,s}$. Thus, we obtain a map $\alpha \mapsto \mathfrak{p}$.

Since both maps are constructed from the relation $\mathfrak{ap} = \alpha\mathcal{O}_K$, it is clear that they are inverse to each other. \square

Corollary 10.31. *Assume Settings 10.23 and 10.25. Let \mathcal{D}' be a fundamental domain for the action $\mathcal{O}_{K,f+}^\times \curvearrowright \mathfrak{a} \setminus \{0\}$. Let $\tau \in \mathcal{O}_K/f\mathcal{O}_K$ and $s \in \{\pm 1\}^{r_1}$.*

(1) *If $\tau \notin (\mathcal{O}_K/f\mathcal{O}_K)^\times$, then the relative asymptotic density of $\mathcal{P}_{\mathfrak{a};\tau,s} \cap \mathcal{D}'$ in $\mathcal{P}_{\mathfrak{a}} \cap \mathcal{D}'$ measured by the ideal norm equals 0. That means,*

$$\lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\#(\mathcal{P}_{\mathfrak{a};\tau,s} \cap \mathcal{D}' \cap \mathcal{O}_K(L))}{\#(\mathcal{P}_{\mathfrak{a}} \cap \mathcal{D}' \cap \mathcal{O}_K(L))} = 0.$$

(2) *If $\tau \in (\mathcal{O}_K/f\mathcal{O}_K)^\times$, then*

$$\lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\#(\mathcal{P}_{\mathfrak{a};\tau,s} \cap \mathcal{D}' \cap \mathcal{O}_K(L))}{\#(\mathcal{P}_{\mathfrak{a}} \cap \mathcal{D}' \cap \mathcal{O}_K(L))} = \frac{1}{2^{r_1} \varphi_K(f)}$$

holds.

Proof. Both items follow from Theorem 10.28 and Lemma 10.30: the factors 2^{r_1} and $\varphi_K(f)$ come from the numbers of possible choices of s and τ , respectively. \square

Finally, we have the following estimate from below of $\mathcal{P}_{\mathfrak{a}}$.

Theorem 10.32. *Assume Settings 10.23 and 10.25. Let $\tau \in (\mathcal{O}_K/f\mathcal{O}_K)^\times$ and $s \in \{\pm 1\}^{r_1}$. Then, for every \mathbb{Z} -basis \mathbf{v} of \mathfrak{a} , we have*

$$\liminf_{M \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\#(\mathcal{P}_{\mathfrak{a};\tau,s} \cap \mathfrak{a}(\mathbf{v}, M))}{M^n (\log M)^{-1}} > 0.$$

Proof. Recall that the NL-compatibility is defined for a subset of $\mathcal{O}_K \setminus \{0\}$, in particular, for a subset of $\mathfrak{a} \setminus \{0\}$. Recall also for an integral basis $\boldsymbol{\omega}$ of K , the restriction of $\|\cdot\|_{\infty, \boldsymbol{\omega}}$ on \mathfrak{a} is bi-Lipschitz equivalent to $\|\cdot\|_{\infty, \mathbf{v}}$.

Fix a \mathbb{Z} -basis \mathbf{v} of \mathfrak{a} . First, we claim that there exists an NL-compatible fundamental domain for the action $\mathcal{O}_{K,f+}^\times \curvearrowright \mathfrak{a} \setminus \{0\}$. Indeed, by Proposition 4.11, we can take an NL-compatible \mathcal{O}_K^\times -fundamental domain $\mathcal{D} \subseteq \mathcal{O}_K \setminus \{0\}$. Since $\mathcal{O}_{K,f+}^\times$ has a finite index in \mathcal{O}_K^\times , by considering the union of finitely many translates of \mathcal{D} , we have an NL-compatible fundamental domain $\tilde{\mathcal{D}} \subseteq \mathcal{O}_K \setminus \{0\}$ for the action $\mathcal{O}_{K,f+}^\times \curvearrowright \mathcal{O}_K \setminus \{0\}$. Finally, set $\mathcal{D}' := \mathfrak{a} \cap \tilde{\mathcal{D}}$; then this \mathcal{D}' is an NL-compatible fundamental domain for $\mathcal{O}_{K,f+}^\times \curvearrowright \mathfrak{a} \setminus \{0\}$.

Now the assertion follows from Corollary 10.31 (2) and the NL-compatibility of \mathcal{D}' ; the deduction goes along the same lines as the proof of Proposition 8.14. \square

In the rest of the current subsection, we treat the case of $\mathcal{P}_{\mathfrak{c}}$ for an invertible fractional ideal \mathfrak{c} of an order \mathcal{O} . We no longer assume Setting 10.25, but we continue to use Setting 10.23.

Lemma 10.33. *Let f be a positive integer. Let $\mathcal{O} \subseteq \mathcal{O}_K$ be an order and $\mathfrak{d} \subseteq \mathcal{O}$ be an ideal coprime with f . Assume that $f\mathcal{O}_K \subseteq \mathcal{O}$. Then, we have $\mathfrak{d}\mathcal{O}_K \cap \mathcal{O} = \mathfrak{d}$.*

Proof. Since \mathfrak{d} is coprime with f , we have $\mathfrak{d} + f\mathcal{O} = \mathcal{O}$. This implies $\mathfrak{d}\mathcal{O}_K + f\mathcal{O}_K = \mathcal{O}_K$. It in turn implies that

$$\mathfrak{d}\mathcal{O}_K \cap f\mathcal{O}_K = f\mathfrak{d}\mathcal{O}_K \subseteq \mathfrak{d}\mathcal{O} = \mathfrak{d}.$$

Hence we conclude that

$$\mathfrak{d}\mathcal{O}_K \cap \mathcal{O} = \mathfrak{d}\mathcal{O}_K \cap (\mathfrak{d} + f\mathcal{O}) \subseteq \mathfrak{d}.$$

Since the inclusion $\mathfrak{d}\mathcal{O}_K \cap \mathcal{O} \supseteq \mathfrak{d}$ trivially holds, the proof is completed. \square

Now we are ready to present our counting result for $\mathcal{P}_\mathfrak{c}$.

Theorem 10.34. *Assume Setting 10.23. Let \mathcal{O} be an order in K , and \mathfrak{c} be an invertible fractional ideal of \mathcal{O} . Let $f \in \mathbb{N}$ be such that $f\mathcal{O}_K \subseteq \mathcal{O}$. Take $\xi \in K^\times$ and $\mathfrak{a} = \xi\mathfrak{c}\mathcal{O}_K \in \text{Ideals}_K$ as in Proposition 10.21. Let $\tau \in (\mathcal{O}/f\mathcal{O}_K)^\times$ and $s \in \{\pm 1\}^r$. Then we have*

$$\mathcal{P}_{\mathfrak{a};\tau,s} \subseteq \xi\mathcal{P}_\mathfrak{c} \tag{10.8}$$

and for every \mathbb{Z} -basis \mathbf{v} of \mathfrak{a} , we have

$$\liminf_{M \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\#(\xi\mathcal{P}_\mathfrak{c} \cap \mathcal{P}_{\mathfrak{a};\tau,s} \cap \mathfrak{a}(\mathbf{v}, M))}{M^n(\log M)^{-1}} > 0. \tag{10.9}$$

Proof. Set $\mathfrak{d} := \xi\mathfrak{c}$ so that $\mathfrak{a} = \mathfrak{d}\mathcal{O}_K$. By the choice of ξ , Lemma 10.33 applies to give $\mathfrak{a} \cap \mathcal{O} = \mathfrak{d}$. It follows that when $\tau \in (\mathcal{O}/f\mathcal{O}_K)$ we have $\mathcal{P}_{\mathfrak{a};\tau,s} \subseteq \mathfrak{a} \cap \tau \subseteq \mathfrak{a} \cap \mathcal{O} = \mathfrak{d}$. This together with the definition $\mathcal{P}_\mathfrak{d} = \mathcal{P}_\mathfrak{a} \cap \mathfrak{d}$ implies $\mathcal{P}_{\mathfrak{a};\tau,s} \subseteq \mathcal{P}_\mathfrak{d}$, which is equivalent to (10.8) since $\mathcal{P}_\mathfrak{d} = \xi\mathcal{P}_\mathfrak{c}$. Now (10.9) follows from (10.8) and Theorem 10.32. \square

Note that we have $(\mathcal{O}/f\mathcal{O}_K)^\times \neq \emptyset$ because $1 \in \mathcal{O}$.

10.6 Proof of Theorem 10.5

Now we are ready to establish Theorem 10.5.

Proof of Theorem 10.5. Fix $f \in \mathbb{N}$ with $f\mathcal{O}_K \subseteq \mathcal{O}$. First, apply Proposition 10.21 to $(\mathcal{O}, f, \mathfrak{c})$ to obtain $\xi \in K^\times$ and $\mathfrak{a} \in \text{Ideals}_K$ satisfying the conditions there. In particular \mathfrak{a} is coprime with f . Fix a \mathbb{Z} -basis \mathbf{v} of \mathfrak{a} . Set $\mathfrak{d} := \xi\mathfrak{c}, \mathfrak{z} := \xi\mathfrak{w}$ and $A' := \xi A$. Then, $\mathfrak{d} \subseteq \mathfrak{a}$, and the restriction of $\|\cdot\|_{\infty, \mathbf{v}}$ on \mathfrak{d} is bi-Lipschitz equivalent to $\|\cdot\|_{\infty, \mathfrak{z}}$. Apply Theorem 10.34 with $\tau = 1 \bmod f \in (\mathcal{O}/f\mathcal{O}_K)^\times$. The assumption $\bar{d}_{\mathcal{P}_\mathfrak{c}, \mathfrak{w}}(A) > 0$ then implies that

$$\limsup_{M \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\#(A' \cap \mathfrak{a}(\mathbf{v}, M))}{M^n(\log M)^{-1}} > 0.$$

By Theorem 10.22 and Lemma 9.14 (2), this set A' is a member of $\text{S}\Psi_{\log}^{\text{SI}}(\mathfrak{a})$. We will verify that A' fulfills condition (ii) of Theorem 8.24. It suffices to prove that the larger set $\mathcal{P}_\mathfrak{d}$ satisfies this.

Let $L \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 2}$ and $\beta \in \mathcal{P}_\mathfrak{d} \cap \mathcal{O}_K(L)$. Then, by definition, $\mathfrak{p}_\beta := \beta\mathfrak{a}^{-1}$ is a prime ideal of \mathcal{O}_K having norm $\mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{p}_\beta) \leq L/\mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{a}) \leq L$. Hence the map $\beta \mapsto \mathfrak{p}_\beta$ gives an injection

$\{\beta\mathcal{O}_K : \beta \in \mathcal{P}_{\mathfrak{d}} \cap \mathcal{O}_K(L)\} \leftrightarrow \{\mathfrak{p} \in |\text{Spec } \mathcal{O}_K| : \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{p}) \leq L\}$. Theorem 3.21 (1) implies that there exists $\Delta > 0$ such that for every $L \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 2}$,

$$\#\{\beta\mathcal{O}_K : \beta \in \mathcal{P}_{\mathfrak{d}} \cap \mathcal{O}_K(L)\} \leq \Delta \cdot \frac{L}{\log L}.$$

This verifies condition (ii) of Theorem 8.24.

Now Theorem 9.22 applies to A' , and we have a sequence $(\mathcal{J}'_l)_{l \in \mathbb{N}}$ of finite subsets in A' satisfying the conclusion of Theorem 9.22. Finally, via the bijection $A' \ni \beta \mapsto \xi^{-1}\beta \in A$, we transfer $(\mathcal{J}'_l)_{l \in \mathbb{N}}$ to a sequence $(\mathcal{J}_l)_{l \in \mathbb{N}}$ of subsets in A . This sequence $(\mathcal{J}_l)_{l \in \mathbb{N}}$ fulfills all the conditions of Theorem 10.5. Indeed, to verify (2), note that by Proposition 10.21 for all $\alpha \in A$ we have

$$N_{K/\mathbb{Q}}(\alpha) = \frac{\mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{c})}{\mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{a})} \cdot N_{K/\mathbb{Q}}(\xi\alpha);$$

the factor $\frac{\mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{c})}{\mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{a})}$ does not depend on α . Hence, given $\theta \in (0, 1)_{\mathbb{R}}$, $S \subseteq \mathfrak{c}$ and $\eta > 0$, we can replace $L \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ with another finite subset of \mathbb{N} in an appropriate manner. \square

10.7 Proof of Theorem 10.1

In this subsection, we will establish Theorem 10.1. Our arguments will actually show the following theorem on *norm forms* in general.

Setting 10.35. Let K be a number field of degree n , and \mathcal{O} an order in K . Let \mathfrak{c} be an invertible fractional ideal. Let \mathbf{u} be the standard basis of \mathbb{Z}^n , $\mathbf{w} = (\gamma_1, \gamma_2, \dots, \gamma_n)$ be a \mathbb{Z} -basis of \mathfrak{c} , and $\iota: \mathbb{Z}^n \rightarrow \mathfrak{c}$ be the isomorphism of \mathbb{Z} -modules which sends \mathbf{u} to \mathbf{w} . Let $F = F_{(\mathcal{O}, \mathfrak{c}, \mathbf{w})}: \mathbb{Z}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ be the *norm form* associated with $(\mathcal{O}, \mathfrak{c}, \mathbf{w})$, meaning that for all $(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n) \in \mathbb{Z}^n$,

$$F_{(\mathcal{O}, \mathfrak{c}, \mathbf{w})}(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n) := \frac{N_{K/\mathbb{Q}}(\gamma_1 x_1 + \gamma_2 x_2 + \dots + \gamma_n x_n)}{\mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{c})}.$$

In other words, $F_{(\mathcal{O}, \mathfrak{c}, \mathbf{w})} = (\mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{c}))^{-1}(N_{K/\mathbb{Q}} \circ \iota)$. Let r_1 be the number of real embeddings of K .

Theorem 10.36 (Szemerédi-type theorem on prime representations of norm forms). *Assume Setting 10.35. If $r_1 > 0$, then take an arbitrary $\epsilon \in \{\pm 1\}$; if $r_1 = 0$, then set $\epsilon = +1$. Let $A \subseteq F^{-1}(\epsilon\mathcal{P})$ be a set with $\bar{d}_{F^{-1}(\epsilon\mathcal{P}), \mathbf{u}}(A) > 0$. Then, there exists a sequence of pairwise disjoint finite subsets $(\mathcal{J}_l)_{l \in \mathbb{N}}$ of A which fulfills the following two conditions.*

- (a) For every $l \in \mathbb{N}$, $F|_{\mathcal{J}_l}: \mathcal{J}_l \rightarrow \mathcal{P}_{\mathbb{Q}}$ is injective.
- (b) For every $\theta \in (0, 1)_{\mathbb{R}}$, for every finite subset $S \subseteq \mathbb{Z}^n$ and for every $\eta > 0$, there exists a finite subset $L \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ such that for every $l \in \mathbb{N} \setminus L$, the following hold:
 - (b1) \mathcal{J}_l contains an S -constellation,

(b2) for every $p_1, p_2 \in F(\mathcal{J}_l)$,

$$\frac{|p_2|}{|p_1|} \leq 1 + \eta \cdot (\min\{|p| : p \in F(\mathcal{J}_l)\})^{\frac{\theta-1}{n}}$$

holds.

Remark 10.37. If $r_1 = 0$, or in other words K is totally imaginary, the norm form F is positive definite. Theorem 10.36 asserts that this is the *only* obstruction to obtaining our constellation theorem with sign $\epsilon = -1$.

To prove Theorem 10.36, take $f \in \mathbb{N}$ with $f\mathcal{O}_K \subseteq \mathcal{O}$. Apply Proposition 10.21 to $(\mathcal{O}, f, \mathfrak{c})$, and obtain $\xi \in K^\times$ and an ideal $\mathfrak{a} \in \text{Ideals}_K$ coprime with f . Recall the definition of the degree of a prime ideal from Subsection 3.3.

Definition 10.38. Assume Setting 10.35. Let $\epsilon \in \{\pm 1\}$. Let $\xi \in K^\times$ and $\mathfrak{a} = \xi\mathfrak{c}\mathcal{O}_K$ be as in Proposition 10.21.

(1) Define $|\text{Spec}(\mathcal{O}_K)|^1$ as the set of prime ideals of \mathcal{O}_K of degree 1.

(2) Define $\mathcal{P}_\mathfrak{c}^\epsilon$ as the set of $\alpha \in \mathcal{P}_\mathfrak{c}$ such that $N_{K/\mathbb{Q}}(\alpha)$ has sign ϵ .

(3) Define $\mathcal{P}_\mathfrak{c}^{1,\epsilon}$ by

$$\mathcal{P}_\mathfrak{c}^{1,\epsilon} := \{\alpha \in \mathfrak{c} : (\xi\alpha)\mathfrak{a}^{-1} \in |\text{Spec}(\mathcal{O}_K)|^1 \text{ and } N_{K/\mathbb{Q}}(\alpha) \text{ has sign } \epsilon\}.$$

Lemma 10.39. *The isomorphism $\iota: \mathbb{Z}^n \rightarrow \mathfrak{c}$ from Setting 10.35 sends the set $F^{-1}(\epsilon\mathcal{P})$ bijectively to $\mathcal{P}_\mathfrak{c}^{1,\epsilon}$.*

Proof. The composite map $F \circ \iota^{-1}$ is computed as

$$\mathfrak{c} \ni \alpha \mapsto N_{K/\mathbb{Q}}(\alpha)\mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{c})^{-1}. \tag{10.10}$$

This last value has sign $\text{sgn}(N_{K/\mathbb{Q}}(\alpha))$. Also, the right-hand side of (10.10) has absolute value $\mathbf{N}(\alpha\mathfrak{c}^{-1})$, which equals $\mathbf{N}((\xi\alpha)\mathfrak{a}^{-1})$ by Proposition 10.21 (4). Note that for $\mathfrak{b} \in \text{Ideals}_K$, $\mathfrak{b} \in |\text{Spec}(\mathcal{O}_K)|^1$ if and only if $\mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{b}) \in \mathcal{P}$. This ends our proof. \square

We consider the inclusions $\mathcal{P}_\mathfrak{c}^{1,\epsilon} \subseteq \mathcal{P}_\mathfrak{c}^\epsilon \subseteq \mathcal{P}_\mathfrak{c}$ multiplied by ξ . The conclusions of the next lemma are equivalent to saying that $\underline{d}_{\mathcal{P}_\mathfrak{c},\mathbf{w}}(\mathcal{P}_\mathfrak{c}^\epsilon) > 0$ and $\underline{d}_{\mathcal{P}_\mathfrak{c}^\epsilon,\mathbf{w}}(\mathcal{P}_\mathfrak{c}^{1,\epsilon}) = 1$.

Lemma 10.40. *Assume Setting 10.35. Let ξ and \mathfrak{a} be as in Proposition 10.21. Let \mathbf{v} be a \mathbb{Z} -basis of \mathfrak{a} . Let ϵ be an arbitrary sign $\epsilon \in \{\pm 1\}$ if $r_1 > 0$; otherwise, let $\epsilon = +1$. Set $\mathcal{P}'_1 := \xi\mathcal{P}_\mathfrak{c}^{1,\epsilon}$, $\mathcal{P}'_2 := \xi\mathcal{P}_\mathfrak{c}^\epsilon$ and $\mathcal{P}'_3 := \xi\mathcal{P}_\mathfrak{c}$. Then, we have $\underline{d}_{\mathcal{P}'_3,\mathbf{v}}(\mathcal{P}'_2) > 0$ and $\underline{d}_{\mathcal{P}'_2,\mathbf{v}}(\mathcal{P}'_1) = 1$.*

Proof. First, we prove $\underline{d}_{\mathcal{P}'_3,\mathbf{v}}(\mathcal{P}'_2) > 0$. If $r_1 = 0$, then the norm form F is positive definite. Hence we have $\mathcal{P}'_2 = \mathcal{P}'_3$; recall we have taken $\epsilon = +1$ in this case. Now we treat the remaining case of $r_1 > 0$.

By (10.8) we know $\mathcal{P}'_2 \supseteq \bigsqcup_{(\tau,s)} \mathcal{P}_{\mathfrak{a};\tau,s}$, where (τ, s) runs over the set of pairs (τ, s) with $\tau \in (\mathcal{O}/f\mathcal{O}_K)^\times$ and $s = (s_1, s_2, \dots, s_{r_1}) \in \{\pm 1\}^{r_1}$ satisfying $s_1 s_2 \cdots s_{r_1} = \epsilon$. Note that this set of pairs is non-empty because $1 \in \mathcal{O}$ and $r_1 > 0$. Corollary 10.31 and Theorem 10.32 apply. Hence, in this case, we also conclude that $\underline{d}_{\mathcal{P}'_3, \mathbf{v}}(\mathcal{P}'_2) > 0$. See also Remark 8.26.

Secondly, we prove $\underline{d}_{\mathcal{P}'_2, \mathbf{v}}(\mathcal{P}'_1) = 1$. By Theorem 10.32 and the argument above, we have

$$\liminf_{M \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\#(\mathcal{P}'_2 \cap \mathfrak{a}(\mathbf{v}, M))}{M^n (\log M)^{-1}} > 0.$$

We claim that

$$\limsup_{M \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\#((\mathcal{P}'_2 \setminus \mathcal{P}'_1) \cap \mathfrak{a}(\mathbf{v}, M))}{M^n (\log M)^{-1}} = 0. \quad (10.11)$$

To prove this, take $\beta \in (\mathcal{P}'_2 \setminus \mathcal{P}'_1) \cap \mathfrak{a}(\mathbf{v}, M)$. Then, there exists $\mathfrak{p}_\beta \in |\mathrm{Spec}(\mathcal{O}_K)| \setminus |\mathrm{Spec}(\mathcal{O}_K)|^1$ such that $\beta \mathfrak{a}^{-1} = \mathfrak{p}_\beta$. Since $\mathfrak{p}_\beta \in |\mathrm{Spec}(\mathcal{O}_K)| \setminus |\mathrm{Spec}(\mathcal{O}_K)|^1$, there exist $p_\beta \in \mathcal{P}$ and $f_\beta \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 2}$ such that $\mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{p}_\beta) = p_\beta^{f_\beta}$. Then we have

$$p_\beta \leq \left(\frac{|N_{K/\mathbb{Q}}(\beta)|}{\mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{a})} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

Here, if M is sufficiently large depending on \mathbf{v} , then the right-hand side of the inequality above does not exceed $M^{(2n+1)/4}$. By Lemma 3.15, there exist at most $nM^{(2n+1)/4}$ possibilities of \mathfrak{p}_β . By Corollary 4.16 (2), we conclude that

$$\limsup_{M \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\#((\mathcal{P}'_2 \setminus \mathcal{P}'_1) \cap \mathfrak{a}(\mathbf{v}, M))}{M^{\frac{2n+1}{4}} (\log M)^n} < \infty;$$

note that $k \leq n$, where k is as in Corollary 4.16. Therefore, (10.11) holds. It follows that $\underline{d}_{\mathcal{P}'_2, \mathbf{v}}(\mathcal{P}'_1) = 1$. \square

Proof of Theorem 10.36. We continue to use the same notation as in Lemma 10.40. By Lemma 10.40, we have $\underline{d}_{\mathcal{P}'_3, \mathbf{v}}(\mathcal{P}'_1) > 0$. By Lemma 10.39, this implies that $\bar{d}_{\mathcal{P}'_3, \mathbf{v}}(\xi \cdot \iota(A)) > 0$. By Theorem 10.34, Theorem 8.28 (1) applies, and there exists an NL-compatible fundamental domain \mathcal{D} for the action $\mathcal{O}_K^\times \curvearrowright \mathfrak{a} \setminus \{0\}$ such that $\bar{d}_{\mathcal{P}'_3, \mathbf{v}}(\mathcal{D} \cap (\xi \cdot \iota(A))) > 0$. Define

$$\mathcal{P}(A, \mathcal{D}) := \left\{ \frac{|N_{K/\mathbb{Q}}(\beta)|}{\mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{a})} : \beta \in \mathcal{D} \cap (\xi \cdot \iota(A)) \right\}.$$

By Lemma 10.39, this is a subset of \mathcal{P} . Next we will construct a new set \tilde{A}' from $\mathcal{D} \cap (\xi \cdot \iota(A))$. For each $p \in \mathcal{P}(A, \mathcal{D})$, choose an arbitrary $\tilde{\beta}_p \in \mathcal{D} \cap (\xi \cdot \iota(A))$ satisfying

$$\|\tilde{\beta}_p\|_{\infty, \mathbf{v}} = \min \left\{ \|\beta\|_{\infty, \mathbf{v}} : \beta \in \mathcal{D} \cap (\xi \cdot \iota(A)), \frac{|N_{K/\mathbb{Q}}(\beta)|}{\mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{a})} = p \right\}. \quad (10.12)$$

Then, define \tilde{A}' by $\tilde{A}' := \{\tilde{\beta}_p : p \in \mathcal{P}(A, \mathcal{D})\}$. We claim that the map $\tilde{A}' \ni \tilde{\beta} \mapsto |N_{K/\mathbb{Q}}(\tilde{\beta})| \in \mathbb{N}$ is injective, and that

$$\underline{d}_{\mathcal{D} \cap (\xi \cdot \iota(A)), \mathbf{v}}(\tilde{A}') \geq \frac{1}{n} \quad (10.13)$$

holds true. Indeed, the former assertion holds by construction. To see the latter assertion, recall from Lemma 3.15 that for every $p \in \mathcal{P}$, the number of prime p -ideals in \mathcal{O}_K does not exceed n . Hence, for every $p \in \mathcal{P}(A, \mathcal{D})$, we have

$$\# \left\{ \beta \in \mathcal{D} \cap (\xi \cdot \iota(A)) : \frac{|N_{K/\mathbb{Q}}(\beta)|}{\mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{a})} = p \right\} \leq n.$$

Therefore, by (10.12), we conclude (10.13).

Set $A' := \xi^{-1}\tilde{A}'$; this is a subset of $\iota(A)$. We have $\bar{d}_{\mathcal{P}, \mathbf{w}}(A') > 0$ by $\bar{d}_{\mathcal{P}'_3, \mathbf{v}}(\mathcal{D} \cap (\xi \cdot \iota(A))) > 0$ and (10.13). Therefore, we can apply Theorem 10.5 to this A' and obtain a sequence $(\mathcal{J}'_l)_{l \in \mathbb{N}}$ of subsets in A' satisfying the conditions there. Again by Lemma 10.39, the sequence $(\mathcal{J}_l)_{l \in \mathbb{N}} := (\iota^{-1}(\mathcal{J}'_l))_{l \in \mathbb{N}}$ of finite subsets in \mathbb{Z}^n fulfills all the conditions of Theorem 10.36. \square

Finally, we establish Theorem 10.1. In the proof below, we do not assume Setting 10.35.

Proof of Theorem 10.1. Let $F(x, y) = ax^2 + bxy + cy^2 \in \mathbb{Z}[x, y]$ be a non-degenerate and primitive binary quadratic form with $a > 0$. By Theorem 10.3, there exist an order \mathcal{O} in a quadratic field K , an invertible fractional ideal \mathfrak{c} of \mathcal{O} , a \mathbb{Z} -basis $\mathbf{w} = (\gamma_1, \gamma_2)$ of \mathfrak{c} and a sign $\epsilon_{\mathfrak{c}}$ such that (10.1) holds.

If $D_F > 0$, then for each $\epsilon_0 \in \{\pm 1\}$, we can apply Theorem 10.36 with sign $\epsilon = \epsilon_0 \epsilon_{\mathfrak{c}}$. This immediately proves the assertion. If $D_F < 0$, then $a > 0$ implies that $\epsilon_{\mathfrak{c}} = +1$. Apply Theorem 10.36 with sign $\epsilon = +1$, and obtain the conclusion. \square

A Binary quadratic forms and quadratic fields

The goal of this appendix is to provide a standard proof of the classical fact, Theorem A.5, on the correspondence of binary quadratic forms with integral coefficients and ideals in orders of quadratic fields. A part of Theorem A.5, in the form of Theorem 10.3, plays a key role in the proof of Theorem C. We will need no more algebraic backgrounds from the main body of the paper than Proposition 10.16, or more precisely (10.5).

A.1 Definitions

Recall that by a *binary quadratic form with integral coefficients*, we mean a map $F: \mathbb{Z}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ which can be written as $F(x, y) = ax^2 + bxy + cy^2$ with $a, b, c \in \mathbb{Z}$ with respect to the standard basis of \mathbb{Z}^2 . In this appendix henceforth, we omit the modifier ‘with integral coefficients.’ Note that the property that F is written in the form $ax^2 + bxy + cy^2$ is preserved under a \mathbb{Z} -linear isomorphism $\mathbb{Z}^2 \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathbb{Z}^2$, in other words, a change of basis. Hence, the following concept of equivalence is natural. Here we consider the so-called *proper* equivalence which respects the orientation, but we drop the adjective ‘proper’ because we will never consider the improper one in this paper.

Definition A.1. Two binary quadratic forms $F, G: \mathbb{Z}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ are said to be *equivalent* if there exists a \mathbb{Z} -linear isomorphism $\iota: \mathbb{Z}^2 \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathbb{Z}^2$ preserving the orientation such that $F = G \circ \iota$, namely such that the following diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathbb{Z}^2 & \xrightarrow{F} & \mathbb{Z} \\ \downarrow \iota & \simeq & \nearrow G \\ \mathbb{Z}^2 & & \end{array}$$

commutes.

Recall that the *discriminant* of a binary quadratic form $F(x, y) = ax^2 + bxy + cy^2$ is the integer $D_F := b^2 - 4ac$. Note that $D_F \equiv 0$ or $1 \pmod{4}$ always holds. The discriminant is preserved by equivalence of binary quadratic forms. Recall also that F is said to be *non-degenerate* if D_F is not a perfect square, and that F is said to be *primitive* if $\gcd(a, b, c) = 1$ holds.

Definition A.2. For an integer $D \in \mathbb{Z}$, we denote by $Q(D)$ the set of equivalence classes of non-degenerate primitive quadratic forms with discriminant D .

The set $Q(D)$ is empty unless $D \equiv 0$ or $1 \pmod{4}$.

For a square-free integer $d \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{1\}$, let us consider the quadratic field $\mathbb{Q}(\sqrt{d})$ as a subfield of \mathbb{C} . We choose a square root $\sqrt{d} \in \mathbb{C}$ of d in the following manner: if $d > 0$, we take \sqrt{d} to be the positive real one, and if $d < 0$, the one with positive imaginary part.

Definition A.3. Let d be a square-free integer not equal to 1 and K the quadratic field $K = \mathbb{Q}(\sqrt{d})$.

(1) Define the discriminant d_K of K by

$$d_K := \begin{cases} d & \text{if } d \equiv 1 \pmod{4}, \\ 4d & \text{if } d \equiv 2, 3 \pmod{4}. \end{cases}$$

(2) Define the discriminant D of an order \mathcal{O} in K by $D := \#(\mathcal{O}_K/\mathcal{O})^2 \cdot d_K$.

There exists a bijective correspondence between the pairs of a quadratic field $K = \mathbb{Q}(\sqrt{d})$ and an order \mathcal{O} in K , and the discriminants D :

$$\left\{ (K, \mathcal{O}) : \begin{array}{l} K \text{ a quadratic field,} \\ \mathcal{O} \text{ an order in } K \end{array} \right\} \simeq \left\{ D \in \mathbb{Z} : \begin{array}{l} D \equiv 0, 1 \pmod{4}, \\ \text{not a square} \end{array} \right\}. \quad (\text{A.1})$$

As it is fundamental in the proof of Theorem A.5, we present the explicit form of correspondence (A.1). The one from the left-hand side to the right-hand side is given in Definition A.3 (2). To explain the reverse correspondence, set d to be the square-free part of D (i.e., the square-free integer d such that D/d is a square) and define

$$K := \mathbb{Q}(\sqrt{d}), \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{O} := \mathbb{Z} \oplus \sqrt{\frac{D}{d_K}} \omega \mathbb{Z}, \quad (\text{A.2})$$

where ω is defined by

$$\omega := \begin{cases} \frac{1+\sqrt{d}}{2} & \text{if } d \equiv 1 \pmod{4}, \\ \sqrt{d} & \text{if } d \equiv 2, 3 \pmod{4}. \end{cases} \tag{A.3}$$

These two maps are inverse to each other by the fact that every order of $K = \mathbb{Q}(\sqrt{d})$ has the form $\mathcal{O} = \mathbb{Z} \oplus f\omega\mathbb{Z}$ for some positive integer f ; an easy consequence of the fact $1 \in \mathcal{O}$, see [Cox13, Lemma 7.2] or the discussion preceding (A.6). With this f , we have $\#(\mathcal{O}_K/\mathcal{O}) = f$ and hence $D = f^2 d_K$.

Definition A.4. Let d be a square-free integer not equal to 1. Let \mathcal{O} be an order of the quadratic field $K = \mathbb{Q}(\sqrt{d})$.

- (1) Define the commutative group $\text{Cl}^+(\mathcal{O})$, called the *narrow class group*, as follows. Let $I_{\mathcal{O}}$ be the group of invertible fractional ideals of \mathcal{O} , where the group law is given by multiplication. Then, we define $\text{Cl}^+(\mathcal{O})$ to be the cokernel of the homomorphism from K^\times to $I_{\mathcal{O}} \times \{\pm 1\}$ defined by $x \mapsto (x\mathcal{O}, \text{sgn}(N_{K/\mathbb{Q}}(x)))$.
- (2) Endow the 2-dimensional \mathbb{Q} -vector space K with the orientation given by the basis $(1, \sqrt{d})$. Let $\mathfrak{c} \in I_{\mathcal{O}}$ and $\epsilon \in \{\pm 1\}$. We say that a \mathbb{Z} -basis (γ_1, γ_2) of \mathfrak{c} has *sign* ϵ if the representing matrix of the inclusion map $\mathfrak{c} \hookrightarrow K$ with respect to the bases (γ_1, γ_2) and $(1, \sqrt{d})$ has determinant with sign ϵ .

A.2 The correspondence

The following theorem is essentially due to Gauss, Dirichlet and Dedekind, and the goal of this appendix. This specific statement is taken from [Bha04, Theorem 10]. For a binary quadratic form F with discriminant $D_F = D$, write $[F]$ for its equivalence class in $Q(D)$. Similarly, for $(\mathfrak{c}, \epsilon) \in I_{\mathcal{O}} \times \{\pm 1\}$, write $[(\mathfrak{c}, \epsilon)]$ for its equivalence class in $\text{Cl}^+(\mathcal{O})$.

Theorem A.5. *Let \mathcal{O} be an order of a quadratic field K and let D be its discriminant. Then the following maps are well-defined, and one is the inverse map to the other. In particular, they provide a bijective correspondence*

$$\text{Cl}^+(\mathcal{O}) \simeq Q(D).$$

- (1) *(From ideals to quadratic forms) For $[(\mathfrak{c}, \epsilon)] \in \text{Cl}^+(\mathcal{O})$ with $(\mathfrak{c}, \epsilon) \in I_{\mathcal{O}} \times \{\pm 1\}$, choose a \mathbb{Z} -basis (γ_1, γ_2) of \mathfrak{c} which has sign ϵ . Then, define the corresponding class $[F]$ of quadratic forms by setting*

$$F(x, y) := \frac{N_{K/\mathbb{Q}}(\gamma_1 x + \gamma_2 y)}{\epsilon \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{c})} \quad \text{for } (x, y) \in \mathbb{Z}^2. \tag{A.4}$$

- (2) *(From quadratic forms to ideals) For $[F] \in Q(D)$, consider a representative F of the form $F(x, y) = ax^2 + bxy + cy^2$. Let d be the square-free part of D so that $K = \mathbb{Q}(\sqrt{d})$. Set $f := \sqrt{D/d_K}$ and $\tau := \frac{-b-f\sqrt{d_K}}{2} \in \mathcal{O}_K$. Then define the corresponding element $[(\mathfrak{c}, \epsilon)] \in \text{Cl}^+(\mathcal{O})$ as follows: set*

$$\mathfrak{c} := a\mathbb{Z} \oplus \tau\mathbb{Z} \quad \text{and} \quad \epsilon := \text{sgn}(a). \tag{A.5}$$

We will prove Theorem A.5 in Subsections A.3, A.4 and A.5. In what follows, we use the following setting.

Setting A.6. Let D be an integer not a square with $D \equiv 0, 1 \pmod{4}$. Let d be the square-free part of D and $K := \mathbb{Q}(\sqrt{d})$. Set $f := \sqrt{D/d_K}$ and $\mathcal{O} := \mathbb{Z} \oplus f\omega\mathbb{Z}$ as in (A.2).

A.3 Well-definedness of correspondence (1)

In this subsection, we prove that correspondence (1) in Theorem A.5 is well-defined. By (10.5), the absolute value of the right-hand side of (A.4) equals $\mathbf{N}((\gamma_1 x + \gamma_2 y)\mathfrak{c}^{-1})$. Since $\gamma_1 x + \gamma_2 y \in \mathfrak{c}$, we have $(\gamma_1 x + \gamma_2 y)\mathfrak{c}^{-1} \subseteq \mathcal{O}$. Hence, for every $(x, y) \in \mathbb{Z}^2$, the value $F(x, y)$ is an integer. This implies that F has integer coefficients.

The equivalence class of $F(x, y)$ clearly does not depend on the auxiliary choice of the basis (γ_1, γ_2) . We claim that it depends only on the class of (\mathfrak{c}, ϵ) in $\text{Cl}^+(\mathcal{O})$. To see this, note that for every element $\xi \in K^\times$, the following commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 & \mathfrak{c} & \\
 (\gamma_1, \gamma_2) \nearrow & & \searrow \begin{array}{l} N_{K/\mathbb{Q}}(-) \\ \epsilon \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{c}) \end{array} & \\
 \mathbb{Z}^2 & & \mathbb{Z} \\
 (\xi\gamma_1, \xi\gamma_2) \searrow & \xi \times & \nearrow \begin{array}{l} N_{K/\mathbb{Q}}(-) \\ \epsilon \cdot \text{sgn}(N_{K/\mathbb{Q}}(\xi)) \cdot \mathbf{N}(\xi\mathfrak{c}) \end{array} & \\
 & \xi \mathfrak{c} &
 \end{array}$$

commutes. Indeed, the commutativity of the left-hand triangle is obvious. The commutativity of the right-hand triangle follows from the fact that the norm map $N_{K/\mathbb{Q}}(-)$ is multiplicative and from (10.5). Note that the change of the basis from (γ_1, γ_2) to $(\xi\gamma_1, \xi\gamma_2)$ changes the sign by the factor $\text{sgn}(N_{K/\mathbb{Q}}(\xi))$, so that the lower composition map in the diagram is a quadratic form obtained from the pair $(\xi\mathfrak{c}, \text{sgn}(N_{K/\mathbb{Q}}(\xi))\epsilon)$.

It remains to check that the discriminant D_F of the quadratic form $F(x, y)$ is equal to the discriminant D of \mathcal{O} , and that F is primitive. First, we will prove that $D_F = D$. For this, we may assume $\mathfrak{c} \subseteq \mathcal{O}$. Indeed, replace \mathfrak{c} with an appropriate $\xi\mathfrak{c}$; the argument above justifies this process. Let us denote the unique non-trivial automorphism of $K = \mathbb{Q}(\sqrt{d})$ over \mathbb{Q} by $\alpha \mapsto \bar{\alpha}$. Then for every $(x, y) \in \mathbb{Z}^2$, we have $N_{K/\mathbb{Q}}(\gamma_1 x + \gamma_2 y) = (\gamma_1 x + \gamma_2 y)(\bar{\gamma}_1 x + \bar{\gamma}_2 y)$. Hence,

$$F(x, y) = \frac{\gamma_1 \bar{\gamma}_1 x^2 + (\gamma_1 \bar{\gamma}_2 + \bar{\gamma}_1 \gamma_2)xy + \gamma_2 \bar{\gamma}_2 y^2}{\epsilon \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{c})}.$$

It then follows that $D_F = \frac{(\gamma_1 \bar{\gamma}_2 - \bar{\gamma}_1 \gamma_2)^2}{\mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{c})^2}$. The numerator is the square of $\det \begin{pmatrix} \gamma_1 & \gamma_2 \\ \bar{\gamma}_1 & \bar{\gamma}_2 \end{pmatrix}$. By the assumption $\mathfrak{c} \subseteq \mathcal{O}$, there exists a unique 2-by-2 integer matrix T satisfying $(\gamma_1 \ \gamma_2) = (1 \ f\omega)T$. It follows $\begin{pmatrix} \gamma_1 & \gamma_2 \\ \bar{\gamma}_1 & \bar{\gamma}_2 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & f\omega \\ 1 & f\bar{\omega} \end{pmatrix} T$. By the definition of T , we have $|\det(T)| = \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{c})$. Hence, we obtain that

$$\det \begin{pmatrix} \gamma_1 & \gamma_2 \\ \bar{\gamma}_1 & \bar{\gamma}_2 \end{pmatrix}^2 = \det \begin{pmatrix} 1 & f\omega \\ 1 & f\bar{\omega} \end{pmatrix}^2 \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{c})^2.$$

A direct calculation shows $\det \begin{pmatrix} 1 & f\omega \\ 1 & f\bar{\omega} \end{pmatrix}^2 = D$. Thus, we conclude that $D_F = D$.

Secondly, we will prove that $F(x, y)$ is primitive. By Corollary 10.11, we may assume that \mathfrak{c} satisfies $\mathfrak{c} + f\mathcal{O} = \mathcal{O}$; in this case $\mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{c})$ is prime to f because f is invertible in the ring \mathcal{O}/\mathfrak{c} . The integer $\mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{c})$ annihilates the abelian group \mathcal{O}/\mathfrak{c} . It follows that $\mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{c}) = \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{c}) \cdot 1 \in \mathfrak{c}$. Take the unique $(x, y) \in \mathbb{Z}^2$ with $\gamma_1 x + \gamma_2 y = \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{c})$. For this (x, y) , we have $F(x, y) = \frac{N_{K/\mathbb{Q}}(\mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{c}))}{\epsilon \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{c})} = \epsilon \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{c})$. Now suppose that $\gcd(a, b, c) \neq 1$. Take a rational prime number p dividing $\gcd(a, b, c)$. Then, p divides every absolute value of F ; in particular, it divides $\mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{c})$. Since $\mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{c})$ is now prime to f , it follows that p is prime to f . Also p^2 divides $b^2 - 4ac = D = f^2 d_K$. It follows that p^2 divides $d_K (= d \text{ or } 4d)$. If p is odd, this contradicts the condition that d is square-free. We can also deduce a contradiction for the case of $p = 2$ by considering the reduction modulo 16. More precisely, since $p^2 = 4$ divides d_K , it must be the case that $d_K = 4d$ and $d \equiv 2, 3 \pmod{4}$. It follows that $d_K \equiv 8, 12 \pmod{16}$. Since f is now odd we have $f^2 \equiv 1, 9 \pmod{16}$. It follows that $f^2 d_K \equiv 8, 12 \pmod{16}$. On the one hand, since a, b, c are even, we have $b^2 - 4ac \equiv 0, 4 \pmod{16}$. This contradicts $b^2 - 4ac = f^2 d_K$. Therefore, $\gcd(a, b, c) = 1$, as desired.

This ends the proof of well-definedness of correspondence (1).

A.4 On well-definedness of correspondence (2)

This subsection is devoted to the proof of well-definedness of correspondence (2) in Theorem A.5. Strictly speaking, we will prove that the map $F \mapsto [(\mathfrak{c}, \epsilon)]$ from the set of all primitive binary quadratic forms $\mathbb{Z}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ with discriminant D to $\text{Cl}^+(\mathcal{O})$ is well-defined, where (\mathfrak{c}, ϵ) is defined in (A.5). First, note that $a \neq 0$, since $D = b^2 - 4ac$ is not a perfect square. Hence $\text{sgn}(a)$ in (A.5) does not cause a problem. We claim that $\mathcal{O} = \mathbb{Z} \oplus \tau\mathbb{Z}$ as an abelian group. Indeed, observe that $f\omega + \tau \equiv \frac{fd_K - b}{2} \pmod{\mathbb{Z}}$. From $f^2 d_K = D = b^2 - 4ac$, observe also that fd_K and b must have the same parity. Hence, $f\omega = -\tau$ in the quotient group \mathcal{O}_K/\mathbb{Z} , and we conclude that

$$\mathcal{O} = \mathbb{Z} \oplus f\omega\mathbb{Z} = \mathbb{Z} \oplus \tau\mathbb{Z}. \tag{A.6}$$

Since $\tau^2 + b\tau + ac = 0$, the subgroup $\mathfrak{c} = a\mathbb{Z} \oplus \tau\mathbb{Z} \subseteq \mathcal{O}$ is in fact an ideal of \mathcal{O} . We will moreover check that \mathfrak{c} is an invertible ideal. Consider the conjugate $\bar{\mathfrak{c}} = a\mathbb{Z} \oplus \bar{\tau}\mathbb{Z} \subseteq \mathcal{O}$ and take the product,

$$\mathfrak{c}\bar{\mathfrak{c}} = (a\mathcal{O} + \tau\mathcal{O}) \cdot (a\mathcal{O} + \bar{\tau}\mathcal{O}) = a^2\mathcal{O} + a\tau\mathcal{O} + a\bar{\tau}\mathcal{O} + \tau\bar{\tau}\mathcal{O}.$$

Since $\tau^2 + b\tau + ac = 0$, we have $\tau\bar{\tau} = ac$. Since $\tau + \bar{\tau} = -b$ and F is primitive, we moreover obtain $\mathfrak{c}\bar{\mathfrak{c}} = a\mathcal{O}$. This shows that \mathfrak{c} is invertible with the inverse $a^{-1}\bar{\mathfrak{c}}$.

The arguments above in this subsection show that the map $F \mapsto [(\mathfrak{c}, \epsilon)]$ is well-defined. To verify that correspondence (2) is well-defined, it remains to check that the class of (\mathfrak{c}, ϵ) in $\text{Cl}^+(\mathcal{O})$ is invariant under changes of the representative F of the equivalence class $[F] \in Q(D)$. This will be done in Subsection A.5.

A.5 End of the proof of Theorem A.5

In Subsections A.3 and A.4, we have checked that the maps in the following diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 \{\text{primitive quadratic forms } F: \mathbb{Z}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{Z} \text{ with } D_F = D\} & & \\
 \xleftarrow{\text{(A.5)}} & \downarrow \text{quotient map} & \\
 \text{Cl}^+(\mathcal{O}) & \xrightarrow{\text{(A.4)}} & Q(D)
 \end{array} \tag{A.7}$$

are all well-defined. To establish Theorem A.5, it suffices to show that the diagram is commutative, and that the horizontal map is injective. That will also establish that the map $Q(D) \xrightarrow{\text{(A.5)}} \text{Cl}^+(\mathcal{O})$ is well defined, thus completing the arguments in Subsection A.4. In this subsection, we will prove the two assertions above.

First, we will show that the diagram (A.7) is commutative. Take a primitive binary quadratic form $F(x, y) = ax^2 + bxy + cy^2$ with discriminant D . Let τ and \mathfrak{c} as in Theorem A.5 (2). The basis $(a, -\tau)$ of \mathfrak{c} has sign $\epsilon := \text{sgn}(a)$. Therefore the quadratic form associated with this pair (\mathfrak{c}, ϵ) and the basis is the map

$$(x, y) \mapsto \frac{N_{K/\mathbb{Q}}(ax - \tau y)}{\epsilon \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{c})}.$$

By (A.6), the denominator is $\epsilon \cdot |a| = a$. The numerator is

$$N_{K/\mathbb{Q}}(ax - \tau y) = (ax - \tau y)(ax - \bar{\tau}y) = a^2x^2 - a(\tau + \bar{\tau})xy + \tau\bar{\tau}y^2.$$

Since $\tau + \bar{\tau} = -b$ and $\tau\bar{\tau} = ac$, we conclude that

$$N_{K/\mathbb{Q}}(ax - \tau y) = a^2x^2 + abxy + acy^2 = a \cdot F(x, y).$$

This proves the commutativity of (A.7).

In the final part of the proof of Theorem A.5, we will show that the map $\text{Cl}^+(\mathcal{O}) \xrightarrow{\text{(A.4)}} Q(D)$ is injective. Suppose that two pairs $(\mathfrak{c}_1, \epsilon_1)$ and $(\mathfrak{c}_2, \epsilon_2)$ of invertible fractional ideals and signs give equivalent quadratic forms. Choose appropriate \mathbb{Z} -bases (γ_1, γ_2) and (γ'_1, γ'_2) respectively so that we obtain the following identity for two quadratic forms:

$$\frac{N_{K/\mathbb{Q}}(\gamma_1x + \gamma_2y)}{\epsilon_1 \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{c}_1)} = \frac{N_{K/\mathbb{Q}}(\gamma'_1x + \gamma'_2y)}{\epsilon_2 \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{c}_2)}. \tag{A.8}$$

Recall that for all $(x, y) \in \mathbb{Z}^2$, we have $N_{K/\mathbb{Q}}(\gamma_1x + \gamma_2y) = (\gamma_1x + \gamma_2y)(\overline{\gamma_1x + \gamma_2y})$. Similarly, $N_{K/\mathbb{Q}}(\gamma'_1x + \gamma'_2y) = (\gamma'_1x + \gamma'_2y)(\overline{\gamma'_1x + \gamma'_2y})$ holds. In each of the two equalities above, the right-hand side makes sense even for $x, y \in K = \mathbb{Q}(\sqrt{d})$. Set $y = 1$. The values of $x \in K$ satisfying $(\gamma_1x + \gamma_2)(\overline{\gamma_1x + \gamma_2}) = 0$ are $-\gamma_2/\gamma_1$ and $-\overline{\gamma_1}/\overline{\gamma_2}$. A similar fact holds for $x \mapsto (\gamma'_1x + \gamma'_2)(\overline{\gamma'_1x + \gamma'_2})$. From (A.8), either $\gamma_2/\gamma_1 = \gamma'_2/\gamma'_1$ or $\gamma_2/\gamma_1 = \overline{\gamma'_2}/\overline{\gamma'_1}$ holds true. In other words, there exists $\xi \in K^\times$ such that the following equality holds in K^2 :

$$(\gamma_1, \gamma_2) = \xi(\gamma'_1, \gamma'_2) \quad \text{or} \quad (\gamma_1, \gamma_2) = \xi(\overline{\gamma'_1}, \overline{\gamma'_2}). \tag{A.9}$$

In either case, if we substitute it into (A.8), we obtain

$$\frac{\xi\bar{\xi}(\gamma'_1x + \gamma'_2y)(\overline{\gamma'_1x + \gamma'_2y})}{\epsilon_1\mathbf{N}(\mathbf{c}_1)} = \frac{(\gamma'_1x + \gamma'_2y)(\overline{\gamma'_1x + \gamma'_2y})}{\epsilon_2\mathbf{N}(\mathbf{c}_2)}$$

as binary quadratic forms. Therefore, we have $\xi\bar{\xi} = \epsilon_1\mathbf{N}(\mathbf{c}_1)/(\epsilon_2\mathbf{N}(\mathbf{c}_2))$. In particular, $N_{K/\mathbb{Q}}(\xi) = \xi\bar{\xi}$ has sign ϵ_1/ϵ_2 . It then follows that the basis $\xi(\gamma'_1, \gamma'_2)$ of $\xi\mathbf{c}_2$ has sign ϵ_1 and $\xi(\overline{\gamma'_1}, \overline{\gamma'_2})$ of $\xi\overline{\mathbf{c}_2}$ has sign $-\epsilon_1$. Since the basis (γ_1, γ_2) has sign ϵ_1 , we conclude that in (A.9), only the first case can hold. This also implies that $\mathbf{c}_1 = \xi\mathbf{c}_2$ as ideals. Since $\text{sgn}(N_{K/\mathbb{Q}}(\xi)) = \epsilon_1/\epsilon_2$, we obtain the equality $(\mathbf{c}_1, \epsilon_1) = (\xi\mathcal{O}, \text{sgn}(N_{K/\mathbb{Q}}(\xi))) \cdot (\mathbf{c}_2, \epsilon_2)$ in $I_{\mathcal{O}} \times \{\pm 1\}$. This proves the desired injectivity.

This completes the proof of Theorem A.5.

References

- [AM16] M. F. Atiyah and I. G. Macdonald, *Introduction to commutative algebra*, economy ed., Addison-Wesley Series in Mathematics, Westview Press, Boulder, CO, 2016, For the 1969 original see [MR0242802].
- [Bha04] M. Bhargava, *Higher composition laws. I. A new view on Gauss composition, and quadratic generalizations*, Ann. of Math. (2) **159** (2004), no. 1, 217–250.
- [BHP01] R. C. Baker, G. Harman, and J. Pintz, *The difference between consecutive primes. II*, Proc. London Math. Soc. (3) **83** (2001), no. 3, 532–562.
- [BS20] T. F. Bloom and O. Sisask, *Breaking the logarithmic barrier in Roth’s theorem on arithmetic progressions*, preprint, arXiv:2007.03528 (2020).
- [CFZ14] D. Conlon, J. Fox, and Y. Zhao, *The Green-Tao theorem: an exposition*, EMS Surv. Math. Sci. **1** (2014), no. 2, 249–282.
- [CFZ15] ———, *A relative Szemerédi theorem*, Geom. Funct. Anal. **25** (2015), no. 3, 733–762.
- [CMT18] B. Cook, Á. Magyar, and T. Titichetrakun, *A multidimensional Szemerédi theorem in the primes via combinatorics*, Ann. Comb. **22** (2018), no. 4, 711–768.
- [Cox13] D. A. Cox, *Primes of the form $x^2 + ny^2$* , second ed., Pure and Applied Mathematics (Hoboken), John Wiley & Sons, Inc., Hoboken, NJ, 2013, Fermat, class field theory, and complex multiplication.
- [EF19] C. Elsholtz and C. Frei, *Arithmetic progressions in binary quadratic forms and norm forms*, Bull. Lond. Math. Soc. **51** (2019), no. 4, 595–602.
- [FK78] H. Furstenberg and Y. Katznelson, *An ergodic Szemerédi theorem for commuting transformations*, J. Analyse Math. **34** (1978), 275–291 (1979).

- [FZ15] J. Fox and Y. Zhao, *A short proof of the multidimensional Szemerédi theorem in the primes*, Amer. J. Math. **137** (2015), no. 4, 1139–1145.
- [Gow07] W. T. Gowers, *Hypergraph regularity and the multidimensional Szemerédi theorem*, Ann. of Math. (2) **166** (2007), no. 3, 897–946.
- [GT08] B. Green and T. Tao, *The primes contain arbitrarily long arithmetic progressions*, Ann. of Math. (2) **167** (2008), no. 2, 481–547.
- [Hec81] E. Hecke, *Lectures on the theory of algebraic numbers*, Graduate Texts in Mathematics, vol. 77, Springer-Verlag, New York-Berlin, 1981, Translated from the German by George U. Brauer, Jay R. Goldman and R. Kotzen.
- [Hei67] H. Heilbronn, *Zeta-functions and L-functions*, Algebraic Number Theory (Proc. Instructional Conf., Brighton, 1965), Thompson, Washington, D.C., 1967, pp. 204–230.
- [HW08] G. H. Hardy and E. M. Wright, *An introduction to the theory of numbers*, sixth ed., Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2008, Revised by D. R. Heath-Brown and J. H. Silverman, With a foreword by Andrew Wiles.
- [KRE20] V. Kuperberg, B. Rodgers, and Roditty-Gershon E., *Sums of singular series and primes in short intervals in algebraic number fields*, preprint, arXiv:2001.09513 (2020).
- [Lan53] E. Landau, *Handbuch der Lehre von der Verteilung der Primzahlen. 2 Bände*, Chelsea Publishing Co., New York, 1953, 2d ed, With an appendix by Paul T. Bateman.
- [May20] J. Maynard, *Primes represented by incomplete norm forms*, Forum of Mathematics, Pi **8** (2020), e3.
- [Mit56] T. Mitsui, *Generalized prime number theorem*, Jpn. J. Math. **26** (1956), 1–42.
- [Neu99] J. Neukirch, *Algebraic number theory*, Grundlehren der Mathematischen Wissenschaften [Fundamental Principles of Mathematical Sciences], vol. 322, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1999, Translated from the 1992 German original and with a note by Norbert Schappacher, With a foreword by G. Harder.
- [NRS06] B. Nagle, V. Rödl, and M. Schacht, *The counting lemma for regular k -uniform hypergraphs*, Random Structures Algorithms **28** (2006), no. 2, 113–179.
- [RS06] V. Rödl and J. Skokan, *Applications of the regularity lemma for uniform hypergraphs*, Random Structures Algorithms **28** (2006), no. 2, 180–194.
- [RS07a] V. Rödl and M. Schacht, *Regular partitions of hypergraphs: counting lemmas*, Combin. Probab. Comput. **16** (2007), no. 6, 887–901.

- [RS07b] ———, *Regular partitions of hypergraphs: regularity lemmas*, *Combin. Probab. Comput.* **16** (2007), no. 6, 833–885.
- [RSTT06] V. Rödl, M. Schacht, E. Tengan, and N. Tokushige, *Density theorems and extremal hypergraph problems*, *Israel J. Math.* **152** (2006), 371–380.
- [RW19] L. Rimanić and J. Wolf, *Szemerédi’s theorem in the primes*, *Proc. Edinb. Math. Soc.* (2) **62** (2019), no. 2, 443–457.
- [Sol03] J. Solymosi, *Note on a generalization of Roth’s theorem*, *Discrete and computational geometry*, *Algorithms Combin.*, vol. 25, Springer, Berlin, 2003, pp. 825–827.
- [Sta67] H. M. Stark, *A complete determination of the complex quadratic fields of class-number one*, *Michigan Math. J.* **14** (1967), 1–27.
- [Tao06] T. Tao, *The Gaussian primes contain arbitrarily shaped constellations*, *J. Anal. Math.* **99** (2006), 109–176.
- [TZ08] T. Tao and T. Ziegler, *The primes contain arbitrarily long polynomial progressions*, *Acta Math.* **201** (2008), no. 2, 213–305.
- [TZ15] ———, *A multi-dimensional Szemerédi theorem for the primes via a correspondence principle*, *Israel J. Math.* **207** (2015), no. 1, 203–228.
- [Var59] P. Varnavides, *On certain sets of positive density*, *J. London Math. Soc.* **34** (1959), 358–360.

MATHEMATICAL INSTITUTE, TOHOKU UNIVERSITY, SENDAI, 980-8578, JAPAN
E-mail address: kaiw@tohoku.ac.jp

MATHEMATICAL INSTITUTE, TOHOKU UNIVERSITY, SENDAI, 980-8578, JAPAN
E-mail address: m.masato.mimura.m@tohoku.ac.jp

GRADUATE SCHOOL OF INFORMATION SCIENCES, TOHOKU UNIVERSITY, SENDAI,
980-8579, JAPAN
E-mail address: munemasa@math.is.tohoku.ac.jp

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES, AOYAMA GAKUIN UNIVERSITY, SAGAMI-
HARA, 252-5258, JAPAN
E-mail address: seki@math.aoyama.ac.jp

GRADUATE SCHOOL OF INFORMATION SCIENCES, TOHOKU UNIVERSITY, SENDAI,
980-8579, JAPAN
E-mail address: kiyoto.yosino.r2@dc.tohoku.ac.jp