

LINEAR PATTERNS OF PRIME ELEMENTS IN NUMBER FIELDS

WATARU KAI

To the memory of Prof. Noriyuki Suwa (1955–2022)

ABSTRACT. We prove that the von Mangoldt function Λ_K of a number field K is well approximated by its Cramér/Siegel models in the Gowers norm sense. Via the inverse theory of Gowers norms, this is achieved by showing that the difference of Λ_K and its model is asymptotically orthogonal to nilsequences. To prove the asymptotic orthogonality, we use Mitsui’s Prime Number Theorem as the base case and proceed by upgrading Green–Tao’s type I/II computation to the general number field. As an application, we prove a number field analog of the Green–Tao–Ziegler theorem on simultaneous prime values of affine-linear forms of finite complexity. This in turn can be used to prove a Hasse principle result for certain fibrations $X \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^1$ over a number field K extending a result of Harpaz–Skorobogatov–Wittenberg which was only available over \mathbb{Q} .

CONTENTS

1. Introduction	2
2. Outline of proof	5
3. Norm-length compatible bases	11
4. Nilsequences	13
5. The Cramér model	16
6. The Siegel model	23
7. The Cramér and Siegel models are close	29
8. Vaughan’s decomposition (a.k.a. the Type I/II sums)	34
9. The orthogonality theorem—equidistributed, average 0 case	39
10. The orthogonality theorem	55
11. The von Mangoldt function and its models are close	60
12. Simultaneous prime values of affine-linear forms	63
13. Hasse principle of rational points for certain fibrations	67
Appendix A. Results from the nilsequence theory	70
Appendix B. Elementary inequalities	78
Appendix C. The pseudorandom majorant	80
Appendix D. Supplements from algebraic number theory	83
Appendix E. Lattice points in a subset	86
Appendix F. The von Neumann theorem for the Gowers norms	88
Appendix G. Verification of the localized variant of main results	102
References	109

Date: December 29, 2023.

1. INTRODUCTION

Schinzel and Sierpinski [27] conjectured that if finitely many irreducible \mathbb{Z} -coefficient polynomials $f_1, \dots, f_t \in \mathbb{Z}[X]$ satisfy the condition that there is no prime p that divides the product $f_1(n) \cdots f_t(n)$ for all $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ (the so-called *Bouniakowsky condition*), then there should be infinitely many $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that the values $f_1(n), \dots, f_t(n)$ are simultaneously prime (positive or negative). Bateman and Horn [1] give the conjectural asymptotic frequency of this event: on the interval $[1, N] \subset \mathbb{N}$ it should happen

$$\frac{C_{f_1, \dots, f_t}}{\deg(f_1) \cdots \deg(f_t)} \cdot \frac{N}{(\log N)^t} + o\left(\frac{N}{(\log N)^t}\right)$$

times, where letting $0 \leq \omega(p) \leq p$ be the number of elements $a \in \mathbb{F}_p$ such that $\prod_{i=1}^t f_i(a) = 0$ in \mathbb{F}_p , we define

$$C_{f_1, \dots, f_t} := \prod_p \left(\frac{p}{p-1}\right)^t \left(1 - \frac{\omega(p)}{p}\right).$$

Their conjectures extend the older conjectures by Dickson [4] and by Hardy and Littlewood [16] about the case where f_i all have degree 1. The twin prime conjecture is a special case of these conjectures, $f_1 = X$, $f_2 = X + 2$. The only known case of these conjectures is when $t = 1$ and $f_1(X) = aX + b$ where $a \neq 0, b \in \mathbb{Z}$ are coprime.

It becomes easier to attain simultaneous prime values when more variables are allowed. A landmark theorem of Green–Tao–Ziegler [15, 11, 14] affirms the multi-variable version of the Hardy–Littlewood conjecture under a “finite complexity” assumption: namely, they established an asymptotic formula for how frequently finitely many degree 1 polynomials $\psi_1, \dots, \psi_t \in \mathbb{Z}[X_1, \dots, X_d]$ attain simultaneous prime values under the additional condition that their linear parts ψ_i (obtained by discarding the constant term) are pairwise linearly independent, which requires at least two variables.

In this paper, we establish an analog of the theorem of Green–Tao–Ziegler for number fields K . To discuss the asymptotic aspect of the problem, fix a linear norm $\|-\| : K \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ in the sense that it satisfies the triangle inequality, non-degeneracy and $\|ax\| = |a| \cdot \|x\|$ for all $a \in \mathbb{Q}$ and $x \in K$, where $|a|$ is the absolute value as a real number (not any p -adic). For example one can consider the l^∞ -norm associated to any chosen \mathbb{Q} -linear basis $K \cong \mathbb{Q}^n$, and consider the associated l^∞ -norm, or consider the canonical norm $\|-\|_{\text{can}}$ discussed in §3. By adding a subscript

$$\mathcal{O}_{K, \leq N} \subset \mathcal{O}_K$$

let us mean the set of elements x satisfying $\|x\| \leq N$. Recall that the von Mangoldt function Λ_K for K associates to an element $x \in \mathcal{O}_K$ the value $\log \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{p})$ if the ideal (x) is a power of a non-zero prime ideal \mathfrak{p} with exponent ≥ 1 , and 0 if not. As usual, the contribution from prime powers of exponents ≥ 2 is asymptotically negligible. In particular, one can consider the usual von Mangoldt function $\Lambda(\mathbf{N}((x)))$ of the norm of the principal ideal (x) if they prefer.

A thumbnail version of our main result is the following:

Theorem 1.1 (Theorem 12.1 and Remark 12.5). *Let $\psi_1, \dots, \psi_t \in \mathcal{O}_K[X_1, \dots, X_d]$ be polynomials of degree 1 such that their linear parts ψ_i are pairwise linearly independent over K . Then we have an asymptotic formula as $N \rightarrow +\infty$:*

$$\sum_{\underline{x} \in \mathcal{O}_{K, \leq N}^d} \left(\prod_{i=1}^t \Lambda_K(\psi_i(\underline{x})) \right) = C_{\psi_1, \dots, \psi_t} \cdot |\mathcal{O}_{K, \leq N}|^d + o(N^{nd}),$$

where $C_{\psi_1, \dots, \psi_t}$ is a constant depending on ψ_1, \dots, ψ_t , which is positive if the following condition is satisfied: for every prime ideal $\mathfrak{p} \subset \mathcal{O}_K$, there is a vector $\underline{x}_{\mathfrak{p}} \in \mathcal{O}_K^d$ such that $\psi_i(\underline{x}_{\mathfrak{p}}) \notin \mathfrak{p}$ for all $1 \leq i \leq t$. (Another equivalent condition is that for every prime number p , there is a vector $\underline{x}_p \in \mathcal{O}_K^d$ such that the norms $\mathbf{N}(\psi_i(\underline{x}_p))$ are prime to p for all $1 \leq i \leq t$.)

In down-to-earth terms, Theorem 1.1 says for example that if we are given a finite set of degree 1 polynomials in two variables

$$(1.1) \quad a_i X + b_i Y + 1 \in \mathcal{O}_K[X, Y], \quad i = 1, \dots, t$$

such that any two vectors (a_i, b_i) , (a_j, b_j) are linearly independent in K^2 , then there are $(x, y) \in \mathcal{O}_K^2$ such that the values $a_i x + b_i y + 1$ are all prime elements, and the number of such $x \in \mathcal{O}_{K, \leq N}^2$ is asymptotically positively proportional to $N^{2n}/(\log N)^t$. By taking the norm $\mathcal{O}_K \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ noting that prime ideals of degree ≥ 2 are negligibly few, Theorem 1.1 gives a family of cases where the multivariate version of the Bateman–Horn conjecture holds (dn variables ($d \geq 2$), degree n , number of polynomials $t \geq 1$).

In our earlier joint work [20], we considered polynomials (1.1) in the case where $a_i = 1$ for all i . This previous result is stronger in this particular case in that we can find prime-attaining pairs (x, y) from a smaller set $\mathcal{O}_K \times (\mathbb{Z} \setminus \{0\})$ (though the asymptotic frequency has been identified only up to a multiplicative constant), but our current result allows more general coefficients including the constant terms.

An outline of the proof of Theorem 1.1 is given in §2.

1.1. Applications. Harpaz, Skorobogatov and Wittenberg [17] used the Green–Tao–Ziegler theorem for the case of $a_i X + b_i Y + c_i \in \mathbb{Z}[X, Y]$ to study \mathbb{Q} -rational points on algebraic varieties. Their technique allows one to show that a \mathbb{Q} -variety X fibered over the projective line $\pi: X \rightarrow \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{Q}}^1$ satisfies the Hasse principle (in that the Brauer–Manin obstruction is the only obstruction) if generic fibers are known to satisfy the honest Hasse principle and one has control over finitely many bad fibers of π . Their results include:

Theorem 1.2 (Harpaz–Skorobogatov–Wittenberg [17, Corollary 3.4]). *Let X be a smooth proper geometrically integral variety over \mathbb{Q} equipped with a morphism $\pi: X \rightarrow \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{Q}}^1$. If the generic fiber of π is a Severi–Brauer variety and if all the fibers that are not geometrically integral are \mathbb{Q} -fibers, then the Brauer–Manin obstruction is the only obstruction for the non-emptiness of $X(\mathbb{Q})$.*

This theorem is a somewhat immediate consequence of their main theorem [17, Theorem 3.1], which is also limited to (geometrically integral) varieties over \mathbb{Q} . In §13 we indicate how to extend it to the general number field K . For this purpose we need a variant of Theorem 1.1 where we can verify under similar assumptions that a given finite set of affine-linear maps into $\mathcal{O}_K[S^{-1}]$ attain values which are simultaneously prime elements of $\mathcal{O}_K[S^{-1}]$ (Theorem 13.1).

In different directions, a Möbius version of the techniques in this paper will likely help give affirmative answers to some of the questions raised by Sun [28, Question 1.20] concerning specific cases of a generalized form of Sarnak’s conjecture.

The error term in Theorem 1.1 does not genuinely depend on the family ψ_1, \dots, ψ_t but only on the sizes of their coefficients. As in [15, Examples 1 (p. 1760)], this allows one e.g. to deduce a positive solution to an appropriately termed ternary Goldbach problem for “large enough” elements in \mathcal{O}_K . The case of Gaussian integers $\mathcal{O}_K = \mathbb{Z}[i]$ has been worked out independently by Giannitsi, Krause, Lacey, Mousavi and Rahimi [6] by a different method.

Acknowledgments. I thank Joni Teräväinen for answering numerous questions about his work [30] with Terence Tao, and Federico Binda, Hiroyasu Miyazaki and Rin Sugiyama for fruitful discussions. During this work, I was supported by Japan Society for the Promotion of Science (JSPS) through JSPS Grant-in-Aid for Young Scientists (JP18K13382 and JP22K13886) and JSPS Overseas Research Fellowship, which funded my long-term visit to University of Milan. My colleagues in Milan have always been immensely helpful both mathematically and non-mathematically.

1.2. Notation and conventions. K is a number field of degree $n := [K : \mathbb{Q}]$. Let $s \in \mathbb{N}$ be the degree of the Gowers norm we consider, which will be equal to the degree of nilpotency of the Lie group G and to the complexity of the set of affine-linear forms in the context of Theorem 1.1.

1.2.1. General notation. When X is a positive quantity and a, b, c, \dots are some parameters, the expression $O_{a,b,c,\dots}(X)$ means a complex number quantity whose magnitude is bounded by $C_{a,b,c,\dots} \cdot X$ where $C_{a,b,c,\dots} > 0$ is a positive number which can be written as a function in a, b, c, \dots . The expressions $Y = O_{a,b,c,\dots}(X)$ and $Y \ll_{a,b,c,\dots} X$ mean that Y is an $O_{a,b,c,\dots}(X)$. An assertion of the form

“If $Y \ll_{a,b,c,\dots} X$, then $Y' \ll_{a',b',c',\dots} X'$ ”

means that there are constants $C_{a,b,c,\dots} > 0$ (typically small) and $C_{a',b',c',\dots} > 0$ (typically large) which make the following true:

“If $|Y| < C_{a,b,c,\dots} X$, then $|Y'| < C_{a',b',c',\dots} X'$.”

For us, $N > 0$ is the main integer parameter and we will make constant use of the quantity

$$(1.2) \quad Q = Q_s = e^{\sqrt{\log N}/O_s(1)}$$

where $O_s(1) > 10s$ is a sufficiently large positive number depending only on s . If the dependence on s is annoying, one could alternatively choose $Q = e^{(\log N)^\eta}$ with any $0 < \eta < 1/2$. This change forces one to modify the exponents in some pseudopolynomial quantities $e^{(\log N)^c}$ in this paper, but otherwise our results are not affected.

Let

$$0 < c_{s,n} < 1$$

be the exponent in Theorem 2.2 on which we keep adding smallness requirements depending on s, n until its proof will be completed towards the end of §11. For a positive number z , let

$$P(z) := \prod_{0 < p < z} p$$

be the product of all positive prime numbers smaller than z . As in this case, the letter p is reserved for positive prime numbers. In particular, symbols \sum_p, \prod_p will mean sums and products over positive prime numbers (often obeying some additional conditions) even when not explicitly so mentioned.

When $\mathbf{P}(-)$ is a condition, the indicator function $\mathbf{1}_{\mathbf{P}(-)}$ is defined to take value 1 when the condition holds and 0 if not. Sometimes we write it as $\mathbf{1}[\mathbf{P}(-)]$ for legibility.

1.2.2. *Cubes in Euclidean spaces.* For a finite-dimensional \mathbb{R} -vector space $V \cong \mathbb{R}^n$ with a chosen basis, we write

$$[a, b]_V^n, (a, b)_V^n, \dots \subset V$$

for cubes with respect to the basis. For a finite-rank free abelian group $\mathfrak{a} \cong \mathbb{Z}^n$ with a chosen basis, we write

$$[a, b]_{\mathfrak{a}}^n := \mathfrak{a} \cap [a, b]_{\mathfrak{a} \otimes \mathbb{R}}^n$$

and so on. The subscripts will be omitted when there is not so much risk of confusion. We use the shorthand symbol $[\pm N]$ to mean $[-N, N]$.

1.2.3. *Ideals.* We assume that the reader is familiar with the very basics of algebraic number theory as in [24, Chapter I]. This includes objects like $\mathcal{O}_K, \text{Cl}(K)$ and the theory of fractional ideals. We write

$$\text{Ideals}_K := \{\mathfrak{a} \subset \mathcal{O}_K \mid \mathfrak{a} \text{ is a non-zero ideal}\}$$

for the multiplicative monoid of non-zero ideals of \mathcal{O}_K .

We will make routine use of *norm-length compatible bases* of ideals, which are explained in §3.

Lower case German letters $\mathfrak{a}, \mathfrak{b}, \mathfrak{c}, \mathfrak{d}, \mathfrak{n}, \mathfrak{q}$ are used to denote non-zero fractional ideals of \mathcal{O}_K . The letter \mathfrak{p} is exclusively used to mean non-zero *prime* ideals. In particular, sums and products of the form $\sum_{\mathfrak{p}}, \prod_{\mathfrak{p}}$ are always those over prime ideals, often with some additional conditions indicated. The adjective “non-zero” might be omitted from time to time.

An element $x \in \mathfrak{a}$ of a fractional ideal and an ideal $\mathfrak{q} \subset \mathcal{O}_K$ are said to be *coprime* in \mathfrak{a} if we have $x\mathcal{O}_K + \mathfrak{q}\mathfrak{a} = \mathfrak{a}$. We say $x \in \mathfrak{a}$ and $\alpha \in \mathcal{O}_K$ are coprime if x and (α) are.

See §D.3 for some conventions related to Hecke characters such as $\psi^{\mathfrak{a}}$ (the restriction of a Hecke character to a fractional ideal) and $C(\mathfrak{q})$ (the mod \mathfrak{q} idèle class group).

2. OUTLINE OF PROOF

We broadly follow the overall plan of Green–Tao [15] and incorporate simplifications by Tao–Teräväinen [30], which are powered by more modern combinatorial machinery. With \mathcal{O}_K , additive combinatorics gets a little more complicated because the geometry of \mathbb{R}^n is richer than \mathbb{R} . Algebra gets more complex as well because unlike in \mathbb{Z} , elements and ideals are two very different notions—the multiplicative structure is cleaner in the framework of ideals, but we have to make sure that they get along with the additive combinatorics concepts which only see elements and additive subgroups at best.

The central combinatorial tool is the *Gowers U^{s+1} -norm*, where $s \geq 0$ is an integer, which will eventually be set to be the *complexity* of the set ψ_1, \dots, ψ_t of linear maps.

Definition 2.1 (Gowers norm). Let A be a finite abelian group and $f: A \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ be a function. The *Gowers U^{s+1} -norm* $\|f\|_{U^{s+1}(A)} \geq 0$ is defined by

$$\left(\|f\|_{U^{s+1}(A)}\right)^{2^{s+1}} := \mathbb{E}_{\substack{x \in A \\ (h_1, \dots, h_{s+1}) \in A^{s+1}}} \left[\prod_{\substack{(\omega_1, \dots, \omega_{s+1}) \\ \in \{0,1\}^{s+1}}} \mathcal{C}^{\omega_1 + \dots + \omega_{s+1}} f\left(x + \sum_{i=1}^{s+1} \omega_i h_i\right) \right],$$

where \mathcal{C} is the complex conjugate operation. Henceforth, for $\underline{h} = (h_1, \dots, h_{s+1}) \in A^{s+1}$ and $\underline{\omega} = (\omega_1, \dots, \omega_{s+1}) \in \{0,1\}^{s+1}$, it is convenient to write $|\underline{\omega}| := \omega_1 + \dots + \omega_{s+1}$ and

$$\underline{\omega} \cdot \underline{h} := \sum_{i=1}^{s+1} \omega_i h_i.$$

Also, if A is a finite subset of an abelian group Z and $f: A \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ is a function, we define $\|f\|_{U^{s+1}(A)} \geq 0$ by

$$\left(\|f\|_{U^{s+1}(A)}\right)^{2^{s+1}} := \mathbb{E}_{\substack{x \in Z \\ \underline{h} \in Z^{s+1} \\ \text{such that} \\ x + \underline{\omega} \cdot \underline{h} \in A \\ \text{for all } \underline{\omega} \in \{0,1\}^{s+1}}} \left[\prod_{\underline{\omega} \in \{0,1\}^{s+1}} \mathcal{C}^{|\underline{\omega}|} f(x + \underline{\omega} \cdot \underline{h}) \right].$$

We will use this norm mainly for $A = \mathcal{O}_{K, \leq N} \subset \mathcal{O}_K$.

See [15, Appendix B] for a comprehensive introduction to the theory of Gowers norms.

2.1. The von Neumann theorem. The von Neumann theorem of Gowers norms (Appendix F) says that the sum $\sum_{x \in \mathcal{O}_{K, \leq N}^d} \prod_{i=1}^t \Lambda_K(\psi_i(x))$ will change little if we replace the function Λ_K by another function which is close in the $U^{s+1}(\mathcal{O}_{K, \leq N})$ -norm, at least if we define $\mathcal{O}_{K, \leq N}$ using the l^∞ -norm associated with a \mathbb{Z} -basis $\mathcal{O}_K \cong \mathbb{Z}^n$. Our choice of the replacement for Λ_K is its *Cramér model* $\Lambda_{\text{Cramér}}$, for which the sum is computable (§5).¹ This reduces the problem to showing that $\|\Lambda_K - \Lambda_{\text{Cramér}}\|_{U^{s+1}(\mathcal{O}_{K, \leq N})}$ is *small* (= decays fast enough as $N \rightarrow +\infty$):

Theorem 2.2 (Theorem 11.1). *We have*

$$\|\Lambda_K - \Lambda_{\text{Cramér}}\|_{U^{s+1}(\mathcal{O}_{K, \leq N})} \ll_{s, K, \|\cdot\|} (\log \log N)^{-c_{s,n}}$$

for some small $0 < c_{s,n} < 1$.

This result alone could be of theoretical importance in its own right.

As an aside, let us mention that the von Neumann theorem is not naively applicable here because the values of Λ_K and $\Lambda_{\text{Cramér}}$ are not uniformly bounded for varying $N > 1$ (they can be as large as $O(\log N)$). To remedy this, we have to

¹To be precise, the definition of the Cramér model involves the choice of a parameter Q growing with the scale N , but we ignore it in Introduction. Similarly for the Siegel model which appears below.

assure that their absolute values are bounded by a *pseudorandom* weight function, which we can prove only after the so-called *W-trick*. This means that Theorem 1.1 does not literally follow from Theorem 2.2, but rather from its *W-tricked* variant (Lemma 12.2). In this Introduction we do not further discuss this issue. That the *W-tricked* Λ_K is bounded by a pseudorandom weight function is a key computation from our previous joint work [20] with Mimura, Munemasa, Seki and Yoshino, which is explained in Appendix C.

2.2. Siegel model. When $K = \mathbb{Q}$, Green–Tao [10] directly compared Λ and $\Lambda_{\text{Cramér}}$. Tao–Teräväinen [30] clarified that it is more efficient to introduce an intermediate model, the *Siegel model* Λ_{Siegel} (§6), and try to show separately that

$$\|\Lambda - \Lambda_{\text{Siegel}}\|_{U^{s+1}(\mathbb{N})} \quad \text{and} \quad \|\Lambda_{\text{Siegel}} - \Lambda_{\text{Cramér}}\|_{U^{s+1}(\mathbb{N})}$$

are small. Green–Tao’s computations can be used to show a faster decay of the first difference, while the second difference can be bounded by utilizing the Weil bounds for character sums. This separation allows one to prove much faster decay, breaking the “sound barrier” so to speak, which makes the remaining procedure substantially simpler.

The Weil bound argument easily carries over to the number field situation (§7). Thus we are left with the question of showing $\|\Lambda_K - \Lambda_{\text{Siegel}}\|_{U^{s+1}(\mathcal{O}_{K, \leq N})}$ is small.

2.3. Gowers Inverse Theorem. There is a combinatorial tool called *Gowers Inverse Theorem*, which gives a sufficient (and in a sense necessary) condition for the Gowers norm $\|f\|_{U^{s+1}}$ of a given function f to be small. It roughly states that the Gowers U^{s+1} -norm of a function $f: [-N, N]^n \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ is small if its correlation with *s-step nilsequences* $\theta: \mathbb{Z}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ is small:

$$\left| \mathbb{E}_{x \in [-N, N]^n} f(x)\theta(x) \right| = o_{N \rightarrow +\infty}(1) \quad (\text{fast enough?})$$

Here *s-step nilsequences* are sequences of complex numbers that arise as composites of the form

$$\theta = F \circ g: \mathbb{Z}^n \xrightarrow{g} G \twoheadrightarrow G/\Gamma \xrightarrow{F} \mathbb{C}$$

where G is a connected, simply connected Lie group which is *s-step nilpotent*, g is a *polynomial map*, $\Gamma \subset G$ is a cocompact discrete subgroup and F is a Lipschitz function (with respect to an appropriate metric) whose values have absolute value ≤ 1 . The precise definitions of these notions are recalled in §4.

By convention, 1-step nilpotency means G is abelian, in which case G/Γ is a real torus isomorphic to $\mathbb{R}^m/\mathbb{Z}^m$. The function F can be well approximated by waves $x \mapsto e^{2\pi i \cdot \xi(x)}$ of various frequencies $\xi \in \text{Hom}_{\text{cont}}(\mathbb{R}^m/\mathbb{Z}^m, \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}) \cong \mathbb{Z}^m$. If moreover g is just an additive map, then we are essentially in the realm of classical Fourier analysis. The general situation, so-called *higher order Fourier analysis*, is a relatively new branch of analysis/combinatorics which has only received enough attention after the turn of the century [7]. Some of the results that we use had been formulated for nilsequences on \mathbb{Z} instead of \mathbb{Z}^n in the literature, so in Appendices A, F we give some supplements on how to extend them to \mathbb{Z}^n .

The *Inverse Gowers Theorem* (§A.1) was first proven by Green–Tao–Ziegler [14] in a qualitative form; the first and fairly useful quantitative version has recently been established by Manners [21].

2.4. Factorization theorem. To make the nilsequence look simpler, we have to rely on the *equidistribution theory* of polynomial maps, the central tools being the Leibman theorem and the factorization theorem.

The Quantitative Factorization Theorem A.7 of polynomial maps gives a decomposition of the polynomial map $g: \mathcal{O}_K \cong \mathbb{Z}^n \rightarrow G$ into the pointwise product of three other polynomial maps:

$$g(x) = \varepsilon(x)g'(x)\gamma(x)$$

where ε is *smooth* (\equiv very slowly varying), g' has values in a closed subgroup G' and is *totally equidistributed* in $G'/G' \cap \Gamma$, and γ is periodic of period $P\mathbb{Z}^n$ (with $P \in \mathbb{N}$ of controlled size). The smooth part ε varies so slowly that by splitting the cube $[\pm N]^n$ into not-so-ridiculously small subcubes, it can be regarded as practically constant on each subcube. Also, by splitting \mathcal{O}_K into residue classes mod $P\mathcal{O}_K$, we will be reduced to showing the following type of decay for each convex subset $\Omega \subset [\pm N]^n$ and residue class $\alpha \in \mathcal{O}_K/P\mathcal{O}_K$:

$$(2.1) \quad \left| \sum_{x \in \Omega \cap (\alpha + P\mathbb{Z}^n)} (\Lambda_K - \Lambda_{\text{Siegel}})(x)F(g(x)) \right| \stackrel{?}{=} o_{N \rightarrow +\infty}(N^n) \quad (\text{fast enough}),$$

under the additional assumption that g is totally equidistributed. In fact, since we always consider finitely many points in G , the only sensible thing we can do with equidistribution concepts is to consider them with admissible errors. In the current situation, the map g is actually assumed to be *totally ϵ -equidistributed* as a map from $[-N, N]^n \subset \mathbb{Z}^n \cong \mathcal{O}_K$ for an ϵ of the form $\epsilon = \exp(-(\log N)^c)$ with c slightly smaller than $1/2$.

2.5. Mitsui's Prime Number Theorem. When F is the constant function 1, the problem is to approximate the sum $\sum_{x \in \Omega \cap (\alpha + P\mathbb{Z}^n)} \Lambda_K(x)$ by the more predictable sum with Λ_{Siegel} replacing Λ_K . In the case of $K = \mathbb{Q}$ this is precisely Prime Number Theorem in arithmetic progressions. For the general number field, Mitsui [22] had proven an almost appropriate analog of Prime Number Theorem building on Landau's Prime Ideal Theorem. The correction term from a Siegel zero and the flexibility to choose the convex set Ω were worked out in our preceding work ([19], see also Proposition 6.4).

Thus, by subtracting the average from F , we may assume that F has average 0. Under this assumption, we shall show that the decay (2.1) is actually true for Λ_K and Λ_{Siegel} separately.

2.6. Vaughan decomposition. To prove the decay (2.1) for Λ_K and Λ_{Siegel} assuming F has average 0, we perform a *Vaughan decomposition* (§8) of them into so-called (twisted) type I/II sums modulo negligible error. This replaces Λ_K and Λ_{Siegel} by functions behaving similarly to the divisor function $\tau(x) := \sum_{a|x} 1$ or the double divisor function $\sum_{a|x} \tau(a)$. Since the von Mangoldt function Λ_K is theoretically well behaved only as a function on the monoid Ideals_K of all non-zero ideals, our Vaughan decomposition inevitably takes place in the context of ideals. To make the error arising from the decomposition small enough, we use the observation that Fundamental Lemma of sieve theory can be formulated on the monoid Ideals_K (Appendix D.2).

Thus our new goal (pursued in §9) is to show certain decays similar to the following, under the assumption that g is totally equidistributed and F has average zero:

$$\frac{1}{N^n} \left| \sum_{x \in \Omega \cap (a + \mathfrak{P}\mathcal{O}_K)} \sum_{\mathfrak{a}|x} 1 \cdot F(g(x)) \right| \stackrel{?}{=} o_{N \rightarrow \infty}(1),$$

$$\frac{1}{N^n} \left| \sum_{x \in \Omega \cap (a + \mathfrak{P}\mathcal{O}_K)} \sum_{\mathfrak{a}|x} \sum_{\mathfrak{b}|\mathfrak{a}} 1 \cdot F(g(x)) \right| \stackrel{?}{=} o_{N \rightarrow \infty}(1) \quad (\text{both fast enough}).$$

We write $\delta > 0$ for the value of the left hand side of one of the above (assuming it is not zero).

2.7. Parametrization of ideals. Intricate applications of the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality and meticulous scrutinies of pigeonholes let Green–Tao [10] create a situation where they have not so few $d \in [1, N]$ and a not so short interval $I_d \subset [1, N]$ for each d such that

$$\left| \mathbb{E}_{x \in I_d} F(g(dx)) \right| \geq \frac{\delta}{(\log N)^{O_n(1)}}$$

(resp. not so few pairs $(d, d') \in [1, N]^2$ and an interval $I_{d,d'}$ for each (d, d') such that

$$\left| \mathbb{E}_{x \in I_{d,d'}} F(g(dx)) \overline{F}(g(d'x)) \right| \geq \left(\frac{\delta}{\log N} \right)^{O_n(1)};$$

for simplicity, we will not further discuss this latter case in Introduction.)

In retrospect, the following two properties of \mathbb{Z} were making Green–Tao’s treatment simple:

- \mathbb{Z} is a PID; more specifically the positive integers \mathbb{N} parametrize all the non-zero ideals of \mathbb{Z} ;
- For every non-zero ideal $\mathfrak{a} \subset \mathbb{Z}$, there is a canonical choice of a basis $\mathfrak{a} \cong \mathbb{Z}$ (isomorphism of abelian groups).

As alternatives of these features, we use the following consequences of geometry of numbers (§§3, 9.1.4),

- If we choose a set $\{\mathfrak{a}_\lambda\}_{\lambda \in \text{Cl}(K)}$ of representing ideals for the ideal class group, then a suitable subset

$$\bigsqcup_{\lambda \in \text{Cl}(K)} \mathcal{D}_\lambda \subset \bigsqcup_{\lambda \in \text{Cl}(K)} \mathfrak{a}_\lambda^{-1}$$

(inverse $(-)^{-1}$ means the *inverse fractional ideal*) parametrizes all the non-zero ideals, where $\alpha \in \mathcal{D}_\lambda$ corresponds to the ideal $\alpha \mathfrak{a}_\lambda$;

- There is a uniform, if not canonical, way of choosing bases $\mathfrak{a} \cong \mathbb{Z}^n$ for all the ideals \mathfrak{a} ; this is important because some of the notions and results from combinatorics are coordinate-dependent.

These will bring us to a situation where there are not so few ideals \mathfrak{b} within a certain norm bound and not so small cubes $C_{\mathfrak{b}} \subset \mathfrak{b}$ with respect to the above bases $\mathfrak{b} \cong \mathbb{Z}^n$ such that we have

$$(2.2) \quad \left| \mathbb{E}_{x \in C_{\mathfrak{b}}} F(g|_{\mathfrak{b}}(x)) \right| \geq \frac{\delta}{(\log N)^{O_n(1)}}.$$

As the function F now has average 0, the inequality (2.2) shows that $g|_{\mathfrak{b}}: \mathfrak{b} \rightarrow G/\Gamma$ is not too well equidistributed because the average computed on the points $(g(x))_{x \in C_{\mathfrak{b}}}$ is failing to give the correct average.

2.8. Leibman's theorem. The Quantitative Leibman Theorem A.4 characterizes the equidistribution property of $g: \mathbb{Z}^n \rightarrow G(\twoheadrightarrow G/\Gamma)$ via its composition with group homomorphisms (*horizontal characters*) $\eta: G \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ sending Γ into \mathbb{Z} : the failure of g to be equidistributed to a certain extent implies that there is an η within a certain complexity such that the composite polynomial map $\eta \circ g: \mathbb{Z}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ has coefficients close to integers.

In our situation (2.2), this gives (after more pigeonholes) a horizontal character $\eta: G \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that after the restriction to \mathfrak{b} , the composite polynomial map $H := \eta \circ g: \mathcal{O}_K \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ has coefficients close to integers for not so few ideals $\mathfrak{b} \subset \mathcal{O}_K$. We want to conclude that H *itself* has coefficients close to integers. Via the parametrization of ideals, the situation that the coefficients of $H|_{\mathfrak{b}}$ are close to integers is equivalently phrased using the two-variable polynomial map

$$H(-, -): \bigsqcup_{\lambda \in \text{Cl}(K)} (\mathcal{D}_{\lambda} \times \mathfrak{a}_{\lambda}) \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_K \xrightarrow{H} \mathbb{R},$$

that for some $\lambda \in \text{Cl}(K)$ and not so few $\alpha \in \mathcal{D}_{\lambda}$ within some bounded region, the polynomial map $H(\alpha, -)$ obtained by freezing the first argument has almost integral coefficients. By the bilinear nature of $H(-, -)$, each coefficient of the polynomial map $H(\alpha, -)$ is then a polynomial in α , to which we apply equidistribution theory of polynomial maps again. This gives us some control of its global behavior in the variable $\alpha \in \mathfrak{a}_{\lambda}^{-1}$ and in particular control of the coefficients of $H(1, -)$, namely the restriction of H to \mathfrak{a}_{λ} . Since $\mathfrak{a}_{\lambda} \subset \mathcal{O}_K$ is a subgroup of index $\ll_K 1$, We obtain control of the coefficients of H itself.

By (the easier implication of) the Leibman theorem, the fact that H has almost integral coefficients imply that g fails to be totally $\tilde{\delta}$ -equidistributed, where $\tilde{\delta}$ has the form $\delta^{O(1)} \exp(-(\log N)^{c'})$. Since g is already assumed to be totally ϵ -equidistributed at the end of §2.4, we must conclude that $\tilde{\delta} < \epsilon$, which gives an upper bound on δ . Some careful choices will have been arranged (§10) so that the resulting bound of δ will achieve the desired kind of decay. This proves that the correlation (2.1) is small.

2.9. Conclusion. As was already explained, from the fact that the correlation (2.1) is small, *Gowers Inverse Theorem* implies that $\|\Lambda_K - \Lambda_{\text{Siegel}}\|_{\mathbb{U}^{s+1}}$ is small.² Together with the smallness of $\|\Lambda_{\text{Siegel}} - \Lambda_{\text{Cramér}}\|_{\mathbb{U}^{s+1}}$ proven earlier (see §2.2), we conclude that $\|\Lambda_K - \Lambda_{\text{Cramér}}\|_{\mathbb{U}^{s+1}}$ is small, and therefore by the *von Neumann theorem* the sum

$$\sum_{x \in \mathcal{O}_K, \leq N} \prod_{i=1}^t \Lambda_K(\psi_i(x))$$

is close to the one where Λ_K is replaced by $\Lambda_{\text{Cramér}}$, which is elementarily computable. This is how we will prove Theorem 1.1.

²To be precise, we again need the W-trick to be able to apply Gowers Inverse Theorem.

3. NORM-LENGTH COMPATIBLE BASES

We sometimes want to choose bases $\mathfrak{a} \cong \mathbb{Z}^n$ of unboundedly many ideals \mathfrak{a} in some uniform manner, in order to get a handle on quantities which depend on the choice of bases. The notion of norm-length compatible bases and their existence serve this purpose.

Given a ring homomorphism $\sigma: K \hookrightarrow \mathbb{C}$, use the same symbol to denote its \mathbb{R} -linear extension $\sigma: K \otimes_{\mathbb{Q}} \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$. We define the *canonical norm* $\|-\|_{\text{can}}$ on $K \otimes_{\mathbb{Q}} \mathbb{R}$ by

$$\|x\|_{\text{can}} := \max_{\sigma: K \hookrightarrow \mathbb{C}} |\sigma(x)|.$$

It is indeed a *norm* in the \mathbb{R} -linear algebra sense because σ 's give rise to an \mathbb{R} -linear (ring) isomorphism $K \otimes_{\mathbb{Q}} \mathbb{R} \cong \mathbb{R}^{r_1} \times \mathbb{C}^{r_2}$ where r_1 is the number of ring homomorphisms $K \hookrightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and r_2 is the number of complex conjugate pairs of homomorphisms $K \hookrightarrow \mathbb{C}$ whose image is not contained in \mathbb{R} .

Let us recall that a subset $\mathcal{D} \subset (K \otimes_{\mathbb{Q}} \mathbb{R})^\times$ is said to be *norm-length compatible* (terminology from [20]) if there is $C > 1$ such that for all $\sigma: K \hookrightarrow \mathbb{C}$ and $x \in \mathcal{D}$, we have

$$\frac{1}{C} \mathbf{N}(x)^{1/n} < |\sigma(x)| < C \mathbf{N}(x)^{1/n}$$

(the existence of an upper bound of this form implies the existence of a lower bound by the formula $\prod_{\sigma} |\sigma(x)| = \mathbf{N}(x)$ and vice versa).

It is known that there are \mathcal{O}_K^\times -fundamental domains $\mathcal{D} \subset (K \otimes_{\mathbb{Q}} \mathbb{R})^\times$ which are norm-length compatible (see e.g. [20, §4.3]).

Now we want to introduce the notion of norm-length compatible *bases* of ideals.

Proposition 3.1. *There is a positive number $C_K > 1$ such that the following holds: for any non-zero fractional ideal $\mathfrak{a} \subset K$, there is a \mathbb{Z} -basis $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_n)$ of \mathfrak{a} such that if we write $\|-\|_{\mathbf{x}, \infty}$ for the associated l^∞ norm, then we have the following relation of norms on \mathfrak{a}*

$$(3.1) \quad \frac{1}{C_K} \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{a})^{1/n} \|-\|_{\mathbf{x}, \infty} \leq \|-\|_{\text{can}} \leq C_K \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{a})^{1/n} \|-\|_{\mathbf{x}, \infty}.$$

Proof. Choose a representative \mathfrak{a}_λ for each ideal class $\lambda \in \text{Cl}(K)$. Choose a \mathbb{Z} -basis $x_1^\lambda, \dots, x_n^\lambda$ of \mathfrak{a}_λ and let $\|-\|_{\lambda, \infty}$ be the associated l^∞ norm. Since any two norms on a finite dimensional real vector space are equivalent, there is a $C > 1$ such that for all λ and $x \in \mathfrak{a}_\lambda$, we have

$$(3.2) \quad \frac{1}{C} \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{a}_\lambda)^{1/n} \|x\|_{\lambda, \infty} \leq \|x\|_{\text{can}} \leq C \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{a}_\lambda)^{1/n} \|x\|_{\lambda, \infty}.$$

Choose also a norm-length compatible \mathcal{O}_K^\times -domain $\mathcal{D} \subset (K \otimes_{\mathbb{Q}} \mathbb{R})^\times$. By the definition of norm-length compatibility, there is a $C' > 1$ such that for all $\sigma: K \hookrightarrow \mathbb{C}$ and $y \in \mathcal{D}$, we have

$$(3.3) \quad \frac{1}{C'} \mathbf{N}(y)^{1/n} \leq |\sigma(y)| \leq C' \mathbf{N}(y)^{1/n}.$$

Now let \mathfrak{a} be an arbitrary non-zero fractional ideal. There are unique $\lambda \in \text{Cl}(K)$ and $y \in \mathcal{D} \cap K^\times$ such that $\mathfrak{a} = y\mathfrak{a}_\lambda$. Note that $\mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{a}) = \mathbf{N}(y)\mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{a}_\lambda)$. Consider the \mathbb{Z} -basis $yx_1^\lambda, \dots, yx_n^\lambda$ of \mathfrak{a} . The associated l^∞ norm $\|-\|_{\mathfrak{a}, \infty}$ on \mathfrak{a} is identical to the norm induced by $\|-\|_{\lambda, \infty}$ via the multiplication-by- y isomorphism $\mathfrak{a}_\lambda \xrightarrow{\cong} \mathfrak{a}$.

For any $x \in \mathfrak{a}_\lambda$, by multiplying (3.2) and (3.3) we get

$$\frac{1}{CC'} \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{a})^{1/n} \|yx\|_{\mathfrak{a}, \infty} \leq \|yx\|_{\text{can}} \leq CC' \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{a})^{1/n} \|yx\|_{\mathfrak{a}, \infty}.$$

Since every element of \mathfrak{a} has the form yx with $x \in \mathfrak{a}_\lambda$, the coefficient $C_K := CC'$ and the bases yx_i^λ ($1 \leq i \leq n$) do the job. \square

Definition 3.2. Choose a $C_K > 1$ as in Proposition 3.1 and fix it throughout the paper.

A \mathbb{Z} -basis x_1, \dots, x_n of a non-zero fractional ideal $\mathfrak{a} \subset K$ is said to be *norm-length compatible* (with coefficient C_K if one wants to be precise) if the condition (3.1) in Proposition 3.1 is satisfied.

By Proposition 3.1, every non-zero fractional ideal admits norm-length compatible bases.

Proposition 3.3. *Let $\mathfrak{a}_1 \subset \mathfrak{a}_2$ be an inclusion of two non-zero fractional ideals. Let x_i^1, x_i^2 ($1 \leq i \leq n$) be a norm-length compatible basis (with coefficient C_K) on each. Then the matrix representing the inclusion map with respect to these bases has entries with absolute value $\leq C_K^2 \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{a}_1 \mathfrak{a}_2^{-1})^{1/n}$.*

In particular, supposing C_K has already been chosen, any two norm-length compatible bases of a given fractional ideal are connected by matrices with entries of absolute value $\leq O_K(1)$.

Proof. Let $\|\cdot\|_{j, \infty}$ be the l^∞ norm associated with the basis x_1^j, \dots, x_n^j of \mathfrak{a}_j . By the definition of norm-length compatibility, we have for each i

$$\begin{aligned} \|x_i^1\|_{2, \infty} &< C_K \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{a}_2)^{-1/n} \|x_i^1\|_{\text{can}} \\ &< C_K \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{a}_2)^{-1/n} \cdot C_K \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{a}_1)^{1/n} \|x_i^1\|_{1, \infty} \\ &= C_K^2 \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{a}_1 \mathfrak{a}_2^{-1})^{1/n}, \end{aligned}$$

as is claimed. \square

Proposition 3.4. *Let \mathfrak{a} be a non-zero fractional ideal and $\iota: \mathbb{Z}^n \cong \mathfrak{a}$ be a norm-length compatible basis. Then the function*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{Z}^n &\rightarrow \mathbb{Z} \\ x &\mapsto N_{K/\mathbb{Q}}(\iota(x)) / \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{a}) \end{aligned}$$

is represented by a homogeneous polynomial of degree n with coefficients of absolute value $\leq O_K(1)$ (a bound independent of \mathfrak{a}).

Proof. Choose $\mathcal{D} \subset (K \otimes_{\mathbb{Q}} \mathbb{R})^\times$ and $(\mathfrak{a}_\lambda)_{\lambda \in \text{Cl}(K)}$ as in the proof of Proposition 3.1. Take the unique $y \in \mathcal{D} \cap K^\times$ and λ such that $\mathfrak{a} = y\mathfrak{a}_\lambda$. Since the matrix representing the multiplication-by- y isomorphism $\mathfrak{a}_\lambda \xrightarrow{\cong} \mathfrak{a}$ has entries of size $\leq O_K(1)$, and since the functions $N_{K/\mathbb{Q}}(-)/\mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{a})$ and $N_{K/\mathbb{Q}}(-)/\mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{a}_\lambda)$ are compatible via this isomorphism at least up to sign, the problem is reduced to the case $\mathfrak{a} = \mathfrak{a}_\lambda$ for some λ . But there are only finitely many $\lambda \in \text{Cl}(K)$. \square

Let us take this opportunity to mention a classical result about ideals:

Proposition 3.5 (density of ideals, see e.g. [2, p. 210]). *Let $\lambda \in \text{Cl}(\mathbb{K})$ and $N \geq 3$. We have*

$$\sum_{\substack{\mathfrak{a} \in \text{Ideals}_{\mathbb{K}} \\ \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{a}) \leq N \\ [\mathfrak{a}] = \lambda \text{ in } \text{Cl}(\mathbb{K})}} 1 = \frac{\text{res}_{s=1}(\zeta_{\mathbb{K}}(s))}{\#\text{Cl}(\mathbb{K})} N + O_{\mathbb{K}}(N^{1-\frac{1}{n}}).$$

4. NILSEQUENCES

Nilsequences are sequences of complex numbers obtained in a certain geometric way. We recall a minimum amount of definitions (and fix conventions thereof) that are needed to make sense of the discussions that follow. For details and references, see [12, §§1, 2]. Those who already know this concept should skip this section. See Appendix A for the advanced results we need in this paper.

We start out with the notions of nilmanifolds and polynomial maps into them.

Definition 4.1 (filtered Lie groups and nilmanifolds). Let $s \geq 0$ be an integer. An *s-step filtered group* (or a filtered group of *degree s*) is an abstract group G equipped with a descending sequence of normal subgroups

$$G \supset G_0 \supset G_1 \supset \cdots \supset G_s \supset G_{s+1} = \cdots = \{1\}$$

such that $[G_i, G_j] \subset G_{i+j}$ for all $i, j \geq 0$.

An *s-step filtered Lie group* (or a filtered Lie group of *degree s*) is a connected, simply connected Lie group G equipped with a descending sequence of normal subgroups as above, where G_i are also required to be closed and connected.

An *s-step nilmanifold* (or a nilmanifold of *degree s*) is the data of an *s-step filtered Lie group* G and a cocompact discrete subgroup $\Gamma \subset G$. In the narrower sense, the quotient from the right G/Γ is called the *nilmanifold*, but usually a choice of the above data is also assumed.

Definition 4.2 (Mel'cev basis). A *Mel'cev basis* X_1, \dots, X_m adapted to a nilmanifold G/Γ is a basis of the \mathbb{R} -vector space $\text{Lie}(G)$ satisfying:

- The map

$$\begin{aligned} \psi_{X_1, \dots, X_m} : \mathbb{R}^m &\rightarrow G \\ (t_1, \dots, t_m) &\mapsto \exp(t_1 X_1) \dots \exp(t_m X_m) \end{aligned}$$

is a bijection mapping \mathbb{Z}^m exactly onto Γ .

- For each $0 \leq j \leq m$, the \mathbb{R} -span \mathfrak{h}_j of the vectors X_{j+1}, \dots, X_m is an ideal of the Lie algebra $\text{Lie}(G)$. (Note that $\dim(\mathfrak{h}_j) = m - j$.)
- For each $0 \leq i \leq s$, the Lie algebra of G_i is $\mathfrak{h}_{m-\dim(G_i)}$.

Mel'cev bases are known to exist for every nilmanifold [12, p. 478].

Definition 4.3 (metric on G/Γ associated with a Mel'cev basis). Let G/Γ be a nilmanifold equipped with a Mel'cev basis. Give $\text{Lie}(G)$ the positive definite inner product where the given basis is an orthonormal basis. Translate it to the entire G by the action from the right, which makes G/Γ a Riemannian manifold and in particular a metric space.

In our main references such as [12, Definition 2.2, also the footnote], they use a somewhat different metric based on the l^∞ -norm. Since we have the inequality $\|x\|_\infty \leq \|x\|_2 \leq \sqrt{m} \cdot \|x\|_\infty$ for $x \in \mathbb{R}^m$ and as we will pretty quickly have to deal

with much larger multiplicative losses than \sqrt{m} , the choice of the metric here turns out insignificant.

Definition 4.4 (complexity of a Mel'cev basis and subgroups). Let $M > 0$ be a positive number.

A Mel'cev basis X_1, \dots, X_m of a nilmanifold G/Γ is said to have *complexity* $\leq M$ (or to be *M-rational*) if the structural constants c_{ijk} defined by

$$[X_i, X_j] = \sum_{k=1}^m c_{ijk} X_k$$

are all rational numbers of height $\leq M$. (I.e., written as the quotient of integers of size $\leq M$.) If the choice of a Mel'cev basis is implicitly assumed, we simply say that the nilmanifold G/Γ has *complexity* $\leq M$.

A closed subgroup $G' \subset G$ is said to have *complexity* $\leq M$ (or to be *M-rational*) with respect to a Mel'cev basis X_1, \dots, X_m if $\text{Lie}(G')$ has a basis where each member can be written as a linear combination of X_1, \dots, X_m with rational coefficients of height $\leq M$.

Definition 4.5 (horizontal characters). A *horizontal character* η on a nilmanifold G/Γ is a continuous group homomorphism $\eta: G \rightarrow \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}$ which annihilates Γ .

If we are also given a Mel'cev basis X_1, \dots, X_m adapted to G/Γ , there is a unique $k = (k_1, \dots, k_m) \in \mathbb{Z}^m$ such that for all $(t_1, \dots, t_m) \in \mathbb{R}^m$:

$$\eta(\psi_{X_1, \dots, X_m}(t_1, \dots, t_m)) = k_1 t_1 + \dots + k_m t_m \pmod{\mathbb{Z}}.$$

The *magnitude* (or the *modulus*) $|\eta|$ of η is defined by

$$|\eta| := \max_{1 \leq i \leq m} |k_i|.$$

Definition 4.6 (polynomial maps). Let H, G be filtered groups in the sense of Definition 4.1. For a map of sets $g: H \rightarrow G$ and $h \in H$, let $\partial_h g: H \rightarrow G$ be the map defined by $(\partial_h g)(x) = g(xh)g(x)^{-1}$ for $x \in G$.

We say g is a *polynomial map* if for any $i_1, \dots, i_m \geq 0$ and $h_1 \in H_{i_1}, \dots, h_m \in H_{i_m}$, the map $\partial_{h_1} \dots \partial_{h_m} g$ takes values in $G_{i_1 + \dots + i_m}$.

It is known that the composite of two polynomial maps is a polynomial map [29, Theorems 1.6.9, 1.6.10]. We usually give abelian groups G the filtration $G = G_0 = G_1 \supset G_2 = \{0\}$. A map $g: H \rightarrow G$ between abelian groups with this filtration is a polynomial map if (and actually only if) it is an affine-linear map (= a group homomorphism plus a constant term).

Suppose $H = \mathbb{Z}^n$, equipped with the filtration $H = H_0 = H_1 \supset H_2 = \{0\}$, and G is a filtered, conneced, simply connected Lie group where $\text{Lie}(G)$ is equipped with a basis X_1, \dots, X_m satisfying the conditions for a Mel'cev basis except the condition $\psi_{X_1, \dots, X_m}(\mathbb{Z}^m) = \Gamma$. In this case there is an explicit description of a polynomial map in terms of coordinates $\psi = \psi_{X_1, \dots, X_m}: \mathbb{R}^m \cong G$. To explain it, for a vector $\underline{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_n) \in \mathbb{Z}^n$ and a multi-index $\underline{i} = (i_1, \dots, i_n) \in \mathbb{N}^n$, let us use the power notation

$$\underline{x}^{\underline{i}} := x_1^{i_1} \cdots x_n^{i_n} \in \mathbb{Z}.$$

We also use the symbol $|\underline{i}| := i_1 + \dots + i_n$. It is known [12, Lemma 6.7] that a map $g: \mathbb{Z}^n \rightarrow G$ is a polynomial map if and only if the composite $\psi^{-1} \circ g: \mathbb{Z}^n \xrightarrow{g} G \xrightarrow{\psi^{-1}} \cong$

\mathbb{R}^m is written as:

$$\psi^{-1} \circ g(\underline{x}) = \sum_{\underline{i} \in \mathbb{N}^n} a_{\underline{i}} \underline{x}^{\underline{i}}$$

for some $a_{\underline{i}} \in \text{Lie}(G_{|\underline{i}|}) = \{0\} \times \mathbb{R}^{\dim(G_{|\underline{i}|})}$. Simply put, polynomial maps are maps written as polynomials where the coefficients in higher degrees are required to be in smaller subgroups.

Definition 4.7 (smoothness norm). For a real number $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$, write

$$\|\alpha\|_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}} := \min_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} |\alpha - n|.$$

Let $g: \mathbb{Z}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a real-valued polynomial map of degree s , written as

$$g(\underline{x}) = \sum_{\substack{\underline{i} \\ |\underline{i}| \leq s}} a_{\underline{i}} \underline{x}^{\underline{i}}.$$

Let $N \geq 1$ be a natural number. Its *smoothness norm* $\|g\|_{C^\infty[-N, N]^n}$ is defined by

$$(4.1) \quad \|g\|_{C^\infty[-N, N]^n} := \max_{\substack{\underline{i} \\ \underline{i} \neq 0}} \left(N^{|\underline{i}|} \|a_{\underline{i}}\|_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}} \right).$$

In fact, this should be written as $\|g\|_{C_*^\infty[-N, N]^n}$ (with a star $*$) if we follow [13, p. 4], which is different from the pre-existing $C^\infty[-N, N]^n$ norm. However as in [13, Lemma 2.1] there is some $q = O(s!)$ such that $\|qg\|_{C^\infty[-N, N]^n} \leq q \|g\|_{C_*^\infty[-N, N]^n}$ and vice versa, and this makes all the results we use valid regardless of which norm we choose. As (4.1) is more convenient for the computation we will perform, we use it in this paper and simply write it as $\|g\|_{C^\infty[-N, N]^n}$ without a star.

Definition 4.8 (nilsequences). An s -step nilsequence is a chain of maps

$$\mathbb{Z}^n \xrightarrow{g} G \rightarrow G/\Gamma \xrightarrow{F} \mathbb{C},$$

where G/Γ is an s -step nilmanifold, g is a polynomial map, $G \rightarrow G/\Gamma$ is the canonical map and F is a Lipschitz function.

It is said to be *1-bounded* if the values of F always have absolute value ≤ 1 , to have *Lipschitz constant* $\leq L$ if F does, and to have *complexity* $\leq M$ if G/Γ is equipped with such a Mel'cev basis.

Nilsequences are used as test functions for the smallness of the Gowers norm. Namely, the *Gowers Inverse Theorem* A.1 roughly says that when one knows that a (suitably bounded) function $f: [-N, N]^n \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ has small correlation

$$(4.2) \quad \left| \mathbb{E}_{x \in [-N, N]^n} f(x) F(g(x)) \right|$$

with every 1-bounded s -step nilsequences $F(g(-)): \mathbb{Z}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ of controlled Lipschitz constant and complexity, then it has small U^{s+1} -norm $\|f\|_{U^{s+1}[-N, N]^n}$. Moreover, there is (*quantitative*) *equidistribution theory* of polynomial sequences (such as Theorem A.4) to the effect that the image of $[-N, N]^n \xrightarrow{g} G \rightarrow G/\Gamma$ is equidistributed on some submanifold within a certain error. This works as one of the main tools for the analysis of the correlation (4.2).

5. THE CRAMÉR MODEL

Recall from §1.2 the symbol $Q = Q_s = e^{(\log N)^{1/2}/O_s(1)}$ and $P(Q) := \prod_{0 < p < Q} p$. Recall that the von Mangoldt function $\Lambda_K: \text{Ideals}_K \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ is defined by

$$\Lambda_K(\mathfrak{a}) = \begin{cases} \log \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{p}) & \text{if } \mathfrak{a} = \mathfrak{p}^m \text{ (}\mathfrak{p} \text{ a non-zero prime ideal, } m \geq 1\text{)} \\ 0 & \text{if not.} \end{cases}$$

It is convenient to also define $\Lambda_K((0)) := 0$.

For a non-zero fractional ideal \mathfrak{a} of K , we define $\Lambda_K^\mathfrak{a}: \mathfrak{a} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by

$$\Lambda_K^\mathfrak{a}(x) = \Lambda_K(x\mathfrak{a}^{-1}).$$

A primitive form of Mitsui's Prime Number Theorem ([22], recalled in the proof of Proposition 6.4) says that for a convex body $\Omega \subset K \otimes_{\mathbb{Q}} \mathbb{R}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{x \in \Omega \cap \mathfrak{a}} \Lambda_K^\mathfrak{a}(x) &\doteq \frac{1}{\prod_{s=1}^r \text{res}(\zeta_K(s))} \frac{2^{r^2}}{\mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{a}) \sqrt{|\mathbf{D}_K|}} \text{Vol}(\Omega) \\ &\doteq \frac{1}{\prod_{s=1}^r \text{res}(\zeta_K(s))} \sum_{x \in \Omega \cap \mathfrak{a}} 1 \end{aligned}$$

This is why we put the coefficient $\frac{1}{\prod_{s=1}^r \text{res}(\zeta_K(s))}$ in the next definition.

Definition 5.1. We define the Cramér model $\Lambda_{\text{Cramér}, Q}$ of the von Mangoldt function Λ_K to be the function $\text{Ideals}_K \cup \{(0)\} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ defined by

$$\Lambda_{\text{Cramér}, Q}(\mathfrak{a}) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } \mathfrak{a} + (P(Q)) \neq \mathcal{O}_K \\ \frac{1}{\prod_{s=1}^r \text{res}(\zeta_K(s))} \frac{P(Q)^n}{\varphi_K(P(Q))} & \text{if } \mathfrak{a} + (P(Q)) = \mathcal{O}_K. \end{cases}$$

For a non-zero fractional ideal \mathfrak{a} , we define $\Lambda_{\text{Cramér}, Q}^\mathfrak{a}: \mathfrak{a} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by

$$\begin{aligned} \Lambda_{\text{Cramér}, Q}^\mathfrak{a}(x) &= \Lambda_{\text{Cramér}, Q}(x\mathfrak{a}^{-1}) \\ &= \begin{cases} \frac{1}{\prod_{s=1}^r \text{res}(\zeta_K(s))} \frac{P(Q)^n}{\varphi_K(P(Q))} & \text{if } x \text{ coprime to } P(Q) \text{ in } \mathfrak{a} \\ 0 & \text{if not.} \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

(Recall that x being coprime to $P(Q)$ means $x\mathcal{O}_K + P(Q)\mathfrak{a} = \mathfrak{a}$.)

The usefulness of the Cramér model is that its statistical behavior is quite predictable.

In order to make the next proposition useful enough later on, we have to formulate it using *subsets of Lipschitz boundary* (Appendix E), a more general notion than convex subsets. This is mainly because the subset obtained by bounding the norm $\Omega_{\leq a} := \{x \in K \otimes_{\mathbb{Q}} \mathbb{R} \mid |\mathbf{N}(x)| \leq a\}$ is not convex unless K is an imaginary quadratic field or $K = \mathbb{Q}$.

Proposition 5.2. Let $\psi_1, \dots, \psi_t: \mathbb{Z}^d \rightarrow \mathfrak{a}$ be \mathbb{Z} -affine-linear maps. Write $\dot{\psi}_i$ for their linear parts. Choose a norm-length compatible basis $\iota: \mathfrak{a} \xrightarrow{\cong} \mathbb{Z}^n$ and assume:

- all $\dot{\psi}_i$ have finite cokernels,
- $\ker(\dot{\psi}_i)$ does not contain $\ker(\dot{\psi}_j)$ for all $i \neq j$,

- the coefficients of $\iota \circ \psi_i : \mathbb{Z}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}^n$ have absolute values bounded from above by some $L > 1$, which we assume satisfies $L \ll_K e^{c \log^{1/2} N}$ for a positive number $0 < c < 1$ small enough depending on t, d, n .

Let $N > 1$ be an integer and $\Omega \subset [\pm N]_{\mathbb{R}}^d$ be a closed set with boundary of Lipschitz class $\text{Lip}(d, M_1, M_2 N)$ (Definition E.2) for some $M_1, M_2 \geq 1$. Assume that N is large enough depending on M_1, M_2 .

(1) Then for any $2 \leq z < Q$, we have

$$(5.1) \quad \sum_{x \in \Omega \cap \mathbb{Z}^d} \prod_{i=1}^t \Lambda_{\text{Cramér}, z}^{\mathfrak{a}}(\psi_i(x)) = \frac{\text{Vol}(\Omega)}{\text{res}_{s=1}(\zeta_K(s))^t} \left(\prod_{0 < p < z} \beta_p(\psi_1, \dots, \psi_t) \right) + O_{t, d, K}(N^d e^{-0.2 \log^{1/2} N}),$$

where $\beta_p(\psi_1, \dots, \psi_t)$ is the following coefficient depending on the maps $\psi_i \pmod p$:

$$\beta_p(\psi_1, \dots, \psi_t) := \left(\frac{p^n}{\varphi_K(p)} \right)^t \mathbb{E}_{x \in (\mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z})^d} \left[\prod_{i=1}^t \prod_{\mathfrak{p}|p} 1[\psi_i(x) \neq 0 \text{ in } \mathfrak{a}/\mathfrak{p}\mathfrak{a}] \right].$$

(2) Suppose $M = \mathbb{Z}^d$ carries an \mathcal{O}_K -module structure and ψ_i are affine- \mathcal{O}_K -linear. For each prime ideal \mathfrak{p} , define

$$\beta_{\mathfrak{p}}(\psi_1, \dots, \psi_t) := \left(\frac{\mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{p})}{\varphi_K(\mathfrak{p})} \right)^t \mathbb{E}_{x \in M/\mathfrak{p}M} \left[\prod_{i=1}^t 1[\psi_i(x) \neq 0 \text{ in } \mathfrak{a}/\mathfrak{p}\mathfrak{a}] \right].$$

Then we have $\beta_p(\psi_1, \dots, \psi_t) = \prod_{\mathfrak{p}|p} \beta_{\mathfrak{p}}(\psi_1, \dots, \psi_t)$.

Proof. The decomposition of $\beta_p(\psi_1, \dots, \psi_t)$ is a consequence of Chinese Remainder Theorem for torsion \mathcal{O}_K -module.

To prove the main assertion, we shall first estimate the sum

$$(5.2) \quad \sum_{x \in \Omega \cap \mathbb{Z}^d} \prod_{i=1}^t \prod_{p < z} \prod_{\mathfrak{p}|p} 1[\psi_i(x) \notin \mathfrak{p}\mathfrak{a}]$$

and then multiply it by the coefficient $\frac{1}{\text{res}_{s=1}(\zeta_K(s))^t} \prod_{0 < p < z} \left(\frac{p^n}{\varphi_K(p)} \right)^t$ to make it equal the left-hand side of (5.1).

For each $m \in \mathbb{N}$, set

$$\Sigma_m := \left\{ x \in \Omega \cap \mathbb{Z}^d \mid \prod_{i=1}^t \mathbf{N}(\psi_i(x)\mathfrak{a}^{-1}) = m \right\},$$

$$a_m := |\Sigma_m|.$$

Note that the condition $p \mid \prod_{i=1}^t \mathbf{N}(\psi_i(x)\mathfrak{a}^{-1})$ for a prime number p is equivalent to the condition that $\psi_i(x) \in \mathfrak{p}\mathfrak{a}$ for some prime ideal \mathfrak{p} over p and some index i . Thus a point $x \in \Omega \cap \mathbb{Z}^d$ contributes to the sum (5.2) if and only if $x \in \Sigma_m$ for some $m \in \mathbb{N}$ that is coprime to all $p < z$.

It follows that the sum (5.2) equals

$$\sum_{\substack{m \in \mathbb{N} \\ (m, P(z))=1}} a_m.$$

We want to evaluate it using Fundamental Lemma D.2 of Sieve Theory.

For each prime number p , write

$$(5.3) \quad \begin{aligned} g(p) &:= \mathbb{E}_{x \in (\mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z})^d} 1[\psi_i(x) \in \mathfrak{p}\mathfrak{a} \text{ for some } i \text{ and } \mathfrak{p} \text{ over } p] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{x \in (\mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z})^d} \left[1 - \prod_{i=1}^t \prod_{\mathfrak{p}|p} 1[\psi_i(x) \notin \mathfrak{p}\mathfrak{a}] \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Suppose first that $g(p) = 1$ for some $p < z$. Then $\beta_p = \left(\frac{p^n}{\varphi_K(p)}\right)^t (1 - g(p)) = 0$ for this p . Meanwhile, the function $\prod_{i=1}^t \Lambda_{\text{Cramér}, z}^{\mathfrak{a}}(\psi_i(x))$ is identically zero under the current supposition. Therefore Proposition 5.2 is true without the need to use sieve method.

Next, let us assume $g(p) < 1$ for all $p < z$. To invoke Lemma D.2, let us first verify the hypothesis (D.2) on the size of the product $\prod_{w \leq p < z} (1 - g(p))^{-1}$. For an index i and a prime number p , write

$$\psi_{i,p}, \dot{\psi}_{i,p}: (\mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z})^d \rightarrow \mathfrak{a}/\mathfrak{p}\mathfrak{a}$$

for the \mathbb{F}_p -affine-linear and linear maps induced by ψ_i . When a prime ideal \mathfrak{p} over p is moreover given, write

$$\psi_{i,\mathfrak{p}}, \dot{\psi}_{i,\mathfrak{p}}: (\mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z})^d \rightarrow \mathfrak{a}/\mathfrak{p}\mathfrak{a}$$

for the induced \mathbb{F}_p -linear and affine-linear maps $\dot{\psi}_i$.

Claim 5.3. *There exists a natural number $A = O_{d,t,K}(L^{\text{O}_{n,t}(1)})$ such that the following hold for all prime numbers p coprime to A :*

- (1) $\psi_{i,\mathfrak{p}}$ is surjective for all i ;
- (2) for two indices i, j and two prime ideals $\mathfrak{p}, \mathfrak{q}$ of residue characteristic p , whenever the pairs $(i, \mathfrak{p}), (j, \mathfrak{q})$ are distinct we have $\ker(\dot{\psi}_{i,\mathfrak{p}}) \not\subset \ker(\dot{\psi}_{j,\mathfrak{q}})$.

Proof of Claim. By undergraduate linear algebra ($n \times n$ minors for the t maps $\dot{\psi}_i$), there is a natural number

$$A_1 = O_{n,t}(L^{\text{O}_{n,t}(1)})$$

such that if $p \nmid A_1$ the maps $\dot{\psi}_i \bmod p: (\mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z})^d \rightarrow \mathfrak{a}/\mathfrak{p}\mathfrak{a} \stackrel{\ell}{\cong} (\mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z})^n$ are surjective. (So any multiple of A_1 will do for the first assertion.)

By the assumption that $\ker(\dot{\psi}_i)$'s do not contain each other, one can find elements $x_{ij} \in \ker(\dot{\psi}_i) \setminus \ker(\dot{\psi}_j)$ which moreover can be taken to have coefficients of sizes $O_{d,n}(L^{\text{O}_{n,t}(1)})$. Their images $\dot{\psi}_j(x_{ij}) \in \mathfrak{a} \setminus \{0\} \stackrel{\ell}{\cong} \mathbb{Z}^n \setminus \{0\}$ have entries of sizes $O_{d,n}(L^{\text{O}_{n,t}(1)})$. Hence their norms $\mathbf{N}(\dot{\psi}_j(x_{ij})\mathfrak{a}^{-1})$ have sizes $O_{d,n,K}(L^{\text{O}_{n,t}(1)})$. Let A_2 to be the least common multiple of these norms:

$$A_2 := \text{lcm}\{\mathbf{N}(\dot{\psi}_j(x_{ij})\mathfrak{a}^{-1}) \mid 1 \leq i, j \leq t\} = O_{t,d,K}(L^{\text{O}_{n,t}(1)}).$$

Let A be the least common multiple of A_2 and A_1 :

$$A := \text{lcm}\{A_1, A_2\}.$$

Now let (i, \mathfrak{p}) and (j, \mathfrak{q}) be two distinct pairs such that $\mathfrak{p}, \mathfrak{q}$ have the same residue characteristic $p \nmid A$. We have to show $\ker(\dot{\psi}_{i,\mathfrak{p}}) \not\subset \ker(\dot{\psi}_{j,\mathfrak{q}})$.

First assume $i \neq j$. In this case the residue class of x_{ij} in $(\mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z})^d$ certainly belongs to $\ker(\dot{\psi}_{i,\mathfrak{p}})$. On the other hand, suppose $x_{ij} \in \ker(\dot{\psi}_{j,\mathfrak{q}})$, namely $\dot{\psi}_j(x_{ij}) \in \mathfrak{q}\mathfrak{a}$. This would imply $\mathbf{N}(\dot{\psi}_j(x_{ij})) \in \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{q}\mathfrak{a})\mathbb{Z}$ and hence

$$\frac{A_2}{p} = \frac{A_2}{\mathbf{N}(\dot{\psi}_j(x_{ij})\mathfrak{a}^{-1})} \cdot \frac{\mathbf{N}(\dot{\psi}_j(x_{ij}))}{\mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{a})\mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{q})} \cdot \frac{\mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{q})}{p} \in \mathbb{Z},$$

contradicting the condition $p \nmid A_2$. Thus we have shown $\ker(\dot{\psi}_{i,\mathfrak{p}}) \not\subset \ker(\dot{\psi}_{j,\mathfrak{q}})$.

Second, assume $i = j$ and hence $\mathfrak{p} \neq \mathfrak{q}$. In this case, by Chinese Remainder Theorem we have a natural surjection $\mathfrak{a}/p\mathfrak{a} \rightarrow \mathfrak{a}/\mathfrak{p}\mathfrak{a} \oplus \mathfrak{a}/\mathfrak{q}\mathfrak{a}$. Since $\dot{\psi}_i \bmod p$ is a surjection $(\mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z})^d \rightarrow \mathfrak{a}/p\mathfrak{a}$ when $p \nmid A_1$, we conclude that the map induced by $\dot{\psi}_i$

$$(\mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z})^d \rightarrow \mathfrak{a}/\mathfrak{p}\mathfrak{a} \oplus \mathfrak{a}/\mathfrak{q}\mathfrak{a}$$

is surjective. In particular there is an element which maps to zero in $\mathfrak{a}/\mathfrak{p}\mathfrak{a}$ and to a non-zero element in $\mathfrak{a}/\mathfrak{q}\mathfrak{a}$. Therefore we conclude $\ker(\dot{\psi}_{i,\mathfrak{p}}) \not\subset \ker(\dot{\psi}_{i,\mathfrak{q}})$.

This completes the proof of Claim 5.3. \square

Resuming the proof of Proposition 5.2, now we can estimate $g(p)$ for $p \nmid A$ as follows. Note that by the inclusion-exclusion principle we have

$$\begin{aligned} g(p) &= \# \left(\bigcup_{\substack{(i,\mathfrak{p}) \\ 1 \leq i \leq t \\ \mathfrak{p}|p}} \psi_{i,\mathfrak{p}}^{-1}(0) \right) / p^d \\ &= \left(\left(\sum_{\substack{(i,\mathfrak{p}) \\ 1 \leq i \leq t \\ \mathfrak{p}|p}} \# \psi_{i,\mathfrak{p}}^{-1}(0) \right) - \left(\sum_{(i,\mathfrak{p}) \neq (j,\mathfrak{q})} \# (\psi_{i,\mathfrak{p}}^{-1}(0) \cap \psi_{j,\mathfrak{q}}^{-1}(0)) \right) + \dots \right) / p^d, \end{aligned}$$

where the alternating sum has $O_{t,n}(1)$ members. Since the linear part $\dot{\psi}_{i,\mathfrak{p}}$ is surjective, we know that the inverse image $\psi_{i,\mathfrak{p}}^{-1}(0)$ is a translate of $\ker(\dot{\psi}_{i,\mathfrak{p}})$. By Claim 5.3, the intersection $\ker(\dot{\psi}_{i,\mathfrak{p}}) \cap \ker(\dot{\psi}_{j,\mathfrak{q}})$ or the intersection of more members has codimension ≥ 2 in the \mathbb{F}_p -vector space $(\mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z})^d$. We conclude that the above

expression can be written as

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left(\sum_{\substack{(i, \mathfrak{p}) \\ 1 \leq i \leq t \\ \mathfrak{p} | p}} \# \ker(\psi_{i, \mathfrak{p}}) \right) / p^d + O_{t, n} \left(\frac{1}{p^2} \right) \\
&= \left(\sum_{\substack{(i, \mathfrak{p}) \\ 1 \leq i \leq t \\ \mathfrak{p} | p}} \frac{1}{\mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{p})} \right) + O_{t, n} \left(\frac{1}{p^2} \right) \\
&= \left(\sum_{\mathfrak{p} | p} \frac{t}{\mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{p})} \right) + O_{t, n} \left(\frac{1}{p^2} \right).
\end{aligned}$$

It follows that for $p \nmid A$ we have

$$(5.4) \quad (1 - g(p))^{-1} = (1 + O_{t, n}(1/p^2)) \prod_{\mathfrak{p} | p} \left(1 - \frac{1}{\mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{p})} \right)^{-t}.$$

For $p | A$ we will simply use the crude inequality $g(p) \leq 1 - \frac{1}{p^d}$, which holds because the expectation \mathbb{E} defining $g(p)$ is over the set $(\mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z})^d$ of cardinality p^d and we are assuming $g(p) < 1$ for all $p < z$; equivalently

$$(5.5) \quad (1 - g(p))^{-1} \leq p^d.$$

Rosen's Mertens' theorem for number fields (Theorem D.1) states

$$(5.6) \quad \prod_{\substack{\mathfrak{p} \\ \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{p}) < x}} \left(1 - \frac{1}{\mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{p})} \right)^{-1} = e^\gamma \cdot \operatorname{res}_{s=1}(\zeta_K(s)) \cdot \log x + O_K(1).$$

Formulas (5.4) (5.5) (5.6), together with the fact that prime ideals \mathfrak{p} with norm $\geq p^2$ are negligibly few,³ imply that

$$\begin{aligned}
\prod_{w \leq p < z} (1 - g(p))^{-1} &= \prod_{w \leq p < z, p | A} (1 - g(p))^{-1} \prod_{w \leq p < z, p \nmid A} (1 - g(p))^{-1} \\
&\ll_{K, t} \prod_{p | A} p^d \cdot \left(\frac{\log z}{\log w} \right)^t \ll_{K, t} A^d \left(\frac{\log z}{\log w} \right)^t,
\end{aligned}$$

verifying the hypothesis (D.2) with

$$(5.7) \quad M = O_{K, t}(A^d) \text{ and } \kappa := t.$$

Now we want to establish a relation of type (D.3) in Lemma D.2. Set $X := \operatorname{Vol}(\Omega)$. For a square free natural number f , a point $x \in \Omega \cap \mathbb{Z}^d$ is in $\bigsqcup_{m \in \mathbb{N}} \Sigma_{fm}$ if and only if $\prod_{i=1}^t \mathbf{N}(\psi_i(x) \mathfrak{a}^{-1})$ is a multiple of p for all prime factors $p | f$. This latter condition

³in the sense that the product $\prod_{\mathfrak{p}} \left(1 - \frac{1}{\mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{p})} \right)^{-1}$ over such \mathfrak{p} 's converges, say.

is equivalent to the condition that for all $p \mid f$, there is a prime ideal $\mathfrak{p} \mid p$ and an index i such that $\psi_i(x) \in \mathfrak{p}\mathfrak{a}$. Thus:

$$\bigsqcup_{m \in \mathbb{N}} \Sigma_{fm} = \bigcap_{p \mid f} \{x \in \Omega \cap \mathbb{Z}^d \mid \psi_i(x) \in \mathfrak{p}\mathfrak{a} \text{ for some } i \text{ and } \mathfrak{p} \mid p\}.$$

Note that the condition in the bracket only depends on the mod f class of $x \in \mathbb{Z}^d$.

Consider the complete set of representatives $[0, f-1]^d \subset \mathbb{Z}^d$ for the quotient $(\mathbb{Z}/f\mathbb{Z})^d$. Out of the f^d residue classes in $(\mathbb{Z}/f\mathbb{Z})^d$, there are exactly $f^d g(f)$ classes (any representatives of) which belong to $\bigsqcup_{m \in \mathbb{N}} \Sigma_{fm}$; this is true by the very definition of $g(p)$ in (5.3) and by Chinese Remainder Theorem for various $p \mid f$. Fill the interior of $\Omega \cap \mathbb{Z}^d$ by as many disjoint translates of $[0, f-1]^d$ as possible. By Proposition E.1 there are $\ll_{d, M_1, M_2} fN^{d-1}$ points of $\Omega \cap \mathbb{Z}^d$ not contained in any of these translates. Note that there are $\text{Vol}(\Omega) + O_{d, M_1, M_2}(N^{d-1})$ points in $\Omega \cap \mathbb{Z}^d$. We conclude:

$$\sum_{m \in \mathbb{N}} a_{fm} = \text{Vol}(\Omega)g(f) + O_{d, M_1, M_2}(fN^{d-1}),$$

which implies that when we take $X = \text{Vol}(\Omega)$ the remainder r_f in (D.3) is an $O_{d, M_1, M_2}(fN^{d-1})$.

Now we can apply Fundamental Lemma D.2 of Sieve Theory. This gives

$$(5.8) \quad \sum_{\substack{m \in \mathbb{N} \\ (m, P(z))=1}} a_m = \text{Vol}(\Omega) \left(\prod_{p < z} (1 - g(p)) \right) \left(1 + O(M^{10} e^{9t - \frac{\log D}{\log z}}) \right) \\ + O_{d, M_1, M_2} \left(\sum_{\substack{1 \leq f \leq D \\ f \mid P(z)}} fN^{d-1} \right).$$

We choose $D := N^{0.4}$, which is larger than $e^{(9t+1)\log^{1/2} N} > Q^{9t+1} > z^{9t+1}$ whenever N is large enough depending on t . For this choice the second $O(-)$ term is an

$$O_{d, M_1, M_2}(D^2 N^{d-1}) = O_{d, M_1, M_2}(N^{d-0.2}).$$

Meanwhile we have $\frac{\log D}{\log z} \geq (0.4 \log N)/(\log^{1/2} N) = 0.4 \log^{1/2} N$. From (5.7) and Claim 5.3, we know

$$M = O_{t, d, K}(L^{O_{t, d, n}(1)}) = O_{t, d, K}(e^{O_{t, d, n}(c) \log^{1/2} N}) = O_{t, d, K}(e^{\log^{1/2} N})$$

if c is small enough depending on t, d, n , (this is the only constraint on how small c should be), the first $O(-)$ term in (5.8) is an

$$O_{t, d, K}(e^{-0.3 \log^{1/2} N}).$$

Combined with the trivial bounds $\text{Vol}(\Omega) \ll_d N^d$ and $1 - g(p) \leq 1$, the right-hand side of (5.8) looks as follows if N is large enough depending on M_1, M_2 :

$$\text{Vol}(\Omega) \left(\prod_{p < z} (1 - g(p)) \right) + O_{t, d, K}(N^d e^{-0.3 \log^{1/2} N}).$$

Lastly we multiply (5.8) by $\frac{1}{\text{res}_{s=1}(\zeta_K(s))^t} \prod_{p<z} \left(\frac{p^n}{\varphi_K(p)}\right)^t = \frac{1}{\text{res}_{s=1}(\zeta_K(s))^t} \prod_{p<z} \prod_{p|p} \left(\frac{\mathbf{N}(p)}{\mathbf{N}(p)-1}\right)^t$, which is an $O_K(\log^t z)$ by Rosen's Mertens' Theorem D.1.⁴ The right-hand side becomes (compromising the exponent in the error term a little to absorb this $O_K(\log^t z)$)

$$\frac{1}{\text{res}_{s=1}(\zeta_K(s))^t} \text{Vol}(\Omega) \left(\prod_{p<z} \beta_p \right) + O_{t,d,K}(N^d e^{-0.2 \log^{1/2} N})$$

and the left-hand side becomes $\sum_{x \in \Omega \cap \mathbb{Z}^d} \prod_{i=1}^t \Lambda_{\text{Cramér},z}^{\mathbf{a}}(\psi_i(x))$ as was noted at the beginning of this proof. This completes the proof of Proposition 5.2. \square

Corollary 5.4. *Let $0 < w < \frac{1}{10} \log N$ and set $W := P(w) = \prod_{0 < p < w} p \ll N^{1/5}$. Let $b \in [0, W-1]^n \subset \mathbf{a}$ be coprime to W in \mathbf{a} . Then*

$$(5.9) \left\| 1 - \text{res}_{s=1}(\zeta_K(s)) \frac{\varphi_K(W)}{W^n} \Lambda_{\text{Cramér},Q}^{\mathbf{a}}(W(-)b) \right\|_{U^{s+1}(\mathbf{a} \cap \frac{[\pm N]^{n-b}}{W})} \ll_{s,K} \frac{1}{w^{1/2s+1}}.$$

Proof. Write $N' := N/W$. Let $\Omega \subset ([\pm 4N']_{\mathbf{a} \otimes \mathbb{R}}^n)^{s+2}$ be the convex set

$$\Omega := \{(x, \underline{h}) \mid x + \underline{\omega} \cdot \underline{h} \in \frac{[\pm N]_{\mathbf{a} \otimes \mathbb{R}}^n - b}{W} \text{ for all } \underline{\omega} \in \{0, 1\}^{s+1}\}.$$

By taking the 2^{s+1} -st power of the left hand side of (5.9) and expanding it, it suffices to show for all subsets $S \subset \{0, 1\}^{s+1}$ the estimate

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{(x, \underline{h}) \in \Omega \cap \mathbf{a}} \left(\text{res}_{s=1}(\zeta_K(s)) \frac{\varphi_K(W)}{W^n} \right)^{\#S} \prod_{\underline{\omega} \in S} \Lambda_{\text{Cramér},Q}^{\mathbf{a}}(W(x + \underline{\omega} \cdot \underline{h}) + b) \\ = \text{Vol}(\Omega) + O_{s,K}((N')^{n(s+2)} \frac{1}{w}). \end{aligned}$$

By Proposition 5.2, the left-hand side is computed as

$$(5.10) \quad \text{Vol}(\Omega) \prod_{\substack{w \leq p < Q \\ p|p}} \beta_p + O_{s,K} \left((N')^{n(s+2)} \exp\left(-\frac{1}{5} \sqrt{\log N'}\right) \right),$$

where by definition

$$\beta_p := \left(\frac{\mathbf{N}(p)}{\mathbf{N}(p)-1} \right)^{\#S} \mathbb{E}_{(x, \underline{h}) \in \mathbf{a}/p\mathbf{a}} 1[W(x + \underline{\omega} \cdot \underline{h}) + b \neq 0 \text{ in } \mathbf{a}/p\mathbf{a} \text{ for all } \underline{\omega} \in S].$$

The error term in (5.10) is negligible because it is much smaller than the aimed decay rate $1/w^{1/O_s(1)} \gg_s (\log N')^{-1/O_s(1)}$.

⁴An asymptotically weaker bound $\prod_{p<z} \prod_{p|p} \left(\frac{\mathbf{N}(p)}{\mathbf{N}(p)-1}\right)^t = O(\log^{nt} z)$ suffice here, which follows from the more naive bound $\prod_{p|p} \left(\frac{\mathbf{N}(p)}{\mathbf{N}(p)-1}\right) \leq \left(\frac{p}{p-1}\right)^n$ and Mertens' theorem for \mathbb{Z} .

Since W and \mathfrak{p} are coprime by the conditions $\mathfrak{p} \mid p$ and $p \geq w$, we can estimate $\beta_{\mathfrak{p}}$ as

$$\begin{aligned} \beta_{\mathfrak{p}} &= \left(\frac{\mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{p})}{\mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{p}) - 1} \right)^{\#\mathcal{S}} \mathbb{E}_{(x, \underline{h}) \in \mathfrak{a}/\mathfrak{p}\mathfrak{a}} 1[x + \underline{\omega} \cdot \underline{h} \neq 0 \text{ in } \mathfrak{a}/\mathfrak{p}\mathfrak{a} \text{ for all } \underline{\omega} \in \mathcal{S}] \\ &= \left(1 + \frac{\#\mathcal{S}}{\mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{p})} + O_s \left(\frac{1}{\mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{p})^2} \right) \right) \cdot \left(1 - \frac{\#\mathcal{S}}{\mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{p})} + O_s \left(\frac{1}{\mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{p})^2} \right) \right) \\ &= 1 + O_s \left(\frac{1}{\mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{p})^2} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Thus $\prod_{\substack{w \leq p < Q \\ \mathfrak{p} \mid p}} \beta_{\mathfrak{p}} = 1 + O_{K,s}(1/w)$. It follows that (5.10) equals

$$\text{Vol}(\Omega) \cdot (1 + O_{K,s}(1/w)) = \text{Vol}(\Omega) + O_{K,s} \left((\mathbf{N}')^{n(s+2)} \frac{1}{w} \right).$$

This completes the proof of Corollary 5.4. \square

6. THE SIEGEL MODEL

Now we define the Siegel model $\Lambda_{\text{Siegel}, Q_s}$, which is a closer approximation to Λ_K than the Cramér model is. To define it we have to recall the notion of Siegel zeros.

Theorem 6.1 (Siegel zeros). *There exists a positive constant $0 < c_K < 1$ such that for every $N \geq 1$ (and hence for every $Q_s = e^{\sqrt{\log N}/O_s(1)}$):*

- (1) *there is at most one Hecke character ψ whose conductor \mathfrak{q} satisfies $\mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{q}) < Q$ and such that the L-function $L(\psi, s)$ has zero in the region (where $s = \sigma + it$)*

$$\sigma > 1 - \frac{c_K}{\log Q + \log(|t| + 4)}.$$

When it exists, let us write it ψ_{Siegel} (the Q_s -Siegel character) and its conductor $\mathfrak{q}_{\text{Siegel}}$.

- (2) *The Siegel character ψ_{Siegel} is real, namely its values are in $\{\pm 1\}$.*
- (3) *The L-function $L(\psi_{\text{Siegel}}, s)$ can have at most one zero β_{Siegel} (the Q_s -Siegel zero) in the said region. It is necessarily real and for any $0 < \epsilon < 1$ there is a positive constant $0 < c_K(\epsilon) < 1$ satisfying:*

$$1 - \frac{c_K}{\log(4Q_s)} < \beta_{\text{Siegel}} < 1 - \frac{c_K(\epsilon)}{\mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{q}_{\text{Siegel}})^{\epsilon}}.$$

Consequently, for any $A > 1$ we have $\mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{q}_{\text{Siegel}}) \gg_{K,A,s} (\log N)^A$.

Proof. See e.g. [31, Theorem 1.9 (p. 277)], and [18, Theorem 5.28 (p. 122)] or [23, Theorem 11.7 (p. 367), Corollary 11.15 (p. 372)]. \square

Of course, the existence of a Siegel zero (for any single $Q = Q_s$) would contradict the Grand Riemann Hypothesis, and so we do not believe in it. Nonetheless, being unable to disprove its existence, we have to take its potential influence into account to achieve better approximations.

We always adopt the convention that we ignore the term related to ψ_{Siegel} when it does not exist.

Definition 6.2. The Siegel model $\Lambda_{\text{Siegel}, Q_s} : \text{Ideals}_K \cup \{(0)\} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is defined by:

$$(6.1) \quad \Lambda_{\text{Siegel}, Q}(\mathfrak{a}) := \Lambda_{\text{Cramér}, Q}(\mathfrak{a}) \cdot (1 - \psi_{\text{Siegel}}([\mathfrak{a}])\mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{a})^{\beta-1}) \\ = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{\text{res}(\zeta_K(s))} \frac{P(Q)^n}{\varphi_K(P(Q))} \left(1 - \frac{\psi_{\text{Siegel}}([\mathfrak{a}])}{\mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{a})^{1-\beta_{\text{Siegel}}}}\right) & \text{if } \mathfrak{a} + (P(Q)) = \mathcal{O}_K \\ 0 & \text{if not.} \end{cases}$$

By our convention, when the Siegel character does not exist, we mean $\Lambda_{\text{Siegel}, Q} := \Lambda_{\text{Cramér}, Q}$ and $\Lambda_{\text{Siegel}, Q}^{\mathfrak{a}} := \Lambda_{\text{Cramér}, Q}^{\mathfrak{a}}$.

Note that the value $\psi_{\text{Siegel}}([\mathfrak{a}]) \in \{\pm 1\}$ is well defined in (6.1) because the ideal \mathfrak{a} is coprime to \mathfrak{q} under the assumption $\mathfrak{a} + (P(Q)) = \mathcal{O}_K$; to see this, it suffices to verify that every prime factor \mathfrak{p} of \mathfrak{q} is also a prime factor of $(P(Q))$ in \mathcal{O}_K . Suppose \mathfrak{p} has residue characteristic p . We have $p \leq \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{p}) \leq \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{q}) < Q$. This implies that p divides $(P(Q))$, and hence so does \mathfrak{p} .

For a non-zero fractional ideal \mathfrak{a} we define $\Lambda_{\text{Siegel}, Q}^{\mathfrak{a}} : \mathfrak{a} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by

$$\Lambda_{\text{Siegel}, Q}^{\mathfrak{a}}(x) = \Lambda_{\text{Siegel}, Q}(x\mathfrak{a}^{-1}) \\ = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{\text{res}(\zeta_K(s))} \frac{P(Q)^n}{\varphi_K(P(Q))} \left(1 - \frac{\psi_{\text{Siegel}}^{\mathfrak{a}}(x)}{\mathbf{N}(x\mathfrak{a}^{-1})^{1-\beta_{\text{Siegel}}}}\right) & \text{if } x \text{ coprime to } P(Q) \text{ in } \mathfrak{a}; \\ 0 & \text{if not,} \end{cases}$$

where we used the fact that for any mod \mathfrak{q} Hecke character ψ and $x \in \mathfrak{a}^{\times, \mathfrak{q}} := \{x \in \mathfrak{a} \mid x \text{ generates } \mathfrak{a}/\mathfrak{q}\mathfrak{a} \text{ as an } \mathcal{O}_K\text{-module}\}$, by subtracting the diagonal image of x in $C(\mathfrak{q})$ we have $\psi^{\mathfrak{a}}(x) = \psi([x^{-1}\mathfrak{a}]) = \psi([x\mathfrak{a}^{-1}])^{-1}$ (see §D.3 for notation).

Proposition 6.3 (Pointwise bound). *For all $N \geq 3$, we have the bound*

$$\Lambda_K(\mathfrak{a}), \Lambda_{\text{Cramér}, Q}(\mathfrak{a}), \Lambda_{\text{Siegel}, Q}(\mathfrak{a}) \ll_K \log N$$

for all non-zero ideal \mathfrak{a} of norm $< N$.

Proof. For Λ_K , we have the obvious bound $|\Lambda_K(\mathfrak{a})| \leq \log \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{a}) < \log N$.

Since $|\Lambda_{\text{Siegel}, Q}(\mathfrak{a})| \leq 2|\Lambda_{\text{Cramér}, Q}(\mathfrak{a})|$, it remains to verify the assertion for $\Lambda_{\text{Cramér}, Q}$, which is equivalent to showing

$$\frac{P(Q)^n}{\varphi_K(P(Q))} \ll_K \log N, \quad \text{where we recall } Q = e^{(\log N)^{1/2}/O_s(1)}.$$

By the multiplicativity of φ_K , the left hand side equals

$$\prod_{0 < p < Q} \prod_{\mathfrak{p} | p} \left(1 - \frac{1}{\mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{p})}\right)^{-1}.$$

Since there are few prime ideals \mathfrak{p} of degree ≥ 2 in that the product $\prod_{\mathfrak{p}} \left(1 - \frac{1}{\mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{p})}\right)$ over such prime ideals converges absolutely (\mathfrak{p} having degree ≥ 2 means by definition $\mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{p}) \geq p^2$ where p is the residue characteristic), Rosen's Mertens' Theorem D.1 implies that the previous quantity is bounded as

$$\ll_K \log Q < \log N,$$

which completes the proof. \square

Proposition 6.4 (Mitsui's Prime Number Theorem). *Let \mathfrak{a} be a non-zero fractional ideal, $N > 2$ a positive number and $\Omega \subset \mathbb{K} \otimes_{\mathbb{Q}} \mathbb{R}_{\leq N\mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{a})^{1/n}}$ a convex body. Let \mathfrak{q} be a non-zero ideal with $\mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{q}) < e^{(\log N)^{1/2}/O_{\mathbb{K}}(1)}$, and $a \in (\mathfrak{a}/\mathfrak{q}\mathfrak{a})^{\times}$ be a residue class. Then we have*

$$(6.2) \quad \sum_{\substack{x \in \Omega \cap \mathfrak{a} \\ x \equiv a \pmod{\mathfrak{a}/\mathfrak{q}\mathfrak{a}}} \Lambda_{\mathbb{K}}^{\mathfrak{a}}(x) - \Lambda_{\text{Siegel}, \mathbb{Q}}^{\mathfrak{a}}(x) \ll_{\mathbb{K}} N^n e^{-\sqrt{\log N}/O_{\mathbb{K}}(1)}.$$

Proof. This is essentially Mitsui's Prime Number Theorem with potential Siegel zero incorporated [19, Theorem 5.1], but spelling out the full derivation process is somewhat tedious, as the reader shall now see.

First we consider the case $\mathfrak{q}_{\text{Siegel}} \mid \mathfrak{q}$. In this case ψ_{Siegel} can be considered as a mod \mathfrak{q} character. Mitsui's Prime Number Theorem [19, Theorem 5.1] reads

$$(6.3) \quad \left(\sum_{\substack{x \in \Omega \cap \mathfrak{a} \\ x \equiv a \pmod{\mathfrak{a}/\mathfrak{q}\mathfrak{a}}} \Lambda_{\mathbb{K}}^{\mathfrak{a}}(x) \right) - \frac{1}{\mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{a})\varphi_{\mathbb{K}}(\mathfrak{q})} \frac{2^{r_2}}{\text{res}_{s=1} \zeta_{\mathbb{K}}(s) \sqrt{|\mathbb{D}_{\mathbb{K}}|}} \int_{\Omega} 1 - \psi_{\text{Siegel}}(-; a) \mathbf{N}((-)\mathfrak{a}^{-1})^{\beta_{\text{Siegel}}-1} d\mu_{\text{add}} \ll_{\mathbb{K}} N^n e^{-\sqrt{\log N}/O_{\mathbb{K}}(1)}.$$

Here, the symbol $\psi_{\text{Siegel}}(-; a)$ means the composite

$$(\mathbb{K} \otimes_{\mathbb{Q}} \mathbb{R})^{\times} \xrightarrow{(\text{id}, a)} (\mathbb{K} \otimes_{\mathbb{Q}} \mathbb{R})^{\times} \times (\mathfrak{a}/\mathfrak{q}\mathfrak{a})^{\times} \xrightarrow{j_{\mathfrak{a}}} \mathbb{C}(\mathfrak{q}) \xrightarrow{\psi_{\text{Siegel}}} S^1$$

where $j_{\mathfrak{a}}$ is the canonical map induced by the inclusions; see §D.3. For $x \in a + \mathfrak{q}\mathfrak{a}$, via the inclusion $a + \mathfrak{q}\mathfrak{a} \subset (\mathbb{K} \otimes_{\mathbb{Q}} \mathbb{R})^{\times}$ we have $\psi_{\text{Siegel}}(x; a) = \psi_{\text{Siegel}}^{\mathfrak{a}}(x)$.

The integral $\frac{2^{r_2}}{\sqrt{|\mathbb{D}_{\mathbb{K}}|}} \int_{\Omega}$ is approximated by the sum

$$\mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{q}\mathfrak{a}) \sum_{\substack{x \in \Omega \cap \mathfrak{a} \\ x \equiv a \pmod{\mathfrak{a}/\mathfrak{q}\mathfrak{a}}} 1 - \psi_{\text{Siegel}}^{\mathfrak{a}}(x) \mathbf{N}(x\mathfrak{a}^{-1})^{\beta_{\text{Siegel}}-1}$$

within an error $O_{\mathbb{K}}(N^{n-\frac{1}{2}})$ (see (6.13) below for some detail), which is negligible here. Up to this error, the left hand side of (6.3) becomes

$$\sum_{\substack{x \in \Omega \cap \mathfrak{a} \\ x \equiv a \pmod{\mathfrak{a}/\mathfrak{q}\mathfrak{a}}} \left(\Lambda_{\mathbb{K}}^{\mathfrak{a}}(x) - \frac{1}{\text{res}_{s=1} \zeta_{\mathbb{K}}(s) \varphi_{\mathbb{K}}(\mathfrak{q})} \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{q}) (1 - \psi_{\text{Siegel}}^{\mathfrak{a}}(x) \mathbf{N}(x\mathfrak{a}^{-1})^{\beta_{\text{Siegel}}-1}) \right).$$

On the other hand, the left hand side of (6.2) is by definition

$$\sum_{\substack{x \in \Omega \cap \mathfrak{a} \\ x \equiv a \pmod{\mathfrak{a}/\mathfrak{q}\mathfrak{a}}} \left(\Lambda_{\mathbb{K}}^{\mathfrak{a}}(x) - \Lambda_{\text{Cramér}, \mathbb{Q}}^{\mathfrak{a}}(x) (1 - \psi_{\text{Siegel}}^{\mathfrak{a}}(x) \mathbf{N}(x\mathfrak{a}^{-1})^{\beta_{\text{Siegel}}-1}) \right).$$

We have to show that the above two quantities are within the claimed error. So we are reduced to showing the following two bounds:

$$(6.4) \quad \sum_{\substack{x \in \Omega \cap \mathfrak{a} \\ x \equiv a \text{ in } \mathfrak{a}/\mathfrak{q}\mathfrak{a}}} \left(\Lambda_{\text{Cramér}, \mathbb{Q}}^{\mathfrak{a}}(x) - \frac{1}{\text{res}_{s=1} \zeta_{\mathbb{K}}(s)} \frac{\mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{q})}{\varphi_{\mathbb{K}}(\mathfrak{q})} \right) = O_{\mathbb{K}} \left(N^n e^{-\sqrt{\log N \log \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{a})}/O_{\mathbb{K}}(1)} \right),$$

which turns out to not require the condition $\mathfrak{q}_{\text{Siegel}} \mid \mathfrak{q}$, and

$$(6.5) \quad \sum_{\substack{x \in \Omega \cap \mathfrak{a} \\ x \equiv a \text{ in } \mathfrak{a}/\mathfrak{q}\mathfrak{a}}} \left(\Lambda_{\text{Cramér}, \mathbb{Q}}^{\mathfrak{a}}(x) - \frac{1}{\text{res}_{s=1} \zeta_{\mathbb{K}}(s)} \frac{\mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{q})}{\varphi_{\mathbb{K}}(\mathfrak{q})} \right) \cdot \psi_{\text{Siegel}}^{\mathfrak{a}}(x) \mathbf{N}(x\mathfrak{a}^{-1})^{\beta_{\text{Siegel}}-1} = O_{\mathbb{K}} \left(N^n e^{-\sqrt{\log N}/O_{\mathbb{K}}(1)} \right).$$

To show (6.4), we apply Proposition 5.2 to the (single) affine-linear map $\mathfrak{q}\mathfrak{a} \rightarrow \mathfrak{a}; y \mapsto y + a$. By §3, if we equip the source and target with norm-length compatible bases, the inclusion map $\mathbb{Z}^n \cong \mathfrak{q}\mathfrak{a} \hookrightarrow \mathfrak{a} \cong \mathbb{Z}^n$ is represented by a matrix with entries of sizes $\leq \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{q})^{1/n} < Q^{1/O_{\mathbb{K}}(1)}$. We conclude

$$(6.6) \quad \sum_{\substack{x \in \Omega \cap \mathfrak{a} \\ x \equiv a \text{ in } \mathfrak{a}/\mathfrak{q}\mathfrak{a}}} \Lambda_{\text{Cramér}, \mathbb{Q}}^{\mathfrak{a}}(x) = \sum_{\substack{y \in \mathfrak{q}\mathfrak{a} \\ y+a \in \Omega}} \Lambda_{\text{Cramér}, \mathbb{Q}}^{\mathfrak{a}}(y+a) = \frac{1}{\text{res}_{s=1}(\zeta_{\mathbb{K}}(s))} \left(\sum_{\substack{x \in \Omega \cap \mathfrak{a} \\ x \equiv a \text{ in } \mathfrak{a}/\mathfrak{q}\mathfrak{a}}} 1 \right) \prod_{\mathfrak{p}} \beta_{\mathfrak{p}} + O_{\mathbb{K}} \left(N^n e^{-0.2\sqrt{\log N}} \right).$$

Let us evaluate $\beta_{\mathfrak{p}}$'s in this case. If $\mathfrak{p} \mid \mathfrak{q}$, for every $y \in \mathfrak{q}\mathfrak{a}$ we know that $y+a \notin \mathfrak{p}\mathfrak{a}$ because a is taken from $(\mathfrak{a}/\mathfrak{q}\mathfrak{a})^{\times}$. This implies that $\beta_{\mathfrak{p}} = \frac{\mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{p})}{\mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{p})-1} \cdot 1 = \frac{\mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{p})}{\mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{p})-1}$. Next suppose $\mathfrak{p} \nmid \mathfrak{q}$. Then since $\mathfrak{q}\mathfrak{a}$ and \mathfrak{a} localized at $O_{\mathbb{K}, \mathfrak{p}}$ are equal, the map $\mathfrak{q}\mathfrak{a}/\mathfrak{p}(\mathfrak{q}\mathfrak{a}) \rightarrow \mathfrak{a}/\mathfrak{p}\mathfrak{a}$ induced by the inclusion is an isomorphism. Hence $\mathbb{E}_{y \in \mathfrak{a}/\mathfrak{p}(\mathfrak{q}\mathfrak{a})} 1[y+a \notin \mathfrak{p}\mathfrak{a}] = 1 - \frac{1}{\mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{p})}$ so that $\beta_{\mathfrak{p}} = \frac{\mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{p})}{\mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{p})-1} \cdot (1 - \frac{1}{\mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{p})}) = 1$. It follows that

$$\prod_{\mathfrak{p}} \beta_{\mathfrak{p}} = \prod_{\mathfrak{p} \mid \mathfrak{q}} \frac{\mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{p})}{\mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{p})-1} = \frac{\mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{q})}{\varphi_{\mathbb{K}}(\mathfrak{q})}.$$

This together with (6.6) implies (6.4).

Next we turn to (6.5). We will deduce this from (6.4) by an Abel summation-like argument.

Under the assumption $\mathfrak{q}_{\text{Siegel}} \mid \mathfrak{q}$, the function $x \mapsto \psi_{\text{Siegel}}^{\mathfrak{a}}(x)$ on $\{x \in \mathfrak{a} \mid x \equiv a \text{ in } \mathfrak{a}/\mathfrak{q}\mathfrak{a}\}$ can be seen as the restriction to \mathfrak{a} of a continuous function $\psi_{\text{Siegel}}(-; a)$ on $(\mathbb{K} \otimes_{\mathbb{Q}} \mathbb{R})^{\times}$. Since $\psi_{\text{Siegel}}(-; a)$ is a locally constant function into $\{\pm 1\}$, by splitting the convex body Ω into $O_n(1)$ convex pieces, we may assume that the

$\psi_{\text{Siegel}}^{\mathfrak{a}}(x)$ part is constant. Thus what we have to show is:

$$(6.7) \quad \sum_{\substack{x \in \Omega \cap \mathfrak{a} \\ x \equiv \mathfrak{a} \pmod{\mathfrak{a}/\mathfrak{q}\mathfrak{a}}} \left(\Lambda_{\text{Cramér}, \mathfrak{Q}}^{\mathfrak{a}}(x) - \frac{1}{\text{res}_{s=1} \zeta_{\mathbb{K}}(s)} \frac{\mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{q})}{\varphi_{\mathbb{K}}(\mathfrak{q})} \right) \cdot \mathbf{N}(x\mathfrak{a}^{-1})^{\beta_{\text{Siegel}}-1} \\ = O_{\mathbb{K}} \left(N^n e^{-\sqrt{\log N}/O_{\mathbb{K}}(1)} \right).$$

Let us write

$$\mathbf{N}^{\mathfrak{a}}(x) := \mathbf{N}(x\mathfrak{a}^{-1}) \quad \text{and} \quad Y := e^{c_Y \sqrt{\log N}},$$

where $0 < c_Y < 1$ is a small enough constant depending on \mathbb{K} that we will specify after (6.10).

We cover the cube $[\pm O_{\mathbb{K}}(1)N]^n$ by disjoint translates P_i ($i \in I$) of $[0, N/Y]^n$. Thus $\#I = O_{\mathbb{K}}(Y^n)$. We have

$$(6.8) \quad \text{L.H.S. of (6.7)} = \sum_{i \in I} \sum_{\substack{x \in \Omega \cap P_i \cap \mathfrak{a} \\ x \equiv \mathfrak{a} \pmod{\mathfrak{a}/\mathfrak{q}\mathfrak{a}}} \left(\Lambda_{\text{Cramér}, \mathfrak{Q}}^{\mathfrak{a}}(x) - \frac{1}{\text{res}_{s=1} \zeta_{\mathbb{K}}(s)} \frac{\mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{q})}{\varphi_{\mathbb{K}}(\mathfrak{q})} \right) \cdot \mathbf{N}^{\mathfrak{a}}(x)^{\beta_{\text{Siegel}}-1}.$$

Let $I_{\text{negl}} \subset I$ be the set of those i 's such that the cube P_i contains a point x with $|\sigma(x)| < N/\sqrt{Y}$ for some $\sigma: \mathbb{K} \hookrightarrow \mathbb{C}$. It is easy to see that $\#I_{\text{negl}} \ll_{\mathbb{K}} N/\sqrt{Y}$. Since $|\Lambda_{\text{Cramér}, \mathfrak{Q}}^{\mathfrak{a}}(x) - \frac{1}{\text{res}_{s=1} \zeta_{\mathbb{K}}(s)} \frac{\mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{q})}{\varphi_{\mathbb{K}}(\mathfrak{q})}| \ll_{\mathbb{K}} \log N$ and $\mathbf{N}^{\mathfrak{a}}(x)^{\beta-1} \leq 1$, the contribution of I_{negl} in (6.8) is bounded as:

$$(6.9) \quad \left| \sum_{i \in I_{\text{negl}}} \sum_{\substack{x \in \Omega \cap P_i \cap \mathfrak{a} \\ x \equiv \mathfrak{a} \pmod{\mathfrak{a}/\mathfrak{q}\mathfrak{a}}} \left(\Lambda_{\text{Cramér}, \mathfrak{Q}}^{\mathfrak{a}}(x) - \frac{1}{\text{res}_{s=1} \zeta_{\mathbb{K}}(s)} \frac{\mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{q})}{\varphi_{\mathbb{K}}(\mathfrak{q})} \right) \cdot \mathbf{N}^{\mathfrak{a}}(x)^{\beta_{\text{Siegel}}-1} \right| \\ \ll_{\mathbb{K}} N^n \log N e^{-c_Y \sqrt{\log N}} \ll_{\mathbb{K}} N^n e^{-0.9c_Y \sqrt{\log N}}.$$

Next, for $i \in I \setminus I_{\text{negl}}$, if we write $M_i := \max_{x \in P_i} \mathbf{N}^{\mathfrak{a}}(x)$, we have

$$\left(1 - O_{\mathbb{K}} \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{Y}} \right) \right) M_i \leq \mathbf{N}^{\mathfrak{a}}(x) \leq M_i \quad \text{for all } x \in P_i$$

and hence

$$M_i^{\beta-1} \leq \mathbf{N}^{\mathfrak{a}}(x)^{\beta-1} \leq M_i^{\beta-1} \cdot \left(1 + \frac{O_{\mathbb{K}}(1)}{\sqrt{Y}} \right).$$

Also noting $0 < M_i^{\beta-1} \leq 1$, we establish the following bound:

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{i \in I \setminus I_{\text{negl}}} \left| \sum_{\substack{x \in \Omega \cap P_i \cap \mathfrak{a} \\ x \equiv a \pmod{\mathfrak{a}/\mathfrak{q}\mathfrak{a}}} \left(\Lambda_{\text{Cramér}, Q}^{\mathfrak{a}}(x) - \frac{1}{\text{res}_{s=1} \zeta_K(s)} \frac{\mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{q})}{\varphi_K(\mathfrak{q})} \right) \cdot \mathbf{N}^{\mathfrak{a}}(x)^{\beta_{\text{Siegel}}-1} \right| \\ & \leq \sum_{i \in I \setminus I_{\text{negl}}} \left(\sum_{\substack{x \in \Omega \cap P_i \cap \mathfrak{a} \\ x \equiv a \pmod{\mathfrak{a}/\mathfrak{q}\mathfrak{a}}} \left(\Lambda_{\text{Cramér}, Q}^{\mathfrak{a}}(x) - \frac{1}{\text{res}_{s=1} \zeta_K(s)} \frac{\mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{q})}{\varphi_K(\mathfrak{q})} \right) M_i^{\beta_{\text{Siegel}}-1} \right. \\ & \quad \left. + \sum_{\substack{x \in \Omega \cap P_i \cap \mathfrak{a} \\ x \equiv a \pmod{\mathfrak{a}/\mathfrak{q}\mathfrak{a}}} O_K(\log N) \cdot O_K\left(\frac{O_K(1)}{\sqrt{Y}}\right) \right). \end{aligned}$$

Since we can write $\Omega \cap P_i \cap \mathfrak{a} = \Omega_i \cap \mathfrak{a}$ for another convex open set Ω_i , we can apply (6.4) to bound the first term. For the second term we use $\#P_i = O_n(N^n/Y^n)$. Let us also recall $\#I = O_K(Y^n)$. This implies that the previous quantity is:

$$\begin{aligned} (6.10) \quad & \sum_{i \in I \setminus I_{\text{negl}}} \left(O_K\left(N^n e^{-\sqrt{\log N}/O_K(1)}\right) + O_K\left(N^n Y^{-n} (\log N) e^{-\frac{c_Y}{2} \sqrt{\log N}}\right) \right) \\ & = N^n O_K\left(e^{(nc_Y - \frac{1}{O_K(1)})\sqrt{\log N}} + e^{-0.49c_Y \sqrt{\log N}}\right). \end{aligned}$$

If c_Y is so small that in the above formula we have $nc_Y - \frac{1}{O_K(1)} < -0.49c_Y$, say $c_Y := \frac{1}{(n+1)O_K(1)}$, this last value is an

$$O_K(N^n + e^{-0.49c_Y \sqrt{\log N}}).$$

Combining this with (6.9), we conclude that the estimate (6.5) holds, which completes the proof of Proposition 6.4 for the case $\mathfrak{q}_{\text{Siegel}} \mid \mathfrak{q}$.

Now consider the (supposedly) easier case $\mathfrak{q}_{\text{Siegel}} \nmid \mathfrak{q}$. In this case (6.3) does not have the Siegel term. Hence what we have to show is:

$$(6.11) \quad \sum_{\substack{x \in \Omega \cap \mathfrak{a} \\ x \equiv a \pmod{\mathfrak{a}/\mathfrak{q}\mathfrak{a}}} \Lambda_{\text{Cramér}, Q}^{\mathfrak{a}}(x) \psi_{\text{Siegel}}^{\mathfrak{a}}(x) \mathbf{N}^{\mathfrak{a}}(x)^{\beta-1} = O_K(N^n e^{-\sqrt{\log N}/O_K(1)}).$$

Let $\mathfrak{q}_{\text{lcm}} = \mathfrak{q}_{\text{Siegel}} \cap \mathfrak{q}$ be the least common multiple of $\mathfrak{q}_{\text{Siegel}}$ and \mathfrak{q} in the monoid of ideals. We have natural surjections with kernels of sizes $< Q$

$$(\mathfrak{a}/\mathfrak{q}_{\text{Siegel}}\mathfrak{a})^{\times} \xleftarrow{\text{Pr}_{\text{Siegel}}} (\mathfrak{a}/\mathfrak{q}_{\text{lcm}}\mathfrak{a})^{\times} \xrightarrow{\text{Pr}_{\mathfrak{q}}} (\mathfrak{a}/\mathfrak{q}\mathfrak{a})^{\times}.$$

Any sum of the form $\sum_{\substack{x \in \Omega \cap \mathfrak{a} \\ x \equiv a \pmod{\mathfrak{a}/\mathfrak{q}\mathfrak{a}}}$ can be partitioned as $\sum_{b \in \text{pr}_{\mathfrak{q}}^{-1}(a)} \sum_{\substack{x \in \Omega \cap \mathfrak{a} \\ x \equiv b \pmod{\mathfrak{a}/\mathfrak{q}_{\text{lcm}}\mathfrak{a}}}$.

By splitting Ω into its intersections with the connected components of $(\mathbf{K} \otimes_{\mathbb{Q}} \mathbb{R})^{\times}$, we may again assume that $x \mapsto \psi_{\text{Siegel}}^{\mathfrak{a}}(x)$ is constant on each $(b + \mathfrak{q}_{\text{Siegel}}\mathfrak{a}) \cap \Omega$, whose value we will write as $\psi_{\text{Siegel}}^{\mathfrak{a}}(\Omega, b)$ (assuming now Ω is contained in a connected component of $(\mathbf{K} \otimes_{\mathbb{Q}} \mathbb{R})^{\times}$). Hence the left hand side of (6.11) becomes:

$$\sum_{b \in \text{pr}_{\mathfrak{q}}^{-1}(a)} \psi_{\text{Siegel}}^{\mathfrak{a}}(\Omega, b) \sum_{\substack{x \in \Omega \cap \mathfrak{a} \\ x \equiv b \pmod{\mathfrak{a}/\mathfrak{q}_{\text{lcm}}\mathfrak{a}}} \Lambda_{\text{Cramér}, Q}^{\mathfrak{a}}(x) \mathbf{N}^{\mathfrak{a}}(x)^{\beta-1}.$$

Since $\mathfrak{q}_{\text{Siegel}} \mid \mathfrak{q}_{\text{lcm}}$, we can apply (6.7) to $\mathfrak{q}_{\text{lcm}}$. The previous value now looks like

$$(6.12) \quad \frac{1}{\text{res}_{s=1}(\zeta_K(s))} \frac{\mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{q})}{\varphi_K(\mathfrak{q})} \left(\sum_{b \in \text{pr}_{\mathfrak{q}}^{-1}(a)} \psi_{\text{Siegel}}^{\mathfrak{a}}(\Omega, b) \sum_{\substack{x \in \Omega \cap \mathfrak{a} \\ x \equiv b \pmod{\mathfrak{q}_{\text{lcm}} \mathfrak{a}}} \mathbf{N}^{\mathfrak{a}}(x)^{\beta-1} \right) + O_K(Ne^{-\sqrt{\log N}/O_K(1)}).$$

Choose a norm-length compatible basis $\mathfrak{q}_{\text{lcm}} \mathfrak{a} \cong \mathbb{Z}^n$ and let $\Gamma \subset \mathfrak{a}$ be the corresponding fundamental parallelogram. The convex body $\Omega \cap \mathfrak{a}$ is covered by $O_K(N^n/\mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{q}_{\text{lcm}}))$ disjoint translates of Γ . The contribution from the points x with $|\sigma(x)| < N^{1/2}$ for some $\sigma: K \hookrightarrow \mathbb{C}$ is $O_K((N)^{n-1/3})$, and is negligible as before. Outside this region (where the value of $\mathbf{N}^{\mathfrak{a}}$ is always $\gg_K N^{n-1/2}$), the value of $\mathbf{N}^{\mathfrak{a}}(-)^{\beta-1}$ varies by at most $\pm O_K(\mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{q}_{\text{lcm}})N^{-1/2})$ within any translate of Γ . It follows that for any $b \in \text{pr}_{\mathfrak{q}_{\text{lcm}}}^{-1}(a)$:

$$(6.13) \quad \sum_{\substack{x \in \Omega \cap \mathfrak{a} \\ x \equiv b \pmod{\mathfrak{q}_{\text{lcm}} \mathfrak{a}}} \mathbf{N}^{\mathfrak{a}}(x)^{\beta-1} = \frac{1}{\mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{q}_{\text{lcm}} \mathfrak{a})} \frac{2^{r_2}}{\sqrt{|\mathbf{D}_K|}} \int_{\Omega} \mathbf{N}^{\mathfrak{a}}(x)^{\beta-1} dx + O_K \left(\frac{N^n}{\mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{q}_{\text{lcm}})} \cdot \frac{\mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{q}_{\text{lcm}})}{N^{1/2}} \right).$$

(Yes, we are more or less doing the theory of integration of Lipschitz functions in a re-scaled environment.) If we substitute this into (6.12), the problem boils down to evaluating

$$\sum_{b \in \text{pr}_{\mathfrak{q}}^{-1}(a)} \psi_{\text{Siegel}}^{\mathfrak{a}}(\Omega, b),$$

which is zero because $\psi_{\text{Siegel}}^{\mathfrak{a}}$ restricted to $\text{pr}_{\mathfrak{q}}^{-1}(a)$ is not constant by the assumption $\mathfrak{q}_{\text{Siegel}} \nmid \mathfrak{q}$.

This settles the case of $\mathfrak{q}_{\text{Siegel}} \nmid \mathfrak{q}$ and completes the proof of Proposition 6.4. \square

7. THE CRAMÉR AND SIEGEL MODELS ARE CLOSE

In this section, we use the Weil bound for character sums to prove that $\Lambda_{\text{Cramér}, \mathbf{Q}}^{\mathfrak{a}}$ and $\Lambda_{\text{Siegel}, \mathbf{Q}}^{\mathfrak{a}}$ are close in the Gowers norms.

Lemma 7.1. *Let $\chi: C(\mathfrak{q}) \rightarrow \{\pm 1\}$ be a real primitive Hecke character. By the natural inclusion $(\mathcal{O}_K/\mathfrak{q})^{\times} \hookrightarrow C(\mathfrak{q})$ and zero extension, we regard it as a function on $\mathcal{O}_K/\mathfrak{q}$.*

Then for any positive number $0 < \epsilon < 1$, we have

$$\|\chi\|_{U^{s+1}(\mathcal{O}_K/\mathfrak{q})} \ll_{\epsilon, s, K} \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{q})^{-\frac{1}{2s+2} + \epsilon}.$$

More concretely,

$$\left| \sum_{\substack{x \in \mathcal{O}_K/\mathfrak{q} \\ \underline{h} \in (\mathcal{O}_K/\mathfrak{q})^{s+1}}} \prod_{\underline{\omega} \in \{0,1\}^{s+1}} \chi(x + \underline{\omega} \cdot \underline{h}) \right| \ll_{\epsilon, s, K} \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{q})^{(s+2) - \frac{1}{2} + \epsilon}$$

for all $0 < \epsilon < 1$.

Proof. Write $\mathfrak{q} = \prod_{\mathfrak{p}} \mathfrak{p}^{m_{\mathfrak{p}}}$. Note that then $\mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{q}) = \prod_{\mathfrak{p}} \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{p})^{m_{\mathfrak{p}}}$. By Chinese Remainder Theorem, the left-hand side of the assertion is $\prod_{\mathfrak{p}} \|\chi\|_{U^{s+1}(\mathcal{O}_K/\mathfrak{p}^{m_{\mathfrak{p}}})}$. Let us consider these factors separately.

When the residue characteristic of \mathfrak{p} is odd, we have $m_{\mathfrak{p}} = 1$ because the kernel of $(\mathcal{O}_K/\mathfrak{p}^{m_{\mathfrak{p}}})^{\times} \rightarrow (\mathcal{O}_K/\mathfrak{p})^{\times} =: \mathbb{F}(\mathfrak{p})^{\times}$ has odd order and hence no non-trivial homomorphism into $\{\pm 1\}$.

We have by the definition of $\|\cdot\|_{U^{s+1}}$ and multiplicativity of χ :

$$\begin{aligned} \|\chi\|_{U^{s+1}(\mathbb{F}(\mathfrak{p}))}^{2^{s+1}} &= \frac{1}{\mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{p})^{s+2}} \sum_{\substack{x \in \mathbb{F}(\mathfrak{p}) \\ \underline{h} \in \mathbb{F}(\mathfrak{p})^{s+1}}} \prod_{\underline{\omega} \in \{0,1\}^{s+1}} \chi(x + \underline{\omega} \cdot \underline{h}) \\ &= \frac{1}{\mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{p})^{s+2}} \sum_{\substack{x \in \mathbb{F}(\mathfrak{p}) \\ \underline{h} \in \mathbb{F}(\mathfrak{p})^{s+1}}} \chi \left(\prod_{\underline{\omega} \in \{0,1\}^{s+1}} (x + \underline{\omega} \cdot \underline{h}) \right). \end{aligned}$$

The 2^{s+1} values $\underline{\omega} \cdot \underline{h}$ (for various $\underline{\omega} \in \{0,1\}^{s+1}$) are all different except for $O(2^{s+1})\mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{p})^s$ values of $\underline{h} \in \mathbb{F}(\mathfrak{p})^{s+1}$. In particular the polynomial $\prod_{\underline{\omega} \in \{0,1\}^{s+1}} (X + \underline{\omega} \cdot \underline{h}) \in \mathbb{F}(\mathfrak{p})[X]$ is not a square. Thus for such an \underline{h} , the Weil bound [18, Theorem 11.23 with $n=1$] applies to give

$$\left| \sum_{x \in \mathbb{F}(\mathfrak{p})} \chi \left(\prod_{\underline{\omega} \in \{0,1\}^{s+1}} (x + \underline{\omega} \cdot \underline{h}) \right) \right| \leq s\mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{p})^{1/2}.$$

For those $O(2^{s+1})\mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{p})^s$ excluded values of \underline{h} , we bound the same sum by the trivial bound $\leq \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{p})$. It follows that for every \mathfrak{p} with odd residue characteristic, we have

$$(7.1) \quad \|\chi\|_{U^{s+1}(\mathbb{F}(\mathfrak{p}))}^{2^{s+1}} < s\mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{p})^{-1/2} + O(2^{s+1})\mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{p})^{-1},$$

which is $\ll_s \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{p})^{-1/2}$ and even $< \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{p})^{-\frac{1}{2}+\epsilon}$ for all but finitely many \mathfrak{p} failing to satisfy $\mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{p})^{\epsilon} > O_s(1)$.

When the residue characteristic of \mathfrak{p} is 2 (there are $\leq n$ of them), it is no longer automatically true that the \mathfrak{p} -part of the conductor of χ satisfies $m_{\mathfrak{p}} = 1$, but nonetheless there is an upper bound on $m_{\mathfrak{p}}$. Namely, by the structure of the completion $\mathcal{O}_{K,\mathfrak{p}}^{\times}$ [24, Proposition 5.7] there is an exponent $e_{\mathfrak{p}}$ such that $1 + \mathfrak{p}^{e_{\mathfrak{p}}}\mathcal{O}_{K,\mathfrak{p}}$ is contained in the set of squares $(\mathcal{O}_{K,\mathfrak{p}}^{\times})^2$. Since any real character χ is trivial on squares, it follows that $m_{\mathfrak{p}} \leq e_{\mathfrak{p}}$. We conclude

$$(7.2) \quad \|\chi\|_{U^{s+1}(\mathbb{F}(\mathfrak{p}))}^{2^{s+1}} \leq 1 = \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{p}^{m_{\mathfrak{p}}})^{1/2} \cdot \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{p}^{m_{\mathfrak{p}}})^{-1/2} \ll_K \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{p}^{m_{\mathfrak{p}}})^{-1/2}.$$

Taking the product of (7.1) (7.2) over all \mathfrak{p} and recalling $\prod_{\mathfrak{p}} \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{p})^{m_{\mathfrak{p}}} = \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{q})$, we conclude that our assertion holds. \square

Proposition 7.2. *Let $\mathfrak{a} \cong \mathbb{Z}^n$ be a norm-length compatible basis and $\Omega \subset [\pm N]_{\mathfrak{a} \otimes \mathbb{R}}^n$ be a convex set. Then*

$$\|(\Lambda_{\text{Siegel}, \mathbb{Q}}^{\mathfrak{a}} - \Lambda_{\text{Cramér}, \mathbb{Q}}^{\mathfrak{a}}) \cdot 1_{\Omega}\|_{U^{s+1}[\pm N]^n} \ll_{s,K,\epsilon} \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{q}_{\text{Siegel}})^{-\frac{1}{2s+2}+\epsilon} \ll_{s,K,A} (\log N)^{-A}$$

for any $0 < \epsilon < 1/2^{s+4}$ and $A > 1$.

Proof. The latter inequality follows from the last line of Theorem 6.1.

Given $0 \leq a \leq \mathcal{O}_K(\mathbf{N}^n)$, consider the following subset

$$\Omega(a) := \{x \in \Omega \mid \mathbf{N}(x\mathfrak{a}^{-1}) \leq a\},$$

which we know to have boundary of Lipschitz class $\text{Lip}(n, \mathcal{O}_n(1), \mathcal{O}_K(\mathbf{N}))$ (see Lemma E.3).

Suppose for the time being that for some $0 < c < 1$ we have the following inequality

$$(7.3) \quad \left\| \Lambda_{\text{Cramér}, \mathbf{Q}}^{\mathfrak{a}}(-) \psi_{\text{Siegel}}^{\mathfrak{a}}(-) 1_{\Omega_1}(-) \right\|_{\mathbb{U}^{s+1}[\pm \mathbf{N}]^n} \ll_{s, K} \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{q}_{\text{Siegel}})^{-c}$$

uniformly for all subsets $\Omega_1 \subset [\pm \mathbf{N}]_{\mathfrak{a} \otimes \mathbb{R}}^n$ with boundary of such Lipschitz class. If we write $M = \mathcal{O}_K(\mathbf{N}^n)$ for the maximum value of norms on $[\pm \mathbf{N}]_{\mathfrak{a}}^n$, we have the following identity of functions on $[\pm \mathbf{N}]_{\mathfrak{a}}^n$:

$$\mathbf{N}((-)\mathfrak{a}^{-1})^{\beta_{\text{Siegel}}-1} 1_{\Omega}(-) = M^{\beta_{\text{Siegel}}-1} 1_{\Omega}(-) + (1 - \beta_{\text{Siegel}}) \int_1^M y^{\beta_{\text{Siegel}}-2} 1_{\Omega(y)}(-) dy.$$

Then we deduce the inequalities below, where the “ \leq ” follows from the triangle inequality for the Gowers norm and its integral version (noting that $\|-\|_{\mathbb{U}^{s+1}[\pm \mathbf{N}]^n} : \mathbb{C}^{[\pm \mathbf{N}]^n} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a continuous function with respect to the unique topology on the source) and “ \ll ” follows from the assumption (7.3):

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| (\Lambda_{\text{Siegel}, \mathbf{Q}}^{\mathfrak{a}} - \Lambda_{\text{Cramér}, \mathbf{Q}}^{\mathfrak{a}}) \cdot 1_{\Omega} \right\|_{\mathbb{U}^{s+1}[\pm \mathbf{N}]^n} \\ &= \left\| \Lambda_{\text{Cramér}, \mathbf{Q}}^{\mathfrak{a}}(-) \psi_{\text{Siegel}}^{\mathfrak{a}}((-)\mathfrak{a}^{-1}) \mathbf{N}((-)\mathfrak{a}^{-1})^{\beta_{\text{Siegel}}-1} 1_{\Omega}(-) \right\|_{\mathbb{U}^{s+1}[\pm \mathbf{N}]^n} \\ &= \left\| \Lambda_{\text{Cramér}, \mathbf{Q}}^{\mathfrak{a}}(-) \psi_{\text{Siegel}}^{\mathfrak{a}}((-)\mathfrak{a}^{-1}) \left[M^{\beta_{\text{Siegel}}-1} 1_{\Omega}(-) + (1 - \beta_{\text{Siegel}}) \int_1^M y^{\beta_{\text{Siegel}}-2} 1_{\Omega(y)}(-) dy \right] \right\|_{\mathbb{U}^{s+1}[\pm \mathbf{N}]^n} \\ &\leq \left\| \Lambda_{\text{Cramér}, \mathbf{Q}}^{\mathfrak{a}} \psi_{\text{Siegel}} 1_{\Omega} \right\|_{\mathbb{U}^{s+1}[\pm \mathbf{N}]^n} \cdot M^{\beta_{\text{Siegel}}-1} \\ &\quad + (1 - \beta_{\text{Siegel}}) \int_1^M y^{\beta_{\text{Siegel}}-2} \left\| \Lambda_{\text{Cramér}, \mathbf{Q}}^{\mathfrak{a}} \psi_{\text{Siegel}} 1_{\Omega(y)} \right\|_{\mathbb{U}^{s+1}[\pm \mathbf{N}]^n} dy \\ &\ll_{s, K} \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{q}_{\text{Siegel}})^{-c} \left(M^{\beta_{\text{Siegel}}-1} + (1 - \beta_{\text{Siegel}}) \int_1^M y^{\beta_{\text{Siegel}}-2} dy \right) \\ &= \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{q}_{\text{Siegel}})^{-c}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus we are reduced to showing an inequality of the form (7.3) with $c = 2^{-(s+2)} - \epsilon$.

To show this, let $\tilde{\Omega} \subset ([\pm 2\mathbf{N}]_{\mathfrak{a} \otimes \mathbb{R}}^n)^{s+2}$ be the following bounded set:

$$\tilde{\Omega} := \{(x, \underline{h}) \in \mathfrak{a} \otimes \mathbb{R} \mid x + \underline{\omega} \cdot \underline{h} \in \Omega_1 \text{ for all } \underline{\omega} \in \{0, 1\}^{s+1}\}.$$

It has boundary of Lipschitz class $\text{Lip}(n(s+2), \mathcal{O}_{n,s}(1), \mathcal{O}_K(\mathbf{N}))$. The 2^{s+1} st power of the left-hand side of (7.3), multiplied by the normalization factor $\asymp_s \mathbf{N}^{n(s+2)}$, is

$$(7.4) \quad \sum_{(x, \underline{h}) \in \tilde{\Omega} \cap \mathfrak{a}^{s+2}} \prod_{\underline{\omega} \in \{0,1\}^{s+1}} \Lambda_{\text{Cramér}, \mathbf{Q}}^{\mathfrak{a}}(x + \underline{\omega} \cdot \underline{h}) \psi_{\text{Siegel}}((x + \underline{\omega} \cdot \underline{h}) \mathfrak{a}^{-1}).$$

Let $\mathcal{D} \subset \mathfrak{a}$ be a complete set of representatives for $\mathfrak{a}/\mathfrak{q}_{\text{Siegel}} \mathfrak{a}$. The above sum can be written as a sum $\sum_{(a, \underline{b}) \in \mathcal{D}^{s+2}} \sum_{(x, \underline{h}) \in \tilde{\Omega} \cap (a, \underline{b}) + (\mathfrak{q}_{\text{Siegel}} \mathfrak{a})^{s+2}} (-)$. Since ψ_{Siegel} is a mod $\mathfrak{q}_{\text{Siegel}}$ character, it is legitimate to write $\psi_{\text{Siegel}}((x + \underline{\omega} \cdot \underline{h}) \mathfrak{a}^{-1}) = \psi_{\text{Siegel}}((a + \underline{\omega} \cdot \underline{b}) \mathfrak{a}^{-1})$ for all $(x, \underline{h}) \in (a, \underline{b}) + (\mathfrak{q}_{\text{Siegel}} \mathfrak{a})^{s+2}$. The sum (7.4) thus equals

$$(7.5) \quad \sum_{(a, \underline{b}) \in \mathcal{D}^{s+2}} \left[\left(\prod_{\underline{\omega} \in \{0,1\}^{s+1}} \psi_{\text{Siegel}}((a + \underline{\omega} \cdot \underline{b}) \mathfrak{a}^{-1}) \right) \cdot \sum_{(x, \underline{h}) \in \tilde{\Omega} \cap (a, \underline{b}) + (\mathfrak{q}_{\text{Siegel}} \mathfrak{a})^{s+2}} \left(\prod_{\underline{\omega} \in \{0,1\}^{s+1}} \Lambda_{\text{Cramér}, \mathbf{Q}}^{\mathfrak{a}}(x + \underline{\omega} \cdot \underline{h}) \right) \right].$$

Note that the first product $\prod_{\underline{\omega}}$ in this expression is nonzero only when a, \underline{b} are such that $a + \underline{\omega} \cdot \underline{b}$ is coprime to $\mathfrak{q}_{\text{Siegel}}$ in \mathfrak{a} for all $\underline{\omega}$. So we concentrate on such a, \underline{b} .

For each a, \underline{b} , the latter factor of the expression has already been computed in Proposition 5.2. The volume part from the proposition is now $\text{Vol}(\tilde{\Omega})/\mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{q}_{\text{Siegel}})^{s+2}$ ($\ll_s \mathbf{N}^{n(s+2)}/\mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{q}_{\text{Siegel}})^{s+2}$) reflecting the fact that we are on the ideal $\mathfrak{q}_{\text{Siegel}} \mathfrak{a}$. The coefficients $\beta_{\mathfrak{p}}$ from the proposition *a priori* seem to depend on a, \underline{b} , but they do not. For when $\mathfrak{p} \mid \mathfrak{q}_{\text{Siegel}}$, all the elements of $a + \underline{\omega} \cdot \underline{b} + \mathfrak{q}_{\text{Siegel}} \mathfrak{a}$ are coprime to \mathfrak{p} in \mathfrak{a} for every $\underline{\omega}$ by the assumption that $a + \underline{\omega} \cdot \underline{b}$ is. It follows that $\beta_{\mathfrak{p}} = (\mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{p})/\varphi_K(\mathfrak{p}))^{2^{s+1}}$ regardless of (a, \underline{b}) . When $\mathfrak{p} \nmid \mathfrak{q}_{\text{Siegel}}$, by the affine- \mathcal{O}_K -linear isomorphisms induced by the inclusion $\mathfrak{q}_{\text{Siegel}} \mathfrak{a} \hookrightarrow \mathfrak{a}$ and the translations by $a + \underline{\omega} \cdot \underline{b}$:

$$\prod_{\underline{\omega}} \mathfrak{q}_{\text{Siegel}} \mathfrak{a} / \mathfrak{p} \mathfrak{q}_{\text{Siegel}} \mathfrak{a} \xrightarrow{\cong} \prod_{\underline{\omega}} \mathfrak{a} / \mathfrak{p} \mathfrak{a} \xrightarrow{\cong} \prod_{\underline{\omega}} \mathfrak{a} / \mathfrak{p} \mathfrak{a},$$

it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \beta_{\mathfrak{p}} &= (\mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{p})/\varphi_K(\mathfrak{p}))^{2^{s+1}} \mathbb{E}_{(x, \underline{h}) \in \mathbb{F}(\mathfrak{p})^{s+2}} \mathbf{1}_{x + \underline{\omega} \cdot \underline{h} \neq 0 \text{ in } \mathbb{F}(\mathfrak{p}) \text{ for all } \underline{\omega}} \\ &= 1 + \mathcal{O}_s \left(\frac{1}{\mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{p})^2} \right), \end{aligned}$$

in which (a, \underline{b}) does not appear. It also follows that

$$\prod_{\substack{p < Q \\ \mathfrak{p} \mid p}} \beta_{\mathfrak{p}} \ll_K \prod_{\mathfrak{p} \mid \mathfrak{q}_{\text{Siegel}}} \left(1 - \frac{1}{\mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{p})} \right)^{-2^{s+1}} \ll_K \log \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{q}_{\text{Siegel}}) < \log \mathbf{N}$$

by Mertens' theorem D.1 say. We conclude that the sum $\sum_{(x, \underline{h})}$ in (7.5) has the following form regardless of (a, \underline{b}) :

$$(7.6) \quad \frac{\text{Vol}(\tilde{\Omega})/\mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{q}_{\text{Siegel}})^{s+2}}{\text{res}_{s=1}(\zeta_K(s))} \prod_{p < Q} \beta_{\mathfrak{p}} + \mathcal{O}_{s, K}(\mathbf{N}^{n(s+2)} \exp(-\frac{1}{5} \sqrt{\log \mathbf{N}})).$$

The contribution of first term of this expression to (7.5) is, by Lemma 7.1,

$$\ll_{\epsilon, s, K} \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{q}_{\text{Siegel}})^{(s+2)-\frac{1}{2}+\epsilon} \cdot \frac{\mathbf{N}^{n(s+2)}}{\mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{q}_{\text{Siegel}})^{s+2}} \cdot \log N.$$

By Theorem 6.1, the $\log N$ factor can be absorbed in $\mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{q}_{\text{Siegel}})^\epsilon$ by modifying ϵ a little, and so we end up with a bound

$$(7.7) \quad \ll_{\epsilon, s, K} \mathbf{N}^{n(s+2)} \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{q}_{\text{Siegel}})^{-\frac{1}{2}+\epsilon}.$$

The contribution of the error term in (7.6) to (7.5) is

$$(7.8) \quad \begin{aligned} &\ll_{s, K} \mathbf{N}^{n(s+2)} \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{q}_{\text{Siegel}})^{s+2} \exp\left(-\frac{1}{5}\sqrt{\log N}\right) \\ &< \mathbf{N}^{n(s+2)} \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{q}_{\text{Siegel}})^{-1}, \end{aligned}$$

where ‘ $<$ ’ is true by the assumption $O_s(1) > 10s$ in (1.2).

The inequalities (7.7) (7.8) give the assertion raised to the 2^{s+1} st power. This completes the proof of Proposition 7.2. \square

Corollary 7.3. *Let $\mathfrak{a} \cong \mathbb{Z}^n$ be a norm-length compatible basis and $\mathfrak{a} \cong \mathbb{Z}^n \xrightarrow{g} G \rightarrow G/\Gamma \xrightarrow{F} \mathbb{C}$ be a 1-bounded nilsequence where the Lipschitz constant of F is bounded from above by a $\text{Lip}(F) \geq \log N$. Assume that the \mathbb{Q} -Siegel zero exists (so that $\Lambda_{\text{Siegel}, \mathbb{Q}}^{\mathfrak{a}}$ and $\Lambda_{\text{Cramér}, \mathbb{Q}}^{\mathfrak{a}}$ are different). Then for any convex set $\Omega \subset [\pm N]_{\mathfrak{a} \otimes \mathbb{R}}^n$ and $a \in \mathfrak{a}$, we have*

$$(7.9) \quad \left| \sum_{x \in \Omega \cap (a + \mathfrak{q}\mathfrak{a})} (\Lambda_{\text{Siegel}, \mathbb{Q}}^{\mathfrak{a}} - \Lambda_{\text{Cramér}, \mathbb{Q}}^{\mathfrak{a}})(x) F(g(x)) \right| \ll_{s, K} \mathbf{N}^n \text{Lip}(F)^{\dim G^{O_s, n(1)}} \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{q}) \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{q}_{\text{Siegel}})^{-1/O_{s, K}(\dim G^{O_s, n(1)})}.$$

Proof. The sum $\sum_{x \in \Omega \cap (a + \mathfrak{q}\mathfrak{a})} (-)$ can be written as $\sum_{x \in [\pm N]^n} 1_{a + \mathfrak{q}\mathfrak{a}}(x) 1_{\Omega}(x) \cdot (-)$. By Fourier analysis on finite abelian groups, we can write

$$1_{a + \mathfrak{q}\mathfrak{a}} = \sum_{\xi \in \text{Hom}(\mathfrak{a}/\mathfrak{q}\mathfrak{a}, \mathbb{C}^\times)} c_\xi \cdot \xi, \quad \text{where } |c_\xi| = \left| \mathbb{E}_{x \in \mathfrak{a}/\mathfrak{q}\mathfrak{a}} 1_{(a + \mathfrak{q}\mathfrak{a})}(x) \xi(x)^{-1} \right| \leq 1.$$

This reduces the problem of showing (7.9) to showing the following inequality for all $\xi \in \text{Hom}(\mathfrak{a}/\mathfrak{q}\mathfrak{a}, \mathbb{C}^\times)$:

$$(7.10) \quad \left| \sum_{x \in [\pm N]_{\mathfrak{a}}^n} \xi(x) 1_{\Omega}(x) (\Lambda_{\text{Siegel}, \mathbb{Q}}^{\mathfrak{a}} - \Lambda_{\text{Cramér}, \mathbb{Q}}^{\mathfrak{a}})(x) F(g(x)) \right| \ll_{s, K} \mathbf{N}^n \text{Lip}(F)^{\dim G^{O_s, n(1)}} \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{q}_{\text{Siegel}})^{-1/O_{s, K}(\dim G^{O_s, n(1)})}.$$

Take the decomposition from Proposition A.10

$$F(g(x)) = F_1(x) + F_2(x),$$

where we will specify the parameter $0 < \epsilon < 1$ from Proposition A.10 shortly. Since $\|F_2\|_\infty \ll_{s, n} \epsilon$, the contribution of F_2 to the left-hand side of (7.10) is

$$(7.11) \quad \ll_{s, K} \epsilon N^n \log N.$$

Meanwhile, by Proposition 7.2 and the invariance of the Gowers norm by the multiplication of the phase function ξ [15, (B.11), p. 1816], we know

$$\|\xi \cdot 1_\Omega \cdot (\Lambda_{\text{Siegel}, \mathbb{Q}}^{\mathfrak{a}} - \Lambda_{\text{Cramér}, \mathbb{Q}}^{\mathfrak{a}})\|_{U^{s+1}[\pm N]^n} \ll_{s, K} \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{q}_{\text{Siegel}})^{-1/O_{s, K}(1)}.$$

It follows by Proposition A.10 that the contribution of F_1 to the sum (7.10) is bounded by

$$(7.12) \quad \ll_{s, K} \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{q}_{\text{Siegel}})^{-1/O_{s, K}(1)} (\text{Lip}(F)/\epsilon)^{\dim G^{O_{s, n}(1)}} \mathbf{N}^n.$$

By comparing (7.11) (7.12) and our assertion (7.10), it suffices to specify the value of $0 < \epsilon < 1$ so that the quantities

$$\epsilon \log N, \quad \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{q}_{\text{Siegel}})^{-1/O_{s, K}(1)} (\text{Lip}(F)/\epsilon)^{\dim G^{O_{s, n}(1)}}$$

are both $\ll_{s, K} \text{Lip}(F)^{\dim G^{O_{s, n}(1)}} \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{q}_{\text{Siegel}})^{-1/O_{s, K}(\dim G^{O_{s, n}(1)})}$. This is achieved by setting for example $\epsilon := \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{q}_{\text{Siegel}})^{-1/2O_{s, K}(1)(\dim G^{O_{s, n}(1)})}$. \square

8. VAUGHAN'S DECOMPOSITION (A.K.A. THE TYPE I/II SUMS)

Having established that $\Lambda_{\text{Cramér}, \mathbb{Q}}^{\mathfrak{a}}$ and $\Lambda_{\text{Siegel}, \mathbb{Q}}^{\mathfrak{a}}$ are close in the U^{s+1} norm (Proposition 7.2), we move on to the task of showing that $\|\Lambda_{\mathbb{K}}^{\mathfrak{a}} - \Lambda_{\text{Siegel}, \mathbb{Q}}^{\mathfrak{a}}\|_{U^{s+1}[\pm N]^n}$ is small. For this it will be convenient to decompose $\Lambda_{\mathbb{K}}^{\mathfrak{a}}$ and $\Lambda_{\text{Siegel}, \mathbb{Q}}^{\mathfrak{a}}$ into manageable chunks in the style of Vaughan.

Recall the definition of the divisor function $\tau: \text{Ideals}_{\mathbb{K}} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ for the number field:

$$\tau(\mathfrak{a}) = \sum_{\mathfrak{b}|\mathfrak{a}} 1.$$

Lemma 8.1. *For any integers $N \geq 3$ and $m \geq 1$ we have*

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\substack{\mathfrak{a} \text{ such that} \\ \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{a}) \leq N}} \tau(\mathfrak{a})^m &\ll_{K, m} N(\log N)^{2^m - 1} \\ \sum_{\substack{\mathfrak{a} \text{ such that} \\ \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{a}) \leq N}} \frac{\tau(\mathfrak{a})^m}{\mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{a})} &\ll_{K, m} (\log N)^{2^m}. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. See e.g. [10, Appendix C] and [26, p. 288] for the case of \mathbb{Z} . The case of $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{K}}$ can be treated in the same way, noting $\sum_{\substack{\mathfrak{a} \text{ such that} \\ \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{a}) \leq N}} \ll_{\mathbb{K}} N$ (Proposition 3.5). \square

Now we introduce the notion of (twisted) type I/II sums for \mathbb{K} . We will give the minimum definitions that covers the objects of our interest.

Definition 8.2. Let $N \geq 3$ be an integer and $A: \text{Ideals}_{\mathbb{K}, \leq N} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ be a function. It is said to be *log-bounded* if we have a bound of the form

$$|A(\mathfrak{a})| \leq \log N$$

for all $\mathfrak{a} \in \text{Ideals}_{\mathbb{K}, \leq N}$.

Definition 8.3. A function $S: \text{Ideals}_{\mathbb{K}, \leq N} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ for some $N \geq 3$ is said to be:

- a *type I sum* if it is of the form

$$S(\mathfrak{a}) = 1_{\mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{a}) \leq N'} \sum_{\substack{\mathfrak{b} \text{ such that} \\ \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{b}) \leq N^{2/3}}} A(\mathfrak{b}) 1_{\mathfrak{b}|\mathfrak{a}},$$

where $A: \text{Ideals}_{\mathbb{K}, \leq N} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ is log-bounded and $N' \leq N$.

- a *twisted type I sum* if it is of the form

$$S(\mathfrak{a}) = 1_{\mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{a}) \leq N'} \sum_{\substack{\mathfrak{b} \text{ such that} \\ \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{b}) \leq N^{2/3}}} A(\mathfrak{b}) 1_{\mathfrak{b}|\mathfrak{a}} \psi_{\text{Siegel}}(\mathfrak{a}\mathfrak{b}^{-1}),$$

where $A: \text{Ideals}_{\mathbb{K}, \leq N} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ is log-bounded and $N' \leq N$. Equivalently

$$S(\mathfrak{a}) = 1_{\mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{a}) \leq N'} \sum_{\substack{\mathfrak{b} \text{ such that} \\ \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{b}) \leq N^{2/3}}} A(\mathfrak{b}) 1_{\mathfrak{b}|\mathfrak{a}} \psi_{\text{Siegel}}(\mathfrak{a}),$$

because $\psi_{\text{Siegel}}(\mathfrak{a}\mathfrak{b}^{-1}) = \psi_{\text{Siegel}}(\mathfrak{a})\psi_{\text{Siegel}}(\mathfrak{b})$ and $\psi_{\text{Siegel}}(\mathfrak{b})$ can be absorbed in $A(\mathfrak{b})$.

- a *type II sum* if it is of the form

$$S(\mathfrak{a}) = \sum_{\substack{\mathfrak{c}, \mathfrak{d} \text{ such that} \\ \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{c}), \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{d}) > N^{1/3} \\ \text{and } \mathfrak{c}\mathfrak{d} = \mathfrak{a}}} L(\mathfrak{c})T(\mathfrak{d})$$

where $L, T: \text{Ideals}_{\mathbb{K}, \leq N} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ obey the bounds

$$\begin{aligned} |L(\mathfrak{c})| &\leq \log N, \\ |T(\mathfrak{d})| &\leq \tau(\mathfrak{d}). \end{aligned}$$

- *negligible* if it is log-bounded and satisfies

$$\sum_{\substack{\mathfrak{a} \text{ such that} \\ \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{a}) \leq N}} |S(\mathfrak{a})| < N \exp\left(-\frac{1}{10} \log^{1/2} N\right).$$

Proposition 8.4 (Pointwise bound of (twisted) type I, II sums). *For any (twisted) type I, II sum $S: \text{Ideals}_{\mathbb{K}, \leq N} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$, we have*

$$|S(\mathfrak{a})| \leq (\log N)\tau(\mathfrak{a})^2$$

for all $\mathfrak{a} \in \text{Ideals}_{\mathbb{K}, \leq N}$.

Proof. First suppose S is a (twisted) type I sum. In either case, by $|A(-)| \leq \log N$ and $|\psi_{\text{Siegel}}(-)| \leq 1$ we have

$$|S(\mathfrak{a})| \leq \log N \sum_{\substack{\mathfrak{b} \\ \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{b}) \leq N^{2/3}}} 1_{\mathfrak{b}|\mathfrak{a}} \leq (\log N)\tau(\mathfrak{a}).$$

Next suppose S is a type II sum. We have

$$\begin{aligned} |S(\mathfrak{a})| &= \left| \sum_{\substack{\mathfrak{c}, \mathfrak{d} \text{ such that} \\ \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{c}), \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{d}) > N^{1/3} \\ \text{and } \mathfrak{c}\mathfrak{d} = \mathfrak{a}}} L(\mathfrak{c})T(\mathfrak{d}) \right| \leq \log N \left| \sum_{\mathfrak{d}|\mathfrak{a}} |T(\mathfrak{d})| \right| \leq \log N \sum_{\mathfrak{d}|\mathfrak{a}} \tau(\mathfrak{d}) \\ &\leq (\log N)\tau(\mathfrak{a})^2. \end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof. \square

Proposition 8.5 (Vaughan's decomposition). *For any $N \geq 3$ sufficiently large depending on K , the functions Λ_K , $\Lambda_{\text{Cramér}, \mathbb{Q}}$, $\Lambda_{\text{Siegel}, \mathbb{Q}}$ restricted to $\text{Ideals}_{K, \leq N}$ can be written as \mathbb{C} -linear combinations of the form*

$$\sum_{i \in I} c_i S_i,$$

where

- the coefficients $c_i \in \mathbb{C}$ satisfy $\sum_{i \in I} |c_i| \leq 2 \log N$;
- each $S_i: \text{Ideals}_{K, \leq N} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ is either a type I sum, a twisted type I sum, a type II sum or negligible.

Proof. First, we consider Λ_K . By the Möbius inversion formula

$$\Lambda_K = \Lambda_K * \mu * 1,$$

for all ideal \mathfrak{a} we have

$$\Lambda_K(\mathfrak{a}) = \sum_{\substack{\mathfrak{b}, \mathfrak{c}, \mathfrak{d} \\ \text{such that } \mathfrak{bc}\mathfrak{d}=\mathfrak{a}}} \Lambda_K(\mathfrak{b})\mu(\mathfrak{c})1 = \sum_{\substack{\mathfrak{b}, \mathfrak{c} \\ \text{such that } \mathfrak{bc}|\mathfrak{a}}} \Lambda_K(\mathfrak{b})\mu(\mathfrak{c}).$$

We partition the sum into four partial sums according to whether $\mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{b}), \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{c}) \leq N^{1/3}$. Out of these four partial sums, let us treat the following three first.

Claim 8.6. (1) *The sum*

$$\sum_{\mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{b}), \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{c}) \leq N^{1/3}} \Lambda_K(\mathfrak{b})\mu(\mathfrak{c})$$

is a type I sum.

(2) *The sum*

$$\left(\sum_{\mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{b}), \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{c}) \leq N^{1/3}} + \sum_{\mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{b}) > N^{1/3}, \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{c}) \leq N^{1/3}} \right) \Lambda_K(\mathfrak{b})\mu(\mathfrak{c})$$

can be written as a linear combination $\sum_{i \in I} c_i S_i$ where $\sum_{i \in I} |c_i| \leq 2 \log N$ and all S_i are type I sums.

(3) *The sum*

$$\left(\sum_{\mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{b}), \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{c}) \leq N^{1/3}} + \sum_{\mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{b}) \leq N^{1/3}, \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{c}) > N^{1/3}} \right) \Lambda_K(\mathfrak{b})\mu(\mathfrak{c})$$

is negligible.

Proof of Claim. For (1), we rearrange the sum as follows by setting $\mathfrak{d} := \mathfrak{bc}$

$$\sum_{\substack{\mathfrak{d} \text{ such that} \\ \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{d}) \leq N^{2/3}}} 1_{\mathfrak{d}|\mathfrak{a}} \left(\sum_{\substack{\mathfrak{b}, \mathfrak{c} \text{ such that} \\ \mathfrak{bc}=\mathfrak{d} \\ \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{b}), \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{c}) \leq N^{1/3}}} \Lambda_K(\mathfrak{b})\mu(\mathfrak{c}). \right)$$

By setting $N' = N^{2/3}$ in Definition 8.3, it suffices to show that the sum $\sum_{\mathfrak{b}, \mathfrak{c}}$ in the parenthesis above is log-bounded in the sense of Definition 8.2. Name it A :

$$A(\mathfrak{d}) = \sum_{\substack{\mathfrak{b}, \mathfrak{c} \text{ such that} \\ \mathfrak{bc} = \mathfrak{d} \\ \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{b}), \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{c}) \leq N^{1/3}}} \Lambda_K(\mathfrak{b}) \mu(\mathfrak{c})$$

By the formula $\Lambda_K * 1 = \log \mathbf{N}(-)$ we have

$$|A(\mathfrak{d})| \leq \sum_{\substack{\mathfrak{b}, \mathfrak{c} \text{ such that} \\ \mathfrak{bc} = \mathfrak{d}}} \Lambda_K(\mathfrak{b}) \cdot 1 = \log \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{d}) \leq \log N.$$

This shows Claim 8.6(1).

We turn to (2). First, note that the sum equals

$$\sum_{\substack{\mathfrak{b}, \mathfrak{c} \text{ such that} \\ \mathfrak{bc} = \mathfrak{a} \\ \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{c}) \leq N^{1/3}}} \Lambda_K(\mathfrak{b}) \mu(\mathfrak{c}) = \sum_{\substack{\mathfrak{c} | \mathfrak{a} \\ \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{c}) \leq N^{1/3}}} \mu(\mathfrak{c}) \left(\sum_{\mathfrak{b} | \mathfrak{ac}^{-1}} \Lambda(\mathfrak{b}) \right)$$

By the formula $\Lambda_K * 1 = \log \mathbf{N}(-)$ again, we can further compute as

$$= \sum_{\substack{\mathfrak{c} \text{ such that} \\ \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{c}) \leq N^{1/3}}} \mu(\mathfrak{c}) 1_{\mathfrak{c} | \mathfrak{a}} \log \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{ac}^{-1}) = \sum_{\substack{\mathfrak{c} \text{ such that} \\ \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{c}) \leq N^{1/3}}} \mu(\mathfrak{c}) 1_{\mathfrak{c} | \mathfrak{a}} (\log \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{a}) - \log \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{c})).$$

The sum arising from $\log \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{c})$'s is a type I sum by setting $N' = N$ and $A(\mathfrak{c}) = 1[\mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{c}) \leq N^{1/3}] \mu(\mathfrak{c}) \log \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{c})$. To treat the sum arising from $\log(\mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{a}))$'s, we use the identity

$$\log(\mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{a})) = \log N + \sum_{t=1}^{N-1} (\log t - \log(t+1)) \cdot 1_{\mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{a}) \leq t}$$

to write the sum in question as

$$\left(\sum_{\substack{\mathfrak{c} \text{ such that} \\ \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{c}) \leq N^{1/3}}} \mu(\mathfrak{c}) 1_{\mathfrak{c} | \mathfrak{a}} \right) \log N + \sum_{t=1}^{N-1} (\log t - \log(t+1)) \left(1_{\mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{a}) \leq t} \sum_{\substack{\mathfrak{c} \text{ such that} \\ \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{c}) \leq N^{1/3}}} \mu(\mathfrak{c}) 1_{\mathfrak{c} | \mathfrak{a}} \right).$$

As the function $A(\mathfrak{c}) := 1[\mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{c}) \leq N^{1/3}] \mu(\mathfrak{c}) \in \{-1, 0, 1\}$ is log-bounded in the sense of Definition 8.2, each sum $\sum_{\mathfrak{c}}$ is a type I sum. The coefficients $\log N, \log t - \log(t+1)$ satisfy the property that the sum of their absolute values is $2 \log N$. This proves Claim 8.6(2).

Lastly we show (3). The sum in question equals

$$\sum_{\substack{\mathfrak{b}, \mathfrak{c} \text{ such that} \\ \mathfrak{bc} | \mathfrak{a} \\ \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{b}) \leq N^{1/3}}} \Lambda_K(\mathfrak{b}) \mu(\mathfrak{c}) = \sum_{\substack{\mathfrak{b} \text{ such that} \\ \mathfrak{b} | \mathfrak{a} \\ \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{b}) \leq N^{1/3}}} \Lambda_K(\mathfrak{b}) \sum_{\substack{\mathfrak{c} \text{ such that} \\ \mathfrak{c} | \mathfrak{ab}^{-1}}} \mu(\mathfrak{c}).$$

By the identity $\sum_{\substack{\mathfrak{c} \text{ such that} \\ \mathfrak{c} | \mathfrak{ab}^{-1}}} \mu(\mathfrak{c}) = 1[\mathfrak{b} = \mathfrak{a}]$ (the Möbius inversion formula), this equals

$$1[\mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{a}) \leq N^{1/3}] \Lambda_K(\mathfrak{a}),$$

which is negligible in the sense of Definition 8.3 because

$$\sum_{\substack{\mathfrak{a} \text{ such that} \\ \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{a}) \leq N}} |1[\mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{a}) \leq N^{1/3}] \Lambda_K(\mathfrak{a})| \leq \sum_{\substack{\mathfrak{a} \text{ such that} \\ \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{a}) \leq N^{1/3}}} \log N \ll_K N^{1/3} \log N.$$

This completes the proof of Claim 8.6. \square

To finish the Λ_K part of Proposition 8.5, it remains to treat the forth partial sum

$$\sum_{\substack{\mathfrak{b}, \mathfrak{c} \text{ such that} \\ \mathfrak{bc} | \mathfrak{a} \\ \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{b}), \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{c}) > N^{1/3}}} \Lambda_K(\mathfrak{b}) \mu(\mathfrak{c}).$$

We show that this is a type II sum. By introducing the dummy variable $\mathfrak{d} := \mathfrak{ab}^{-1}$, rewrite the sum as

$$\sum_{\substack{\mathfrak{b}, \mathfrak{d} \text{ such that} \\ \mathfrak{bd} = \mathfrak{a} \\ \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{b}) > N^{1/3}}} \Lambda_K(\mathfrak{b}) \sum_{\substack{\mathfrak{c} \text{ such that} \\ \mathfrak{c} | \mathfrak{d} \\ \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{c}) > N^{1/3}}} \mu(\mathfrak{c}).$$

Note that the conditions $\mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{c}) > N^{1/3}$, $\mathfrak{c} | \mathfrak{d}$ imply $\mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{d}) > N^{1/3}$. Hence we are reduced to showing that the functions

$$L(\mathfrak{b}) = \Lambda_K(\mathfrak{b}) \quad \text{and} \quad T(\mathfrak{d}) = \sum_{\substack{\mathfrak{c} \text{ such that} \\ \mathfrak{c} | \mathfrak{d} \\ \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{c}) > N^{1/3}}} \mu(\mathfrak{c})$$

obey the bounds $|L(\mathfrak{b})| \leq \log N$ and $|T(\mathfrak{d})| \leq \tau(\mathfrak{d})$. But both of them are obvious.

We next show the assertion for $\Lambda_{\text{Cramér}, Q}$, $\Lambda_{\text{Siegel}, Q}$. Since the coefficient $P(Q)^n / \varphi_K(P(Q))$ has size $\ll_K \log N$ by Mertens' theorem, it suffices to show that the functions

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{a} &\mapsto 1[\mathfrak{a} + (P(Q)) = \mathcal{O}_K] \\ \mathfrak{a} &\mapsto 1[\mathfrak{a} + (P(Q)) = \mathcal{O}_K] \cdot \psi_{\text{Siegel}}([\mathfrak{a}]) \cdot \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{a})^{\beta_{\text{Siegel}} - 1} \end{aligned}$$

are of the asserted form. Set $D := N^{0.2}$ and let $(\lambda_{\mathfrak{d}}^+)_{\mathfrak{d} \in \text{Ideals}_K}$ be the associated upper linear sieve coefficient from Lemma D.2 (2). We know

$$(8.1) \quad 1_{\mathfrak{a} + P(Q) = (1)} \leq \sum_{\mathfrak{d} | P(Q)} \lambda_{\mathfrak{d}}^+ 1_{\mathfrak{d} | \mathfrak{a}}$$

for all \mathfrak{a} . The right hand side is a type I sum in the sense of Definition 8.3 by setting $A(\mathfrak{d}) := \lambda_{\mathfrak{d}}^+ 1_{\mathfrak{d} | P(Q)}$ and noting that λ^+ is supported on $\text{Ideals}_{K, \leq N^{0.2}} \subset \text{Ideals}_{K, \leq N^{2/3}}$ and has values in $\{-1, 0, 1\}$.

We want to apply Lemma D.2 to $a_n := 1_{\mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{n}) \leq N}$. The theorem of density of ideals 3.5 says

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\mathfrak{d} | \mathfrak{n}} 1_{\mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{n}) \leq N} &\stackrel{m := \mathfrak{n}\mathfrak{d}^{-1}}{=} \sum_{m \in \text{Ideals}_K} 1_{\mathbf{N}(m) \leq N/\mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{d})} \\ &= \text{res}_{s=1}(\zeta_K(s)) \frac{N}{\mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{d})} + O_K \left(\left(\frac{N}{\mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{d})} \right)^{1 - \frac{1}{n}} \right), \end{aligned}$$

which means that if we set $g(\mathfrak{d}) := 1_{\mathfrak{d}|P(Q)}/\mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{d})$ and $X := \text{res}_{s=1}(\zeta_K(s)) \cdot N$, we have the estimate $r_{\mathfrak{d}} = O_K \left(\left(\frac{N}{\mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{d})} \right)^{1-\frac{1}{n}} \right)$.

By Lemma D.2 (2), we have, noting (8.1) and $\frac{\log D}{\log Q} \geq 0.2\sqrt{\log N}$

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{\mathfrak{a}, \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{a}) \leq N} \left| \left(\sum_{\mathfrak{d}|P(Q)} \lambda_{\mathfrak{d}}^+ 1_{\mathfrak{d}|\mathfrak{a}} \right) - 1_{\mathfrak{a}+P(Q)=(1)} \right| \\ &= S^+(Q) - S(Q) \\ &= O_K(Ne^{-0.2\sqrt{\log N}} + N^{1-\frac{0.8}{n}}) = O_K(Ne^{-\sqrt{\log N}}). \end{aligned}$$

This expresses $1_{\mathfrak{a}+P(Q)=(1)}$ as the sum of a type I sum and a negligible sum in the sense of Definition 8.3.

Multiplying by ψ_{Siegel} , we see that the function

$$\mathfrak{a} \mapsto 1[\mathfrak{a} + (P(Q)) = \mathcal{O}_K] \cdot \psi_{\text{Siegel}}([\mathfrak{a}])$$

is the sum of a twisted type I sum $\mathfrak{a} \mapsto \sum_{\mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{b}) \leq D} \lambda_{\mathfrak{b}}^+ 1_{\mathfrak{b}|\mathfrak{a}} \psi_{\text{Siegel}}([\mathfrak{a}])$ and a negligible sum.

We further multiply it by $\mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{a})^{\beta_{\text{Siegel}}-1}$. The negligible part stays negligible because $\mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{a})^{\beta_{\text{Siegel}}-1} \leq 1$. To handle the twisted type I part, just as before, we use the identity

$$\mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{a})^{\beta_{\text{Siegel}}-1} = N^{\beta_{\text{Siegel}}-1} + \sum_{t=1}^{N-1} (t^{\beta_{\text{Siegel}}-1} - (t+1)^{\beta_{\text{Siegel}}-1}) \cdot 1_{\mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{a}) \leq t}.$$

Note that for any twisted type I sum $S(-)$ and $t \leq N$, the product $S_{\leq t}(\mathfrak{a}) := 1[\mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{a}) \leq t]S(\mathfrak{a})$ is also a twisted type I sum. Thus $\mathfrak{a} \mapsto \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{a})^{\beta_{\text{Siegel}}-1}S(\mathfrak{a})$ is written as a linear combination of

$$S(\mathfrak{a}) := \sum_{\mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{b}) \leq D} \lambda_{\mathfrak{b}}^+ 1_{\mathfrak{b}|\mathfrak{a}} \psi_{\text{Siegel}}([\mathfrak{a}])$$

and the associated $S_{\leq t}(\mathfrak{a})$'s with coefficients $N^{\beta_{\text{Siegel}}-1}$ (≤ 1) and $(t^{\beta_{\text{Siegel}}-1} - (t+1)^{\beta_{\text{Siegel}}-1})$'s. Since the sum of the absolute values of these coefficients is $N^{\beta_{\text{Siegel}}-1} + (1 - N^{\beta_{\text{Siegel}}-1}) = 1$, the proof for the case of $\Lambda_{\text{Siegel}, Q}$ is now complete. \square

9. THE ORTHOGONALITY THEOREM—EQUIDISTRIBUTED, AVERAGE 0 CASE

The following proposition is our key computation. The strategy follows that of [10, §4], but the treatment necessarily gets considerably more complicated because unlike in the case of \mathbb{Z} , elements and ideals are two very different notions and the geometry of \mathbb{R}^n is richer than that of \mathbb{R} .

Proposition 9.1. *$N \geq 2$ a natural number sufficiently large depending only on K, s . Let $\mathfrak{a} \subset \mathcal{O}_K$ be a non-zero ideal and let $\mathfrak{a} \cong \mathbb{Z}^n$ be a norm-length compatible basis.*

For any:

- *filtered s -step nilmanifold G/Γ of dimension $\dim(G)$, complexity $\text{comp}(G/\Gamma)$;*
- *polynomial map $g: \mathfrak{a} \rightarrow G \rightarrow G/\Gamma$ totally ϵ -equidistributed on $[\pm N]_{\mathfrak{a}}^n$ for some $0 < \epsilon < 1/2$;*
- *1-bounded function $F: G/\Gamma \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ with average 0 and whose Lipschitz constant is bounded from above by some $\text{Lip}(F) \geq 1$;*

- *type I, twisted type I or type II sum S*: $\text{Ideals}_{\mathbb{K}, \leq \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{K}}(N^n)} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$, where the $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{K}}(1)$ constant is from Proposition 3.4;
- *convex body* $\Omega \subset [\pm N]_{\mathfrak{a} \otimes \mathbb{R}}^n$;
- *non-zero ideal* $\mathfrak{q} \subset \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{K}}$ of norm $\leq e^{(\log N)^{1/2}/\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{K}}(1)}$ and a residue class $a \in (\mathfrak{a}/\mathfrak{q}\mathfrak{a})^\times$;

satisfying the condition $\text{Lip}(F) \text{comp}(G/\Gamma) \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{q}\mathfrak{q}_{\text{Siegel}}) \epsilon^{-1} < N^{1/10}$, we have

$$\left| \sum_{\substack{x \in [\pm N]_{\mathfrak{a}}^n \cap \Omega \\ x=a \text{ in } \mathfrak{a}/\mathfrak{q}\mathfrak{a}}} S(x\mathfrak{a}^{-1})F(g(x)) \right| \ll_{s, \mathbb{K}} (\log N)^{\mathcal{O}_n(1)} \text{Lip}(F) \text{comp}(G/\Gamma) \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{q}\mathfrak{q}_{\text{Siegel}}) \epsilon^{1/\exp((2 \dim G)^{\mathcal{O}_{s, n(1)})}} N^n.$$

Except in the twisted type I case, the $\mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{q}\mathfrak{q}_{\text{Siegel}})$ factor can be omitted from the hypothesis and conclusion.

The rest of this section is devoted to the proof of Proposition 9.1. The proof is divided into the case of a (twisted) type I sum and that of a type II sum. In either case, it is convenient to write

$$G(x) := F(g(x))$$

because in the preliminary parts of the proofs, it only counts that $G(x)$ is a 1-bounded function.

Let $\delta \geq 0$ be the value defined by

$$(9.1) \quad \left| \sum_{\substack{x \in [\pm N]_{\mathfrak{a}}^n \cap \Omega \\ x=a \text{ in } \mathfrak{a}/\mathfrak{q}\mathfrak{a}}} S(x\mathfrak{a}^{-1})G(x) \right| = \delta N^n.$$

We may assume $\delta > N^{-1/50}$ because otherwise the assertion is already true.

Our task is to show that then g is not totally

$$(9.2) \quad (\delta (\log N)^{\mathcal{O}_n(1)} \text{Lip}(F)^{-1} \text{comp}(G/\Gamma)^{-1})^{\exp((2 \dim G)^{\mathcal{O}_{s, n(1)})}} \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{q}\mathfrak{q}_{\text{Siegel}})^{-\mathcal{O}_{s, n(\dim G)}} \mathcal{O}_{s, \mathbb{K}}(1)^{-1}$$

-equidistributed, which implies that this quantity is less than ϵ .

The following *a priori* bound of δ will be useful.

Lemma 9.2 (δ is not too large). *In the situation of (9.1), we have $\delta \ll_{\mathbb{K}} (\log N)^{n+3}$.*

Proof. The left-hand side of (9.1) is bounded from above by

$$\sum_{\substack{x \in [\pm N]_{\mathfrak{a}}^n \cap \Omega \\ x=a \text{ in } \mathfrak{a}/\mathfrak{q}\mathfrak{a}}} |S(x\mathfrak{a}^{-1})| \ll_{\mathbb{K}} \log N \sum_{x \in [\pm N]^n} \tau(x\mathfrak{a}^{-1})^2,$$

where we used Proposition 8.4. For $x \in [\pm N]^n$, the ideal $\mathfrak{b} := x\mathfrak{a}^{-1}$ has norm $\ll_{\mathbb{K}} N^n$ by Proposition 3.4. For each given ideal \mathfrak{b} satisfying such a bound, there are at most $\ll_{\mathbb{K}} (\log N)^{n-1}$ values of $x \in [\pm N]^n$ associated with it by [20, Lemma 4.14]. Thus we can bound the previous sum as

$$\ll_{\mathbb{K}} (\log N)^n \sum_{\substack{\mathfrak{b} \\ \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{b}) \ll_{\mathbb{K}} N^n}} \tau(\mathfrak{b})^2 \ll_{\mathbb{K}} N^n (\log N)^{n+3},$$

where we used Lemma 8.1. \square

9.1. The case of a (twisted) type I sum. Write our (twisted) type I sum as

$$S(\mathfrak{a}') = 1[\mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{a}') \leq N'] \sum_{\mathfrak{b}|\mathfrak{a}', \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{b}) \leq N^{2n/3}} A(\mathfrak{b}) \psi_{\text{Siegel}}(\mathfrak{a}' \mathfrak{b}^{-1})$$

for some $N' \leq O_K(N^n)$. If we are in the type I case, ignore the ψ_{Siegel} factor and read $\mathfrak{q}_{\text{Siegel}} = (1)$. The definition of δ (9.1) now reads

$$(9.3) \quad \left| \sum_{\substack{x \in [\pm N]^n \cap \Omega \\ x=a \text{ in } \mathfrak{a}/\mathfrak{q}\mathfrak{a} \\ \mathbf{N}(x\mathfrak{a}^{-1}) \leq N'}} \sum_{\substack{\mathfrak{b}|x\mathfrak{a}^{-1} \\ \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{b}) \leq N^{2n/3}}} A(\mathfrak{b}) \psi_{\text{Siegel}}(x\mathfrak{a}^{-1}\mathfrak{b}^{-1}) G(x) \right| = \delta \frac{N^n}{\mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{q})}.$$

9.1.1. Eliminating the coefficient $A(\mathfrak{b})$ and the Siegel character ψ_{Siegel} . As the condition $\mathfrak{b} | x\mathfrak{a}^{-1}$ is equivalent to $x \in \mathfrak{a}\mathfrak{b}$, any sum of the form

$$\sum_{\substack{x \in [\pm N]^n \cap \Omega \\ x=a \text{ in } \mathfrak{a}/\mathfrak{q}\mathfrak{a} \\ \mathbf{N}(x\mathfrak{a}^{-1}) \leq N'}} \sum_{\substack{\mathfrak{b}|x\mathfrak{a}^{-1} \\ \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{b}) \leq N^{2n/3}}} \text{ equals } \sum_{\substack{\mathfrak{b} \\ \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{b}) \leq N^{2n/3}}} \sum_{\substack{x \in [\pm N]^n \cap \Omega \cap \mathfrak{a}\mathfrak{b} \\ x=a \text{ in } \mathfrak{a}/\mathfrak{q}\mathfrak{a} \\ \mathbf{N}(x\mathfrak{a}^{-1}) \leq N'}}.$$

We also know $|A(\mathfrak{b})| \leq \log N$ by the definition 8.3 of the notion of twisted type I sums. It follows that the left hand side of (9.3) is bounded from above by

$$\log N \sum_{\substack{\mathfrak{b} \\ \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{b}) \leq N^{2n/3}}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{\mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{b})}} \left| \sqrt{\mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{b})} \sum_{\substack{x \in [\pm N]^n \cap \Omega \cap \mathfrak{a}\mathfrak{b} \\ x=a \text{ in } \mathfrak{a}/\mathfrak{q}\mathfrak{a} \\ \mathbf{N}(x\mathfrak{a}^{-1}) \leq N'}} \psi_{\text{Siegel}}([x\mathfrak{a}^{-1}\mathfrak{b}^{-1}]) G(x) \right|.$$

We want to apply Cauchy–Schwarz to the sum $\sum_{\mathfrak{b}}$. By Lemma 8.1 we know $\sum_{\substack{\mathfrak{b} \text{ such that} \\ \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{b}) \leq N^{2n/3}}} \frac{1}{\mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{b})} \ll_K \log N$. It follows that the square of the previous value is bounded from above by

$$(\log N)^3 \sum_{\substack{\mathfrak{b} \\ \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{b}) \leq N^{2n/3}}} \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{b}) \left| \sum_{\substack{x \in [\pm N]^n \cap \Omega \cap \mathfrak{a}\mathfrak{b} \\ x=a \text{ in } \mathfrak{a}/\mathfrak{q}\mathfrak{a} \\ \mathbf{N}(x\mathfrak{a}^{-1}) \leq N'}} \psi_{\text{Siegel}}([x\mathfrak{a}^{-1}\mathfrak{b}^{-1}]) G(x) \right|^2.$$

Assumption (9.3) implies that this value is $\geq \delta^2 N^{2n} / \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{q})^2$.

By the dyadic decomposition $[1, 2] \cup [2, 4] \cup [4, 8] \cup \dots$ of the range $[1, N^{2n/3}]$ of $\mathbf{N}(\mathbf{b})$, which has $\ll_n \log N$ members, there is a $1 \leq D < N^{2n/3}$ such that

$$(9.4) \quad (\log N)^4 \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{b} \\ D \leq \mathbf{N}(\mathbf{b}) \leq 2D}} D \left| \sum_{\substack{x \in [\pm N]^n \cap \Omega \cap \mathbf{a}\mathbf{b} \\ x=a \text{ in } \mathbf{a}/\mathbf{q}\mathbf{a} \\ \mathbf{N}(x\mathbf{a}^{-1}) \leq N'}} \psi_{\text{Siegel}}([x\mathbf{a}^{-1}\mathbf{b}^{-1}])G(x) \right|^2 \gg_n \delta^2 N^{2n} / \mathbf{N}(\mathbf{q})^2.$$

We may increase $(\log N)^4$ to $(\log N)^{2(n+4)}$ because it only weakens the inequality. Then we rewrite (9.4) using the quantity

$$\delta' = \delta / (\log N)^{n+4}$$

which has been shown to be $< 1/2$ for $N > O_K(1)$ in Lemma 9.2:

$$(9.5) \quad \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{b} \\ D \leq \mathbf{N}(\mathbf{b}) \leq 2D}} D \left| \sum_{\substack{x \in [\pm N]^n \cap \Omega \cap \mathbf{a}\mathbf{b} \\ x=a \text{ in } \mathbf{a}/\mathbf{q}\mathbf{a} \\ \mathbf{N}(x\mathbf{a}^{-1}) \leq N'}} \psi_{\text{Siegel}}([x\mathbf{a}^{-1}\mathbf{b}^{-1}])G(x) \right|^2 \gg_n (\delta')^2 N^{2n} / \mathbf{N}(\mathbf{q})^2.$$

The number of \mathbf{b} 's with $D \leq \mathbf{N}(\mathbf{b}) \leq 2D$ is $\ll_K D$ and the inner sum $\left| \sum_{\substack{x \in [\pm N]^n \cap \Omega \cap \mathbf{a}\mathbf{b} \\ x=a \text{ in } \mathbf{a}/\mathbf{q}\mathbf{a} \\ \mathbf{N}(x\mathbf{a}^{-1}) \leq N'}} \right|^2$ is $\ll_n (N^n/D)^2$ for each \mathbf{b} . It follows that for $\gg_n (\delta')^2 D$ many \mathbf{b} 's with $D \leq \mathbf{N}(\mathbf{b}) \leq 2D$, we have the bound from below

$$(9.6) \quad \left| \sum_{\substack{x \in [\pm N]^n \cap \Omega \cap \mathbf{a}\mathbf{b} \\ x=a \text{ in } \mathbf{a}/\mathbf{q}\mathbf{a} \\ \mathbf{N}(x\mathbf{a}^{-1}) \leq N'}} \psi_{\text{Siegel}}([x\mathbf{a}^{-1}\mathbf{b}^{-1}])G(x) \right| \gg_K \delta' N^n / D.$$

If $(\delta')^2 D \ll_n 1$ then the existence of \mathbf{b} satisfying (9.6) does not automatically follow from the previous sentence. However, by a separate pigeonhole argument applied to (9.4) one can see that there is at least one such \mathbf{b} . Thus the arguments that follow are not vacuous in either case.

Let us use the symbol $[-, -]$ to mean the least common multiple (i.e., the intersection) of two non-zero ideals. By the property $\mathbf{a}\mathbf{b} \cap \mathbf{q}\mathbf{a} = [\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{b}]\mathbf{a}$, for each \mathbf{b} there is a (unique) residue class $a_{\mathbf{b}} \in \mathbf{a}\mathbf{b}/[\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{b}]\mathbf{a}$ such that the condition that $x \in \mathbf{a}\mathbf{b}$ and $x = a$ in $\mathbf{a}/\mathbf{q}\mathbf{a}$ is equivalent to $x = a_{\mathbf{b}}$ in $\mathbf{a}/[\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{b}]\mathbf{a}$.

Also, by dividing this residue class into mod $\mathbf{q}_{\text{Siegel}}[\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{b}]\mathbf{a}$ residue classes in order to make ψ_{Siegel} constant and applying the pigeonhole principle, there is a residue

class $a'_b \in \mathfrak{ab}/\mathfrak{q}_{\text{Siegel}}[\mathfrak{q}, \mathfrak{b}]\mathfrak{a}$ such that the following holds

$$(9.7) \quad \left| \sum_{\substack{x \in [\pm N]^n \cap \Omega \cap \mathfrak{ab} \\ x = a'_b \text{ in } \mathfrak{ab}/\mathfrak{q}_{\text{Siegel}}[\mathfrak{q}, \mathfrak{b}]\mathfrak{a} \\ \mathbf{N}(x\mathfrak{a}^{-1}) \leq N'}} G(x) \right| \gg_K \delta' N^n / \mathbf{DN}(\mathfrak{q}_{\text{Siegel}}).$$

Thus we have managed to simplify the summand compared with (9.3), but the index set of the sum in (9.7) is pretty messy. We will perform some maneuver to replace it by a cube $[0, L]^n$ with some L .

9.1.2. *Re-parametrization of x 's.* By Proposition 3.3, if we give norm-length compatible bases to \mathfrak{ab} , $[\mathfrak{q}, \mathfrak{b}]\mathfrak{a}$ and $\mathfrak{q}_{\text{Siegel}}[\mathfrak{q}, \mathfrak{b}]\mathfrak{a}$ then the inclusion maps

$$(9.8) \quad \mathfrak{q}_{\text{Siegel}}[\mathfrak{q}, \mathfrak{b}]\mathfrak{a} \hookrightarrow [\mathfrak{q}, \mathfrak{b}]\mathfrak{a} \hookrightarrow \mathfrak{ab} \hookrightarrow \mathfrak{a}$$

are represented by matrices with entries of absolute values

$$\begin{aligned} &\ll_K \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{q}_{\text{Siegel}})^{1/n}, \\ &\ll_K \mathbf{N}([\mathfrak{q}, \mathfrak{b}])^{1/n} \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{b})^{-1/n} \leq \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{q})^{1/n}, \\ &\ll_K D^{1/n} \end{aligned}$$

respectively.

We know the following inclusion relation by the norm-length compatibility of our bases (9.8):

$$[\pm N]_{\mathfrak{a}}^n \cap \Omega \cap \mathfrak{ab} \subset \left[\pm O_K(1) \frac{N}{D^{1/n}} \right]_{\mathfrak{ab}}^n.$$

Likewise, we have the following inclusion, if we choose a representative a'_b close enough to the origin

$$\begin{aligned} \left[\pm O_K(1) \frac{N}{D^{1/n}} \right]_{\mathfrak{ab}}^n \cap (a'_b + \mathfrak{q}_{\text{Siegel}}[\mathfrak{q}, \mathfrak{b}]\mathfrak{a}) \subset \\ a'_b + \left[\pm O_K(1) \frac{N}{\mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{q}_{\text{Siegel}}[\mathfrak{q}, \mathfrak{b}])^{1/n}} \right]_{\mathfrak{q}_{\text{Siegel}}[\mathfrak{q}, \mathfrak{b}]\mathfrak{a}}^n. \end{aligned}$$

Introduce the next shorthand symbol (whose value depends on \mathfrak{b})

$$N_1 := \frac{N}{\mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{q}_{\text{Siegel}}[\mathfrak{q}, \mathfrak{b}])^{1/n}}.$$

The sum in (9.7) now looks like

$$(9.9) \quad \sum_{\substack{x \in \Omega \cap [\pm O_K(1)N_1]_{\mathfrak{q}_{\text{Siegel}}[\mathfrak{q}, \mathfrak{b}]\mathfrak{a}}^n \\ \mathbf{N}(x\mathfrak{a}^{-1}) \leq N'}} G(x + a'_b).$$

Let $C_K > 1$ be a large enough positive number depending on K soon to be specified right after (9.10). Let us cover the cube $[\pm O_K(1)N_1]_{\mathfrak{q}_{\text{Siegel}}[\mathfrak{q}, \mathfrak{b}]\mathfrak{a}}^n$ by $\ll_K (\delta')^{-n} C_K^n$ disjoint translates of the cube $[0, \delta'N_1/C_K]_{\mathfrak{q}_{\text{Siegel}}[\mathfrak{q}, \mathfrak{b}]\mathfrak{a}}^n$. Here, since $\delta' = \delta/(\log N)^4$ is not too small (say $> N^{-1/40}$), the value $\delta'N_1/C_K$ is reasonably large (say $> N^{0.9}/C_K$). This allows us to treat this non-integer value as though it were

an integer within negligible error. By Proposition E.1 and the fact that G is 1-bounded, the contribution to (9.9) from those cubes intersecting the boundary of the region $\Omega \cap \{x \mid \mathbf{N}(x\mathbf{a}^{-1}) \leq N'\}$ is

$$(9.10) \quad \ll_K \frac{\delta'}{C_K} N_1^n = \frac{\delta'}{C_K} \cdot \frac{N^n}{\mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{q}_{\text{Siegel}})\mathbf{N}([\mathfrak{q}, \mathfrak{b}])} \ll_K \frac{\delta'}{C_K} \cdot \frac{N^n}{\mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{q}_{\text{Siegel}})D}$$

which is negligible compared with the right hand side of (9.7) if C_K is taken large enough to beat the \ll_K constants involved. Choose such an C_K and incorporate it in the symbol $O_K(1)$ henceforth.

By pigeonholing among the $O_K((\delta')^{-n})$ cubes, by replacing a'_b by another representative

$$(9.11) \quad a''_b \in [\pm O_K(1)N/D^{1/n}]_{\mathfrak{a}\mathfrak{b}},$$

we obtain

$$\left| \sum_{x \in [0, \delta'N_1/O_K(1)]_{\mathfrak{q}_{\text{Siegel}}[\mathfrak{q}, \mathfrak{b}]\mathfrak{a}}^n} G(x + a''_b) \right| \gg_K (\delta')^{n+1} N^n / \text{DN}(\mathfrak{q}_{\text{Siegel}}),$$

which in terms of average means

$$(9.12) \quad \left| \mathbb{E}_{x \in [0, \delta'N_1/O_K(1)]_{\mathfrak{q}_{\text{Siegel}}[\mathfrak{q}, \mathfrak{b}]\mathfrak{a}}^n} G(x + a''_b) \right| \gg_K \delta' \frac{\mathbf{N}([\mathfrak{q}, \mathfrak{b}])}{D} \gg_K \delta'.$$

Thus we have deduced a seemingly cleaner version of (9.7) as promised.

9.1.3. Using Leibman's theorem. Now we recall that $G(x) = F(g(x))$ is the composite of a polynomial map and a Lipschitz function. The previous inequality (9.12) shows that $g|_{\mathfrak{q}_{\text{Siegel}}[\mathfrak{q}, \mathfrak{b}]\mathfrak{a}}((-) + a''_b)$ is not $\delta' \text{Lip}(F)^{-1} \text{comp}(G/\Gamma)^{-1} O_K(1)^{-1}$ -equidistributed as a map $[0, \delta'N_1/O_K(1)]_{\mathfrak{q}_{\text{Siegel}}[\mathfrak{q}, \mathfrak{b}]\mathfrak{a}}^n \rightarrow G/\Gamma$. By Theorem A.4 there is a horizontal character $\eta_b: G \rightarrow \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}$ with

$$0 < |\eta_b| < ((\delta')^{-1} \text{Lip}(F) \text{comp}(G/\Gamma) O_K(1))^{\exp((2 \dim G)^{O_{s,n}(1)})}$$

such that

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| \eta_b \circ (g|_{\mathfrak{q}_{\text{Siegel}}[\mathfrak{q}, \mathfrak{b}]\mathfrak{a}}((-) + a''_b)) \right\|_{C^\infty[0, \delta'N_1/O_K(1)]_{\mathfrak{q}_{\text{Siegel}}[\mathfrak{q}, \mathfrak{b}]\mathfrak{a}}^n} \\ & \leq ((\delta')^{-1} \text{Lip}(F) \text{comp}(G/\Gamma) O_K(1))^{\exp((2 \dim G)^{O_{s,n}(1)})}. \end{aligned}$$

Proposition A.9 with parameters $N \rightsquigarrow \delta'N_1/O_K(1)$ and $q_0 \rightsquigarrow O_K((\delta')^{-1} \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{q}_{\text{Siegel}})^{1/n})$ can be applied to the affine-linear map

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{Z}^n & \cong \mathfrak{q}_{\text{Siegel}}[\mathfrak{q}, \mathfrak{b}]\mathfrak{a} \rightarrow \mathfrak{a}\mathfrak{b} \cong \mathbb{Z}^n \\ x & \mapsto x + a''_b \end{aligned}$$

by the norm-length compatible choice of the bases and (9.11). It follows that there is a $0 < q_b \ll_K \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{q}_{\text{Siegel}})^{O_{n,s}(1)}$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| q_b \eta_b \circ (g|_{\mathfrak{a}\mathfrak{b}}) \right\|_{C^\infty[0, \delta'N_1/O_K(1)]_{\mathfrak{a}\mathfrak{b}}} \\ & \ll_K \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{q}_{\text{Siegel}})^{O_{n,s}(1)} ((\delta')^{-1} \text{Lip}(F) \text{comp}(G/\Gamma) O_K(1))^{\exp((2 \dim G)^{O_{s,n}(1)})}. \end{aligned}$$

The horizontal character $q_{\mathfrak{b}}\eta_{\mathfrak{b}}$ has magnitude

$$0 < |q_{\mathfrak{b}}\eta_{\mathfrak{b}}| < \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{q}\mathfrak{q}_{\text{Siegel}})^{\mathcal{O}_{n,s}(1)}((\delta')^{-1} \text{Lip}(\mathbf{F}) \text{comp}(\mathbf{G}/\Gamma)\mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{K}}(1))^{\exp((2 \dim \mathbf{G})^{\mathcal{O}_{n,s}(1)})}.$$

There are

$$\begin{aligned} &< \left[2\mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{q}\mathfrak{q}_{\text{Siegel}})^{\mathcal{O}_{n,s}(1)}((\delta')^{-1} \text{Lip}(\mathbf{F}) \text{comp}(\mathbf{G}/\Gamma)\mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{K}}(1))^{\exp((2 \dim \mathbf{G})^{\mathcal{O}_{n,s}(1)})} \right]^{\dim \mathbf{G}} \\ &= \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{q}\mathfrak{q}_{\text{Siegel}})^{\mathcal{O}_{n,s}(\dim \mathbf{G})}((\delta')^{-1} \text{Lip}(\mathbf{F}) \text{comp}(\mathbf{G}/\Gamma)\mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{K}}(1))^{\exp((2 \dim \mathbf{G})^{\mathcal{O}_{n,s}(1)})} \end{aligned}$$

horizontal characters satisfying the same magnitude bound. By the pigeonhole principle, by choosing some

$$> \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{q}\mathfrak{q}_{\text{Siegel}})^{-\mathcal{O}_{n,s}(\dim \mathbf{G})}(\delta' \text{Lip}(\mathbf{F})^{-1} \text{comp}(\mathbf{G}/\Gamma)^{-1}\mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{K}}(1)^{-1})^{\exp((2 \dim \mathbf{G})^{\mathcal{O}_{n,s}(1)})} \mathbf{D}$$

values of \mathfrak{b} with $\mathbf{D} \leq \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{b}) \leq 2\mathbf{D}$, we may assume $q_{\mathfrak{b}}\eta_{\mathfrak{b}}$ is a common horizontal character η . (Even when the displayed quantity might be < 1 , by picking any random \mathfrak{b} , the arguments that follow are not vacuous.)

Also, by the finiteness of the class number, we may assume that these \mathfrak{b} 's belong to the same ideal class. To summarize, we have so far obtained the following conclusion:

Conclusion 9.3. *The s -step nilmanifold \mathbf{G}/Γ , polynomial map $g: \mathfrak{a} \rightarrow \mathbf{G} \rightarrow \mathbf{G}/\Gamma$ and the 1-bounded Lipschitz function $\mathbf{F}: \mathbf{G}/\Gamma \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ are as in Proposition 9.1. Also, $1 \leq \mathbf{D} < \mathbf{N}^{2n/3}$ is as in (9.4).*

For some

(9.13)

$$\delta_1 := \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{q}\mathfrak{q}_{\text{Siegel}})^{\mathcal{O}_{n,s}(\dim \mathbf{G})}(\delta' \text{Lip}(\mathbf{F})^{-1} \text{comp}(\mathbf{G}/\Gamma)^{-1}\mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{K}}(1)^{-1})^{\exp((2 \dim \mathbf{G})^{\mathcal{O}_{n,s}(1)})},$$

where $\delta' = \delta/(\log \mathbf{N})^{n+4}$, there is a horizontal character η satisfying

$$0 < |\eta| < \delta_1^{-1}$$

such that for $> \delta_1 \mathbf{D}$ ideals \mathfrak{b} with $\mathbf{D} \leq \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{b}) \leq 2\mathbf{D}$ in a common ideal class, we have

$$\|\eta \circ (g|_{\mathfrak{ab}})\|_{\mathbf{C}^\infty[0, \delta' \mathbf{N}_1 / \mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{K}}(1)]_{\mathfrak{ab}}} < \delta_1^{-1}.$$

Now we take advantage of the fact that the above bound is valid for many \mathfrak{b} 's by utilizing the theory of polynomial maps and nilsequences on the space of ideals.

In the case of \mathbb{Z} , this coming step was handled by the solution of a Waring-type problem within a few lines [11, p. 551], but for the general $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{K}}$ we need to implement a new perspective, which is the subject of the next paragraph.

9.1.4. *Utilizing the parametrization of ideals.* Let $\mathfrak{b}_0 \subset \mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{K}}$ be a chosen representative of the ideal class mentioned in Conclusion 9.3. Let $\mathcal{D} \subset (\mathbf{K} \otimes_{\mathbb{Q}} \mathbb{R})^\times$ be a chosen norm-length compatible fundamental domain for the quotient $(\mathbf{K} \otimes_{\mathbb{Q}} \mathbb{R})^\times / \mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{K}}^\times$. The ideals $\mathfrak{b} \subset \mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{K}}$ in the class $[\mathfrak{b}_0]$ is parametrized by the inverse fractional ideal \mathfrak{b}_0^{-1} via

$$(9.14) \quad \begin{aligned} \{\mathfrak{b} \subset \mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{K}} \mid [\mathfrak{b}] = [\mathfrak{b}_0] \text{ in } \text{Cl}(\mathbf{K})\} &\cong \mathfrak{b}_0^{-1} \cap \mathcal{D} \\ \mathfrak{b} &:= \mathfrak{b}_0 z \leftarrow z. \end{aligned}$$

Equip \mathfrak{ab}_0 with a norm-length compatible basis $\mathfrak{ab}_0 \cong \mathbb{Z}^n$ and assume that the norm-length compatible bases $\mathfrak{ab} \cong \mathbb{Z}^n$ that we have been using above were given by: let $z \in \mathfrak{b}_0^{-1} \cap \mathcal{D}$ be the element corresponding to \mathfrak{b} and

$$\mathbb{Z}^n \cong \mathfrak{ab}_0 \xrightarrow[\cong]{\times z} \mathfrak{ab}.$$

Let H be the following composite map

$$H: \mathfrak{ab}_0 \times \mathfrak{b}_0^{-1} \xrightarrow{(y,z) \mapsto yz} \mathfrak{a} \xrightarrow{g} G \xrightarrow{\eta} \mathbb{R}.$$

For the chosen bases $\mathfrak{ab}_0 \cong \mathbb{Z}^n$ and $\mathfrak{b}_0^{-1} \cong \mathbb{Z}^n$, write $y \in \mathfrak{ab}_0$ as $y = (y_1, \dots, y_n) \in \mathbb{Z}^n$ and $z \in \mathfrak{b}_0^{-1}$ as $z = (z_1, \dots, z_n) \in \mathbb{Z}^n$. For multi-indices $\underline{i} = (i_1, \dots, i_n) \in \mathbb{N}^n$, write $y^{\underline{i}} := \prod_{k=1}^n y_k^{i_k}$. The map H can be written as

$$H(y, z) = \sum_{\underline{i}, \underline{j} \in \mathbb{N}^n} h_{\underline{i}, \underline{j}} y^{\underline{i}} z^{\underline{j}}, \quad h_{\underline{i}, \underline{j}} \in \mathbb{R}.$$

Let $|\underline{i}| := i_1 + \dots + i_n$. Note that $h_{\underline{i}, \underline{j}} \neq 0$ only when $|\underline{i}| = |\underline{j}|$ because the map $(y, z) \mapsto yz$ is bilinear.

For each $z \in \mathfrak{b}_0^{-1}$, the map

$$\begin{aligned} H(-, z): \mathfrak{ab}_0 &\rightarrow \mathbb{R} \\ y &\mapsto H(y, z) \end{aligned}$$

is a polynomial map of degree $\leq s$. Its $\underline{i}^{\text{th}}$ coefficient is $\sum_{\substack{\underline{j} \in \mathbb{N}^n \\ |\underline{j}| = |\underline{i}|}} h_{\underline{i}, \underline{j}} z^{\underline{j}}$. Via the bijection (9.14), Conclusion 9.3 can be phrased as: for

$$(9.15) \quad > \delta_1 D \text{ values of } z \in [\pm \text{OK}(1)D^{1/n}]_{\mathfrak{b}_0^{-1}}^n,$$

the polynomial map $H(-, z)$ satisfies

$$\|H(-, z)\|_{C^\infty[0, \delta' N_1 / \text{OK}(1)]_{\mathfrak{ab}_0}^n} \ll_K \delta_1^{-1}.$$

By the definitions of $\|-\|_{C^\infty[0, N_1 / \text{OK}(1)]^n}$ and $N_1 := N/\mathbf{N}([\mathfrak{q}, \mathfrak{b}]\mathfrak{q}_{\text{Siegel}})^{1/n}$, this last inequality is equivalent to saying that for each multi-degree $\underline{i} \neq 0$, we have

$$(9.16) \quad \left\| \sum_{\substack{\underline{j} \in \mathbb{N}^n \\ |\underline{j}| = |\underline{i}|}} h_{\underline{i}, \underline{j}} z^{\underline{j}} \right\|_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}} \ll_{K,s} \delta_1^{-1} (\delta')^{-|\underline{i}|} \frac{\mathbf{N}([\mathfrak{q}, \mathfrak{b}])^{|\underline{i}|/n} \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{q}_{\text{Siegel}})^{|\underline{i}|/n}}{\mathbf{N}^{|\underline{i}|}}.$$

Let $H_{\underline{i}}$ be the polynomial map $z \mapsto \sum_{\substack{\underline{j} \in \mathbb{N}^n \\ |\underline{j}| = |\underline{i}|}} h_{\underline{i}, \underline{j}} z^{\underline{j}}$. Its $\underline{j}^{\text{th}}$ coefficient is $h_{\underline{i}, \underline{j}}$.

Since (9.16) holds for $> \delta_1 D$ values of z (9.15), Proposition A.8 gives an integer $0 < q_{\underline{i}} < \delta_1^{-O_{s,n}(1)}$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} \|q_{\underline{i}} H_{\underline{i}}\|_{C^\infty[\pm \text{OK}(1)D^{1/n}]_{\mathfrak{b}_0^{-1}}^n} &\ll_{K,s} \delta_1^{-O_{s,n}(1)} \cdot \delta_1^{-1} (\delta')^{-|\underline{i}|} \frac{\mathbf{N}([\mathfrak{q}, \mathfrak{b}])^{|\underline{i}|/n} \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{q}_{\text{Siegel}})^{|\underline{i}|/n}}{\mathbf{N}^{|\underline{i}|}} \\ &\ll_{K,s} \delta_1^{-O_{s,n}(1)} \frac{D^{|\underline{i}|/n} \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{q})^{O_{s,n}(1)} \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{q}_{\text{Siegel}})^{O_{s,n}(1)}}{\mathbf{N}^{|\underline{i}|}}. \end{aligned}$$

Since there are only $O_{s,n}(1)$ indices \underline{i} at play, by taking the least common multiple of $q_{\underline{i}}$'s and compromising the exponent $O_{s,n}(1)$ a little, we may assume they are a

common value, say q_H . Unfolding the definition of the norm $\|-\|_{C^\infty[\pm O_K(1)D^{1/n}]^n}$, we conclude

$$(9.17) \quad \left\| q_H h_{\underline{i}, \underline{j}} \right\|_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}} \ll_{K,s} \delta_1^{-O_{s,n}(1)} \frac{\mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{q}\mathfrak{q}_{\text{Siegel}})^{O_{s,n}(1)}}{N^{|\underline{i}|}} \quad \text{for all } \underline{j}, \underline{i} \neq 0$$

(recall that $h_{\underline{i}, \underline{j}} = 0$ unless $|\underline{i}| = |\underline{j}|$).

This gives some bounds on the coefficients of the map

$$q_H H: \mathfrak{ab}_0 \times \mathfrak{b}_0^{-1} \rightarrow \mathfrak{a} \xrightarrow{g} \mathbb{G} \xrightarrow{q_H \eta} \mathbb{R},$$

from which we can deduce the following.

Let us specialize to $1 \in \mathfrak{b}_0^{-1}$. This corresponds to considering the map $q_H \eta \circ (g|_{\mathfrak{ab}_0})$. Because 1 is represented by a vector with entries of sizes $O_K(1)$ with respect to the fixed norm-length compatible basis of \mathfrak{b}_0^{-1} , the bound (9.17) implies that the $\underline{i}^{\text{th}}$ coefficient of $q_H \eta \circ (g|_{\mathfrak{ab}_0})$ has $\|-\|_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}}$ norm $\ll_{s,K} \delta_1^{-O_{s,n}(1)} \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{q}\mathfrak{q}_{\text{Siegel}})^{O_{s,n}(1)} / N^{|\underline{i}|}$. By the definition of the C^∞ norm $\|-\|_{C^\infty[\pm N]_{\mathfrak{ab}_0}^n}$, we conclude

$$\|q_H \eta \circ (g|_{\mathfrak{ab}_0})\|_{C^\infty[\pm N]_{\mathfrak{ab}_0}^n} \ll_{s,K} \delta_1^{-O_{s,n}(1)} \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{q}\mathfrak{q}_{\text{Siegel}})^{O_{s,n}(1)}.$$

Since the inclusion map $\mathfrak{ab}_0 \hookrightarrow \mathfrak{a}$ is represented by a matrix of entries with size $O_K(1)$ under norm-length compatible bases, Proposition A.9 implies that up to enlarging q_H by a factor $O_K(1)^{O_{s,n}(1)}$ while maintaining a bound of the form

$$0 < q_H < \delta_1^{-O_{s,n}(1)}$$

(so that $|q_H \eta|$ also obeys the same form of bound), we have

$$(9.18) \quad \|q_H \eta \circ g\|_{C^\infty[\pm N]_{\mathfrak{a}}^n} \ll_{K,s} \delta_1^{-O_{s,n}(1)} \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{q}\mathfrak{q}_{\text{Siegel}})^{O_{s,n}(1)} =: (\delta_2)^{-1}.$$

Let $O_{s,n}(1) > 1$ be the constant from Proposition A.6 and consider the smaller cube $[\pm \frac{\delta_2}{O_{s,n}(1)} N]_{\mathfrak{a}}^n$. The C^∞ -norm on this cube is smaller than $\|-\|_{C^\infty[\pm N]_{\mathfrak{a}}^n}$ at least by the factor of $\frac{\delta_2}{O_{s,n}(1)}$ so that we obtain

$$\|q_H \eta \circ g\|_{C^\infty[\pm \frac{\delta_2}{O_{s,n}(1)} N]_{\mathfrak{a}}^n} < \frac{1}{O_{s,n}(1)}.$$

Proposition A.6 can be applied to this situation and implies that g is not $\frac{1}{21|q_H \eta|}$ -equidistributed on $[\pm \frac{\delta_2}{O_{s,n}(1)} N]_{\mathfrak{a}}^n$.

As $\delta_2/O_{s,n}(1) < 1/21|q_H \eta|$, we conclude that g is not totally $\delta_2/O_{s,n}(1)$ -equidistributed on $[\pm N]_{\mathfrak{a}}^n$. By recalling the definitions of δ_2 (9.18) and δ_1 (9.13), for an appropriate choice of $O_{s,n}(1)$, the map g is not

$$(\delta(\log N)^{-(n+4)} \text{Lip}(\mathbb{F})^{-1} \text{comp}(\mathbb{G}/\Gamma)^{-1})^{\exp((2 \dim \mathbb{G})^{O_{s,n}(1)})} \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{q}\mathfrak{q}_{\text{Siegel}})^{-O_{s,n}(1)} O_{s,K}(1)^{-1}$$

-equidistributed.

As was noted at (9.3), this settles the case of a (twisted) type I sum.

9.1.5. *Before moving on: recycling.* We shall reuse the procedure from (9.17) to the conclusion of the (twisted) type I case in the following form:

Lemma 9.4. *Let $0 < \epsilon < 1/O_{s,K}(1)$ be a positive number and Let H be the following composite*

$$H: \mathfrak{ab}_0 \times \mathfrak{b}_0^{-1} \rightarrow \mathfrak{a} \xrightarrow{g} G \xrightarrow{\eta} \mathbb{R}$$

where η is a nonzero horizontal character of magnitude $< \epsilon^{-1}$. Let $h_{\underline{i}, \underline{j}}$ be the coefficients of H with respect to some norm-length compatible bases of \mathfrak{ab}_0 and \mathfrak{b}_0 (note $h_{\underline{i}, \underline{j}} = 0$ unless $|\underline{i}| = |\underline{j}|$).

Suppose that we have:

$$\|h_{\underline{i}, \underline{j}}\|_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}} < \epsilon^{-1} \frac{1}{N^{|\underline{i}|}} \text{ for all } \underline{i}, \underline{j} \neq 0.$$

Then $\{g(x)\}_{x \in [\pm N]_{\mathfrak{a}}^n}$ is not totally $\epsilon/O_{s,K}(1)$ -equidistributed in G/Γ .

9.2. The case of type II sums. Recall that a type II sum has the form

$$S(\mathfrak{a}') = \sum_{\substack{\mathfrak{c}, \mathfrak{d} \\ \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{c}), \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{d}) > O_K(N^n)^{1/3} \\ \mathfrak{cd} = \mathfrak{a}'}} L(\mathfrak{c})T(\mathfrak{d}), \text{ where}$$

$$|L(\mathfrak{c})| \leq \log N,$$

$$|T(\mathfrak{d})| \leq \tau(\mathfrak{d}).$$

The definition of $\delta \geq 0$ (9.1) now reads

$$\left| \sum_{\substack{x \in [\pm N]_{\mathfrak{a}}^n \cap \Omega \\ x = a \text{ in } \mathfrak{a}/q\mathfrak{a}}} \sum_{\substack{\mathfrak{c}, \mathfrak{d} \\ \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{c}), \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{d}) \gg_K N^{n/3} \\ \mathfrak{cd} = x\mathfrak{a}^{-1}}} L(\mathfrak{c})T(\mathfrak{d})G(x) \right| = \delta N^n$$

where $G(x) := F(g(x))$.

First, by eliminating $\mathfrak{c} = x\mathfrak{a}^{-1}\mathfrak{d}^{-1}$ from the expression, the left hand side is the absolute value of

$$\sum_{\substack{x \in [\pm N]_{\mathfrak{a}}^n \cap \Omega \\ x = a \text{ in } \mathfrak{a}/q\mathfrak{a}}} \sum_{\substack{\mathfrak{d} \\ \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{d}) \gg_K N^{n/3} \\ x \in \mathfrak{a}\mathfrak{d} \\ \mathbf{N}(x) \gg_K N^{n/3} \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{a}\mathfrak{d})}} L(x\mathfrak{a}^{-1}\mathfrak{d}^{-1})T(\mathfrak{d})G(x).$$

One can move the sum in \mathfrak{d} ahead so that this quantity equals

$$\sum_{\substack{\mathfrak{d} \\ N^{n/3} \ll_K \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{d}) \ll_K N^{2n/3}}} \sum_{\substack{x \in [\pm N]_{\mathfrak{a}}^n \cap \Omega \cap \mathfrak{a}\mathfrak{d} \\ x = a \text{ in } \mathfrak{a}/q\mathfrak{a} \\ \mathbf{N}(x) \gg_K N^{n/3} \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{a}\mathfrak{d})}} L(x\mathfrak{a}^{-1}\mathfrak{d}^{-1})T(\mathfrak{d})G(x)$$

$$= \sum_{\substack{\mathfrak{d} \\ N^{n/3} \ll_K \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{d}) \ll_K N^{2n/3}}} \left[\frac{T(\mathfrak{d})}{\sqrt{\mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{d})}} \cdot \left(\sqrt{\mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{d})} \sum_{\substack{x \in [\pm N]_{\mathfrak{a}}^n \cap \Omega \cap \mathfrak{a}\mathfrak{d} \\ x = a \text{ in } \mathfrak{a}/q\mathfrak{a} \\ \mathbf{N}(x) \gg_K N^{n/3} \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{a}\mathfrak{d})}} L(x\mathfrak{a}^{-1}\mathfrak{d}^{-1})G(x) \right) \right].$$

By Cauchy–Schwarz for the sum $\sum_{\mathfrak{d}}$ we obtain the following, where \mathfrak{d} satisfies $N^{n/3} \ll_K \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{d}) \ll_K N^{2n/3}$ in both summation

$$\left(\sum_{\mathfrak{d}} \frac{T(\mathfrak{d})}{\sqrt{\mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{d})}} \right)^2 \cdot \left(\sum_{\mathfrak{d}} \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{d}) \left| \sum_{\substack{x \in [\pm N]_{\mathfrak{a}}^n \cap \Omega \cap \mathfrak{a}\mathfrak{d} \\ x=a \text{ in } \mathfrak{a}/\mathfrak{q}\mathfrak{a} \\ \mathbf{N}(x) \gg_K N^{n/3} \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{a}\mathfrak{d})}} L(x\mathfrak{a}^{-1}\mathfrak{d}^{-1})G(x) \right|^2 \right) \geq \delta^2 N^{2n}.$$

By the condition $|T(\mathfrak{d})| \leq \tau(\mathfrak{d})$ and Lemma 8.1 we know that the first factor of the left hand side is $\ll_K (\log N)^4$. Thus

$$(\log N)^4 \sum_{\substack{\mathfrak{d} \\ N^{n/3} \ll_K \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{d}) \ll_K N^{2n/3}}} \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{d}) \left| \sum_{\substack{x \in [\pm N]_{\mathfrak{a}}^n \cap \Omega \cap \mathfrak{a}\mathfrak{d} \\ x=a \text{ in } \mathfrak{a}/\mathfrak{q}\mathfrak{a} \\ \mathbf{N}(x) \gg_K N^{n/3} \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{a}\mathfrak{d})}} L(x\mathfrak{a}^{-1}\mathfrak{d}^{-1})G(x) \right|^2 \geq \delta^2 N^{2n}.$$

We perform the dyadic decomposition of the range of $\mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{d})$ to find a $N^{n/3} \ll_K D \ll_K N^{2n/3}$ (out of $\ll_K \log N$ possibilities) such that

$$(9.19) \quad (\log N)^5 \sum_{\substack{\mathfrak{d} \\ D \leq \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{d}) \leq 2D}} D \left| \sum_{\substack{x \in [\pm N]_{\mathfrak{a}}^n \cap \Omega \cap \mathfrak{a}\mathfrak{d} \\ x=a \text{ in } \mathfrak{a}/\mathfrak{q}\mathfrak{a} \\ \mathbf{N}(x) \gg_K N^{n/3} \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{a}\mathfrak{d})}} L(x\mathfrak{a}^{-1}\mathfrak{d}^{-1})G(x) \right|^2 \geq \delta^2 N^{2n}.$$

By the pigeonhole principle among the $h_K = \# \text{Cl}(K)$ ideal classes, by compromising this factor we may assume that the \mathfrak{d} 's are in a common ideal class, say that of \mathfrak{d}_0 . As in §9.1.4, the ideals in this class are parametrized by the space $\mathfrak{d}_0^{-1} \cap \mathcal{D}$.

When a \mathfrak{d} corresponds to $d \in \mathfrak{d}_0 \cap \mathcal{D}$, the bijection

$$\mathfrak{a}\mathfrak{d}_0 \xrightarrow[\cong]{\times d} \mathfrak{a}\mathfrak{d}$$

associates to every element $x \in \mathfrak{a}\mathfrak{d}$ an element $\alpha := xd^{-1} \in \mathfrak{a}\mathfrak{d}_0$. The range of summation \sum_x in (9.19) corresponds to the set of α 's satisfying:

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha &\in [\pm O_K(1)N/D^{1/n}]_{\mathfrak{a}\mathfrak{d}_0}^n \cap d^{-1}\Omega, \\ \alpha d &= a \text{ in } \mathfrak{a}/\mathfrak{q}\mathfrak{a}, \\ \mathbf{N}(\alpha) &\gg_K N^{n/3} \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{a}\mathfrak{d}_0). \end{aligned}$$

In this language, the inequality (9.19) looks as (also recall $G(x) = F(g(x))$):

$$(9.20) \quad (\log N)^5 \cdot \sum_{\substack{d \in \mathfrak{d}_0^{-1} \cap \mathcal{D} \\ D \leq \mathbf{N}(d\mathfrak{d}_0) \leq 2D}} D \left| \sum_{\substack{\alpha \in [\pm O_K(1)N/D^{1/n}]_{\mathfrak{a}\mathfrak{d}_0}^n \cap d^{-1}\Omega \\ \alpha d = a \text{ in } \mathfrak{a}/\mathfrak{q}\mathfrak{a} \\ \mathbf{N}(\alpha) \gg_K N^{n/3} \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{a}\mathfrak{d}_0)}} L(\alpha \mathfrak{a}^{-1} \mathfrak{d}_0^{-1}) F(g(\alpha d)) \right|^2 \\ \gg_K \delta^2 N^{2n}.$$

We reuse the symbol δ' to mean a quantity similar to but slightly different from (9.5):

$$(9.21) \quad \delta' := \frac{\delta}{(\log N)^{O_n(1)}} < \frac{1}{2},$$

where we will keep increasing $O_n(1) > n + 4$ so that it absorbs the $O_n(1)$ many $\log N$ factors and \gg_K constants that appear below. By the assumption $\delta > N^{-1/50}$, we also know that δ' is not too small, say $\delta' > N^{-1/40}$.

As we did in (9.10), we pack the cube $[\pm O_K(1)N/D^{1/n}]_{\mathfrak{a}\mathfrak{d}_0}^n$ by translates of $[\delta'N/D^{1/n}O_K(1)]_{\mathfrak{a}\mathfrak{d}_0}^n$ with a large enough $O_K(1)$ in the denominator (there are $O_K((\delta')^{-n})$ translates).

For each $d \in \mathfrak{d}_0^{-1} \cap \mathcal{D}$, the number of points in some translate meeting the boundary of the region defined by

$$\alpha \in d^{-1}\Omega \text{ and } \mathbf{N}(\alpha) \gg_K N^{n/3} \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{a}\mathfrak{d}_0)$$

is $\leq \delta'N^n/DO_K(1)$ by Proposition E.1. Call such α 's *negligible*. By the bound $|L(-)| \leq \log N$ and the bound of the number of negligible points, one sees that the contribution from the negligible points to the sum (9.20) is $(\delta')^2 N^{2n}/O_K(1)$, which is indeed negligible if $O_K(1)$ is chosen large enough. Therefore, by the pigeonhole principle applied to the non-negligible points for each d , we conclude that we can associate to each $d \in \mathfrak{d}_0^{-1} \cap \mathcal{D}$ either $I(d) = \emptyset$ or a translate $I(d) \subset [\pm O_K(1)N/D^{1/n}]_{\mathfrak{a}\mathfrak{d}_0}^n$ of $[\delta'N/D^{1/n}O_K(1)]_{\mathfrak{a}\mathfrak{d}_0}^n$ in a way that

$$\sum_{\substack{d \in [\pm O_K(1)D^{1/n}]_{\mathfrak{d}_0^{-1}}^n \cap \mathcal{D} \\ D \leq \mathbf{N}(d\mathfrak{d}_0) \leq 2D}} D \left| \sum_{\substack{\alpha \in I(d) \\ \alpha d = a \text{ in } \mathfrak{a}/\mathfrak{q}\mathfrak{a}}} L(\alpha \mathfrak{a}^{-1} \mathfrak{d}_0^{-1}) F(g(\alpha d)) \right|^2 \\ > \delta^{2n+2} N^{2n}.$$

By the Fourier-theoretic Proposition B.1, we find some $\xi: \mathfrak{a}\mathfrak{d}_0 \rightarrow \mathbb{Q}/\mathbb{Z}$ such that the following holds (now the cubes $I(d)$ have been removed)

$$(9.22) \quad \sum_{\substack{d \in [\pm O_K(1)D^{1/n}]_{\mathfrak{d}_0^{-1}}^n \cap \mathcal{D} \\ D \leq \mathbf{N}(d\mathfrak{d}_0) \leq 2D}} D \left| \sum_{\substack{\alpha \in [\pm O_K(1)N/D^{1/n}]_{\mathfrak{a}\mathfrak{d}_0}^n \\ \alpha d = a \text{ in } \mathfrak{a}/\mathfrak{q}\mathfrak{a}}} e^{2\pi i \xi(\alpha)} L(\alpha \mathfrak{a}^{-1} \mathfrak{d}_0^{-1}) F(g(\alpha d)) \right|^2 \\ > (\delta')^{2n+2} N^{2n}$$

Now we expand the $|\cdot|^2$ part as

$$(9.23) \quad \sum_{\alpha, \alpha' \in [\pm \mathcal{O}_K(1)N/D^{1/n}]_{\mathfrak{a}\mathfrak{d}_0}^n} B(\alpha, \alpha') F(g(\alpha d)) 1_{\alpha d = a \text{ in } \mathfrak{a}/\mathfrak{q}\mathfrak{a}} \overline{F}(g(\alpha' d)) 1_{\alpha' d = a \text{ in } \mathfrak{a}/\mathfrak{q}\mathfrak{a}},$$

where $B(\alpha, \alpha') := e^{2\pi i \xi(\alpha - \alpha')} L(\alpha \mathfrak{a}^{-1} \mathfrak{d}_0^{-1}) \overline{L}(\alpha' \mathfrak{a}^{-1} \mathfrak{d}_0^{-1})$ is a function of α 's not involving d and obeying the bound $|B(\alpha, \alpha')| \leq (\log N)^2$.

Now Proposition B.2 implies

$$\left| \sum_{\substack{d \in [\pm \mathcal{O}_K(1)D^{1/n}]_{\mathfrak{d}_0}^n \\ D \leq \mathbf{N}(d\mathfrak{d}_0) \leq 2D}} (9.23) \right| \ll_K (\log N)^2 \frac{N^n}{D} \left| \sum_{d, d'} \sum_{\alpha, \alpha'} F(g(\alpha d)) \overline{F}(g(\alpha' d)) \overline{F}(g(\alpha d')) F(g(\alpha' d')) \right. \\ \left. 1_{[\alpha d = \alpha' d = \alpha d' = \alpha' d' = a \text{ in } \mathfrak{a}/\mathfrak{q}\mathfrak{a}]} \right|^{1/2},$$

where d, d' are subject to the same condition as in the preceding line and α, α' are as in (9.23). Together with (9.22), this implies

$$\sum_{d, d'} \sum_{\alpha, \alpha'} F(g(\alpha d)) \overline{F}(g(\alpha' d)) \overline{F}(g(\alpha d')) F(g(\alpha' d')) \cdot 1_{[\alpha d = \alpha' d = \alpha d' = \alpha' d' = a \text{ in } \mathfrak{a}/\mathfrak{q}\mathfrak{a}]} > (\delta')^{4n+4} N^{2n}.$$

We interpret this left-hand side as

$$\sum_{d, d'} \left| \sum_{\alpha} F(g(\alpha d)) \overline{F}(g(\alpha d')) 1_{[\alpha d = \alpha d' = a \text{ in } \mathfrak{a}/\mathfrak{q}\mathfrak{a}]} \right|^2.$$

(Note that the roles of α and d has switched somehow in the sense that in (9.23) we had the index α doubled, but now we have d doubled.)

Since there are at most $\mathcal{O}_K(1)D^2$ pairs of (d, d') and $\mathcal{O}_K(1)N^n/D$ values of α 's, one concludes that there are

$$\gg_K (\delta')^{4n+4} D^2 \quad \text{pairs } (d, d')$$

in the domain of summation such that

$$(9.24) \quad \left| \sum_{\substack{\alpha \in [\pm \mathcal{O}_K(1)N/D^{1/n}]_{\mathfrak{a}\mathfrak{d}_0}^n \\ \alpha d = \alpha d' = a \text{ in } \mathfrak{a}/\mathfrak{q}\mathfrak{a}}} F(g(\alpha d)) \overline{F}(g(\alpha d')) \right| > (\delta')^{2n+2} N^n / D.$$

9.2.1. *Analysis of individual pairs (d, d') .* Let (d, d') be one of such pairs that satisfy (9.24). By the pigeonhole principle on the finite set $\mathfrak{a}\mathfrak{d}_0/\mathfrak{q}\mathfrak{a}\mathfrak{d}_0$ of order $\mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{q})$, there is a residue class $a_{d, d'} \in \mathfrak{a}\mathfrak{b}_0/\mathfrak{q}\mathfrak{a}\mathfrak{b}_0$ such that for $\alpha \equiv a_{d, d'}$ in $\mathfrak{a}\mathfrak{b}_0/\mathfrak{q}\mathfrak{a}\mathfrak{b}_0$ the condition

$\alpha d = \alpha d' = a$ in $\mathfrak{a}/\mathfrak{q}\mathfrak{a}$ is automatic and

$$(9.25) \quad \left| \sum_{\substack{\alpha \in [\pm O_K(1)N/D^{1/n}]_{\mathfrak{a}\mathfrak{d}_0}^n \\ \alpha = a_{d,d'} \text{ in } \mathfrak{a}\mathfrak{d}_0/\mathfrak{q}\mathfrak{a}\mathfrak{d}_0}} F(g(\alpha d)) \overline{F}(g(\alpha d')) \right| > (\delta')^{2n+2} N^n / (\text{DN}(\mathfrak{q})).$$

We want to delete the congruence condition from the sight. Choose a representative $a_{d,d'} \in [\pm O_K(1)N/D^{1/n}]_{\mathfrak{a}\mathfrak{d}_0}^n$ and consider the map

$$(9.26) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathfrak{q}\mathfrak{a}\mathfrak{d}_0 &\hookrightarrow \mathfrak{a}\mathfrak{d}_0 \\ \alpha &\mapsto \alpha + a_{d,d'}. \end{aligned}$$

By the norm-length compatible choice of the basis of $\mathfrak{q}\mathfrak{a}\mathfrak{d}_0$, the inverse image of $[\pm O_K(1)N/D^{1/n}]_{\mathfrak{a}\mathfrak{d}_0}^n$ is contained in an $[\pm O_K(1)N/(\text{DN}(\mathfrak{q}))^{1/n}]_{\mathfrak{q}\mathfrak{a}\mathfrak{d}_0}^n$. Partition this latter cube into translates of the small cube

$$\left[\pm (\delta')^{2n+2} \frac{N}{(\text{DN}(\mathfrak{q}))^{1/n} O_K(1)} \right]_{\mathfrak{q}\mathfrak{a}\mathfrak{d}_0}^n.$$

There are $O_K((\delta')^{2n+2})^{-n}$ relevant translates.

The contribution to (9.25) of those small cubes whose image along the map (9.26) is not contained in $[\pm O_K(1)N/(\text{DN}(\mathfrak{q}))^{1/n}]_{\mathfrak{a}\mathfrak{d}_0}^n$ is $\ll_K (\delta')^{2n+2} N^n / (\text{DN}(\mathfrak{q}) O_K(1))$. This contribution is negligible if we choose the $O_K(1)$ in the denominator small enough. Then by the pigeonhole principle among the non-negligible translates, there is another representative $a'_{d,d'} \in [\pm O_K(1)N/D^{1/n}]_{\mathfrak{a}\mathfrak{d}_0}^n$ of $a_{d,d'}$ such that

$$\left| \sum_{\alpha \in \left[\pm (\delta')^{2n+2} \frac{N}{(\text{DN}(\mathfrak{q}))^{1/n} O_K(1)} \right]_{\mathfrak{q}\mathfrak{a}\mathfrak{d}_0}^n} F(g((\alpha + a'_{d,d'})d)) \overline{F}(g((\alpha + a'_{d,d'})d')) \right| > (\delta')^{2n^2+4n+2} \frac{N^n}{\text{DN}(\mathfrak{q})}.$$

In terms of average, this says (with the same range for α)

$$\left| \mathbb{E}_{\alpha} F(g((\alpha + a'_{d,d'})d)) \overline{F}(g((\alpha + a'_{d,d'})d')) \right| > (\delta')^{2n+2}.$$

If we consider the next sequence of polynomial maps and a Lipschitz function

$$\mathfrak{q}\mathfrak{a}\mathfrak{d}_0 \xrightarrow{\alpha \mapsto \alpha + a_{d,d'}} \mathfrak{a}\mathfrak{d}_0 \xrightarrow{g((-)d), g((-)d')} G \times G \rightarrow (G/\Gamma) \times (G/\Gamma) \xrightarrow{F(-) \cdot \overline{F}(-)} \mathbb{C},$$

the previous inequality shows that the polynomial map $\mathfrak{q}\mathfrak{a}\mathfrak{d}_0 \rightarrow G \times G$ is not

$$(9.27) \quad \delta_3 := (\delta')^{2n+2} \text{Lip}(F)^{-1}$$

-equidistributed on $[\pm (\delta')^{2n+2} N / (\text{DN}(\mathfrak{q}))^{1/n} O_K(1)]_{\mathfrak{q}\mathfrak{a}\mathfrak{d}_0}^n$. By Theorem A.4 there is a non-zero horizontal character (necessarily the sum of horizontal characters $G \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$)

$$\eta_{d,d'} = \eta_{d,d'}^1 + \eta_{d,d'}^2 : G \times G \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, \quad |\eta_{d,d'}| \leq ((\delta_3)^{-1} \text{comp}(G/\Gamma))^{\exp((2 \dim G) O_{s,n}(1))}$$

such that

$$(9.28) \quad \left\| \eta_{d,d'}^1(g((-) + a'_{d,d'}d)) + \eta_{d,d'}^2(g((-) + a'_{d,d'}d')) \right\|_{C^\infty \left[\pm (\delta')^{2n+2} \frac{N/O_K(1)}{(\mathbf{DN}(\mathfrak{q}))^{1/n}} \right]_{\mathfrak{q}\mathfrak{a}\mathfrak{d}_0}^n} \leq ((\delta_3)^{-1} \text{comp}(G/\Gamma))^{\exp((2 \dim G)^{O_{s,n}(1)})}.$$

Let us pause a little to simplify the expression of (9.28). By the definition of the norm $\|-\|_{C^\infty[-]^n}$, changing the size of the cube in $C^\infty[-]^n$ by a factor X can change the norm at most by the factor X^s . So we may remove the factor $(\delta')^{2n+2}$ from $C^\infty[-]^n$ by enlarging the $O_{s,n}(1)$ exponent in the right-hand side. The same goes for the $O_K(1)$ in the denominator (recall once again the remark after (9.21)). Removing $\mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{q})^{1/n}$ from the denominator has the effect of multiplying the right-hand side by $\mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{q})^{s/n}$.

Proposition A.9 with $q_0 = O_K(\mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{q})^{1/n})$ applied to the map (9.26) and the bound (9.28) gives a positive integer $q_{d,d'} \ll_K \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{q})^{O_{s,n}(1)}$ satisfying

$$(9.29) \quad \left\| q_{d,d'} \eta_{d,d'}^1(g((-)d)) + q_{d,d'} \eta_{d,d'}^2(g((-)d')) \right\|_{C^\infty \left[\pm \frac{N}{D^{1/n}} \right]_{\mathfrak{a}\mathfrak{d}_0}^n} \leq ((\delta_3)^{-1} \text{comp}(G/\Gamma))^{\exp((2 \dim G)^{O_{s,n}(1)})} \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{q})^{O_{s,n}(1)}.$$

9.2.2. *The conspiracy of (d, d') 's.* Now we have to use the fact that (9.29) is true for *many* pairs (d, d') . For more consistent notation let us write henceforth

$$(d^1, d^2) \text{ instead of } (d, d').$$

(We didn't do so before because it would have created messy formulas.)

The horizontal characters $q_{d,d'} \eta_{d,d'}$ in (9.29) have magnitudes

$$\leq ((\delta_3)^{-1} \text{comp}(G/\Gamma))^{\exp((2 \dim G)^{O_{s,n}(1)})} \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{q})^{O_{s,n}(1)}.$$

There are $\leq ((\delta_3)^{-1} \text{comp}(G/\Gamma))^{\exp((2 \dim G)^{O_{s,n}(1)})} \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{q})^{O_{s,n}(\dim G)}$ horizontal characters having such magnitude. By the pigeonhole principle, up to reducing the number of $(d, d') = (d^1, d^2)$'s by this factor, we assume that $q_{d,d'} \eta_{d,d'}$ in (9.29) is common for all $(d, d') = (d^1, d^2)$ under consideration.

We conclude that there is a horizontal character

$$\eta = \eta^1 + \eta^2 : G \times G \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$$

of magnitude $\leq ((\delta_3)^{-1} \text{comp}(G/\Gamma))^{\exp((2 \dim G)^{O_{s,n}(1)})} \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{q})^{O_{s,n}(1)}$ such that for

$$\gg_K (\delta_3 \text{comp}(G/\Gamma)^{-1})^{\exp((2 \dim G)^{O_{s,n}(1)})} \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{q})^{-O_{s,n}(\dim G)} D^2 \quad \text{pairs } (d^1, d^2)$$

we have the following inequality

$$(9.30) \quad \left\| \eta^1(g((-)d^1)) + \eta^2(g((-)d^2)) \right\|_{C^\infty \left[\pm \frac{N}{D^{1/n}} \right]_{\mathfrak{a}\mathfrak{d}_0}^n} \leq ((\delta_3)^{-1} \text{comp}(G/\Gamma))^{\exp((2 \dim G)^{O_{s,n}(1)})} \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{q})^{O_{s,n}(1)}.$$

Now, at least either η^1 or η^2 is non-zero. By symmetry, let us assume

$$\eta^1 \neq 0.$$

Because the number of possible d^2 's is $O_K(D)$, there is at least one d^2 such that for $\gg_K ((\delta_3)^{-1} \text{comp}(G/\Gamma))^{\exp((2 \dim G)^{O_{s,n}(1)})} \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{q})^{O_{s,n}(\dim G)} D$ values of d^1 , the pair (d^1, d^2) satisfies (9.30). Fix such a d^2 .

Let H^k ($k = 1, 2$) be the polynomial map

$$\mathfrak{a}\mathfrak{d}_0 \times \mathfrak{d}_0^{-1} \xrightarrow{(\alpha, d) \mapsto \alpha d} \mathfrak{a} \xrightarrow{g} \mathbf{G} \xrightarrow{\eta^k} \mathbb{R}.$$

If we write $\alpha = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n)$ and $d = (d_1, \dots, d_n)$ with respect to some norm-length compatible bases $\mathfrak{a}\mathfrak{d}_0 \cong \mathbb{Z}^n$, $\mathfrak{d}_0^{-1} \cong \mathbb{Z}^n$, we can write this map as follows, introducing the coefficients $h_{\underline{i}, \underline{j}}^k$

$$H^k(\alpha, d) = \sum_{\underline{i}, \underline{j}} h_{\underline{i}, \underline{j}}^k \alpha^{\underline{i}} d^{\underline{j}}, \quad h_{\underline{i}, \underline{j}}^k \in \mathbb{R} \text{ zero unless } |\underline{i}| = |\underline{j}|.$$

For each (d^1, d^2) , the map $\alpha \mapsto \eta^1(g(\alpha d^1)) + \eta^2(g(\alpha d^2))$ is a polynomial map $\mathfrak{a}\mathfrak{d}_0 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ whose $\underline{i}^{\text{th}}$ coefficient is

$$\sum_{\substack{\underline{j} \\ |\underline{j}| = |\underline{i}|}} h_{\underline{i}, \underline{j}}^1 \cdot (d^1)^{\underline{j}} + h_{\underline{i}, \underline{j}}^2 \cdot (d^2)^{\underline{j}}.$$

By the definition of $\|\cdot\|_{C^\infty[\pm N/D^{1/n}]^n}$, the relation (9.30) says that for all $\underline{i} \neq 0$,

$$(9.31) \quad \left\| \sum_{\substack{\underline{j} \\ |\underline{j}| = |\underline{i}|}} h_{\underline{i}, \underline{j}}^1 \cdot (d^1)^{\underline{j}} + h_{\underline{i}, \underline{j}}^2 \cdot (d^2)^{\underline{j}} \right\|_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}} \leq ((\delta_3)^{-1} \text{comp}(\mathbf{G}/\Gamma))^{\exp((2 \dim \mathbf{G})^{O_{s,n}(1)})} \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{q})^{O_{s,n}(1)} \frac{D^{|\underline{i}|/n}}{N^{|\underline{i}|}}.$$

For each fixed d^2 and \underline{i} , the map $d^1 \mapsto \sum_{\substack{\underline{j} \\ |\underline{j}| = |\underline{i}|}} h_{\underline{i}, \underline{j}}^1 (d^1)^{\underline{j}} + h_{\underline{i}, \underline{j}}^2 (d^2)^{\underline{j}}$ is a polynomial map $\mathfrak{d}_0^{-1} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ of homogeneous degree $|\underline{i}|$ plus a constant term. Proposition A.8 applied to the situation that (9.31) holds for

$$\gg_K (\delta_3 \text{comp}(\mathbf{G}/\Gamma)^{-1})^{\exp((2 \dim \mathbf{G})^{O_{s,n}(1)})} \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{q})^{O_{s,n}(\dim \mathbf{G})} D$$

values of d^1 implies that there is a positive integer

$$q = O(((\delta_3)^{-1} \text{comp}(\mathbf{G}/\Gamma))^{\exp((2 \dim \mathbf{G})^{O_{s,n}(1)})} \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{q})^{O_{s,n}(\dim \mathbf{G})})$$

such that

$$\left\| d^1 \mapsto q \sum_{\substack{\underline{j} \\ |\underline{j}| = |\underline{i}|}} h_{\underline{i}, \underline{j}}^1 (d^1)^{\underline{j}} + h_{\underline{i}, \underline{j}}^2 (d^2)^{\underline{j}} \right\|_{C^\infty[\pm O_K(1)D]_{\mathfrak{d}_0^{-1}}^n} < ((\delta_3)^{-1} \text{comp}(\mathbf{G}/\Gamma))^{\exp((2 \dim \mathbf{G})^{O_{s,n}(1)})} \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{q})^{O_{s,n}(1)} \frac{D^{|\underline{i}|/n}}{N^{|\underline{i}|}},$$

in concrete terms (by letting $O_K(1)$ absorb in δ_3)

$$\left\| q h_{\underline{i}, \underline{j}}^1 \right\|_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}} < \delta_3^{-\exp((2 \dim \mathbf{G})^{O_{s,n}(1)})} \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{q})^{O_{s,n}(\dim \mathbf{G})} / N^{|\underline{i}|}.$$

This is the same situation as in (9.17) and so we can use Lemma 9.4 to the coefficients $qh_{i,j}^1$. It implies that $\{g(x)\}_{x \in [\pm N]_{\mathfrak{a}}^n}$ is not totally $\delta_3^{-\exp((2 \dim G)^{O_{s,n}(1)})} \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{q})^{-O_{s,n}(\dim G)}$ -equidistributed in G/Γ . By recalling the definition of δ_3 (9.27) and δ' (9.21), we conclude that g is not

$$\delta(\log N)^{-O_n(1)} \text{Lip}(\mathbf{F})^{-1} \text{comp}(G/\Gamma)^{-\exp((2 \dim G)^{O_{s,n}(1)})} \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{q})^{-O_{s,n}(\dim G)}$$

-equidistributed. As was noted in (9.2), this completes the proof of the type II case, thereby proving the whole Proposition 9.1.

10. THE ORTHOGONALITY THEOREM

Now we are ready to state and prove Theorem 10.1 below.

Theorem 10.1. *Let $0 < \epsilon < 1/10$ be any positive number and $0 < c_{s,n} \ll_{s,n} 1$ be the small enough positive number.*

For every nilsequence $\mathfrak{a} \xrightarrow{g} G \rightarrow G/\Gamma \xrightarrow{\mathbf{F}} \mathbb{C}$ satisfying:

- G/Γ is an s -step filtered nilmanifold of dimension $\leq (\log \log N)^{O_{s,n}(c_{s,n})}$, complexity $\leq \exp((\log N)^{(1/2)-\epsilon})$,
- $\mathbf{F}: G/\Gamma \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ a 1-bounded function with Lipschitz constant $\leq \exp((\log N)^{(1/2)-\epsilon})$,

and the data:

- a convex open subset $C \subset \mathbb{R}^n$,
- an ideal $\mathfrak{q} \subset \mathcal{O}_K$ of norm $\leq \exp((\log N)^{(1/2)-\epsilon})$ and a residue class $a \in (\mathfrak{a}/\mathfrak{q}\mathfrak{a})^\times$,

we have

$$\left| \sum_{\substack{x \in [\pm N]^n \cap \Omega \\ x=a \text{ in } \mathfrak{a}/\mathfrak{q}\mathfrak{a}}} (\Lambda_K^{\mathfrak{a}} - \Lambda_{\text{Siegel}, \mathbb{Q}}^{\mathfrak{a}})(x) \cdot \mathbf{F}(g(x)) \right| \leq N^n \left(\exp((\log N)^{(1/2)-\epsilon}) \right)^{-1}$$

for all $N > 1$ large enough depending on K, ϵ, s .

This section is devoted to the proof of Theorem 10.1. Of course, when g is sufficiently equidistributed, the problem has been essentially settled by Proposition 9.1. So what remains is the fun part where we use the equidistribution theory of polynomial maps to reduce the problem to Proposition 9.1.

First, we apply the Factorization Theorem A.7 with parameters $m = (\log \log N)^{O_{s,n}(c_{s,n})}$ (where $O_{s,n}(1)$ is the constant from the dimension bound in Theorem A.7 and $c_{s,n} > 0$ is the exponent in the assertion of Theorem 11.1), $M_0 = \exp((\log N)^{(1/2)-\epsilon})$ and $A = \exp((\log \log N)^{1/2})$. We obtain a value M satisfying

$$M_0 = \exp((\log N)^{(1/2)-\epsilon}) \leq M \leq M_0^{A^{(2+m)^{O_{s,n}(1)}}},$$

an M -rational closed connected subgroup $G' \subset G$ (which we equip with an M -rational Mel'cev basis for $\Gamma \cap G'$ obtained as M -rational linear combinations of that of G) and a decomposition

$$(10.1) \quad g = \varepsilon g' \gamma$$

into the pointwise product of polynomial maps $\varepsilon, g', \gamma: \mathfrak{a} \rightarrow G$ such that

- ε is $(M, [\pm N]^n)$ -smooth;

- g' takes values in G' and $\{g'(x) \bmod \Gamma \cap G'\}_{x \in [\pm N]^n}$ is totally $1/M^A$ -equidistributed;
- γ is M -rational and has period $M'\mathfrak{a}$ with $0 < M' \leq M$.

Let us note in passing that when $c_{s,n} > 0$ is small enough depending on K, s and N is large enough depending on ϵ , then we have $M \leq \exp((\log N)^{(1/2)-\epsilon/2})$. This is because $(2+m)^{O_{s,n}}$ is again a $(\log \log N)^{O_{s,n}(c_{s,n})}$, which is $\leq (\log \log N)^{1/3}$ if $c_{s,n}$ is small enough. So $A^{(2+m)^{O_{s,n}}} \leq \exp((\log \log N)^{1/2} \cdot (\log \log N)^{1/3}) = \exp((\log \log N)^{5/6})$, and this is way smaller than $(\log N)^{\epsilon/2}$ (take log of both and compare) if N is sufficiently large depending on ϵ . This implies that $M_0^{A^{(2+m)^{O_{s,n}}}} \leq \exp((\log N)^{(1/2)-\epsilon} \cdot (\log N)^{\epsilon/2}) = \exp((\log N)^{(1/2)-\epsilon/2})$.

We want to use the factorization (10.1) to reduce the problem to the case where the polynomial sequence is equidistributed. Let us first dispose of the smooth part ε .

Let $Y > 0$ be a moderately large real number (which we will take as a power of M). Split $[\pm N]_{\mathbb{R}}^n \cap \Omega$ into Y^n smaller convex bodies Ω_i ($i \in I$) of diameter $\leq 3N/Y$ (in the $\|\cdot\|_{l^\infty}$ metric). Choose any $x_i \in [\pm N]^n \cap \Omega_i$ for each $i \in I$. The $(M, [\pm N]^n)$ -smoothness of ε in particular says that it has Lipschitz constant $\leq nM/N$. Thus for any other $x \in [\pm N]^n \cap \Omega_i$ we have

$$d_G(\varepsilon(x), \varepsilon(x_i)) \leq \frac{nM}{N} \cdot \frac{3N}{Y} = \frac{3nM}{Y}.$$

By the right-invariance of d_G , we also have

$$d_G(\varepsilon(x)g'(x)\gamma(x), \varepsilon(x_i)g'(x)\gamma(x)) = d_G(\varepsilon(x), \varepsilon(x_i)) \leq \frac{3nM}{Y}.$$

It follows that

$$|F(\varepsilon(x)g'(x)\gamma(x)) - F(\varepsilon(x_i)g'(x)\gamma(x))| \leq \text{Lip}(F) \frac{3nM}{Y} \leq \exp((\log N)^{(1/2)-\epsilon}) \frac{3nM}{Y} \leq \frac{3nM^2}{Y}.$$

Write $\varepsilon_i := \varepsilon(x_i)$. We conclude

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \sum_{\substack{x \in [\pm N]^n \cap \Omega \\ x=a \text{ in } \mathfrak{a}/q\mathfrak{a}}} (\Lambda_K^{\mathfrak{a}} - \Lambda_{\text{Siegel}, \mathbb{Q}}^{\mathfrak{a}})(x) F(g(x)) \right| \leq \sum_{i \in I} \left| \sum_{\substack{x \in [\pm N]^n \cap \Omega_i \\ x=a \text{ in } \mathfrak{a}/q\mathfrak{a}}} (\Lambda_K^{\mathfrak{a}} - \Lambda_{\text{Siegel}, \mathbb{Q}}^{\mathfrak{a}})(x) F(\varepsilon(x)g'(x)\gamma(x)) \right| \\ & \leq \sum_{i \in I} \left(\left| \sum_{\substack{x \in [\pm N]^n \cap \Omega_i \\ x=a \text{ in } \mathfrak{a}/q\mathfrak{a}}} (\Lambda_K^{\mathfrak{a}} - \Lambda_{\text{Siegel}, \mathbb{Q}}^{\mathfrak{a}})(x) F(\varepsilon_i g'(x)\gamma(x)) \right| + O_K(\#[\pm N]^n \cap \Omega_i) \cdot (\log N) \cdot \frac{3nM^2}{Y} \right) \\ & \leq \left(\sum_{i \in I} \left| \sum_{\substack{x \in [\pm N]^n \cap \Omega_i \\ x=a \text{ in } \mathfrak{a}/q\mathfrak{a}}} (\Lambda_K^{\mathfrak{a}} - \Lambda_{\text{Siegel}, \mathbb{Q}}^{\mathfrak{a}})(x) F(\varepsilon_i g'(x)\gamma(x)) \right| \right) + O_K(N^n \cdot (\log N) \cdot \frac{3nM^2}{Y}). \end{aligned}$$

If we set $Y := M^4$, the latter $O_K(-)$ -term decays at a rate $\leq N^n/M^2 \leq N^n \exp(-2(\log N)^{(1/2)-\epsilon})$. So it suffices to show that for each $i \in I$ we have

$$\left| \sum_{\substack{x \in [\pm N]^n \cap \Omega_i \\ x=a \text{ in } \mathfrak{a}/\mathfrak{q}\mathfrak{a}}} (\Lambda_K^{\mathfrak{a}} - \Lambda_{\text{Siegel}, \mathbb{Q}}^{\mathfrak{a}})(x) F(\varepsilon_i g'(x) \gamma(x)) \right| \leq \frac{1}{2} N^n \exp(-(\log N)^{(1/2)-\epsilon}) M^{-4n}.$$

It suffices to bound the left-hand side by an even smaller value like N^n/M^{4n+1} .

By the $(M, [\pm N]^n)$ -smoothness of ε , we know that $\varepsilon_i \in G$ has distance $\leq \text{poly}_m(M)$ from the origin. Hence the left-multiplication by ε_i as a map $G/\Gamma \rightarrow G/\Gamma$ has Lipschitz constant $\leq \text{poly}_m(M)$ by [12, Lemmas A.5 and A.16]. Therefore $F(\varepsilon_i(-)): G/\Gamma \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ has Lipschitz constant $\leq \text{Lip}(F) \cdot \text{poly}_m(M) \leq M \cdot \text{poly}_m(M)$. We are reduced to proving the following claim (set $C > 1$ in the claim to be large enough so it exceeds all the absolute constants $O(1)$ in $\text{poly}_m(M)$ that have appeared so far. Then declare that $0 < c_{s,n} < 1$ had been chosen small enough that such a choice is allowed).

Claim 10.2 (orthogonality, smooth part removed). *The following variant of Theorem 10.1 holds, where $C > 1$ is a given positive number and we assume $0 < c_{s,n} < 1$ had been chosen so that $c_{s,n}C$ does not exceed a certain constant depending s, n (specified in (10.3)).*

The bound $\exp((\log N)^{(1/2)-\epsilon})$ on the Lipschitz constant is replaced with $M^{\exp(m^C)}$. The polynomial sequence g has the form $g(x) = g'(x)\gamma(x)$ where g', γ are as in (10.1). The conclusion is that if N is large enough depending in addition on the constant C , then

$$(10.2) \quad \left| \sum_{\substack{x \in [\pm N]^n \cap \Omega \\ x=a \text{ in } \mathfrak{a}/\mathfrak{q}\mathfrak{a}}} (\Lambda_K^{\mathfrak{a}} - \Lambda_{\text{Siegel}, \mathbb{Q}}^{\mathfrak{a}})(x) F(g'(x)\gamma(x)) \right| \leq N^n/M^{4n+1}.$$

Next we want to reduce the proof of Claim 10.2 to the case where we have no periodic factor γ . Since γ has period $M'\mathfrak{a}$ with $0 < M' \leq M$, we split the sum in (10.2) into the sum of $\leq M^n$ residue classes $\tilde{a} \in \mathfrak{a}/M'\mathfrak{q}\mathfrak{a}$ over a . Then γ becomes constant on each of these residue classes. It suffices to show that each of these sums has size $\leq N^n/M^{5n+1}$.

If we let $\{\gamma(x)\} \in G$ be the fractional part of $\gamma(x)$ (meaning that its Mel'cev coordinates are in $[0, 1)^m$), then we know $F(g(x)\gamma(x)) = F(g(x)\{\gamma(x)\})$ because F is a function on G/Γ , and $\{\gamma(x)\}$ is a $\text{poly}_m(M)$ -rational point of G whose distance from the origin is $\leq \text{poly}_m(M)$. This reduces the problem to showing (let the new C be the largest of C and $O(1)$'s in the newly appeared $\text{poly}_m(M)$):

Claim 10.3 (orthogonality, γ now constant). *The following variant of Theorem 10.1 holds, where $C > 1$ is a given positive number and we assume that $c_{s,n}$ had been chosen small enough that $c_{s,n}C$ does not exceed a certain constant depending s, n (specified in (10.3)).*

The bounds $\exp((\log N)^{(1/2)-\epsilon})$ on the Lipschitz constant and the norm $\mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{q})$ is extended to $M^{\exp(m^C)}$. The polynomial sequence g has the form $g(x) = g'(x)\gamma$ where g' is as in (10.1) and $\gamma \in G$ is a $M^{\exp(m^C)}$ -rational point whose distance from the

unit element is $\leq M^{\exp(m^C)}$. The conclusion is that if N is large enough depending in addition on C , then

$$\left| \sum_{\substack{x \in [\pm N]^n \cap \Omega \\ x=a \text{ in } \mathfrak{a}/\mathfrak{q}\mathfrak{a}}} (\Lambda_K^{\mathfrak{a}} - \Lambda_{\text{Siegel}, \mathbb{Q}}^{\mathfrak{a}})(x) F(g'(x)\gamma) \right| \leq N^n / M^{5n+1}.$$

To eliminate γ completely, we view the function $x \mapsto F(g'(x)\gamma)$ as the following composition

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathfrak{a} \cong \mathbb{Z}^n & \xrightarrow{x \mapsto \gamma^{-1}g'(x)\gamma} & G'_\gamma := \gamma^{-1}G'\gamma \xrightarrow{F(\gamma \cdot (-))} \mathbb{C} \\ & & \downarrow \quad \nearrow \\ & & G'_\gamma / \Gamma \cap G'_\gamma \end{array}$$

Apply Proposition A.11 with parameters

$$\begin{aligned} M &\rightsquigarrow M^{\exp(m^C)}, \\ \delta &\rightsquigarrow 1/M^A. \end{aligned}$$

we conclude that $\{\gamma^{-1}g'(x)\gamma\}_{x \in [\pm N]^n}$ is totally $1/M^{(A/\exp(m^{O_{s,n}(1)})) - \exp(m^C + m^{O(1)})}$ -equidistributed in $G'_\gamma / \Gamma \cap G'_\gamma$ with respect to a poly $_m(M)$ -rational Mel'cev basis there.

We also know that $F(\gamma \cdot (-))$ has Lipschitz constant $\leq M^{\exp(m^C + m^{O(1)})}$ because γ has distance $\leq M^{\exp(m^C)}$ from the origin. Note that G'_γ has a $M^{\exp(m^C + m^{O(1)})}$ -rational Mel'cev basis by [12, Lemmas A.10 and A.13].

To formulate the final intermediate claim, rename $(G'_\gamma, \gamma^{-1}g'\gamma, F(\gamma \cdot (-)))$ as (G, g, F) . By setting the new C to be the largest of the old C and $O(1)$'s that appeared now (added by 1 for the absolute safety), we are reduced to the following equidistributed case.

Claim 10.4 (orthogonality, γ removed thus equidistributed). *The following variant of Theorem 10.1 holds, where $C > 1$ is a given positive number and we assume $c_{s,n}$ had been chosen small enough that $c_{s,n}C$ does not exceed a certain constant which depends on s, n (specified in (10.3)).*

The bounds $\exp((\log N)^{(1/2) - \epsilon})$ on the complexity, Lipschitz constant and the norm $\mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{q})$ is extended to $M^{\exp(m^C)}$. The polynomial sequence g is assumed to be totally $1/M^{(A/\exp(m^{O_{s,n}(1)}) - \exp(m^C))}$ equidistributed in G/Γ . The conclusion is that if N is large enough depending in addition on C , then

$$\left| \sum_{\substack{x \in [\pm N]^n \cap \Omega \\ x=a \text{ in } \mathfrak{a}/\mathfrak{q}\mathfrak{a}}} (\Lambda_K^{\mathfrak{a}} - \Lambda_{\text{Siegel}, \mathbb{Q}}^{\mathfrak{a}})(x) F(g(x)) \right| \leq N^n / M^{5n+1}.$$

When F is a constant function, by Mitsui's Prime Number Theorem (Proposition 6.4) the claim holds. Therefore by subtracting the average from F (and possibly dividing by 2 to keep it 1-bounded), we may furthermore assume

$$F \text{ has average } 0.$$

Now let us simplify the exponent $\frac{A}{\exp(m^{O_{s,n}(1)})} - \exp(m^C)$. By the definitions $A = \exp((\log \log N)^{1/2})$ and $m = (\log \log N)^{O_{s,n}(c_{s,n})}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{A}{\exp(m^{O_{s,n}(1)})} - \exp(m^C) \\ &= \exp\left((\log \log N)^{1/2} - (\log \log N)^{O_{s,n}(c_{s,n})}\right) - \exp\left((\log \log N)^{O_{s,n}(c_{s,n}C)}\right). \end{aligned}$$

We declare that the assumptions on $c_{s,n}, C$ had been such that the above quantities (and a few analogous ones shortly below) satisfy

$$(10.3) \quad \begin{aligned} O_{s,n}(c_{s,n}) &< 1/10, \\ O_{s,n}(c_{s,n}C) &< 1/10 \quad \text{say,} \end{aligned}$$

so that we conclude g is at least totally $1/M^{\exp((\log \log N)^{1/3})}$ -equidistributed.

Now we want to apply Proposition 9.1, but as the factor $\mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{q}_{\text{Siegel}})$ has an adverse effect for our purpose, we need separate treatments depending on whether $\mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{q}_{\text{Siegel}})$ is small or large.

First, assume $\mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{q}_{\text{Siegel}}) \leq M^{\exp(m^{C+2})}$. Proposition 9.1 together with Proposition 8.5 implies that

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \sum_{\substack{x \in [\pm N]^n \cap \Omega \\ x=a \text{ in } \mathfrak{a}/\mathfrak{q}\mathfrak{a}}} (\Lambda_{\mathbf{K}}^{\mathfrak{a}} - \Lambda_{\text{Siegel}, \mathbf{Q}}^{\mathfrak{a}})(x) F(g(x)) \right| \\ & \ll_{s, \mathbf{K}} N^n \cdot (\log N)^{O_n(1)} \text{Lip}(F) \text{comp}(G/\Gamma) \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{q}) \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{q}_{\text{Siegel}}) \cdot M^{-\frac{\exp(\log \log N)^{1/3}}{\exp(m^{O_{s,n}(c_{s,n})})}} \\ & \leq N^n M^{3 \exp(m^C)} \cdot M^{\exp(m^{C+2})} \cdot M^{-\exp((\log \log N)^{1/3}) - m} \\ & \leq N^n M^{-\exp((\log \log N)^{1/4})}, \end{aligned}$$

if N is large enough depending on s, \mathbf{K}, C . This is by far a better bound than we want.

Next let us assume $\mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{q}_{\text{Siegel}}) > M^{m^{C+2}}$. Then Corollary 7.3 implies

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \sum_{\substack{x \in [\pm N]^n \cap \Omega \\ x=a \text{ in } \mathfrak{a}/\mathfrak{q}\mathfrak{a}}} (\Lambda_{\text{Siegel}, \mathbf{Q}}^{\mathfrak{a}} - \Lambda_{\text{Cramér}, \mathbf{Q}}^{\mathfrak{a}})(x) F(g(x)) \right| \\ & \ll_{s, \mathbf{K}} N^n \text{Lip}(F)^{m^{O_{s,n}(1)}} \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{q}) \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{q}_{\text{Siegel}})^{-1/O_{s, \mathbf{K}}(m^{O_{s,n}(1)})} \\ & \leq N^n M^{\exp(m^C) \cdot m^{O_{s,n}(1)}} M^{\exp(m^C)} M^{-\frac{\exp(m^{C+2})}{O_{s, \mathbf{K}}(m^{O_{s,n}(1)})}} \\ & \leq N^n M^{-\exp(m^{C+1})} \\ & \leq N^n M^{-10n}, \end{aligned}$$

if N is large enough depending on s, \mathbf{K}, C . Thus by the triangle inequality, the problem reduces to showing that the sum

subject to a similar bound. But this follows from Proposition 9.1 and Proposition

8.5 again, because now we can ignore the $\mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{q}_{\text{Siegel}})$ factors in these propositions as $\Lambda_{\text{Siegel}, \mathbb{Q}}^{\mathfrak{a}}$ is not involved.⁵

This completes the proof of Claim 10.4, hence of Theorem 10.1.

11. THE VON MANGOLDT FUNCTION AND ITS MODELS ARE CLOSE

We are finally ready to prove one of our main goals:

Theorem 11.1. *For every non-zero fractional ideal \mathfrak{a} equipped with a norm-length compatible basis, integer $N \gg_{K,s} 1$ and convex subset $\Omega \subset [\pm N]_{\mathfrak{a} \otimes \mathbb{R}}^n$, we have*

$$\|(\Lambda_K^{\mathfrak{a}} - \Lambda_{\text{Cramér}, \mathbb{Q}}^{\mathfrak{a}}) \cdot 1_{\Omega}\|_{U^{s+1}[\pm N]_{\mathfrak{a}}^n} \ll_{K,s} (\log \log N)^{-c_{n,s}}$$

for some $0 < c_{s,n} \ll_{s,n} 1/100$.

Recall that we have established a much better bound on the Gowers distance between $\Lambda_{\text{Siegel}, \mathbb{Q}}^{\mathfrak{a}}$ and $\Lambda_{\text{Cramér}, \mathbb{Q}}^{\mathfrak{a}}$ in Proposition 7.2. So the remaining problem is to bound the distance between $\Lambda_K^{\mathfrak{a}}$ and $\Lambda_{\text{Siegel}, \mathbb{Q}}^{\mathfrak{a}}$.

Having proven Orthogonality Theorem 10.1, one might think that Gowers Inverse Theorem A.1 immediately implies some bound on $\|(\Lambda_K^{\mathfrak{a}} - \Lambda_{\text{Siegel}, \mathbb{Q}}^{\mathfrak{a}}) \cdot 1_{\Omega}\|_{U^{s+1}[\pm N]_{\mathfrak{a}}^n}$. This is not quite true because we do not have a pseudorandom majorant to $\Lambda_K^{\mathfrak{a}} - \Lambda_{\text{Siegel}, \mathbb{Q}}^{\mathfrak{a}}$ required by Gowers Inverse Theorem. That is why we have to make a detour along the so-called *W-trick*.⁶

The *W-trick* consists in choosing a mildly large integer $W > 1$ and restricting functions to each mod W class. To be more precise, we choose $a \in [0, W-1]_{\mathfrak{a}}^n$, and for a given function $f: \mathfrak{a} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ we consider the function $\frac{\varphi_K(W)}{W^n} f(W(-) + a)$. The next lemma guarantees that for functions of our interest, Gowers norm bounds on the *W-tricked* functions give Gowers norm bounds on the original ones.

Recall that an element $x \in \mathfrak{a}$ of a fractional ideal is said to be *coprime to W* if one has $W\mathfrak{a} + x\mathcal{O}_K = \mathfrak{a}$.

Lemma 11.2. *Let $1 \leq W < N/10$ be an integer and let $\mathfrak{a} \cong \mathbb{Z}^n$ be a fractional ideal equipped with a norm-length compatible basis. Suppose we are given a function $f: [\pm N]_{\mathfrak{a}}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ supported on the set $\{x \in [\pm N]_{\mathfrak{a}}^n \mid x \text{ is coprime to } W\}$.*

If we have a bound

$$\left\| \frac{\varphi_K(W)}{W^n} f(W(-) + b) \right\|_{U^{s+1}(\mathfrak{a} \cap (([\pm N]_{\mathfrak{a}}^n - b)/W))} < A$$

for some $A > 0$ uniformly for all $b \in [0, W-1]_{\mathfrak{a}}^n$ coprime to W , then we have

$$\|f\|_{U^{s+1}[\pm N]_{\mathfrak{a}}^n} \ll_{K,s} A.$$

Proof. As in [30, Corollary 4.2], one is reduced to showing the following, where $(\mathfrak{a}/W\mathfrak{a})^{\times}$ is the set of residue classes which can be a single generator of $\mathfrak{a}/W\mathfrak{a}$ as an \mathcal{O}_K -module:

$$\|1_{(\mathfrak{a}/W\mathfrak{a})^{\times}}\|_{U^{s+1}(\mathfrak{a}/W\mathfrak{a})} \ll_{K,s} \frac{\varphi_K(W)}{W^n}.$$

⁵The reader might have wondered why we did not compare $\Lambda_K^{\mathfrak{a}}$ and $\Lambda_{\text{Cramér}, \mathbb{Q}}^{\mathfrak{a}}$ directly, then. Remember that this argument worked because we are already reduced to the case of F having average 0, and for this reduction we needed Mitsui's Prime Number Theorem with Siegel zeros considered.

⁶The term “*W-trick*” seems to have been first used in [9, p. 484]. The letter W is the name they gave to a parameter rather casually, which therefore has no actual meaning (see also [8, §6]).

By the \mathcal{O}_K -linear isomorphism $\mathfrak{a}/W\mathfrak{a} \cong \mathcal{O}_K/(W)$ and Chinese Remainder Theorem, one is reduced to showing

$$(11.1) \quad \left\| 1_{\mathbb{F}(\mathfrak{p})^\times} \right\|_{U^{s+1}(\mathbb{F}(\mathfrak{p}))} \leq \frac{\varphi_K(\mathfrak{p})}{\mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{p})} (1 + \epsilon_s(\mathfrak{p}))$$

for some function $\mathfrak{p} \mapsto \epsilon_s(\mathfrak{p}) > 0$ such that the product $\prod_{\mathfrak{p}} (1 + \epsilon_s(\mathfrak{p}))$ converges absolutely. Here $\mathbb{F}(\mathfrak{p}) := \mathcal{O}_K/\mathfrak{p}$ is the residue field of \mathfrak{p} .

By the definition of the U^{s+1} -norm and $\mathbb{F}(\mathfrak{p})$ -linear algebra as in *loc. cit.* (subtraction of 2^{s+1} hyperplanes from an $\mathbb{F}(\mathfrak{p})$ -vector space), we have

$$\left\| 1_{\mathbb{F}(\mathfrak{p})^\times} \right\|_{U^{s+1}(\mathbb{F}(\mathfrak{p}))}^{2^{s+1}} = 1 - \frac{2^{s+1}}{\mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{p})} + O_s \left(\frac{1}{\mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{p})^2} \right),$$

which implies

$$\left\| 1_{\mathbb{F}(\mathfrak{p})^\times} \right\|_{U^{s+1}(\mathbb{F}(\mathfrak{p}))} = 1 - \frac{1}{\mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{p})} + O_s \left(\frac{1}{\mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{p})^2} \right) = \frac{\varphi_K(\mathfrak{p})}{\mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{p})} (1 + O_s \left(\frac{1}{\mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{p})^2} \right)).$$

This confirms (11.1) and completes the proof. \square

Now consider

$$w := (\log \log N)^{1/3}.$$

with $\eta > 0$ small enough. Set $W := P(w) = \prod_{0 < p < w} p$. A motivation for this choice of w is that it should be fast enough that the decay rate $1/w^{1/2^{s+1}}$ assured by Proposition 11.3 beats (11.4), which is a small power of $(\log \log N)^{-1}$. Also, W should not have a growth faster than the pseudopolynomial rate (11.2).

Proposition 11.3. *Assume $N > 1$ is large enough depending on s, K . Let $a \in [0, W - 1]^n \subset \mathfrak{a}$ be coprime to W . On $\mathfrak{a} \cap \frac{[\pm N]^n - a}{W}$ except for $< N^{n-0.8}$ points, the function*

$$\frac{\varphi_K(W)}{W^n} ((\Lambda_K^{\mathfrak{a}} - \Lambda_{\text{Siegel}, Q}^{\mathfrak{a}}) \cdot 1_{\Omega})(W(-) + a)$$

is pointwise bounded in magnitude by $O_{K,s}(\nu)$, where ν is a function satisfying

$$\left\| 1 - \nu \right\|_{U^{2(s+1)}(\mathfrak{a} \cap \frac{[\pm N]^n - a}{W})} \ll_{s,K} 1/w^{1/2^{s+1}} = (\log \log N)^{-1/3 \cdot 2^{s+1}}.$$

Write $\tilde{\Lambda}_K^{\mathfrak{a}}$ and $\tilde{\Lambda}_{\text{Siegel}, Q}^{\mathfrak{a}}$ for the modified version of $\Lambda_K^{\mathfrak{a}}$ and $\Lambda_{\text{Siegel}, Q}^{\mathfrak{a}}$ where the value is set to 0 at those $< N^{n-0.8}$ points at which the values are not bounded by the $O_{K,s}(\nu)$.

Proof. There exist such majorants for $\Lambda_{\text{Siegel}, Q}^{\mathfrak{a}}$ by the fact $|\Lambda_{\text{Siegel}, Q}^{\mathfrak{a}}(-)| \leq 2|\Lambda_{\text{Cramér}, Q}^{\mathfrak{a}}(-)|$ and Corollary 5.4, and for $\Lambda_K^{\mathfrak{a}}$ by Proposition C.2 and Corollary C.4.

By the triangle inequality for the Gowers norm, the average of these two majorants does the job. \square

Prime Number Theorem implies

$$(11.2) \quad W = \prod_{p < w} p \ll e^{2w} = \exp(2(\log \log N)^{1/3})$$

and its growth is slower than any pseudopolynomial quantity (of course, actually it is slower than $\log N$). Hence errors of the form $\exp(-(\log N)^{\frac{1}{2}-\epsilon})$ from Theorem 10.1 can absorb bounded powers of W by slightly enlarging the value of ϵ .

Proof of Theorem 11.1. Let $G \twoheadrightarrow G/\Gamma \xrightarrow{F} \mathbb{C}$ be as in Theorem 10.1 and $g: \mathfrak{a} \rightarrow G$ be a polynomial map. By [12, Lemma 6.7] and the fact that G is uniquely divisible (being a successive extension of uniquely divisible groups), there is a unique polynomial map $g': \mathfrak{a} \rightarrow G$ satisfying $g'(W(-) + a) = g(-)$. We apply Theorem 10.1 to $\mathfrak{a} \xrightarrow{g'} G \twoheadrightarrow G/\Gamma \xrightarrow{F} \mathbb{C}$ and $\mathfrak{q} = W\mathcal{O}_K$ with various $a \in \mathfrak{a}$ coprime to W in \mathfrak{a} . This implies

$$(11.3) \quad \left| \sum_{x \in \mathfrak{a} \cap ((\Omega - a)/W)} \frac{\varphi_K(W)}{W^n} (\Lambda_K^{\mathfrak{a}} - \Lambda_{\text{Siegel}, \mathbb{Q}}^{\mathfrak{a}})(Wx + a) \cdot F(g(x)) \right| \leq \left(\frac{N}{W} \right)^n \exp(-(\log N)^{\frac{1}{2} - \epsilon}).$$

Replacing $\Lambda_K^{\mathfrak{a}}$ and $\Lambda_{\text{Siegel}, \mathbb{Q}}^{\mathfrak{a}}$ with $\tilde{\Lambda}_K^{\mathfrak{a}}$ and $\tilde{\Lambda}_{\text{Siegel}, \mathbb{Q}}^{\mathfrak{a}}$ from Proposition 11.3 does not affect the validity of (11.3).

This shows that Manners' Gowers Inverse Theorem A.1 with $\delta = (\log \log N)^{-c_{n,s}}$ is applicable to the W -tricked $(\tilde{\Lambda}_K^{\mathfrak{a}} - \tilde{\Lambda}_{\text{Siegel}, \mathbb{Q}}^{\mathfrak{a}}) \cdot 1_{\Omega}$, where $0 < c_{n,s} < 1$ is as in Theorem 10.1. The requirement of pseudorandom majorant in Theorem A.1 says $\|1 - \nu\|_{U^{2(s+1)}}$ should decay at a pace

$$(11.4) \quad (\log \log N)^{-O_{s,n}(c_{s,n})},$$

which is milder than $(\log \log N)^{-1/10 \cdot 2^{s+1}}$, say, by assuming $0 < c_{s,n} \ll_{s,n} 1$ is small enough to beat the $O_{s,n}(1)$. By Proposition 11.3 we know this is achieved. We conclude

$$(11.5) \quad \left\| \frac{\varphi_K(W)}{W^n} ((\tilde{\Lambda}_K^{\mathfrak{a}} - \tilde{\Lambda}_{\text{Siegel}, \mathbb{Q}}^{\mathfrak{a}}) \cdot 1_{\Omega})(Wx + a) \right\|_{U^{s+1}(\mathfrak{a} \cap \frac{[\pm N]^{n-a}}{W})} \leq (\log \log N)^{-c_{s,n}}.$$

Replacing $\tilde{\Lambda}_K^{\mathfrak{a}}$, $\tilde{\Lambda}_{\text{Siegel}, \mathbb{Q}}^{\mathfrak{a}}$ back to $\Lambda_K^{\mathfrak{a}}$, $\Lambda_{\text{Siegel}, \mathbb{Q}}^{\mathfrak{a}}$ only changes the left hand side by $\pm N^{-c}$ (with some $0 < c < 1$) and so does not affect the validity of (11.5). Lemma 11.2 implies that we have a similar bound for the original functions:

$$\left\| (\Lambda_K^{\mathfrak{a}} - \Lambda_{\text{Siegel}, \mathbb{Q}}^{\mathfrak{a}}) \cdot 1_{\Omega} \right\|_{U^{s+1}[\pm N]_{\mathfrak{a}}^n} \ll_{K,s} (\log \log N)^{-c_{s,n}}.$$

Since we have a much better bound for $(\Lambda_{\text{Siegel}, \mathbb{Q}}^{\mathfrak{a}} - \Lambda_{\text{Cramér}, \mathbb{Q}}^{\mathfrak{a}}) \cdot 1_{\Omega}$ by Proposition 7.2, this completes the proof of Theorem 11.1. \square

Let us isolate a bound from above as an independent statement because we are using it later.

Corollary 11.4 (of the proof of Theorem 11.1). *Let $w = (\log \log N)^{1/3}$ and $W = P(w) = \prod_{p < w} p$. For $N \gg_{s,K} 1$, we have*

$$\left\| \frac{\varphi_K(W)}{W^n} ((\Lambda_K^{\mathfrak{a}} - \Lambda_{\text{Siegel}, \mathbb{Q}}^{\mathfrak{a}}) \cdot 1_{\Omega})(W(-) + a) \right\|_{U^{s+1}(\mathfrak{a} \cap \frac{[\pm N]^{n-a}}{W})} \leq (\log \log N)^{-c_{s,n}}.$$

Proof. This is (11.5). \square

12. SIMULTANEOUS PRIME VALUES OF AFFINE-LINEAR FORMS

Our second main result is Theorem 12.1, which generalizes the Green–Tao–Ziegler theorem [15, Main Theorem (p. 1763)] [11, Theorem 1.1] [14, Theorem 1.3] on simultaneous prime values of affine-linear forms $\mathbb{Z}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ of finite complexity to the case where the target is the ring of integers \mathcal{O}_K of a general number field K . In fact, for aesthetic and practical reasons it is better to allow the target to be also a non-zero fractional ideal.

Recall that for an affine linear map $\psi: \mathbb{Z}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}^n$ written as $\psi(x_1, \dots, x_d) = c_0 + \sum_{i=1}^d c_i x_i$ and a positive number $N > 1$, we define

$$\|\psi\|_N := \max(c_0 N, \max_{1 \leq i \leq d} |c_i|).$$

Theorem 12.1. *Let $\mathfrak{a} \cong \mathbb{Z}^n$ be a non-zero fractional ideal of a number field K equipped with a norm-length compatible basis. Let $t, d \geq 1$ be integer parameters. Let $N > 1$ be an integer large enough depending on t, K .*

Let $\psi_1, \dots, \psi_t: \mathbb{Z}^d \rightarrow \mathfrak{a}$ be affine-linear maps of finite cokernels satisfying

- $\psi_i|_{\ker(\psi_j)}$ has finite cokernel for all $i \neq j$ (which implies that ψ_1, \dots, ψ_t have finite complexity $\leq s \leq t$ (Definition F.1));
- $\|\psi_i\|_N \leq (\log \log N)^{\frac{1}{10^3 d^2 c_{s,n}}}$.

Let $\Omega \subset [\pm N]^d$ be a convex set. There is some $0 < c_{s,n,d} \ll_{s,n,d} 1$ such that

$$(12.1) \quad \sum_{x \in \Omega \cap \mathbb{Z}^d} \left(\prod_{i=1}^t \Lambda_K^{\mathfrak{a}}(\psi_i(x)) \right) = \frac{\text{Vol}(\Omega)}{\text{res}(\zeta_K(s))^t} \cdot \prod_p \beta_p(\psi_1, \dots, \psi_t) + O_{t,d,K}(N^d (\log \log N)^{-c_{s,n,d}}),$$

where the quantities $\beta_p(\psi_1, \dots, \psi_t)$ are defined by

$$\beta_p(\psi_1, \dots, \psi_t) := \left(\frac{p^n}{\varphi_K(p)} \right)^t \mathbb{E}_{x \in (\mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z})^d} 1[\psi_i(x) \neq 0 \text{ in } \mathfrak{a}/p\mathfrak{a} \text{ for all } i \text{ and } p \mid p].$$

Proof. Set once again

$$w = (\log \log N)^{1/3}$$

and write $W = P(w) := \prod_{p < w} p \leq e^{2w} = \exp(2(\log \log N)^{1/3})$. What is important about this choice is that W is slow enough ($<$ some power of $\log N$) to make (12.4) true and fast enough so $1/w$ has a decay of type $(\log \log N)^{-c}$ (12.5). Also, having the same w as in §11 helps keep the proof of Lemma 12.2 slightly simple.

For each $\underline{a} \in [0, W-1]^d \subset \mathbb{Z}^d$, consider the substitution

$$x = Wy + \underline{a},$$

$y \in \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \frac{\Omega - \underline{a}}{W}$. Any sum of the form $\sum_{x \in \Omega \cap \mathbb{Z}^d} (-)$ equals $\sum_{\underline{a} \in [0, W-1]^d} \sum_{y \in \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \frac{\Omega - \underline{a}}{W}} (-)$. In particular, our sum becomes

$$\sum_{\underline{a} \in [0, W-1]^d} \sum_{y \in \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \frac{\Omega - \underline{a}}{W}} \prod_{i=1}^t \Lambda_K^{\mathfrak{a}}(\psi_i(Wy + \underline{a})).$$

As affine-linear maps ψ_i satisfy $\psi_i(x) = \dot{\psi}_i(x) + \psi_i(0)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\psi_i(x) &= W\dot{\psi}_i(y) + \dot{\psi}_i(\underline{a}) + \psi_i(0) \\ &= W\dot{\psi}_i(y) + \psi_i(\underline{a}).\end{aligned}$$

The contribution from the \underline{a} 's such that $\psi_i(\underline{a})$ is *not* coprime to W for some i is negligible. Set

$$\mathcal{A}_{W, \psi_1, \dots, \psi_t} := \{\underline{a} \in [0, W-1]^d \mid \psi_i(\underline{a}) \text{ is coprime to } W \text{ for all } 1 \leq i \leq t\}.$$

By the definition of $\beta_{\mathfrak{p}}$, we have $\#\mathcal{A}_{W, \psi_1, \dots, \psi_t} = \varphi_K(W) \prod_{\mathfrak{p} \mid W} \beta_{\mathfrak{p}}(\psi_1, \dots, \psi_t)$.

Let $\underline{a} \in \mathcal{A}_{W, \psi_1, \dots, \psi_t}$. Set $b_i := \psi_i(\underline{a})$ and suppose we have an estimate

$$(12.2) \quad \sum_{y \in \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \frac{\Omega - \underline{a}}{W}} \left(\prod_{i=1}^t \frac{\varphi_K(W)}{W^n} \Lambda_K^{\mathfrak{a}}(W\dot{\psi}_i(y) + b_i) \right) = \frac{\text{Vol}(\Omega)/W^n}{\text{res}(\zeta_K(s))^t} \prod_{\mathfrak{p} \nmid W} \beta_{\mathfrak{p}}(\psi_1, \dots, \psi_t) + O_{t,d,K} \left(\left(\frac{N}{W} \right)^d (\log \log N)^{-c_{s,n,d}} \right)$$

for some $0 < c_{s,n,d} \ll_{s,n,d} 1$ and for all $\underline{a} \in \mathcal{A}_{W, \psi_1, \dots, \psi_t}$ uniformly. Then by taking the sum over $\underline{a} \in \mathcal{A}_{W, \psi_1, \dots, \psi_t}$ and multiplying both sides by $\left(\frac{W^n}{\varphi_K(W)} \right)^t$, we recover the main terms of (12.1) and obtain an error term of the form

$$\prod_{\mathfrak{p} \mid W} \beta_{\mathfrak{p}}(\psi_1, \dots, \psi_t) \cdot N^d (\log \log N)^{-c_{s,n,d}}.$$

By Rosen's Mertens' Theorem D.1, we have a bound

$$\begin{aligned}\prod_{\mathfrak{p} \mid W} \beta_{\mathfrak{p}}(\psi_1, \dots, \psi_t) &\leq \prod_{\mathfrak{p} < w} \prod_{\mathfrak{p} \mid \mathfrak{p}} \left(\frac{N(\mathfrak{p})}{\varphi_K(\mathfrak{p})} \right)^t \ll_{t,K} \prod_{\substack{\mathfrak{p} \\ N(\mathfrak{p}) < w}} \left(1 - \frac{1}{N(\mathfrak{p})} \right)^t \\ &\ll_{t,K} (\log w)^t \ll (\log \log \log N)^t.\end{aligned}$$

This can be absorbed in $(\log \log N)^{-c_{s,n,d}}$ by slightly compromising $c_{s,n,d}$. Thus the proof of Theorem 12.1 is reduced to proving (12.2).

Actually, the factor $\prod_{\mathfrak{p} \nmid W} \beta_{\mathfrak{p}}(\psi_1, \dots, \psi_t)$ in (12.2) can be omitted for the following reason. Our w is large enough for Claim 5.3 and (5.4) to be valid. This implies that

$$(12.3) \quad \beta_{\mathfrak{p}}(\psi_1, \dots, \psi_t) = 1 + O_{t,n}(1/p^2)$$

for $\mathfrak{p} \nmid W$. Hence $\prod_{\mathfrak{p} \nmid W} \beta_{\mathfrak{p}}(\psi_1, \dots, \psi_t) = 1 + O_{t,n}(1/w) = 1 + O_{t,n}((\log \log N)^{-1/3})$. Separating this $O_{t,n}(1/w)$ term in (12.2) causes an error smaller than the asserted one. Therefore the factor $\prod_{\mathfrak{p} \nmid W} \beta_{\mathfrak{p}}(\psi_1, \dots, \psi_t)$ can be omitted.

To proceed further, we need the following.

Lemma 12.2. *Let $w = (\log \log N)^{1/3}$. For any $b \in \mathfrak{a}$ coprime to W , we have*

$$\left\| \frac{1}{\text{res}_{s=1}(\zeta_K(s))} - \left(\frac{\varphi_K(W)}{W^n} \Lambda_K^{\mathfrak{a}}(W(-) + b) \right) \right\|_{U^{s+1}(\mathfrak{a} \cap \frac{[\pm N]_{\mathfrak{a}}^n - b}{W})} \ll_{s,K} (\log \log N)^{-c_{s,n}}$$

Proof. We show that each of the next functions is within the claimed distance to the one that follows:

$$\frac{\varphi_K(W)}{W^n} \Lambda_K^{\mathfrak{a}}(W(-) + b), \quad \frac{\varphi_K(W)}{W^n} \Lambda_{\text{Siegel}, Q}^{\mathfrak{a}}(W(-) + b), \\ \frac{\varphi_K(W)}{W^n} \Lambda_{\text{Cramér}, Q}^{\mathfrak{a}}(W(-) + b), \quad \frac{1}{\text{res}_{s=1}(\zeta_K(s))}.$$

By Corollary 11.4 we know

$$\left\| \frac{\varphi_K(W)}{W^n} (\Lambda_K^{\mathfrak{a}} - \Lambda_{\text{Siegel}, Q}^{\mathfrak{a}})(W(-) + b) \right\|_{U^{s+1}(\mathfrak{a} \cap \frac{[\pm N]_{\mathfrak{a}}^n - b}{W})} \leq (\log \log N)^{-c_{s,n}}.$$

As in [30, p. 47], using Fourier analysis

$$1_{b+W\mathfrak{a}} = \frac{1}{W^n} \sum_{\xi \in \text{Hom}(\mathfrak{a}/W\mathfrak{a}, \mathbb{Q}/\mathbb{Z})} e^{2\pi i(\xi(-) - \xi(b))}, \quad \text{an equality of functions on } \mathfrak{a},$$

one can deduce from Proposition 7.2 the inequality

$$(12.4) \quad \left\| \frac{\varphi_K(W)}{W^n} (\Lambda_{\text{Siegel}, Q}^{\mathfrak{a}} - \Lambda_{\text{Cramér}, Q}^{\mathfrak{a}})(W(-) + b) \right\|_{U^{s+1}(\mathfrak{a} \cap \frac{[\pm N]_{\mathfrak{a}}^n - b}{W})} \\ \ll_{s,K} W^{O_{n,s}(1)} (\log N)^{-A} \ll_{s,K} (\log N)^{-A/2}$$

for any $A > 1$.

We know by Corollary 5.4

$$(12.5) \quad \left\| \frac{\varphi_K(W)}{W^n} \Lambda_{\text{Cramér}, Q}^{\mathfrak{a}}(W(-) + b) - \frac{1}{\text{res}_{s=1}(\zeta_K(s))} \right\|_{U^{s+1}(\mathfrak{a} \cap \frac{[\pm N]_{\mathfrak{a}}^n - b}{W})} \\ \ll_{s,K} \frac{1}{w^{1/2^{s+1}}} = (\log \log N)^{1/3 \cdot 2^{s+1}}.$$

This completes the proof of Lemma 12.2. \square

Recall that the proof of Theorem 12.1 had been reduced to proving (12.2) with the $\prod_{p|W} \beta_p$ factor omitted. Let us reproduce it for the convenience of reference.

Claim 12.3. *Let $w = (\log \log N)^{1/3}$. There is a $0 < c_{s,n,d} \ll_{s,n,d} 1$ such that for any choice of $b_1, \dots, b_t \in [0, W-1]_{\mathfrak{a}}^n$ coprime to W and convex body $\Omega \subset [\pm 2N/W]^d$, we have*

$$\sum_{y \in \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \Omega} \left(\prod_{i=1}^t \frac{\varphi_K(W)}{W^n} \Lambda_K^{\mathfrak{a}}(W\psi_i(y) + b_i) \right) \\ = \frac{\text{Vol}(\Omega)}{\text{res}_{s=1}(\zeta_K(s))^t} + O_{t,d,K} \left(\left(\frac{N}{W} \right)^d (\log \log N)^{-c_{s,n,d}} \right).$$

If the $\frac{\varphi_K(W)}{W^n} \Lambda_K^{\mathfrak{a}}(W\psi_i(y) + b_i)$'s in the left-hand side are replaced by the constant function $1/\text{res}_{s=1}(\zeta_K(s))$, the assertion trivially holds. Thus it suffices to show that replacing $\frac{\varphi_K(W)}{W^n} \Lambda_K^{\mathfrak{a}}(W\psi_i(y) + b_i)$'s with $1/\text{res}_{s=1}(\zeta_K(s))$ one by one causes errors of

asserted type. We show this by applying the von Neumann theorem F.4 to the function

$$\left(\frac{1}{\operatorname{res}_{s=1}(\zeta_K(s))} - \left(\frac{\varphi_K(W)}{W^n} \Lambda_K^a(W(-) + b_i) \right) \right) \cdot \prod_{j=i+1}^t \frac{\varphi_K(W)}{W^n} \Lambda_K^a(W(-) + b_j).$$

By Lemma 12.2, for each i we have

$$\left\| \frac{1}{\operatorname{res}_{s=1}(\zeta_K(s))} - \left(\frac{\varphi_K(W)}{W^n} \Lambda_K^a(W(-) + b_i) \right) \right\|_{U^{s+1}[\pm 2N/W]^n} \ll_{s,K} (\log \log N)^{-c_{s,n}}.$$

There are parameters δ, ρ, L, M, X that we can choose in Theorem F.4. Let $0 < c'_{s,n} \ll_{s,n,d} c_{s,n}$ be small enough and we choose (say) $\delta := (\log \log N)^{-c'_{s,n}}$, $\rho := \delta^{2^{s+1}}$, $X := (\log \log N)^{\frac{1}{10d}c'_{s,n}}$, $M := X^{1/10}$ and $L := M^{1/(10d)} = (\log \log N)^{\frac{1}{10^3 d^2}c'_{s,n}}$. The right hand side in Theorem F.4 is then $< (\log \log N)^{-\frac{1}{200d}c'_{s,n}}$. So we may set $c_{s,n,d} := \frac{1}{200d}c'_{s,n}$.

The pseudorandom majorant requirement in Theorem F.4 says that $1/\operatorname{res}_{s=1}(\zeta_K(s))$ and $\frac{\varphi_K(W)}{W^n} \Lambda_K^a(W(-) + b_j)$ ($j = i, \dots, t$) should be majorized by a function ν satisfying the $(O_{t,s}(1), O_s(1), O_{d,n}((\log \log N)^{\frac{O_n(1)}{10^3 d^2}c'_{s,n}}))$ -linear forms condition in scale $\geq N$ and error $< (\log \log N)^{-2^{s+2}c'_{s,n}}$. This is true by Corollary C.5 modulo a factor $O_{K,t}(1)$ if the choice of $c'_{s,n}$ is small enough that exponents

$$\frac{O_n(1)}{10^3 d^2} c'_{s,n} \quad \text{and} \quad -2^{s+2} c'_{s,n}$$

are smaller than $1/3$, the exponent in $w = (\log \log N)^{1/3}$.

Therefore Theorem F.4 applies, verifying Claim 12.3. This completes the proof of Theorem 12.1. \square

Remark 12.4. We would have liked to state and prove Theorem 12.1 by only assuming that $\ker(\psi_i)$'s do not contain each other (making no difference when $K = \mathbb{Q}$), so that the theorem would determine the correct asymptotic number of constellations in prime numbers studied in our former work [20]. This limitation comes from our current form of the von Neumann Theorem F.4. It is unclear whether this limitation can be overcome just by some clever linear algebra trick or it is more deeply rooted.

Remark 12.5. The product $\prod_p \beta_p(\psi_1, \dots, \psi_t)$ is either zero (precisely when one of the β_p 's is zero) or an absolutely convergent product (in particular a positive value) by (12.3). We have $\beta_p(\psi_1, \dots, \psi_t) \neq 0$ if and only if there is an $x \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ such that $\psi_i(x) \neq 0$ in $\mathfrak{a}/\mathfrak{p}\mathfrak{a}$ for all $\mathfrak{p} \mid p$ and all i , or equivalently $p \nmid \mathbf{N}(\psi_i(x)\mathfrak{a}^{-1})$ for all i .

When \mathbb{Z}^d carries an \mathcal{O}_K -module structure with respect to which ψ_i are all affine- \mathcal{O}_K -linear, then as was mentioned in Proposition 5.2 we have a decomposition

$$\beta_p(\psi_1, \dots, \psi_t) = \prod_{\mathfrak{p} \mid p} \beta_{\mathfrak{p}}(\psi_1, \dots, \psi_t).$$

We have $\beta_{\mathfrak{p}}(\psi_1, \dots, \psi_t) \neq 0$ if and only if there is an $x \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ such that $\psi_i(x) \neq 0$ in $\mathfrak{a}/\mathfrak{p}\mathfrak{a}$ for all i .

13. HASSE PRINCIPLE OF RATIONAL POINTS FOR CERTAIN FIBRATIONS

Here we prove Theorem 13.4, which was formerly known only over \mathbb{Q} by Harpaz–Skorobogatov–Wittenberg [17]. For this application, we need Theorem 13.1, a variant of Theorem 12.1 for the localized ring $\mathcal{O}_K[S^{-1}]$.

13.1. The localized variant of main theorem. For a finite set S of non-zero prime ideals of \mathcal{O}_K , define $\mathcal{O}_K[S^{-1}]$ to be the ring obtained by inverting all $\mathfrak{p} \in S$; a pedantic formal definition of it is $\mathcal{O}_K[S^{-1}] = \Gamma(\text{Spec } \mathcal{O}_K \setminus S, \mathcal{O})$, where \mathcal{O} is the structure sheaf. A more concrete description is, since $\text{Cl}(K)$ is torsion (even finite), some power of the ideal $\prod_{\mathfrak{p} \in S} \mathfrak{p}$ is a principal ideal, say $f\mathcal{O}_K$. Then one has $\mathcal{O}_K[S^{-1}] = \mathcal{O}_K[f^{-1}]$.

For a fractional ideal $\mathfrak{a} \subset K$ of \mathcal{O}_K , write $\mathfrak{a}[S^{-1}] := \mathfrak{a} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_K} \mathcal{O}_K[S^{-1}]$.

Let $\text{Ideals}_{\mathcal{O}_K[S^{-1}]}$ be the multiplicative monoid of non-zero ideals of $\mathcal{O}_K[S^{-1}]$. It is the free commutative monoid on the set of non-zero prime ideals of $\mathcal{O}_K[S^{-1}]$, which is identified with the set of non-zero prime ideals of \mathcal{O}_K away from S . Let $\mathbf{N} = \mathbf{N}_{S^{-1}}: \text{Ideals}_{\mathcal{O}_K[S^{-1}]} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ be the norm map $\mathfrak{b} \mapsto |\mathcal{O}_K[S^{-1}]/\mathfrak{b}|$. We omit the subscript except when there is risk of confusion.

Define the von Mangoldt function of the ring $\mathcal{O}_K[S^{-1}]$

$$\Lambda_{\mathcal{O}_K[S^{-1}]}: \text{Ideals}_{\mathcal{O}_K[S^{-1}]} \cup \{(0)\} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$$

by $\mathfrak{b} \mapsto \log(\mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{p}))$ if \mathfrak{b} is a non-trivial power of a prime ideal \mathfrak{p} of $\mathcal{O}_K[S^{-1}]$, and $\mathfrak{b} \mapsto 0$ otherwise. For a non-zero fractional ideal \mathfrak{a} over \mathcal{O}_K , define the function

$$\Lambda_{\mathcal{O}_K[S^{-1}]}^{\mathfrak{a}}: \mathfrak{a} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$$

by $x \mapsto \Lambda_{\mathcal{O}_K[S^{-1}]}(x\mathfrak{a}[S^{-1}]^{-1})$.

A routine but tedious argument lets one deduce the following from our main results.

Theorem 13.1. *Let $\mathfrak{a} \subset K$ be a non-zero fractional ideal of \mathcal{O}_K . Let $t, d \geq 1$ be integers and $\Psi = \{\psi_1, \dots, \psi_t\}$ be a set of affine-linear maps*

$$\psi_i: \mathbb{Z}^d \rightarrow \mathfrak{a}[S^{-1}]$$

having torsion cokernels such that for every pair $i \neq j$ the restriction $\psi_i|_{\ker(\psi_j)}$ also has torsion cokernel.

Let $N \gg_{\Psi, K, S} 1$ and $\Omega \subset [\pm N]^d \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ be a closed set with boundary of Lipschitz class $\text{Lip}(d, Z, L)$ for some $Z, L \geq 1$.

Then we have

$$\sum_{\underline{x} \in \Omega \cap \mathbb{Z}^d} \prod_{i=1}^t \Lambda_{\mathcal{O}_K[S^{-1}]}^{\mathfrak{a}}(\psi_i(\underline{x})) = C_{S, \Psi} \frac{\text{Vol}(\Omega)}{\text{res}_{s=1}(\zeta_K(s))^t} + O_{K, S, \Psi, Z, L}(N^d (\log \log N)^{-1/O_{K, d, t}(1)}),$$

where the coefficient $C_{S, \Psi}$ is as follows:

$$C_{S, \Psi} := \prod_p \left(\frac{p^n}{\varphi_K(p)} \right)^t \left(1 - \frac{1}{p^d} \left| \bigcup_{i=1}^t \bigcup_{\substack{\mathfrak{p}|p \\ \text{not in } S}} \psi_{i, \mathfrak{p}}^{-1}(0) \right| \right),$$

where for each prime ideal \mathfrak{p} not in S with residue characteristic p , the map $\psi_{i,\mathfrak{p}}: \mathbb{Z}^d/p\mathbb{Z}^d \rightarrow \mathfrak{a}/\mathfrak{p}\mathfrak{a}$ is the affine-linear map induced by ψ_i . The coefficient $C_{S,\Psi}$ is positive if the following condition is satisfied:

$$(13.1) \quad \text{for all } p, \text{ there is an } \underline{x} \in \mathbb{Z}^d \text{ such that } \mathbf{N}(\psi_i(\underline{x})\mathfrak{a}[\mathbb{S}^{-1}]^{-1}) \text{ is prime} \\ \text{to } p \text{ simultaneously for all } 1 \leq i \leq t.$$

When the source \mathbb{Z}^d admits an \mathcal{O}_K -module structure with respect to which ψ_i are affine- \mathcal{O}_K -linear, then the last condition is equivalent to:

$$\text{for all } \mathfrak{p} \notin S, \text{ there is an } \underline{x} \in \mathbb{Z}^d \text{ such that } \psi_i(\underline{x}) \text{ are non-zero in} \\ \mathfrak{a}/\mathfrak{p}\mathfrak{a} \text{ simultaneously for all } 1 \leq i \leq t.$$

The deduction of Theorem 13.1 is not the main focus of this section, and thus is deferred until §G.

13.2. Application to rational points. Below, for a place v of a number field K , write K_v for the completion. Let $|\cdot|_v: K_v \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ be the associated absolute value, which we choose (say) as $|x|_{\mathfrak{p}} := \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{p})^{-v_{\mathfrak{p}}(x)}$ if $v = \mathfrak{p}$ is non-archimedean and the usual absolute value of \mathbb{R}, \mathbb{C} if v is archimedean.

In any metric space, let us say that two elements are ε -close ($\varepsilon > 0$) if their distance is $\leq \varepsilon$.

Here is an analog of [17, Proposition 1.2]. The case $\tau_v = +\infty$ and $\tau_v = \infty$ for all real and complex places v will suffice for the application in this section, but the following form is somewhat more natural to formulate.

Proposition 13.2. *Let S be a finite set of non-zero prime ideals of \mathcal{O}_K and suppose we are given the data of*

- $(\lambda_{\mathfrak{p}}, \mu_{\mathfrak{p}}) \in K_{\mathfrak{p}}^{\oplus 2}$ for each $\mathfrak{p} \in S$,
- $\tau_v \in \mathbb{R} \cup \{\pm\infty\}$ and $\sigma_v \in \{\pm 1\}$ for each real place v and
- $\tau_v \in \mathbb{C} \cup \{\infty\}$ for each complex place v .

Let $e_1, \dots, e_t \in \mathcal{O}_K[\mathbb{S}^{-1}]$ be distinct elements.

Then for any $0 < \varepsilon < 1$ there exist pairs $(\lambda, \mu) \in (\mathcal{O}_K[\mathbb{S}^{-1}] \setminus \{0\})^{\oplus 2}$ satisfying the following conditions:

- (1) for all $\mathfrak{p} \in S$, in the \mathfrak{p} -adic sup metric on $K_{\mathfrak{p}}^{\oplus 2}$, the pair (λ, μ) is ε -close to $(\lambda_{\mathfrak{p}}, \mu_{\mathfrak{p}})$;
- (2) for each archimedean place v , the ratio λ/μ is ε -close to τ_v . Here, when v is real and $\tau_v = \pm\infty$, this is interpreted as λ/μ having the same sign as τ_v and $|\lambda/\mu| > 1/\varepsilon$. When v is complex and $\tau_v = \infty$, then as $|\lambda/\mu| > 1/\varepsilon$.
- (3) μ has sign σ_v in $K_v = \mathbb{R}$ for each real v .
- (4) $\lambda - e_i\mu$ are prime elements of $\mathcal{O}_K[\mathbb{S}^{-1}]$ for all i and no two of them are associates under the $\mathcal{O}_K[\mathbb{S}^{-1}]^{\times}$ -action.

Proof. By multiplying everything by some element of $\mathcal{O}_K[\mathbb{S}^{-1}]^{\times}$ having large valuations at primes $\mathfrak{p} \in S$, we may assume that $(\lambda_{\mathfrak{p}}, \mu_{\mathfrak{p}}) \in \mathcal{O}_{K_{\mathfrak{p}}}^{\oplus 2}$. Under this additional assumption, we claim that we can find $(\lambda, \mu) \in \mathcal{O}_K^{\oplus 2}$ (more restrictively than $\mathcal{O}_K[\mathbb{S}^{-1}]^{\oplus 2}$) satisfying the asserted condition.

Consider the following maps for $i = 1, \dots, t$:

$$(13.2) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathcal{O}_K^{\oplus 2} &\rightarrow \mathcal{O}_K[\mathbb{S}^{-1}] \\ (\lambda, \mu) &\mapsto \lambda - e_i\mu. \end{aligned}$$

Define the ideal $\mathfrak{a} := \left(\prod_{\mathfrak{p} \in S} \mathfrak{p} \right)^e$ with $e \gg_\varepsilon 1$ so that every element of \mathfrak{a} has distance $< \varepsilon$ from 0 in $K_{\mathfrak{p}}$ for all $\mathfrak{p} \in S$. Let $(\lambda_0, \mu_0) \in \mathcal{O}_K^{\oplus 2}$ be a representative of the class

$$(\lambda_{\mathfrak{p}}, \mu_{\mathfrak{p}})_{\mathfrak{p} \in S} \in \bigoplus_{\mathfrak{p} \in S} (\mathcal{O}_{K_{\mathfrak{p}}} / \mathfrak{p}^e \mathcal{O}_{K_{\mathfrak{p}}})^{\oplus 2} \cong (\mathcal{O}_K / \mathfrak{a})^{\oplus 2}.$$

Choose a basis $\mathfrak{a} \cong \mathbb{Z}^n$ and consider the following composite maps ψ_i for $i = 1, \dots, t$:

$$(13.3) \quad \begin{array}{ccccc} \psi_i: \mathbb{Z}^{2n} \cong \mathfrak{a}^{\oplus 2} & \rightarrow & \mathcal{O}_K^{\oplus 2} & \rightarrow & \mathcal{O}_K[S^{-1}] \\ (x, y) & \mapsto & (\lambda_0 + x, \mu_0 + y) & \mapsto & (\lambda_0 + x) - e_i(\mu_0 + y). \end{array}$$

The condition (13.1) is satisfied by the collection of maps (13.2) by taking $\lambda = 1, \mu = 0$, and therefore also by ψ_1, \dots, ψ_t because the affine- \mathcal{O}_K -linear map $\mathfrak{a}^{\oplus 2} \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_K^{\oplus 2}$ in (13.3) becomes a bijection modulo \mathfrak{p} for each $\mathfrak{p} \notin S$.

One easily checks that the condition that the quotient $(\lambda_0 + x)/(\mu_0 + y)$ be ε -close to τ_v for all archimedean v and μ has sign σ_v for all real v defines a set $\Omega \subset [\pm N]^{2n} \subset \mathbb{R}^{2n} \cong \mathfrak{a}^{\oplus 2} \otimes \mathbb{R}$ with a $\text{Lip}(2n, O(n), O_{S, \varepsilon}(N))$ boundary and volume $\gg_{S, \varepsilon} N^{2n}$.

We can now apply Theorem 13.1 to this situation and obtain $(\gg_{S, \varepsilon, \{e_i\}_i} N^{2n} / (\log N)^t$ many pairs $(x, y) \in \mathfrak{a}^{\oplus 2}$, which in turn determine $(\lambda, \mu) := (\lambda_0 + x, \mu_0 + y)$, satisfying the asserted conditions. Note that the event that two of the $\lambda - e_i \mu$'s be associates under the $\mathcal{O}_K[S^{-1}]^\times$ -action is asymptotically negligibly rare basically because $|\mathcal{O}_K[S^{-1}]^\times \cap \mathcal{O}_{K, \leq N}| \ll_K (\log N)^{n+|S|-1}$. \square

The passage from Proposition 13.2 to the following statement is identical to [17, Proposition 1.2 to Proposition 2.1].

Proposition 13.3 (known for $K = \mathbb{Q}$ e.g. by [17, Proposition 2.1]). *Let S be a finite set of non-zero prime ideals of \mathcal{O}_K . Let $e_1, \dots, e_t \in \mathcal{O}_K[S^{-1}]$ be distinct. Suppose we are given the data of $\tau_{\mathfrak{p}} \in K_{\mathfrak{p}}$ for each $\mathfrak{p} \in S$.*

Then for any $0 < \varepsilon < 1$ there exist $\tau \in K$ and distinct non-zero prime ideals $\mathfrak{p}_1, \dots, \mathfrak{p}_t \notin S$ such that

- (1) τ is ε -close to $\tau_{\mathfrak{p}}$ in $K_{\mathfrak{p}}$ for each $\mathfrak{p} \in S$;
- (2) τ is totally positive and $|\tau|_v > 1/\varepsilon$ for all archimedean place v ;
- (3) for all $i = 1, \dots, t$, we have $v_{\mathfrak{p}_i}(\tau - e_i) = 1$;
- (4) for all $i = 1, \dots, t$ and $\mathfrak{p} \notin S \cup \{\mathfrak{p}_i\}$, we have $v_{\mathfrak{p}}(\tau - e_i) \leq 0$;
- (5) for any $i = 1, \dots, t$ and any cyclic extension L/K unramified outside S , we have

$$\text{inv}_{\mathfrak{p}_i}(L/K, \tau - e_i) + \sum_{\mathfrak{p} \in S} \text{inv}_{\mathfrak{p}}(L/K, \tau_{\mathfrak{p}} - e_i) = 0 \in \mathbb{Q}/\mathbb{Z}.$$

In particular, if $\sum_{\mathfrak{p} \in S} \text{inv}_{\mathfrak{p}}(L/K, \tau_{\mathfrak{p}} - e_i) = 0$, then \mathfrak{p}_i splits completely in L/K .

Thanks to Propositions 13.2 and 13.3 which play the roles of [17, Propositions 1.2 and 2.1], all the results in [17] now hold over an arbitrary number field K rather than just \mathbb{Q} .

For example, we have the following theorem. There, let \mathbf{A}_K be the ring of adèles of K . Write $\text{Br}_{\text{vert}}(X) := \pi^* \text{Br}(K(\mathbb{P}^1)) \cap \text{Br}(X) \subset \text{Br}(K(X))$ for the so-called *vertical*

Brauer group of an integral variety X and set

$$X(\mathbf{A}_K)^{\text{Brvert}} := \{x = (x_v)_v \in X(\mathbf{A}_K) \mid \text{for all } \omega \in \text{Br}_{\text{vert}}(X), \sum_{v: \text{all places}} \text{inv}_v(\omega|_{x_v}) = 0 \text{ in } \mathbb{Q}/\mathbb{Z}\}.$$

Theorem 13.4 (known for $K = \mathbb{Q}$ by [17, Theorem 3.1]). *Let X be a geometrically integral variety over K equipped with a smooth surjective morphism $\pi: X \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^1$. Assume:*

- *except for finitely many fibers X_1, \dots, X_t over $\mathbb{P}^1(K)$, each fiber of π contains a geometrically integral irreducible component;*
- *the fiber X_i ($1 \leq i \leq t$) has an irreducible component X_i^0 such that the algebraic closure of K in its function field is abelian over K .*

Then $\mathbb{P}^1(K) \cap \pi(X(\mathbf{A}_K))$ is dense in $\pi(X(\mathbf{A}_K)^{\text{Brvert}}) \subset \mathbb{P}^1(\mathbf{A}_K)$.

Proof. The proof of [17, Theorem 3.1] works because it uses nothing particular about \mathbb{Q} except [17, Proposition 2.1], now available for general number fields as Proposition 13.3. Perhaps it might seem that Step 2 of *loc. cit.* is using the fact that \mathbb{Q} has only one archimedean place, but one can as usual use small deformation in $X(K_v)$'s by the inverse function theorem and the density of the inclusion $K \hookrightarrow K \otimes \mathbb{R}$ to achieve the situation where the archimedean part $(M_v)_v$ of the adélic point to approximate lies over the point $\infty \in \mathbb{P}^1(K)$. \square

APPENDIX A. RESULTS FROM THE NILSEQUENCE THEORY

A.1. The inverse theory of Gowers norms. For positive integers $N \in \mathbb{N}$ recall that we write $[\pm N]^n \subset \mathbb{Z}^n$ for the product of intervals $[-N, N]^n$.

Let us state a version of the Inverse Theorem for Gowers norms. This type of statement was first conjectured (in public) by Green–Tao [15] and subsequently proven by Green–Tao–Ziegler [14]. There has been a major quantitative improvement by Manners [21]. It has been known since [15] that the statement for 1-bounded functions implies a statement for ν -bounded functions for pseudorandom functions ν , but the precise form of the pseudorandomness condition had been complicated. Tao–Teräväinen [30] applied the work of Conlon–Fox–Zhao [3] to relax the pseudorandomness condition required and to reduce the quantitative loss.

Theorem A.1 (Gowers Inverse Theorem on \mathbb{Z}^n). *Let $k, n \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$ and let $0 < \delta < 1$ be small enough depending on k, n . Let $N > 1$ be an integer sufficiently large depending on k, n .*

Let $\nu: [\pm N]^n \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ be a function satisfying

$$\|\nu - 1\|_{U^{2k}([\pm N]^n)} \leq \delta^{C_0}$$

where $C_0 \gg_{k,n} 1$ is sufficiently large depending on k, n , and let $f: [\pm N]^n \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ be a ν -bounded function satisfying

$$\|f\|_{U^k([\pm N]^n)} \geq \delta.$$

Then there exist:

- *a filtered nilmanifold G/Γ of degree $k - 1$, $\dim \delta^{-O_{k,n}(1)}$, complexity $\leq \exp \exp(\delta^{-O_{k,n}(1)})$;*
- *a 1-bounded function $F: G/\Gamma$ of Lipschitz constant $\leq \exp \exp(\delta^{-O_{k,n}(1)})$;*
- *a polynomial map $g: \mathbb{Z}^n \rightarrow G$*

such that

$$\left| \mathbb{E}_{x \in [\pm N]^n} f(x)F(g(x)) \right| \geq \left(\exp \exp(\delta^{-O_{k,n}(1)}) \right)^{-1}.$$

Proof. For $n = 1$, this is exactly [30, Theorem 8.3] except that for notational simplicity we have omitted some constants $O_k(1)$ by increasing the $O_{k,n}(1)$ in the exponent and assuming δ is sufficiently small. This change makes the assertion a little weaker but will have no visible effect on our final result.

The assertion for $n > 1$ can be reduced to the case of $n = 1$ by the following somewhat well-known trick.⁷

Let $\phi: \mathbb{Z}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ be the map $(x_1, \dots, x_n) \mapsto \sum_{i=1}^n (5N)^{i-1} x_i$. This maps the cube $[\pm N]^n$ injectively into the interval $[\pm(5N)^n] \subset \mathbb{Z}$. Define

$$\nu', f': [\pm(5N)^n] \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$$

by setting the value equal to that of ν (resp. f) on the image of $[\pm N]^n$, and zero otherwise. By the invariance of Gowers norms under Freiman isomorphisms [15, p. 1817] we know that the ratios of Gowers norms

$$(A.1) \quad \frac{\|\nu'\|_{U^{2k}([\pm(5N)^n])}}{\|\nu\|_{U^{2k}([\pm N]^n)}} \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{\|f'\|_{U^k([\pm(5N)^n])}}{\|f\|_{U^k([\pm N]^n)}}$$

are bounded from above and below by positive numbers depending only on k, n . Then by the theorem for $n = 1$ with slightly compromised exponents (to make up for the difference caused by the ratios (A.1)) one can find data $G/\Gamma, F: G/\Gamma \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ and $g': \mathbb{Z} \rightarrow G$ satisfying

$$\left| \mathbb{E}_{x \in [\pm(5N)^n]} f'(x)F(g'(x)) \right| \geq \exp \exp(\delta^{-O_k(1)}).$$

Define a polynomial map $g: \mathbb{Z}^n \rightarrow G$ by the composition (recall that every additive map $\mathbb{Z}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ is a polynomial map)

$$g: \mathbb{Z}^n \xrightarrow{\phi} \mathbb{Z} \xrightarrow{g'} G.$$

As we know that the expectations computed on $[\pm N]^n$ and $[\pm(5N)^n]$ are not so different:

$$\left(\mathbb{E}_{x \in [\pm N]^n} f(x)F(g(x)) \right) \bigg/ \left(\mathbb{E}_{x \in [\pm(5N)^n]} f'(x)F(g'(x)) \right) = \frac{10N^n + 1}{(2N + 1)^n} \asymp_n 1,$$

the assertion for n follows. \square

Remark A.2. Our main problem in this paper is to show $\|\Lambda_K - \Lambda_{\text{Siegel}, \mathbb{Q}}\|_{U^{s+1}([\pm N]^n)} < (\log \log N)^{-c_{s,n}}$ for some small $0 < c_{s,n} \ll_{s,n} 1$ (Theorem 11.1). Theorem A.1 tells us that, modulo the need of the W-trick to guarantee a pseudorandom majorant, for this purpose it suffices to show a bound of the form (where the $O_{s,n}(1)$ constants are given by the theorem and potentially huge)

$$(A.2) \quad \left| \mathbb{E}_{x \in [\pm N]^n} (\Lambda_K - \Lambda_{\text{Siegel}, \mathbb{Q}})(x) \cdot F(g(x)) \right| < \left(\exp \exp((\log \log N)^{O_{s,n}(c_{s,n})}) \right)^{-1}$$

⁷This trick appears for example in Terence Tao's blog post: <https://terrytao.wordpress.com/2015/07/24/>

for all data $\mathcal{O}_K \cong \mathbb{Z}^n \xrightarrow{g} G \rightarrow G/\Gamma \xrightarrow{F} \mathbb{C}$ where G/Γ has degree s and dimension $\leq (\log \log N)^{O_{s,n}(c_{s,n})}$, and its complexity and the Lipschitz constant of F are both $\leq \exp \exp((\log \log N)^{O_{s,n}(c_{s,n})})$.

If we demand that $c_{s,n}$ is small enough that the quantities $O_{s,n}(c_{s,n})$ become less than $1/2$ say, then the quantities $\exp \exp((\log \log N)^{O_{s,n}(c_{s,n})})$ are smaller than any quantity of the form $\exp((\log N)^c)$ ($c > 0$) when N is large enough depending on c . So it strengthens the problem if we attempt to show (A.2) after replacing $\exp \exp((\log \log N)^{O_{s,n}(c_{s,n})})$'s by $\exp((\log N)^c)$'s, and that is what we do in the main part of the text.

A.2. The equidistribution theory of polynomial sequences.

Definition A.3 (Smoothness norm [13, (2.2)]). Let $g: \mathbb{Z}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a polynomial map. Let

$$g(\underline{x}) = \sum_{\underline{i} \in \mathbb{N}^n} \beta_{\underline{i}} \underline{x}^{\underline{i}}$$

be its expansion ($\beta_{\underline{i}} \in \mathbb{R}$ non-zero only for finitely many \underline{i}). Define the *smoothness norm* $\|g\|_{C^\infty([\pm N]^n)}$ of g in scale $N \geq 1$ by

$$\|g\|_{C^\infty([\pm N]^n)} := \sup_{\underline{i} \in \mathbb{N}^n} \|\beta_{\underline{i}}\|_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}} N^{|\underline{i}|}.$$

As is explained in [13, Lemma 2.1], this differs from the variant of this norm used in [12] (which uses the expansion $g(x) = \sum_{\underline{i}} \alpha_{\underline{i}} \binom{x}{\underline{i}}$ where $\binom{x}{\underline{i}} = \prod_{k=1}^n \binom{x_k}{i_k}$) only by a factor $\asymp_{s,n} 1$, where s is the degree of g .

Theorem A.4 (Quantitative Leibman Theorem on \mathbb{Z}^n). *The quantitative Leibman Theorem in [30, Theorem A.3] remains true for $n \geq 1$. Namely, let $m \geq m_* \geq 0$, $N \geq 1$ be integers and let $0 < \delta < 1/2$.*

Let G/Γ be a filtered nilmanifold of degree s , dimension m , and nonlinearity dimension m_ [12, pp. 482, 503].*

Let $g: \mathbb{Z}^n \rightarrow G$ be a polynomial sequence which is not δ -equidistributed in G/Γ .

(1) *Suppose G/Γ has complexity $< 1/\delta$ with respect to some Mel'cev basis. Then there exists a horizontal character $\eta: G \rightarrow \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}$ with*

$$0 < |\eta| < O_{s,n}(1) \cdot \delta^{-O_{s,n}(1) \cdot \exp((m+m_*)^{O_s(1)})}$$

such that

$$\|\eta \circ g\|_{C^\infty([\pm N]^n)} \leq O_{s,n}(1) \cdot \delta^{-O_{s,n}(1) \cdot \exp((m+m_*)^{O_s(1)})}.$$

(2) *Even when one is not sure if the complexity $\text{comp}(G/\Gamma)$ is less than $1/\delta$, the assertion stays true if we replace the bounds in the conclusion by*

$$O_{s,n}(1) \cdot \left(\delta^{-1} \text{comp}(G/\Gamma) \right)^{O_{s,n}(1) \cdot \exp((m+m_*)^{O_s(1)})},$$

because one always has $\text{comp}(G/\Gamma) \leq \text{comp}(G/\Gamma)/\delta$.

Proof. For $n = 1$, this is exactly [30, Theorem A.3]. Green–Tao [13] prove this with an unspecified exponent $-O_{s,n,m}(1)$ instead of $-O_{s,n}(1) \cdot \exp((m+m_*)^{O_s(1)})$. In their proof [13, §3], they show that if the assertion for $n = 1$ holds with bounds $\delta^{-C_{m,m_*,s}}$ for some $C_{m,m_*,s} > 0$, then the assertion for general n holds with bounds

$O_{s,n}(1) \cdot \delta^{-O_{s,n}(1)mC_{m,m_*,s}}$. For $n = 1$, we know we can take $C_{m,m_*,s} = \exp((m + m_*)^{O_s(1)})$ by Tao–Teräväinen [30]. Therefore the assertion for the general n follows. \square

Remark A.5. Theorem A.4 probably holds for the Gowers norm on cubes with unequal sides. To verify it, one would only have to do a similar analysis of [13, §4].

Note that the following partial converse (existence of such a character \Rightarrow non-equidistribution) is straightforward to prove. Spelling out an explicit estimate helps us be concrete.

Proposition A.6. *Let G/Γ be as in Theorem A.4 and $g: \mathbb{Z}^n \rightarrow G$ be a polynomial map. Suppose there is a non-trivial horizontal character $\eta: G \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that $\|\eta \circ g(\underline{x}) - \eta \circ g(0)\|_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}} \leq 0.2$ for all $\underline{x} \in [\pm N]^n$. Then the polynomial map g is not $\frac{1}{21|\eta|}$ -equidistributed on $[\pm N]^n$.*

Consequently, there is some constant $O_{n,s}(1) > 1$ depending only on n and $s = \deg(g)$ such that the same conclusion holds when $\|\eta \circ g\|_{C^\infty[\pm N]^n} \leq \frac{1}{O_{n,s}(1)}$.

Proof. Let $\chi = \chi_{0.2}: \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be the piecewise linear function whose value on $[-0.2, 0.2]$ is 1, and -1 on $[0.3, 0.7]$. It has Lipschitz constant $\frac{2}{0.1} = 20$. Since any horizontal character $\eta: G/\Gamma \rightarrow \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}$ has Lipschitz constant $\leq |\eta|$ by definitions (Definitions 4.3, 4.5), the function $F := \chi(\eta(-) - \eta(g(0))): G/\Gamma \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ has Lipschitz constant $\leq 20|\eta|$ and so $\|F\|_{\text{Lip}} := \|F\|_\infty + (\text{Lip. const.}) < 21|\eta|$.

Now suppose that $\eta \circ g(-) - \eta \circ g(0): \mathbb{Z}^n \rightarrow G/\Gamma \rightarrow \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}$ carries $[\pm N]^n$ into $[\pm 0.2]$. As χ has constant value 1 on this interval, we have

$$\mathbb{E}_{x \in [\pm N]^n} F(g(x)) = \mathbb{E}_{x \in [\pm N]^n} \chi(\eta(g(x)) - \eta(g(0))) = 1 > \frac{1}{21|\eta|} \|F\|_{\text{Lip}}.$$

Therefore g violates the definition of $\frac{1}{21|\eta|}$ -equidistribution on $[\pm N]^n$.

The “consequently” part follows because for any polynomial map $f: \mathbb{Z}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ of degree s and $x \in [\pm N]^n$, we have a bound of the form

$$\|f(x) - f(0)\|_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}} = O_{n,s}\left(\frac{\|x\|_\infty}{N} \cdot \|f\|_{C^\infty[\pm N]^n}\right)$$

and hence $f = \eta \circ g$ can vary at most $O_{n,s}(\|\eta \circ g\|_{C^\infty[\pm N]^n})$ on $[\pm N]^n$. This completes the proof. \square

In the next theorem, a polynomial map $\varepsilon: \mathbb{Z}^n \rightarrow G$ (the target being equipped with a Mel’ceev basis) is said to be $(M, [\pm N]^n)$ -smooth ($M, N \geq 3$) if for all $x \in [\pm N]^n$ we have $d(\varepsilon(x), 1_G) \leq M$ and $d(\varepsilon(x), \varepsilon(x + e_i)) \leq M/N$ for all $1 \leq i \leq n$, where e_i is the i^{th} elementary vector [12, Definition 9.1].

A polynomial map $\gamma: \mathbb{Z}^n \rightarrow G$ is said to be M -rational if for every $x \in \mathbb{Z}^n$, the residue class $\gamma(x)\Gamma$ contains an element g_x such that $g_x^{M'_x} = 1$ for some $0 < M'_x \leq M$. [12, Definition 1.7]. When the Mel’ceev basis has complexity $\leq M$, modulo raising M to the $m^{O(1)}$ st power, this is the same as saying that its values via the Mel’ceev coordinates $G \cong \mathbb{R}^{\dim G}$ are all in $\frac{1}{M'}\mathbb{Z}^{\dim G}$ for some $0 < M' \leq M$ [12, Lemma A.11]

Theorem A.7 (Factorization Theorem). *The quantitative Factorization Theorem [30, Theorem A.6] remains true for polynomial maps on \mathbb{Z}^n : namely,*

Let $m \geq 0$, $M_0 \geq 2$, $A \geq 2$, $N \geq 1$, $d \geq 0$. Given:

- *a filtered nilmanifold G/Γ of dimension m , degree s and complexity $\leq M_0$;*

- a polynomial map $g: \mathbb{Z}^n \rightarrow \mathbf{G}$,

there exist:

- some M with $M_0 \leq M \leq M_0^{A(2+m)^{O_{s,n}(1)}}$;
- a subgroup $\mathbf{G}' \subset \mathbf{G}$ which is M -rational with respect to the given Mal'cev basis of \mathbf{G} (which gives \mathbf{G}' a Mal'cev basis)
- a decomposition $g = \varepsilon g' \gamma$ into polynomial maps (pointwise product)

such that

- (1) ε is $(M, [\pm N]^n)$ -smooth;
- (2) g' takes values in \mathbf{G}' and is totally $1/M^A$ -equidistributed in \mathbf{G}'/Γ'
- (3) γ is M -rational and is periodic in \mathbf{G}/Γ with period $M'\mathbb{Z}^n$ for some $0 < M' \leq M$.

Proof. The proof goes as in [12, §§9–10] (see also [30, p. 53] for the choice of the parameters δ_i). One uses Theorem A.4 to prove Factorization of poorly-distributed polynomial sequences like [12, Proposition 9.2] and apply it repeatedly. \square

Proposition A.8 (Polynomial Vinogradov theorem, [13, Proposition 2.3]). *Let $g: \mathbb{Z}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a polynomial map of degree s , and $0 < \delta < 1$ and $0 < \varepsilon < \frac{\delta}{10}$ be positive numbers.*

If the bound

$$\|g(x)\|_{\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}} \leq \varepsilon$$

holds for at least δN^n values of $x \in [\pm N]^n$, then there is some $0 < Q < \delta^{-O_{s,n}(1)}$ such that

$$\|Qg\|_{C^\infty([\pm N]^n)} < \delta^{-O_{s,n}(1)} \varepsilon.$$

Proposition A.9 (Extrapolation, [13, Lemma 8.4]). *Let $s, n \geq 1$ be integers. Let $q_0, N \geq 1$ be integers, q_0 being sufficiently large depending on s, n , and $g: \mathbb{Z}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a polynomial map of degree $\leq s$.*

Let $\underline{a} = (a_1, \dots, a_n), \underline{b} = (b_1, \dots, b_n) \in \mathbb{Z}^n$ be vectors satisfying

$$|a_i| \leq q_0 N, \quad |b_i| \leq q_0.$$

Then there is $0 < q < q_0^{O_{s,n}(1)}$ such that we have

$$\|qg\|_{C^\infty([\pm N]^n)} < q_0^{O_{s,n}(1)} \cdot \|g(\underline{a} + \underline{b} \cdot (-))\|_{C^\infty([\pm N]^n)}.$$

Proof. This statement differs from [13, Lemma 8.4] in that we allow $|a_i| \leq q_0 N$ rather than $|a_i| \leq q_0$ in *loc. cit.* But the same proof works (which is in any case easy). \square

Proposition A.10 (Decomposition by averaged nilsequence). *Let \mathbf{G}/Γ be an s -step nilmanifold, $g: \mathbb{Z}^n \rightarrow \mathbf{G}$ a polynomial map and $F: \mathbf{G}/\Gamma \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ a 1-bounded Lipschitz function whose Lipschitz constant is bounded from above by $\text{Lip}(F) \geq 1$.*

Let $0 < \varepsilon < 1$ be a positive number and $N > 1$ be a positive integer. Then there is a decomposition

$$F(g(x)) = F_1(x) + F_2(x),$$

where $F_1, F_2: \mathbb{Z}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ are functions, F_1 being 1-bounded, satisfying

$$\mathbb{E}_{x \in [\pm N]^n} F_1(x) f(x) \ll_{s,n} (\text{Lip}(F)/\varepsilon)^{\dim(\mathbf{G})^{O_{s,n}(1)}} \|f\|_{U^{s+1}[\pm N]^n}$$

for any $f: [\pm N]^n \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$, and

$$F_2(x) \ll_{s,n} \epsilon \quad \text{for all } x \in [\pm N]^n.$$

Proof. For $n = 1$ this is due to Green–Tao [15, Proposition 11.2]⁸ strengthened by the comment by Tao–Teräväinen in [30, Proof of Proposition 7.1, p. 36]. Their proof turns out to work for general $n \geq 1$ just by replacing all $\mathbb{Z}/N\mathbb{Z}$ by $(\mathbb{Z}/(2N+1)\mathbb{Z})^n$ and $\mathbb{Z}/N'\mathbb{Z}$ by $(\mathbb{Z}/N'\mathbb{Z})^n$, where $N' := 10sN$. The implicit constants $O(1)$ depend on n in addition to s because they arise from Fourier analysis on $(\mathbb{Z}/N'\mathbb{Z})^{n(s+1)}$ and the theory of Gowers U^{s+1} -norm on \mathbb{Z}^n (see the lines around [15, (11.7) on p. 1802] for both of these points). \square

A.3. Conjugacy preserves equidistribution. We state and record a proof of Proposition A.11 below, an explicitly quantitative version of [11, Claim on p. 547], the details of whose proof are not written in *loc. cit.* It is used in the reduction of the main theorem to the equidistributed case.

As in [30, Appendix A], for an integer $m \geq 2$ and a positive number $M > 3$ we write

$$\text{poly}_m(M)$$

for a value bounded from above by an $\exp(\exp(m^{O(1)}))M^{\exp(m^{O(1)})}$ where $O(1)$'s can be taken to be absolute constants. (So it is actually also an $M^{\exp(m^{O(1)})}$.) Note the the product of $O(\exp(m^{O(1)}))$ many $\text{poly}_m(M)$'s is still a $\text{poly}_m(M)$ with new $O(1)$ constants.

Below we always use the remark [30, the paragraph before Lemma A.4] by Tao–Teräväinen that in Green–Tao's summary [12, Appendix A] of the basic properties of Mel'cev basis, the rationality bounds $Q^{O_m(1)}$ can actually be taken as $\text{poly}_m(Q)$'s.

Proposition A.11. *Let G/Γ be an m -dimensional nilmanifold equipped with an M -rational Mel'cev basis adapted for some s -step filtration G_\bullet . Let $\gamma \in G$ be an M -rational point and $G' \subset G$ be an M -rational subgroup. Equip G' and its conjugate $G'_\gamma := \gamma^{-1}G'\gamma$ with the induced filtration from G and an $\text{poly}_m(M)$ -rational Mel'cev basis each (which exist by [12, Proposition A.10 and Lemma A.13]). Let $g: \mathbb{Z}^n \rightarrow G'$ be a polynomial map which is totally δ -equidistributed as a map $[\pm N]^n \rightarrow G'/\Gamma \cap G'$ for some $N \geq 1$ and $0 < \delta < 1/2$.*

Then the conjugate

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma^{-1}g\gamma: [\pm N]^n &\rightarrow G'_\gamma \\ x &\mapsto \gamma^{-1}g(x)\gamma \end{aligned}$$

is totally $\text{poly}_m(M)\delta^{1/\exp(m^{O_{s,n}(1)})}$ -equidistributed as a map $[\pm N]^n \rightarrow G'_\gamma/\Gamma \cap G'_\gamma$.

For the proof of Proposition A.11, we need the following lemma, whose proof is deferred to §A.3.1

Lemma A.12. *In the situation of Proposition A.11, let $\psi': G' \cong \mathbb{R}^{\dim G'}$ be the coordinate defined by the chosen Mel'cev basis. Then the subgroup*

$$\Gamma \cap (\gamma\Gamma\gamma^{-1}) \cap G' \subset \Gamma \cap G'$$

⁸I think their cutoff function $\sigma: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow [0, 1]$ on [15, p. 1801] should be supported on $[0, 1]$ and equal to 1 on $[1/3, 2/3]$ (say), instead of $[-1, 2]$ and $[0, 1]$.

contains the set $(\psi')^{-1}(C\mathbb{Z}^{\dim G'})$ for some $C = \text{poly}_m(\mathbb{M})$ and this subset is a subgroup. Consequently, this subgroup has finite index $(\text{poly}_m(\mathbb{M}))^{\dim G'}$.

Proof of Proposition A.11 assuming Lemma A.12. The main part of this proof will be the claim that g as a map $[\pm N]^n \rightarrow G'/\Gamma \cap (\gamma\Gamma\gamma^{-1}) \cap G'$ is $\text{poly}_m(\mathbb{M})\delta^{1/\exp(m^{O_s, n(1)})}$ -equidistributed.

Let us first verify that this claim can be used to prove Proposition A.11. In the following diagram, where we write $G'_\gamma := \gamma^{-1}G'\gamma$:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} g: \mathbb{Z}^n \rightarrow G' & \xrightarrow[\cong]{\gamma^{-1}(-)\gamma} & G'_\gamma \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ G'/\Gamma \cap (\gamma\Gamma\gamma^{-1}) \cap G' & \dashrightarrow & G'_\gamma/\gamma^{-1}\Gamma\gamma \cap \Gamma \cap G'_\gamma \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ G'/\Gamma \cap G' & & G'_\gamma/\Gamma \cap G'_\gamma, \end{array}$$

endow the intermediate quotients $G'/\Gamma \cap (\gamma\Gamma\gamma^{-1}) \cap G'$ and $G'_\gamma/\gamma^{-1}\Gamma\gamma \cap \Gamma \cap G'_\gamma$ with $\text{poly}_m(\mathbb{M})$ -rational Mel'cev bases.⁹

The conjugacy map $G'/\Gamma \cap (\gamma\Gamma\gamma^{-1}) \cap G' \rightarrow G'_\gamma/\gamma^{-1}\Gamma\gamma \cap \Gamma \cap G'_\gamma$ has Lipschitz constant $\text{poly}_m(\mathbb{M})$ by [12, Lemma A.17] applied to the inclusions $G' \subset G \supset G'_\gamma$. Thus by the assumption that $g: [\pm N]^n \rightarrow G'/\Gamma \cap (\gamma\Gamma\gamma^{-1}) \cap G'$ is $\text{poly}_m(\mathbb{M})\delta^{1/\exp(m^{O_s, n(1)})}$ -equidistributed, the map $\gamma^{-1}g\gamma$ seen as a map $[\pm N]^n \rightarrow G'_\gamma/\gamma^{-1}\Gamma\gamma \cap \Gamma \cap G'_\gamma$ remains $\text{poly}_m(\mathbb{M})\delta^{1/\exp(m^{O_s, n(1)})}$ -equidistributed.

The quotient map to $G'_\gamma/\Gamma \cap G'_\gamma$ always preserves equidistribution (at least at the cost of compromising a $\text{poly}_m(\mathbb{M})$ factor caused by the difference of the Mel'cev bases).

This proves a weaker version of Proposition A.11 where the adverb ‘‘totally’’ in the conclusion is omitted. To draw the full assertion, let

$$N' > N \cdot \text{poly}_m(\mathbb{M})\delta^{1/\exp(m^{O_s, n(1)})}$$

be an integer and $[\pm N']^n \hookrightarrow [\pm N]^n$ be a map given by a map of the form $x \mapsto ax + x_0$ ($a \in \mathbb{N}$, $x_0 \in [\pm N]^n$). Since $N' > \delta^{1/2}N$, we know that $g(a(-) + x_0)$ as a map $[\pm N']^n \rightarrow G'/\Gamma \cap G'$ is still totally $\delta^{1/2}$ -equidistributed. By the weaker version of Proposition A.11 that we have just proven, we conclude that its conjugate $\gamma^{-1}g(a(-) + x_0)\gamma$ as a map $[\pm N']^n \rightarrow G'_\gamma/\Gamma \cap G'_\gamma$ is $\text{poly}_m(\mathbb{M})(\delta^{1/2})^{1/\exp(m^{O_s, n(1)})}$ -equidistributed. This proves Proposition A.11, assuming the claim made at the beginning of the proof.

It remains to verify this key claim. Let us state it again.

Claim A.13. *The map g is $\text{poly}_m(\mathbb{M})\delta^{1/\exp(m^{O_s, n(1)})}$ -equidistributed when seen as a map $[\pm N]^n \rightarrow G'/\Gamma \cap (\gamma\Gamma\gamma^{-1}) \cap G'$.*

The rest of this proof is devoted to the verification of Claim A.13.

⁹They exist by [12, Proposition A.9] applied to the already given Mel'cev bases for the smaller quotients, seen as $\text{poly}_m(\mathbb{M})$ -weak bases for the subgroups in question; these are weak bases by Lemma A.12.

Suppose it is *not* δ' -equidistributed for some $\delta' > 0$. By the quantitative Leibman theorem A.4 there exist a non-zero horizontal character $\eta: G' \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ satisfying

$$\begin{aligned} \eta(\Gamma \cap (\gamma\Gamma\gamma^{-1}) \cap G') &\subset \mathbb{Z} \\ |\eta| &< (\delta')^{-\exp((2m)^{O_{s,n}(1)})} \\ \|\eta \circ g\|_{C^\infty[\pm N]^n} &< (\delta')^{-\exp((2m)^{O_{s,n}(1)})}. \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma A.12, the index $C = (\Gamma \cap G' : \Gamma \cap (\gamma\Gamma\gamma^{-1}) \cap G') = \text{poly}_m(M)$ satisfies the condition that $C\eta$ carries $\Gamma \cap G'$ into \mathbb{Z} . We conclude that the non-zero horizontal character $C\eta$ satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} C\eta(\Gamma \cap G') &\subset \mathbb{Z}, \\ |C\eta| &< \text{poly}_m(M) \cdot (\delta')^{-\exp((2m)^{O_{s,n}(1)})} \\ \|\eta \circ g\|_{C^\infty[\pm N]^n} &< \text{poly}_m(M) \cdot (\delta')^{-\exp((2m)^{O_{s,n}(1)})}. \end{aligned}$$

The (easier) converse of the Leibman theorem (Proposition A.6) implies that then $g: [\pm N]^n \rightarrow G'/\Gamma \cap G'$ is not *totally* $\text{poly}_m(M)^{-1}(\delta')^{\exp((2m)^{O_{s,n}(1)})}$ -equidistributed. As we are assuming that it is totally δ -equidistributed, we conclude that

$$\text{poly}_m(M)^{-1}(\delta')^{\exp((2m)^{O_{s,n}(1)})} < \delta,$$

in particular

$$(A.3) \quad \delta' < \text{poly}_m(M)\delta^{1/\exp((2m)^{O_{s,n}(1)})}.$$

By contraposition, for any δ' violating (A.3), we know that g as a map $[\pm N]^n \rightarrow G'/\Gamma \cap (\gamma\Gamma\gamma^{-1})G'$ is δ' -equidistributed. Taking δ' as the right hand side of (A.3), the proof of Claim A.13 and hence of Proposition A.11 is complete.

(But remember that Lemma A.12 remains to be shown.) \square

A.3.1. *The proof of Lemma A.12.* We will make repeated use of the following description of the group structure through the lens of a Mel'cev basis.

Lemma A.14. *Let $M > 1$ be a positive number and let G/Γ be an m -dimensional nilmanifold equipped with an M -Mel'cev basis adapted to some filtration. Let $G \cong \mathbb{R}^m$ be the corresponding Mel'cev coordinate.*

Then the multiplication and inversion on G is written by polynomials as follows: for $x = (x_1, \dots, x_m)$, $y = (y_1, \dots, y_m) \in G \cong \mathbb{R}^m$, we have

$$(A.4) \quad \begin{aligned} x \cdot y &= (x_i + y_i + P_i(x_1, \dots, x_{i-1}; y_1, \dots, y_{i-1}))_{i=1, \dots, m}, \\ x^{-1} &= (-x_i + \tilde{P}_i(x_1, \dots, x_{i-1}))_{i=1, \dots, m}. \end{aligned}$$

Here, P_i, \tilde{P}_i are polynomials of degree $\leq m$ whose coefficients are rational numbers of height $\leq \text{poly}_m(M)$. Moreover, the polynomials P_i only have terms of bidegree $\geq (1, 1)$ in x and y (meaning that each term must contain one of the x_i 's and one of the y_i 's). The polynomials \tilde{P}_i only have terms of degree ≥ 2 .

Proof. This is [12, Lemma A.3] with the height bound clarified in [30, the paragraph before Lemma A.4]. The claims about degrees do not appear in *loc. cit.*, but follow from the specific form of the Baker–Campbell–Hausdorff formula

$$\exp(X) \cdot \exp(Y) = \exp\left(X + Y + \frac{1}{2}[X, Y] + \dots\right),$$

where the higher terms are nested Lie brackets with rational coefficients in which X and Y both appear at least once. \square

Proof of Lemma A.12. The first assertion of Lemma A.12 was that the subgroup $\Gamma \cap (\gamma\Gamma\gamma^{-1}) \cap G'$ contains the set $(\psi')^{-1}(C\mathbb{Z}^{\dim G'})$ for some $C = \text{poly}_m(\mathbb{M})$ when G/Γ admits an M -rational Mel'cev basis, and G' and $\gamma \in G$ are M -rational.

Recall that by using [12, Proposition A.9], $G'/\Gamma \cap G'$ and $G'_\gamma/\Gamma \cap G'_\gamma$ are given $\text{poly}_m(\mathbb{M})$ -rational Mel'cev bases (adapted to some filtration) obtained as $\text{poly}_m(\mathbb{M})$ -rational linear combinations of that for G/Γ . By Lemma A.14, the conjugacy map composed with the Mel'cev coordinates

$$(A.5) \quad \gamma^{-1}(-)\gamma: \quad \mathbb{R}^{m'} \cong G' \rightarrow G'_\gamma \cong \mathbb{R}^{m'}$$

($m' = \dim G'$) is represented by constant-term-free polynomials of degree $\leq m$ with rational coefficients of height $\leq \text{poly}_m(\mathbb{M})$. Let $C = \text{poly}_m(\mathbb{M})$ be a common multiple of the denominators appearing there. Then it is easy to see that the map (A.5) carries $C\mathbb{Z}^{m'}$ into $\mathbb{Z}^{m'}$. This implies that $(\psi')^{-1}(C\mathbb{Z}^{m'}) \subset \gamma\Gamma\gamma^{-1}$. Since we trivially know that $C\mathbb{Z}^{m'} \subset \mathbb{Z}^{m'} = \psi'(\Gamma \cap G')$, this establishes the first assertion.

Next we want to prove that $C\mathbb{Z}^{m'}$ is a subgroup of $\Gamma \cap G'$ by possibly modifying C by a factor $\leq \text{poly}_m(\mathbb{M})$. By Lemma A.14 applied to $G'/\Gamma \cap G'$, the multiplication and inversion of the group G' is represented by polynomials P_i, \tilde{P}_i with rational coefficients of height $\leq \text{poly}_m(\mathbb{M})$. We add the requirement that C is also a common multiple of the denominators appearing there. Then by the description (A.4) and the condition that P_i only have terms of bidegree $\geq (1, 1)$, we conclude that $C\mathbb{Z}^{m'}$ is closed under multiplication and inversion of G' , namely $C\mathbb{Z}^{m'}$ is a subgroup.

Lastly we prove that $C\mathbb{Z}^{m'} \subset \mathbb{Z}^{m'}$ has index $C^{m'}$, and in particular that $\Gamma \cap \gamma\Gamma\gamma^{-1} \cap G'$ has index $\leq C^{m'} = \text{poly}_m(\mathbb{M})$ in $\Gamma \cap G'$. Use the identification $G' \cong \mathbb{R}^{m'}$ by the Mel'cev coordinates. Let us write $\Gamma^{(C)} := C\mathbb{Z}^{m'} \subset \Gamma \cap G'$. It suffices to show that a fundamental domain for the quotient $G'/\Gamma^{(C)}$ can be taken as the product $[0, C]^{m'}$ of intervals, an analogous statement to [12, Lemma A.14]. The verification goes exactly as in *loc. cit.*¹⁰

This completes the proof of Lemma A.12 (and therefore of Proposition A.11, phew!). \square

APPENDIX B. ELEMENTARY INEQUALITIES

We recall a few inequalities from [10, Appendix A]. As we need them in slightly different formats than in *loc. cit.*, we will include complete proofs of them.

Proposition B.1 (Eliminating the characteristic function of cubes). *Let B be a finite set and $J(\beta) \subset \mathbb{Z}^n$ a bounded cube given for each $\beta \in B$. Let $B \times \mathbb{Z}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ be a function and $N \geq 2$ an integer. Then there is a homomorphism $\xi: \mathbb{Z}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{Q}/\mathbb{Z}$*

¹⁰We believe that the order $m, m-1, \dots, 1$ in the proof in *loc. cit.* has to be reversed.

such that we have

$$(B.1) \quad \sum_{\beta \in \mathbf{B}} \left| \sum_{x \in [\pm N]^n} 1_{\mathbf{J}(\beta)}(x) \mathbf{K}(\beta, x) \right|^2 \ll_n (\log^{2n} N) \sum_{\beta \in \mathbf{B}} \left| \sum_{x \in [\pm N]^n} e^{2\pi i \xi(x)} \mathbf{K}(\beta, x) \right|^2.$$

Proof. This is essentially taken from [10, Lemma A.2]. We identify the set $[\pm N]^n$ with the additive group $(\mathbb{Z}/(2N+1)\mathbb{Z})^n$. By Fourier analysis, for any cube \mathbf{J} we can write

$$1_{\mathbf{J}}(x) = \sum_{\xi \in \text{Hom}((\mathbb{Z}/(2N+1)\mathbb{Z})^n, \mathbb{Q}/\mathbb{Z})} \langle 1_{\mathbf{J}}, e^{2\pi i \xi(-)} \rangle \cdot e^{2\pi i \xi(x)}$$

where $\langle 1_{\mathbf{J}}, e^{2\pi i \xi(-)} \rangle = \mathbb{E}_{x \in (\mathbb{Z}/(2N+1)\mathbb{Z})^n} 1_{\mathbf{J}}(x) e^{-2\pi i \xi(x)}$.

Suppose \mathbf{J} is the product $[a_1, b_1] \times \cdots \times [a_n, b_n]$, and that under the bijection

$$\text{Hom}((\mathbb{Z}/(2N+1)\mathbb{Z})^n, \mathbb{Q}/\mathbb{Z}) \cong \left(\frac{1}{2N+1}\mathbb{Z}\right)^n / \mathbb{Z}^n \cong [\pm N]^n,$$

the map ξ corresponds to the tuple $(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_n) \in [\pm N]^n$. Then

$$\langle 1_{\mathbf{J}}, e^{2\pi i \xi(-)} \rangle = \prod_{i=1}^n \left(\frac{1}{2N+1} \sum_{x=a_i}^{b_i} e^{-\frac{2\pi i}{2N+1} \xi_i x} \right).$$

By the sum of geometric series, unless $\xi_i = 0$ we have

$$(B.2) \quad \frac{1}{2N+1} \left| \sum_{x=a_i}^{b_i} e^{-\frac{2\pi i}{2N+1} \xi_i x} \right| = \frac{1}{2N+1} \left| \frac{e^{-\frac{2\pi i}{2N+1} \xi_i a_i} - e^{-\frac{2\pi i}{2N+1} \xi_i (b_i+1)}}{1 - e^{-\frac{2\pi i}{2N+1} \xi_i}} \right| \leq \frac{1}{2N+1} \cdot \frac{2}{\frac{2\pi}{2N+1} |\xi_i|} = \frac{1}{\pi |\xi_i|}$$

and when $\xi_i = 0$ the left hand side equals $(b_i - a_i + 1)/(2N+1)$ which is ≤ 1 . Let us denote this upper bound by $b(\xi_i)$:

$$b(\xi) := \begin{cases} \frac{1}{\pi |\xi|} & \text{if } \xi \in [\pm N] \setminus \{0\} \\ 1 & \text{if } \xi = 0, \end{cases}$$

so that $|\langle 1_{\mathbf{J}}, e^{2\pi i \xi(-)} \rangle| \leq b(\xi_1) \cdots b(\xi_n)$.

By the triangle inequality for the l^2 -norm, we have

$$(L.H.S. \text{ of } (B.1))^{1/2} = \left(\sum_{\beta \in \mathbf{B}} \left| \sum_{\xi \in [\pm N]^n} \sum_{x \in [\pm N]^n} \langle 1_{\mathbf{J}(\beta)}, e^{-2\pi i \xi(-)} \rangle e^{2\pi i \xi(x)} \mathbf{K}(\beta, x) \right|^2 \right)^{1/2} \leq \sum_{\xi \in [\pm N]^n} \left(\sum_{\beta \in \mathbf{B}} \left| \sum_{x \in [\pm N]^n} \langle 1_{\mathbf{J}(\beta)}, e^{-2\pi i \xi(-)} \rangle e^{2\pi i \xi(x)} \mathbf{K}(\beta, x) \right|^2 \right)^{1/2}.$$

By the relation $|\langle 1_{J(\beta)}, e^{2\pi i\xi(-)} \rangle| \leq b(\xi_1) \cdots b(\xi_n)$, this is bounded as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} &\leq \sum_{\xi \in [\pm N]^n} b(\xi_1) \cdots b(\xi_n) \left(\sum_{\beta \in B} \left| \sum_{x \in [\pm N]^n} e^{2\pi i\xi(x)} \mathbf{K}(\beta, x) \right|^2 \right)^{1/2} \\ &\leq \left(\sum_{\xi \in [\pm N]^n} b(\xi_1) \cdots b(\xi_n) \right) \cdot \max_{\xi \in [\pm N]^n} \left(\sum_{\beta \in B} \left| \sum_{x \in [\pm N]^n} e^{2\pi i\xi(x)} \mathbf{K}(\beta, x) \right|^2 \right)^{1/2}. \end{aligned}$$

By (B.2), we know

$$\sum_{\xi \in [\pm N]^n} b(\xi_1) \cdots b(\xi_n) \leq \prod_{i=1}^n \left(1 + \frac{2}{\pi} \left(1 + \frac{1}{2} + \cdots + \frac{1}{N} \right) \right) \ll_n \log^n N.$$

This completes the proof of Proposition B.1. \square

Proposition B.2 (A version of Cauchy–Schwarz). *Let A, B be finite sets and let $f: A \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$, $F: A \times B \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ be functions. Then*

$$\left| \sum_{a \in A} \sum_{b \in B} f(a) F(a, b) \right| \leq \max_{a \in A} |f(a)| (\#A)^{1/2} \left| \sum_{a \in A} \sum_{b, b' \in B} F(a, b) \overline{F(a, b')} \right|^{1/2}$$

Proof. This is taken from [10, Lemma A.10]. By the triangle inequality

$$\left| \sum_{a \in A} \sum_{b \in B} f(a) F(a, b) \right| \leq \sum_{a \in A} |f(a)| \left| \sum_{b \in B} F(a, b) \right| \leq \max_{a \in A} |f(a)| \sum_{a \in A} \left| \sum_{b \in B} F(a, b) \right|.$$

By Cauchy–Schwarz for the functions 1 and $a \mapsto \left| \sum_{b \in B} F(a, b) \right|$ on A , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{a \in A} \left| \sum_{b \in B} F(a, b) \right| &\leq (\#A)^{1/2} \left(\sum_{a \in A} \left| \sum_{b \in B} F(a, b) \right|^2 \right)^{1/2} \\ &= (\#A)^{1/2} \left(\sum_{a \in A} \sum_{b, b' \in B} F(a, b) \overline{F(a, b')} \right)^{1/2}. \end{aligned}$$

These two inequalities imply the assertion of Proposition B.2. \square

APPENDIX C. THE PSEUDORADOM MAJORANT

As usual, let \mathfrak{a} be a non-zero fractional ideal of K equipped with a norm-length compatible basis $\mathfrak{a} \cong \mathbb{Z}^n$. Fix once and for all a C^∞ -function $\chi: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow [0, 1]$ supported in $[-1, 1]$ and satisfying $\chi(0) = 1$. Set

$$c_\chi := \int_0^1 \chi'(t)^2 dt > 0.$$

Whenever a positive real number $w > 0$ is given, we write $W := P(w) := \prod_{p < w} p \in \mathbb{N}$.

The following definition is taken from [20, §§6–7].

Definition C.1. Let $R, w > 0$ be positive numbers. Let $b \in \mathfrak{a}$ be coprime to W in the sense that $W\mathfrak{a} + b\mathcal{O}_K = \mathfrak{a}$. Define the function $\nu_{R,w,b}^{\mathfrak{a}} : \mathfrak{a} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ by

$$(C.1) \quad \nu_{R,w,b}^{\mathfrak{a}}(x) := \frac{\varphi_K(W)}{W^n} \cdot \frac{\text{res}_{s=1}(\zeta_K(s)) \log R}{c_\chi} \cdot \left(\sum_{(Wx+b)\mathfrak{a}^{-1} \subset \mathfrak{d}} \mu_K(\mathfrak{d}) \chi \left(\frac{\log \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{d})}{\log R} \right) \right)^2,$$

where \mathfrak{d} runs through the non-zero ideals of \mathcal{O}_K containing $(Wx+b)\mathfrak{a}^{-1}$.

We want to use this function to majorize the W -tricked Λ_K . In fact, it is more convenient to consider the following variant where we ignore the contribution from prime powers of exponents ≥ 2 :

$$\begin{aligned} \Lambda'_K(\mathfrak{d}) &:= 1[\mathfrak{d} \text{ is a prime ideal}] \cdot \Lambda_K(\mathfrak{d}), \\ \Lambda'_K(x) &:= \Lambda'_K(x\mathfrak{a}^{-1}) \quad \text{for } x \in \mathfrak{a} \setminus \{0\}. \end{aligned}$$

Proposition C.2. *Assume $0 < w < (\log N)^{0.5}$ and $b \in [0, W-1]^n \subset \mathfrak{a}$ (a complete set of representatives for $\mathfrak{a}/W\mathfrak{a}$). Then we have a bound*

$$(C.2) \quad \frac{\varphi_K(W)}{W^n} \Lambda'_K(Wx+b) \ll_{K,\chi} \frac{\log N}{\log R} \cdot \nu_{R,w,b}^{\mathfrak{a}}(x)$$

for all $x \in [\pm N]^n \subset \mathfrak{a}$ satisfying $\mathbf{N}(Wx+b) > R \cdot \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{a})$.

In particular, set $R := N^{1/10t}$ for some integer $t \geq 1$. Then

$$(C.3) \quad \frac{\varphi_K(W)}{W^n} \Lambda'_K(Wx+b) \ll_{K,\chi} 10t \cdot \nu_{N^{1/10t},w,b}^{\mathfrak{a}}(x)$$

for all but $\ll_K N^{n-0.8}$ many $x \in [\pm N]^n \subset \mathfrak{a}$.

Proof. When $(Wx+b)\mathfrak{a}^{-1}$ is not a prime ideal, the assertion is trivially true because the left hand side is zero.

Assume $(Wx+b)\mathfrak{a}^{-1}$ is a prime ideal. Then the left hand side is $\frac{\varphi_K(W)}{W^n} \mathbf{N}((Wx+b)\mathfrak{a}^{-1})$. By the assumptions on w, b , we know $Wx+b \in [\pm 2WN]^n$ and thus $\mathbf{N}((Wx+b)\mathfrak{a}^{-1}) \ll_K (WN)^n < N^{n+1}$. Therefore the left-hand side is

$$\ll_K \frac{\varphi_K(W)}{W^n} \log N.$$

On the other hand, since $\mathfrak{p} := (Wx+b)\mathfrak{a}^{-1}$ is assumed to be prime, the only choices for \mathfrak{b} in (C.1) are $\mathfrak{b} = \mathfrak{p}, \mathcal{O}_K$. But \mathfrak{p} does not contribute by the assumptions $\mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{p}) > R$ and $\text{Supp}(\chi) \subset [-1, 1]$. So we can compute as:

$$\nu_{R,w,b}^{\mathfrak{a}}(x) = \frac{\varphi_K(W)}{W^n} \cdot \frac{\text{res}_{s=1}(\zeta_K(s)) \log R}{c_\chi} \gg_{K,\chi} \frac{\varphi_K(W)}{W^n} \cdot \log R.$$

This proves (C.2).

To prove (C.3) we have to bound the number of $x \in [\pm N]^n$ satisfying $\mathbf{N}((Wx+b)\mathfrak{a}^{-1}) \leq R$. By Proposition E.1 and Lemma E.3, we know that the number of $y \in [\pm 2WN]^n$ satisfying $\mathbf{N}(y\mathfrak{a}^{-1}) \leq R$ is

$$\ll_K R + \mathcal{O}_K((WN)^{n-1}) \ll_K N^{n-0.8}.$$

Since the map $x \mapsto y := Wx+b$ is injective and carries $[\pm N]^n$ into $[\pm 2WN]^n$, we deduce that the number of $x \in [\pm N]^n$ satisfying $\mathbf{N}((Wx+b)\mathfrak{a}^{-1}) \leq R$ is subject to the same bound. This completes the proof. \square

Now we want to verify that our majorants satisfy suitable pseudorandomness condition. Though the concrete pseudorandomness conditions needed in Theorem A.1 and Theorem F.4 are slightly different, they are both derived from the main computation in our earlier work [20].

Theorem C.3. *Let $N, t, d, L > 0$ be positive integers and let*

$$\phi_1, \dots, \phi_t: \mathbb{Z}^d \rightarrow \mathfrak{a}$$

be linear maps of coefficients $\leq L$ with respect to a norm-length compatible basis of \mathfrak{a} . Assume that they all have finite cokernels and that their kernels do not contain each other.

Let $1 < w < (\log N)^{0.5}$ be a real number and set $W = P(w) := \prod_{p < w} p$. Choose any $b_1, \dots, b_t \in \mathfrak{a}$ coprime to W in the sense that $W\mathfrak{a} + b_i\mathcal{O}_K = \mathfrak{a}$. Choose any intervals $I_1, \dots, I_d \subset \mathbb{Z}$ of $\geq N^{1/2}$ elements and set $B := I_1 \times \dots \times I_d \subset \mathbb{Z}^d$.

If $N > O_{t,K}(1)$ and $w > O_{K,d}(L^{O_n(1)}) + O(4^{nt})$, we have

$$\left| 1 - \mathbb{E}_{x \in B} \left[\prod_{i=1}^t \nu_{N^{1/10t}, w, b_i}^{\mathfrak{a}}(\phi_i(x)) \right] \right| = O_{\chi, t, n}(1/w).$$

Proof. This is a specialized form ($R := N^{1/10t}$) of [20, Theorem 6.33, Remark 6.32] (see also [20, comment before Remark 6.30]). \square

Corollary C.4 (majorization, Gowers-close to 1). *Let $s \geq 1$ be an integer. Let $O_{s,K}(1) < w < (\log N)^{0.5}$ be a positive number and let $b \in \mathfrak{a}$ be coprime to $W = P(w)$. Set $t := 2^{s+1}$. Then for any cuboid $B \subset \mathbb{Z}^n \cong \mathfrak{a}$ that is the product of intervals of $\geq N^{1/2}$ elements, we have*

$$\left\| 1 - \nu_{N^{1/10t}, w, b}^{\mathfrak{a}} \right\|_{U^{s+1}(B)} \ll_{\chi, s, n} \frac{1}{w}.$$

Proposition C.2 and Corollary C.4 can be summarized that except for negligibly few ($< N^{n-0.8}$) points in $[\pm N]^n$, the W -tricked $\Lambda_K^{\mathfrak{a}}$ is bounded from above up to a constant factor $O_{K,\chi}(t)$ by a function which is only $O_{\chi, s, n}(1/w)$ away from 1 in the Gowers U^{s+1} -norm.

Corollary C.5 (simultaneous majorization, linear forms condition). *Let $N, t, d, L \geq 1$ be integers and assume $N > L^{100} + O_{t,d,K}(1)$.*

Let $O_{K,d}(L^{O_n(1)}) + O(4^{nt}) < w < (\log N)^{0.5}$ be a positive number and set $W = P(w) = \prod_{p < w} p$. Choose any $b_1, \dots, b_t \in [0, W-1]^n \subset \mathfrak{a}$ coprime to W . Then there exists a function $\nu: \mathfrak{a} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ that satisfies the (t, d, L) -linear forms condition in scale $\geq N^{0.52}$ within error $< O_{t,n}(1/w)$ (Definition F.3) such that we have a pointwise bound

$$1, \Lambda_{W, b_i}^{\mathfrak{a}}(x) \ll_K t \cdot \nu(x)$$

for all $1 \leq i \leq t$ and all but $< N^{n-0.8}$ many $x \in [\pm N]^n \subset \mathfrak{a}$.

Proof. Choose any C^∞ function $\chi: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow [0, 1]$ as in the beginning of this section. Then the function $\frac{1}{t+1}(1 + \nu_{N^{1/10t}, w, b_1}^{\mathfrak{a}} + \dots + \nu_{N^{1/10t}, w, b_t}^{\mathfrak{a}})$ works thanks to Proposition C.2 and Theorem C.3.

When verifying the linear forms condition, there is a “wraparound” issue arising from the somewhat artificial definition of $\nu_{[\pm \frac{p}{2}]^n}$ in Definition F.3 which goes through the bijection $\mathbb{F}_p^n \cong [\pm p/2]^n$. This can be handled by chopping the domain of summation (which is the product of copies of $[\pm p/2]^n$, $p \geq N^{0.52}$) into cuboids

of side lengths $\in [N^{1/2}, 2N^{1/2}]$ and disregarding not *nice* cuboids as in [9, p. 527] (their contribution is $\ll_{t,d} L N^{1/2}/p$). \square

C.1. Variant for the localization $\mathcal{O}_K[S^{-1}]$. When we treat the localization $\mathcal{O}_K[S^{-1}]$ in relation to the application for the Hasse principle in §13, we will want to have a pseudorandom majorant for its von Mangoldt function $\Lambda_{\mathcal{O}_K[S^{-1}]}$. For this we modify (C.1) by only considering ideals \mathfrak{d} coprime to S :

$$\nu_{S^{-1},R,w,b}^{\mathfrak{a}}(x) := \frac{|(\mathcal{O}_K[S^{-1}]/(W))^{\times}|}{|\mathcal{O}_K[S^{-1}]/(W)|} \cdot \frac{\text{res}_{s=1}(\zeta_K(s)) \log R}{c_{\chi}} \cdot \left(\sum_{\substack{\mathfrak{d} \in \text{Ideals}_{\mathcal{O}_K} \\ \text{coprime to } S \\ \mathfrak{d} | (Wx+b)\mathfrak{a}^{-1}}} \mu_K(\mathfrak{d}) \chi \left(\frac{\log \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{d})}{\log R} \right) \right)^2.$$

Here it will be useful to know the following description of the coefficient:

$$\frac{|(\mathcal{O}_K[S^{-1}]/(W))^{\times}|}{|\mathcal{O}_K[S^{-1}]/(W)|} = \left(\prod_{\substack{\mathfrak{p} | W \\ \text{coprime to } S}} \frac{\varphi_K(\mathfrak{p})}{\mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{p})} \right).$$

Proposition C.2 holds by exactly the same proof:

$$\frac{|(\mathcal{O}_K[S^{-1}]/(W))^{\times}|}{|\mathcal{O}_K[S^{-1}]/(W)|} \Lambda'_{\mathcal{O}_K[S^{-1}]}(Wx+b) \ll_{K,\chi} 10t \cdot \nu_{S^{-1},N^{1/10t},w,b}^{\mathfrak{a}}(x).$$

To see that Theorem C.3 and its corollaries C.4 C.5 continue to hold for $\nu_{S^{-1},N^{1/10t},R,w,b}^{\mathfrak{a}}$ one has to go through the proof of it in [20, §6]. Everything in *loc. cit.* works equally just by focusing on ideals coprime to S . The error terms do not need modification because there are less terms to deal with. We conclude:

Theorem C.6. *Let $s, N \geq 1$ be integers. Let $O_{s,K}(1) < w < (\log N)^{0.5}$ be a positive number and let $b \in \mathfrak{a}$ be coprime to $W = P(w)$ in $\mathfrak{a}[S^{-1}]$, i.e., $b \notin \mathfrak{p}\mathfrak{a}$ for all $\mathfrak{p} | W$ that is coprime to S . Then there is a function $\nu_{S^{-1},N^{1/2s+5},w,b}^{\mathfrak{a}} : \mathfrak{a} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ such that*

$$\left\| 1 - \nu_{S^{-1},N^{1/2s+5},w,b}^{\mathfrak{a}} \right\|_{U^{s+1}(B)} \ll_{s,n,\chi} \frac{1}{w}$$

for any $B \subset \mathfrak{a}$ that is the product of intervals of lengths $\geq N^{1/2}$ with respect to a norm-length compatible basis $\mathfrak{a} \cong \mathbb{Z}^n$, and that we have a pointwise bound on $[\pm N]_{\mathfrak{a}}^n$ except for $< N^{n-0.8}$ points:

$$\left| \frac{|(\mathcal{O}_K[S^{-1}]/(W))^{\times}|}{|\mathcal{O}_K[S^{-1}]/(W)|} \Lambda'_{\mathcal{O}_K[S^{-1}]}(W(-)+b) \right| \ll_{s,K,\chi} \nu_{S^{-1},N^{1/2s+5},w,b}^{\mathfrak{a}}.$$

APPENDIX D. SUPPLEMENTS FROM ALGEBRAIC NUMBER THEORY

D.1. Mertens' theorem.

Proposition D.1 (Mertens' theorem for number fields; [25, Theorem 2]). *For positive numbers $x > 0$ we have:*

$$\prod_{\substack{\mathfrak{p} \\ \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{p}) < x}} \left(1 - \frac{1}{\mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{p})} \right)^{-1} = e^{\gamma} \cdot \text{res}_{s=1}(\zeta_K(s)) \cdot \log x + O_K(1).$$

Here, γ is Euler's constant.

D.2. Sieve theory for ideals. In the proof of Proposition 5.2, we used part (1) of the following lemma (for the usual context of integers \mathbb{Z}). Part (2) was used when we performed a Vaughan-type decomposition of the Cramér/Siegel models of Λ_K in Proposition 8.5.

Let $\text{Ideals}_K^{\text{sq-free}}$ be the set of square-free elements (i.e., the products $\mathfrak{n} = \mathfrak{p}_1 \cdots \mathfrak{p}_r$ of distinct prime ideals, $r \geq 0$). Choose a total order “ $<$ ” on the set of non-zero prime ideals, compatible with the norm in the sense that

$$(D.1) \quad \mathfrak{p}_1 < \mathfrak{p}_2 \text{ implies } \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{p}_1) \leq \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{p}_2).$$

For an ideal \mathfrak{n} and a real numbers z , let us write $\mathfrak{n} < z$ (resp. $\mathfrak{n} \leq z, \dots$) to mean $\mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{n}) < z$ (resp. $\mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{n}) \leq z, \dots$). For $z > 2$, let $\mathfrak{P}(z)$ be the ideal

$$\mathfrak{P}(z) := \prod_{\mathfrak{p} < z} \mathfrak{p}.$$

Lemma D.2 (Fundamental Lemma). *Let $z > 0$, $\kappa > 0$ be real numbers and let $D \geq z^{9\kappa+1}$.*

Let $g: \text{Ideals}_K^{\text{sq-free}} \rightarrow [0, 1) \subset \mathbb{R}$ be a multiplicative function. Assume that we have a bound

$$(D.2) \quad \prod_{w \leq \mathfrak{p} < z} (1 - g(\mathfrak{p}))^{-1} \leq M \left(\frac{\log z}{\log w} \right)^\kappa$$

for some constant $M > 0$ and all $2 \leq w < z$.

Let $(a_{\mathfrak{n}})_{\mathfrak{n} \in \text{Ideals}_K}$ be a family of non-negative real numbers, zero except for finitely many \mathfrak{n} , and $X > 0$ be a real number. For each ideal $\mathfrak{d} \leq D$ dividing $\mathfrak{P}(z)$, let $r_{\mathfrak{d}}$ be the remainder defined by the relation

$$(D.3) \quad \sum_{\substack{\mathfrak{n} \in \text{Ideals}_K \\ \mathfrak{d} | \mathfrak{n}}} a_{\mathfrak{n}} = Xg(\mathfrak{d}) + r_{\mathfrak{d}}.$$

Then:

(1) Write $S(z) := \sum_{\mathfrak{n} \in \text{Ideals}_K} a_{\mathfrak{n}} 1_{\mathfrak{n} + \mathfrak{P}(z) = (1)}$. We have

$$S(z) = X \left(\prod_{0 < \mathfrak{p} < z} (1 - g(\mathfrak{p})) \right) (1 + O(M^{10} e^{9\kappa - \frac{\log D}{\log z}})) + O \left(\sum_{\substack{1 \leq \mathfrak{d} \leq D \\ \mathfrak{d} | \mathfrak{P}(z)}} |r_{\mathfrak{d}}| \right).$$

(2) There are functions (depending on D) $\lambda^{\pm}: \text{Ideals}_K \rightarrow \{-1, 0, 1\}$; $\mathfrak{d} \mapsto \lambda_{\mathfrak{d}}^{\pm}$ satisfying:

- $\lambda_{(1)}^{\pm} = 1$;
- λ^+ is supported on $\text{Ideals}_{K, \leq D}$;
- for all $\mathfrak{n} \in \text{Ideals}_K$, we have

$$\sum_{\mathfrak{d} | \mathfrak{n}} \lambda_{\mathfrak{d}}^- \leq 1_{\mathfrak{n}=(1)} \leq \sum_{\mathfrak{d} | \mathfrak{n}} \lambda_{\mathfrak{d}}^+;$$

- Write $S^{\pm}(z) := \sum_{\mathfrak{n} \in \text{Ideals}_K} a_{\mathfrak{n}} \sum_{\mathfrak{d} | (\mathfrak{n} + \mathfrak{P}(z))} \lambda_{\mathfrak{d}}^{\pm}$. We have

$$|S(z) - S^{\pm}(z)| < O(e^{9\kappa - \frac{\log D}{\log z}} M^{10}) \cdot X \cdot \prod_{\mathfrak{p} < z} (1 - g(\mathfrak{p})) + \sum_{\substack{\mathfrak{d} | \mathfrak{P}(z) \\ \mathfrak{d} < D}} |r_{\mathfrak{d}}|.$$

Proof. When $K = \mathbb{Q}$, this is [18, pp. 153–159], notably (6.19), (6.20), Theorem 6.1, Corollary 6.2 and Lemma 6.3 in *loc. cit.* (We are writing D for their y .) Consult also [5, §§6.4–6.5] for clearer definitions and more careful proofs.

One can check, slightly amazingly, that the definitions and arguments in the above continue to make sense and work for any free commutative monoid \mathcal{S} generated by a countable set, equipped with:

- a multiplicative function (the “norm”) $\mathbf{N}: \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ such that for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$, the inverse image $\mathbf{N}^{-1}(n) \subset \mathcal{S}$ is finite;
- a total order on the set of irreducible elements (“prime ideals”) compatible with the norm in the sense of (D.1).

In particular they apply to $\mathcal{S} = \text{Ideals}_K$ with the usual norm and the chosen ordering. \square

D.3. Hecke characters. We make a minimum recollection on the notion of Hecke characters. See [19, §2.3] for references.

Let \mathbf{I}_K be the group of idèles of K . For non-zero ideals $\mathfrak{q} = \prod_{\mathfrak{p}} \mathfrak{p}^{n_{\mathfrak{p}}} \subset \mathcal{O}_K$, denote by $C(\mathfrak{q})$ the following quotient of \mathbf{I}_K :

$$C(\mathfrak{q}) := \left((\mathbb{K} \otimes_{\mathbb{Q}} \mathbb{R})^{\times} \times \bigoplus_{\mathfrak{p}|\mathfrak{q}} \mathbb{K}^{\times} / (1 + \mathfrak{p}^{n_{\mathfrak{p}}} \mathcal{O}_{K,\mathfrak{p}}) \times \bigoplus_{\mathfrak{p} \nmid \mathfrak{q}} \mathbb{Z} \right) / K^{\times}.$$

An inclusion $\mathfrak{q} \subset \mathfrak{q}'$, or $\mathfrak{q}' \mid \mathfrak{q}$, induces a surjection $C(\mathfrak{q}) \twoheadrightarrow C(\mathfrak{q}')$. When a non-zero fractional ideal \mathfrak{a} is coprime to \mathfrak{q} , we have a well-defined class

$$[\mathfrak{a}] \in C(\mathfrak{q}).$$

A *Hecke character* of the number field K is a continuous homomorphism from the group of idèles to the group of complex numbers of absolute value 1:

$$\psi: \mathbf{I}_K \rightarrow S^1 := \{z \in \mathbb{C}^{\times} \mid |z| = 1\}.$$

The continuity implies that ψ factors through $C(\mathfrak{q})$ for some non-zero ideal \mathfrak{q} . In this case ψ is called a *mod \mathfrak{q} Hecke character*. There is a maximum ideal \mathfrak{q} such that this factorization happens; we call it the *conductor* of ψ .

For a non-zero fractional ideal \mathfrak{a} , let us write

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathfrak{a}/\mathfrak{q}\mathfrak{a})^{\times} &:= \{x \in \mathfrak{a}/\mathfrak{q}\mathfrak{a} \mid x \text{ generates } \mathfrak{a}/\mathfrak{q}\mathfrak{a} \text{ as an } \mathcal{O}_K\text{-module}\}, \\ \mathfrak{a}^{\times, \mathfrak{q}} &:= \mathfrak{a} \times_{\mathfrak{a}/\mathfrak{q}\mathfrak{a}} (\mathfrak{a}/\mathfrak{q}\mathfrak{a})^{\times} \\ &= \{x \in \mathfrak{a} \mid x \text{ generates } \mathfrak{a}/\mathfrak{q}\mathfrak{a} \text{ as an } \mathcal{O}_K\text{-module}\}. \end{aligned}$$

There is a natural map of sets, which we also denote by incl :

$$\text{incl}: (\mathfrak{a}/\mathfrak{q}\mathfrak{a})^{\times} \rightarrow C(\mathfrak{q}),$$

induced by the maps $(\mathfrak{a}/\mathfrak{q}\mathfrak{a})^{\times} \rightarrow \mathbb{K}^{\times} / (1 + \mathfrak{p}^{n_{\mathfrak{p}}} \mathcal{O}_{K,\mathfrak{p}})$ for $\mathfrak{p} \mid \mathfrak{q}$, and the constant maps $(\mathfrak{a}/\mathfrak{q}\mathfrak{a})^{\times} \rightarrow \{v_{\mathfrak{p}}(\mathfrak{a})\} \subset \mathbb{Z}$ for $\mathfrak{p} \nmid \mathfrak{q}$. Let us write

$$\psi^{(\mathfrak{a}/\mathfrak{q}\mathfrak{a})^{\times}} := \psi \circ \text{incl}: (\mathfrak{a}/\mathfrak{q}\mathfrak{a})^{\times} \rightarrow C(\mathfrak{q}) \rightarrow S^1.$$

By the *restriction $\psi^{\mathfrak{a}}: \mathfrak{a} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ of ψ to \mathfrak{a}* we mean the zero-extension of the following composite map to \mathfrak{a} :

$$\psi^{\mathfrak{a}}: \mathfrak{a}^{\times, \mathfrak{q}} \xrightarrow{(\text{incl}, \text{can})} (\mathbb{K} \otimes_{\mathbb{Q}} \mathbb{R})^{\times} \times (\mathfrak{a}/\mathfrak{q}\mathfrak{a})^{\times} \xrightarrow{\text{incl} + \text{incl}} C(\mathfrak{q}) \xrightarrow{\psi} S^1 \subset \mathbb{C}^{\times}.$$

Suppose that ψ has discrete image (as in the case of a Siegel character) and that we are given a subset $\Omega \subset (\mathbb{K} \otimes_{\mathbb{Q}} \mathbb{R})^{\times}$ of *constant sign* in the sense that for each real embedding $\sigma: \mathbb{K} \hookrightarrow \mathbb{R}$, the image $\sigma(\Omega)$ is contained in either $\mathbb{R}_{>0}$ or $\mathbb{R}_{<0}$. Then by continuity, the image $\psi(\text{incl}(\Omega)) \subset S^1$ consists of one point, which we write $\psi(\omega) \in S^1$ for short. Then we have

$$\psi^{\mathfrak{a}}(x) = \omega \cdot \psi^{(\mathfrak{a}/\mathfrak{q}\mathfrak{a})^{\times}}(x) \quad \text{for all } x \in \mathfrak{a}^{\times, \mathfrak{q}} \cap \Omega,$$

and in particular the restriction of $\psi^{\mathfrak{a}}$ to $\mathfrak{a} \cap \Omega$ factors through $\mathfrak{a}/\mathfrak{q}\mathfrak{a}$.

APPENDIX E. LATTICE POINTS IN A SUBSET

The intuition that the number of lattice points in a subset of \mathbb{R}^n should be well approximated by its volume is deeply rooted in our genes. In this section we recall a quantitative result to this effect.

By convention, subsets of the Euclidean spaces \mathbb{R}^n are given the usual l^2 -metric (also called the Euclidean metric) and its restriction in this section.

A *lattice* Λ in \mathbb{R}^n means a discrete subgroup isomorphic to \mathbb{Z}^n . Its *determinant* $\det(\Lambda)$ is defined to be the volume of the compact quotient \mathbb{R}^n/Λ . We write λ_1 for the smallest length of non-zero elements:

$$\lambda_1 := \min\{|v| \mid v \in \Lambda \setminus \{0\}\}.$$

The choice of notation is based on the fact that it is the first of the so-called *successive minima* of Λ .

The following proposition involves the notion of *subsets of Lipschitz class* $\text{Lip}(n, Z, L)$. We recall it in Definition E.2.

Proposition E.1. *Let $\Lambda \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be a lattice.*

(1) *Let $v_1, \dots, v_n \in \Lambda$ be a basis. Write*

$$F = \{a_1 v_1 + \dots + a_n v_n \mid a_i \in [0, 1)_{\mathbb{R}} \text{ for all } 1 \leq i \leq n\}$$

for the associated fundamental domain. Let $C \geq 1$ be a positive number such that

$$|v_i| \leq C\lambda_1 \quad \text{for all } i = 1, \dots, n.$$

Then for every subset $S \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ of Lipschitz class $\text{Lip}(n, Z, L)$ with $L \geq \lambda_1$, we have

$$\#\{v \in \Lambda \mid (v + F) \cap S \neq \emptyset\} \ll_n Z C^{n^2} \left(\frac{L}{\lambda_1}\right)^{n-1}.$$

(2) *Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be a closed set whose boundary $\partial\Omega$ is of Lipschitz class $\text{Lip}(n, Z, L)$ with $L \geq \lambda_1$. Then we have*

$$\left| \#(\Omega \cap \Lambda) - \frac{\text{Vol}(\Omega)}{|\det(\Lambda)|} \right| \ll_n Z \left(\frac{L}{\lambda_1}\right)^{n-1}$$

Proof. These are specialized forms of [32, Proposition 5.2 and Corollary 5.3]. \square

Above we used the following notion.

Definition E.2 (subsets of certain Lipschitz classes). Let $Z \geq 1$ be an integer and $L > 0$ be a positive real number. A subset $S \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ is said to be of *Lipschitz class* $\text{Lip}(n, Z, L)$ if there are maps

$$\psi_i: [0, 1]^{n-1} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n, \quad i = 1, \dots, Z$$

which have Lipschitz constant $\leq L$ and cover S in the sense that $S \subset \bigcup_{i=1}^Z \phi_i([0, 1]^{n-1})$.

This is taken from [33, Definition 2.2]. The same notion is written as $\text{Lip}(n, 1, Z, L)$ in [32, Definition 2.1].

Note that when we have finitely many sets $\Omega_i \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ whose boundary $\partial\Omega_i$ is of Lipschitz class $\text{Lip}(n, Z_i, L_i)$, then the intersection $\bigcap_i \Omega_i$ has boundary of Lipschitz class $\text{Lip}(n, \sum_i Z_i, \max_i L_i)$ at worst.

Convex sets in the cube $[-N, N]^n$ are known to have boundary of Lipschitz class $\text{Lip}(n, 1, O_n(N))$ [33, Theorem 2.6]. Other than that, Proposition E.1 is used mainly to subsets with the following type of boundary:

Lemma E.3 (The sets with constant norm are Lipschitz). *Let $N \geq 2$ be a positive real number and set*

$$\mathbb{C}_{\leq N} := \{z \in \mathbb{C} \mid |z| \leq N\}.$$

Let $r_1, r_2 \geq 0$ be integers and consider the norm function

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{N}: \mathbb{R}^{r_1} \times \mathbb{C}^{r_2} &\rightarrow \mathbb{R} \\ (x, z) = (x_1, \dots, x_{r_1}; z_1, \dots, z_{r_2}) &\mapsto \prod_{i=1}^{r_1} x_i \prod_{j=1}^{r_2} |z_j|^2. \end{aligned}$$

Then for any $a \in \mathbb{R}$ the subset

$$S_{\leq N}(a) := \{(x, z) \in [-N, N]^{r_1} \times \mathbb{C}_{\leq N}^{r_2} \mid \mathbf{N}(x, z) = a\}$$

is in Lipschitz class $\text{Lip}(r_1 + 2r_2, O_{r_1, r_2}(1), O_{r_1, r_2}(N))$: in other words, there are continuous maps ϕ_i ($1 \leq i \leq O_{r_1, r_2}(1)$)

$$[0, 1]^{r_1 + 2r_2 - 1} \xrightarrow{\phi_i} \mathbb{R}^{r_1} \times \mathbb{C}^{r_2}$$

with Lipschitz constants $\leq O_{r_1, r_2}(N)$ such that

$$S_{\leq N}(a) \subset \bigcup_i \phi_i([0, 1]^{r_1 + 2r_2 - 1}).$$

Proof. This is elementary but we include a proof for the sake of completeness. The norm map \mathbf{N} factors as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{R}^{r_1} \times \mathbb{C}^{r_2} &\rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{r_1} \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^{r_2} && \xrightarrow{\overline{\mathbf{N}}} \mathbb{R} \\ (x, z) &\mapsto (x; |z_1|, \dots, |z_{r_2}|), && \\ &&& (x, y) \mapsto \prod_{i=1}^{r_1} x_i \prod_{j=1}^{r_2} y_j^2 \end{aligned}$$

and for any $a \in \mathbb{R}$ if we set

$$\overline{S}_{\leq N}(a) := \{(x, y) \in [-N, N]_{\leq N}^{r_1} \times [0, N]^{r_2} \mid \overline{\mathbf{N}}(x, y) = a\} \subset \mathbb{R}^{r_1} \times \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^{r_2},$$

we can recover $S_{\leq N}(a)$ by

$$\begin{aligned} S_{\leq N}(a) = \\ \{(x; y_1 e^{2\pi i \theta_1}, \dots, y_{r_2} e^{2\pi i \theta_{r_2}}) \in \mathbb{R}^{r_1} \times \mathbb{C}^{r_2} \mid (x, y) \in \overline{S}(a), (\theta_j)_{1 \leq j \leq r_2} \in [0, 1]^{r_2}\}. \end{aligned}$$

This reduces the problem to showing that $\overline{S}_{\leq N}(a)$ is of Lipschitz class $\text{Lip}(r_1 + r_2, O_{r_1, r_2}(1), O_{r_1, r_2}(N))$. While it is easy to construct an explicit covering with this Lipschitz property, here we choose to describe a quick proof using the case of the boundary of a convex set.

By the symmetry $\pm x_i$ one can restrict attention to $\overline{S}_{\leq N}(a) \cap [0, N]^{r_1+r_2}$ and assume $a \geq 0$. Since \overline{N} is a convex function on $[0, N]^{r_1+r_2}$, the set $\Omega_{\leq N}(a) := \{x \in [0, N]^{r_1+r_2} \mid \overline{N}(x) \geq a\}$ is a convex set. As $\partial\Omega_{\leq N}(a)$ is known to be of Lipschitz class $\text{Lip}(r_1 + r_2, 1, O_{r_1+r_2}(N))$ by [33, Theorem 2.6] and we have $\overline{S}_{\leq N}(a) \subset \partial\Omega_{\leq N}(a)$, we conclude that $\overline{S}_{\leq N}(a)$ is of the same Lipschitz class. This completes the proof. \square

The next proposition could also be formulated in the Lipschitz boundary setting, but we do not need to do so.

Proposition E.4. *Let $\Omega \subset [\pm N]_{\mathbb{R}}^n$ be a convex set and $M, Y > 1$ be positive numbers. Then*

- (1) *There is a decomposition of the indicator function $1_{\Omega}: [\pm N]^n \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ of Ω into a sum of the form*

$$(E.1) \quad 1_{\Omega} = \left(\sum_{\xi \in \Xi} c_{\xi} \cdot \xi \right) + G + H,$$

where

- $\Xi \subset \mathbb{Q}^n$ is a finite set of size $O_n(Y^n)$, and each $\xi = (\xi_1, \dots, \xi_n) \in \mathbb{Q}^n$ is seen as a function on \mathbb{Z}^n by $\xi(x_1, \dots, x_n) := \exp(2\pi i(\xi_1 x_1 + \dots + \xi_n x_n))$;
- $|c_{\xi}| \leq 1$ for all $\xi \in \Xi$;
- the values of G have absolute values ≤ 1 and $\#\text{supp}(G) = O_n(N^n/M)$;
- $\|H\|_{\infty} = O_n(M \frac{\log Y}{Y})$.

- (2) *Furthermore, suppose a lattice $\Lambda \subset \mathbb{Z}^n$ and a residue class $a \in \mathbb{Z}^n/\Lambda$ is given. Then the indicator function $1_{\Omega \cap (a+\Lambda)}$ is written as a sum of the same form (E.1), where some of the conditions on Ξ , G and $\|H\|_{\infty}$ are relaxed to*

- $\#\Xi = O_n(Y^n) \cdot \#(\mathbb{Z}^n/\Lambda)$,
- the values of G have absolute values $\leq \#(\mathbb{Z}^n/\Lambda)$,
- $\|H\|_{\infty} = O_n\left(M \frac{\log Y}{Y} \cdot \#(\mathbb{Z}^n/\Lambda)\right)$.

Proof. Part (1) follows from [10, Lemma A.9] and [15, Corollary A.3].

For part (2), by Fourier analysis on the finite abelian group \mathbb{Z}^n/Λ , the indicator function $1_{a+\Lambda}: \mathbb{Z}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ can be written as a \mathbb{C} -linear combination

$$1_{a+\Lambda} = \sum_{\eta \in \widehat{\mathbb{Z}^n/\Lambda}} c_{\eta} \cdot \eta,$$

where $\widehat{\mathbb{Z}^n/\Lambda} = \text{Hom}(\mathbb{Z}^n/\Lambda, \mathbb{C}^{\times}) \hookrightarrow \text{Hom}(\mathbb{Z}^n, \mathbb{C}^{\times})$ is the dual abelian group. To conclude, multiply (E.1) by $1_{a+\Lambda}$. \square

APPENDIX F. THE VON NEUMANN THEOREM FOR THE GOWERS NORMS

The (generalized) von Neumann theorem for the Gowers norms gives a criterion for when a sum of the form $\sum_{\mathbf{x} \in [-N, N]^n \cap \Omega} \prod_{i=1}^t f_i(\phi_i(\mathbf{x}))$, where $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ is a convex set, $\phi_i: \mathbb{Z}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}^n$ are affine-linear maps and $f_i: \mathbb{Z}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ are functions.

We state it (Theorem F.4) after explaining the *complexity* $s \geq 0$ of the set of linear maps $\dot{\phi}_1, \dots, \dot{\phi}_t$ and the *linear forms condition* on a function $\mathbb{Z}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$.

Our exposition is different from [15, Appendix C] in that we consider \mathbb{Z}^n instead of \mathbb{Z} , we make it explicit that the so-called *correlation condition* from *loc. cit.* is not needed, and we write down an explicit bound because unlike [15], the decay rate matters to us.

We will use bold face letters such as \mathbf{x} to denote tuples instead of underlined ones \underline{x} because after some experiments, the author thinks they are easier to read in this section, where we use so many sub/superscripts.

F.1. Preliminary notions.

Definition F.1 (complexity of a set of linear maps). Let $\psi_1, \dots, \psi_t: \mathbb{Z}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}^n$ linear maps.

- (1) They are said to have (*Cauchy–Schwarz*) *complexity* $\leq s$ at the index $i \in \{1, \dots, t\}$ if there is a partition $\{1, \dots, \widehat{i}, \dots, t\} = \bigcup_{k=1}^{s+1} C_k$ such that for all $k \in \{1, \dots, s+1\}$, the restriction of ψ_i :

$$\psi_i: \bigcap_{j \in C_k} \ker(\psi_j) \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}^n$$

has finite cokernel. (For this to hold, of course each $\ker(\psi_i)$ must have rank $\geq n$.)

- (2) They are said to have *complexity* $\leq s$ if they do at every index.
 (3) They are said to be *in s -normal form at the index i* if there are disjoint sets B_1, \dots, B_{s+1} (or less members) of standard vectors of \mathbb{Z}^d such that
 (a) for all $j \neq i$, there is a $1 \leq k \leq s+1$ such that ψ_j is the zero map on \mathbb{Z}^{B_k} ;
 (b) for all $1 \leq k \leq s+1$, the restriction of ψ_i :

$$\psi_i: \mathbb{Z}^{B_k} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}^n$$

has finite cokernel.

Note that if the maps $\{\psi_j\}_{1 \leq j \leq t}$ are in s -normal form at i , then they have Cauchy–Schwarz complexity $\leq s$ at i because we can take $C_k := \{j \mid \psi_j|_{\mathbb{Z}^{B_k}} = 0\}$.

The next fact can be used to reduce problems involving linear maps of Cauchy–Schwarz complexity $\leq s$ to the case of s -normal forms.

Proposition F.2. Let $\psi_1, \dots, \psi_t: \mathbb{Z}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}^n$ be linear maps having Cauchy–Schwarz complexity $\leq s$ at some index $i \in \{1, \dots, t\}$.

Then there is a surjection $\mathbb{Z}^{d'} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}^d$ with $d' \leq (s+2)d$ such that the composites $\psi'_i: \mathbb{Z}^{d'} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}^n$ ($i = 1, \dots, t$) are in s -normal form at the index i .

Moreover, if ψ_j 's have coefficients of sizes $\leq L$ for some positive L , then ψ'_j 's can be taken to have coefficients $\leq O_{d,n}(L^{O_n(1)})$.

Proof. A standard algorithm gives us a basis of $\bigcap_{j \in C_k} \ker(\psi_j)$ having coefficients $\leq O_{d,n}(L^{O_n(1)})$. Let d_k ($\leq d$) be its rank and $\mathbb{Z}^{d_k} \xrightarrow{\cong} \bigcap_{j \in C_k} \ker(\psi_j) \subset \mathbb{Z}^d$ be the corresponding map. Then the surjection

$$\mathbb{Z}^d \oplus \bigoplus_{k=1}^{s+1} \mathbb{Z}^{d_k} \longrightarrow \mathbb{Z}^d$$

satisfies the desired properties. \square

Next we formulate the linear forms condition.

Definition F.3 (Linear forms condition). Let t, d, L, N be positive integers and $0 < \rho < 1$ a positive real number.

A function $\nu: \mathbb{Z}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ is said to satisfy the (t, d, L) -linear forms condition in scale $\geq N$ and within error $< \rho$ if the following is always true:

Let $\psi_1, \dots, \psi_t: \mathbb{Z}^{d'} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}^n$ ($t' \leq t, d' \leq d$) be linear maps such that:

- (1) their linear parts $\dot{\psi}_i$ have coefficients of size $\leq L$,
- (2) for every pair of distinct indices $i \neq j$, we have $\ker(\dot{\psi}_i) \not\subset \ker(\dot{\psi}_j)$,
- (3) $\text{coker}(\psi_i)$ are all finite.

Then for any prime number $p \geq N$, we have

$$\left| 1 - \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{F}_p^d} \left(\prod_{i=1}^{t'} (\nu_{|\pm \frac{p}{2}|^{d'}} \circ \psi_{i, \mathbb{F}_p}) \right) \right| < \rho.$$

Here, ψ_{i, \mathbb{F}_p} is the \mathbb{F}_p -linear map $\psi_{i, \mathbb{F}_p} := \psi_i \otimes \mathbb{F}_p: \mathbb{F}_p^{d'} \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_p^n$ and $\nu_{|\pm \frac{p}{2}|^n}$ denotes the composite

$$\nu_{|\pm \frac{p}{2}|^n}: \mathbb{F}_p^n \xleftarrow{\cong} \left[\pm \frac{p}{2} \right]^n \subset \mathbb{Z}^n \xrightarrow{\nu} \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}.$$

F.2. The statement of the generalized von Neumann theorem. The next is a direct generalization of [15, Proposition 7.1] to the case where the target is \mathbb{Z}^n rather than \mathbb{Z} . There, $\|\psi\|_N \leq L$ means that the affine-linear map $\psi: \mathbb{Z}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}^n$ has linear coefficients of l^∞ -norm $\leq L$ and constant term of l^∞ -norm $\leq NL$.

Theorem F.4. *Let $t, d, L, n > 0$ be positive parameters. Then there exists $N_0 = O_{d,n}(L^{O_n(1)})$ such that for all $N > N_0$, the following holds:*

Let $\psi_1, \dots, \psi_t: \mathbb{Z}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}^n$ be affine-linear maps, $\|\psi_i\|_N \leq L$, having Cauchy-Schwarz complexity $\leq s$. Let $f_1, \dots, f_t: \mathbb{Z}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ be functions satisfying:

- (1) $\|f_i\|_{U^{s+1}([- (d+1)LN, (d+1)LN]^n)} \leq \delta$ for some i and positive $\delta > 0$.
- (2) We have a pointwise bound $|f_i| \leq \nu$ on $[\pm (d+1)LN]^n$ for all i where $\nu: \mathbb{Z}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ is a function satisfying the $(t2^{s+1}, 4(s+2)d, O_{d,n}(L^{O_n(1)}))$ -linear forms condition in scale $\geq N$ with error $< \rho$ for some positive ρ .

Let $\Omega \subset [-N, N]^d \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ be a convex body.

Then for any positive value $M, X > 0$ we have

$$\left| \mathbb{E}_{[-N, N]^d} 1_\Omega \prod_{i=1}^t (f_i \circ \psi_i) \right| \ll_{d,n,s} L^d \left(X^d (\delta + \rho^{1/2^{s+2}} + 2^t \rho^{1/2^{s+1}}) + \frac{1}{M} + M \frac{\log X}{X} \right).$$

We will give an outline of the proof in the next subsection. It follows the strategy below.

Strategy F.5. *The proof will go through several reduction steps:*

- (1) we go modulo p , where p is a prime number comparable in size to $(d+1)LN$; this step account for the factor L^d in the right hand side.
- (2) in order to dispose of the characteristic function 1_Ω , we first replace it with functions with Lipschitz constants $\leq M$. This account for the term $\frac{1}{M}$.

- (3) we write the Lipschitz function(s) as a Fourier series containing at most $O_d(X^d)$ terms and an error term. The error term accounts for the term $M \frac{\log X}{X}$ and the number of terms in the Fourier series accounts for the factor X^d .
- (4) the trigonometric functions in the Fourier series can be absorbed into the functions f_i so that we can ignore them.
- (5) we are reduced to the estimation of averages of the form $\mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{F}_p^d} \prod_{i=1}^t f_i \circ \psi_i$. This will be bounded in size by $\delta + \rho^{1/2^{s+2}} + 2^t \rho^{1/2^{s+1}}$.

F.3. Proof of the von Neumann theorem. We first treat the mod p version of Proposition F.4, where the convex set Ω is also omitted.

Proposition F.6. *Let $t, d, L, n > 0$ positive parameters. Then there exists $N_0 = O_{d,n}(L^{O_n(1)})$ such that for all $N > N_0$:*

Let $\psi_1, \dots, \psi_t: \mathbb{Z}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}^n$ be affine-linear maps satisfying $\|\psi_i\| \leq L$ and having Cauchy-Schwarz complexity $\leq s$ for some integer $s \geq 0$.

Let $p > N_0$ any prime number and $f_1, \dots, f_t: \mathbb{F}_p^n \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ be functions whose absolute values are pointwise bounded by a function ν that satisfies the $(t2^{s+1}, 4(s+2)d, O_{d,n}(L^{O_n(1)}))$ -linear forms condition in scale $\geq N_0$ and with error $\leq \rho$ for some positive ρ .

Also assume $\|f_i\|_{U^{s+1}(\mathbb{F}_p^n)} \leq \delta$ for some i and positive $\delta > 0$.

Then for any prime number $p > N_0$ we have

$$\left| \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{F}_p^d} \prod_{i=1}^t (f_i \circ \psi_i) \right| \leq 8(\delta + \rho^{1/2^{s+2}}).$$

Proof. By symmetry in the indices $i = 1, \dots, t$, we may assume $\|f_1\|_{U^{s+1}(\mathbb{F}_p^n)} \leq \delta$. By Proposition F.2, we may assume ψ_i are in s -normal form at the index 1. Note that because of this maneuver, every $O(L^{O(1)})$ -type quantities appearing below must be taken as an $O_{d,n}(-)^{O_n(1)}$ of it for the validity of the proposition in the general case. Also, the rank d gets replaced by at most $(s+2)d$.

Using the disjoint sets B_1, \dots, B_{s+1} (or less members) from Definition F.1, write

$$X_k := \mathbb{Z}^{B_k} \text{ and } X := \bigoplus_{k=1}^{s+1} X_k.$$

Also, let Y be the subspace spanned by those standard vectors not in $\bigcup_{k=1}^{s+1} B_k$. We have a decomposition

$$\mathbb{Z}^d = X_1 \oplus \dots \oplus X_k \oplus Y$$

and we know

- (1) for all $j \in \{2, \dots, t\}$, the map ψ_j is zero on some X_k ;
- (2) for all $1 \leq k \leq s+1$, the restriction $\psi_1: X_k \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}^n$ has finite cokernel (whose order is $O_n(L^n)$ by elementary \mathbb{Z} -linear algebra).

Let us use the symbol x_k to denote elements of X_k and y to denote elements of Y . We denote elements of $X = X_1 \oplus \dots \oplus X_{s+1}$ by the symbol $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_{s+1})$.

Now we go modulo p . Denote by $\overline{X}_k, \overline{X}$ and \overline{Y} the \mathbb{F}_p -vector spaces $X_k \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{F}_p, X \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{F}_p$ and $Y \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{F}_p$. We can rewrite the average $\mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{F}_p^d}$ as a nested one $\mathbb{E}_{y \in \overline{Y}} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x} \in \overline{X}}$.

By the triangle inequality we have

$$(F.1) \quad \left| \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{F}_p^d} \prod_{j=1}^t f_j \circ \psi_j \right| \leq \mathbb{E}_{y \in \bar{Y}} \left| \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x} \in \bar{X}} \prod_{j=1}^t f_j(\psi_j(\mathbf{x} + y)) \right|$$

We apply the Cauchy–Schwarz–Gowers inequality [15, Corollary B.4] to the situation $A = \{1, \dots, s+1\}$, $\bar{X} = \bar{X}_1 \times \dots \times \bar{X}_{s+1}$ and functions

$$f_j(\psi_j(- + y)): \quad \bar{X}_1 \times \dots \times \bar{X}_{s+1} \rightarrow \mathbb{C} \\ (x_1, \dots, x_{s+1}) \mapsto f_j(\psi_j(x_1 + \dots + x_{s+1} + y)).$$

Note that as ψ_j ($j \neq 1$) is zero on some \bar{X}_k , we know $\Omega(j) \subsetneq \{1, \dots, s+1\}$ for $j \neq 1$. Hence the previous value (F.1) is bounded as:

$$(F.2) \quad \leq \mathbb{E}_{y \in \bar{Y}} \|f_1(\psi_1(- + y))\|_{\square^A(\nu_A, y; \bar{X}_A)} \prod_{B \subsetneq A} \|\nu_{B, y}\|_{\square_B(\nu_B, y; \bar{X}_B)}^{2^{|\mathbb{B}|}/2^{s+1}},$$

where we have set

$$\nu_{B, y}(x_k; k \in B) := \prod_{j \text{ s.t. } \Omega(j)=B} \nu \left(\psi_j \left(\sum_{k \in B} x_k + y \right) \right).$$

The quantity (F.2) is the average of the product of 2^{s+1} functions. Recall Hölder's inequality: $\mathbb{E}XYZ \leq (\mathbb{E}X^p)^{1/p}(\mathbb{E}Y^q)^{1/q}(\mathbb{E}Z^r)^{1/r}$ for positively valued functions X, Y, Z and exponents p, q, r satisfying $(1/p) + (1/q) + (1/r) = 1$, and similarly when there are more factors. By this we can bound (F.2) as

$$(F.3) \quad \leq \left(\mathbb{E}_{y \in \bar{Y}} \|f_1(\psi_1(- + y))\|_{\square^A(\nu_A, y; \bar{X}_A)}^{2^{s+1}} \right)^{1/2^{s+1}} \prod_{B \subsetneq A} \left(\mathbb{E}_{y \in \bar{Y}} \|\nu_{B, y}\|_{\square_B(\nu_B, y; \bar{X}_B)}^{2^{|\mathbb{B}|}} \right)^{1/2^{s+1}}$$

We treat the first factor and the latter ones separately.

Lemma F.7. *For all $B \subset A$ we have*

$$\left| 1 - \left(\mathbb{E}_{y \in \bar{Y}} \|\nu_{B, y}\|_{\square_B(\nu_B, y; \bar{X}_B)}^{2^{|\mathbb{B}|}} \right) \right| < \rho.$$

In particular, the latter factors of (F.3) are bounded as:

$$\prod_{B \subsetneq A} \left(\mathbb{E}_{y \in \bar{Y}} \|\nu_{B, y}\|_{\square_B(\nu_B, y; \bar{X}_B)}^{2^{|\mathbb{B}|}} \right)^{1/2^{s+1}} < \prod_{B \subsetneq A} (1 + \rho)^{1/2^{s+1}} < 1 + \rho.$$

Proof. By the definition of the box norm $\|\cdot\|_{\square_B(\nu_B, y; \bar{X}_B)}$ and the function $\nu_{B, y}$, we have

$$(F.4) \quad \mathbb{E}_{y \in \bar{Y}} \|\nu_{B, y}\|_{\square_B(\nu_B, y; \bar{X}_B)}^{2^{|\mathbb{B}|}} = \mathbb{E}_{y \in \bar{Y}} \mathbb{E}_{\substack{\mathbf{x}^{(1)}, \mathbf{x}^{(2)} \\ \in \bigoplus_{k \in B} \bar{X}_k}} \prod_{j \text{ s.t. } \Omega(j) \subset B} \prod_{\omega \in \{0,1\}^{\Omega(j)}} \nu \left(\psi_j \left(\sum_{k \in \Omega(j)} x_k^{(\omega_k)} + y \right) \right).$$

By some linear algebra, it turns out we can use the pseudorandomness of ν to the linear maps (given for each pair of $j \in \{2, \dots, t\}$ and $\omega \in \{0, 1\}^{\Omega(j)}$)

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi_{j,\omega} : \quad Y \oplus \left(\bigoplus_{k \in B} X_k \right)^2 &\quad \rightarrow \quad \mathbb{Z}^n \\ \left(y, \left(x_k^{(0)} \right)_{k \in B}, \left(x_k^{(1)} \right)_{k \in B} \right) &\quad \mapsto \quad \psi_j \left(y + \sum_{k \in \Omega(j)} x_k^{(\omega_k)} \right). \end{aligned}$$

The number of linear maps listed here is $\sum_{j=2}^t 2^{|\Omega(j)|} < t2^s$. They have coefficients $\leq L$. Via the surjection $\mathbb{Z}^{d'} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}^d$ at the beginning of the proof of Proposition F.6, this translates to coefficients $\leq O_{d,n}(L^{O_n(1)})$. The source (a subspace of $\mathbb{Z}^{d'} \oplus \mathbb{Z}^{d'}$) has rank $\leq 2d' \leq 2(s+2)d$.

We conclude that the difference between (F.4) and 1 is less than ρ . This completes the proof of Lemma F.7. \square

By Lemma F.7, the second factor of (F.3) is $< 1 + \rho < 2$. So far we have obtained:

$$(F.5) \quad \left| \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{F}_p^d} \prod_{j=1}^t f_j \circ \psi_j \right| < 2 \cdot \left(\mathbb{E}_{y \in \bar{Y}} \|f_1(\psi_1(- + y))\|_{\square^A(\nu_A, y; \bar{X}_A)}^{2^{s+1}} \right)^{1/2^{s+1}}.$$

We move on to the computation of the right hand side. By unfolding definitions we see:

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E}_{y \in Y} \|f_1(\psi_1(- + y))\|_{\square^A(\nu_A, y; \bar{X}_A)}^{2^{s+1}} \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{y \in Y} \mathbb{E}_{\substack{\mathbf{x}^{(0)} \\ \in X}} \mathbb{E}_{\substack{\mathbf{x}^{(1)} \\ \in X}} \left(\prod_{\omega \in \{0,1\}^{s+1}} \mathcal{C}^{|\omega|} f_1 \left(\psi_1 \left(\sum_{k=1}^{s+1} x_k^{(\omega_k)} + y \right) \right) \right) \prod_{j \neq 1} \prod_{\omega \in \{0,1\}^{\Omega(j)}} \nu \left(\psi_j \left(\sum_{k \in \Omega(j)} x_k^{(\omega_k)} + y \right) \right) \end{aligned}$$

We introduce a variable $\mathbf{h} = (h_1, \dots, h_{s+1}) := \mathbf{x}^{(1)} - \mathbf{x}^{(0)}$ to delete $\mathbf{x}^{(1)}$. We write \mathbf{x} afresh for $\mathbf{x}^{(0)}$ and replace the expressions $\sum_k x_k^{(\omega_k)}$ by the expression $\mathbf{x} + \omega \cdot \mathbf{h} := \mathbf{x} + \sum_k \omega \cdot h_k$. This gives us:

$$= \mathbb{E}_{y \in Y} \mathbb{E}_{\substack{\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{h} \\ \in X}} \left(\prod_{\omega \in \{0,1\}^{s+1}} \mathcal{C}^{|\omega|} f_1(\psi_1(\mathbf{x} + \omega \cdot \mathbf{h} + y)) \cdot \prod_{j \neq 1} \prod_{\omega \in \{0,1\}^{\Omega(j)}} \nu(\psi_j(\mathbf{x} + \omega \cdot \mathbf{h} + y)) \right).$$

Since ψ_j is affine-linear, we know

$$\psi_j(\mathbf{x} + \omega \cdot \mathbf{h} + y) = \dot{\psi}_j(\mathbf{x} + y) + \dot{\psi}_j(\omega \cdot \mathbf{h}) + \psi_j(0).$$

Let us introduce new variables $\mathbf{z} := \dot{\psi}_1(\mathbf{x} + y) \in \mathbb{F}_p^n$ and $\mathbf{k} := \dot{\psi}_1(\mathbf{h}) \in \mathbb{F}_p^n$. Denote by $\phi_i(\mathbf{x})_j$ the j^{th} component of $\phi_i(\mathbf{x}) \in \mathbb{Z}^d$. This gives us:

$$(F.6) \quad = \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{k} \in \mathbb{F}_p^n} \left(\prod_{\omega \in \{0,1\}^{s+1}} \mathcal{C}^{|\omega|} f_1(\mathbf{z} + \omega \cdot \mathbf{k} + \psi_1(0)) \right. \\ \left. \cdot \mathbb{E}_{(\mathbf{x}, y) \mapsto \mathbf{z}} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{h} \mapsto \mathbf{k}} \prod_{j \neq 1} \prod_{\omega \in \{0,1\}^{\Omega(j)}} \nu \left(\dot{\psi}_j(\mathbf{x} + y) + \dot{\psi}_j(\omega \cdot \mathbf{h}) + \psi_j(0) \right) \right)$$

Where $\mathbb{E}_{(\mathbf{x}, y) \mapsto \mathbf{z}}$ means the average over all (\mathbf{x}, y) that map to the given \mathbf{z} . Similarly for $\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{h} \mapsto \mathbf{k}}$.

Note that without the gigantic ν -factor, the expression (F.6) would be exactly $\mathbb{E}_{y \in Y} \|f_1(- + \psi_1(0))\|_{U^{s+1}(\mathbb{F}_p^n)}^{2^{s+1}}$ by the definition of the Gowers U^{s+1} -norm. Because the Gowers U^{s+1} -norm is invariant under translation on \mathbb{F}_p^n , it equals $\mathbb{E}_{y \in Y} \|f_1\|_{U^{s+1}(\mathbb{F}_p^n)}^{2^{s+1}} = \|f_1\|_{U^{s+1}(\mathbb{F}_p^n)}^{2^{s+1}}$. Thus we want to show that we can ignore the ν -factor in (F.6). We introduce a shorthand symbol:

$$W(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{k}) := \mathbb{E}_{(\mathbf{x}, y) \mapsto \mathbf{z}} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{h} \mapsto \mathbf{k}} \prod_{j \neq 1} \prod_{\omega \in \{0,1\}^{\Omega(j)}} \nu \left(\dot{\psi}_j(\mathbf{x} + y) + \dot{\psi}_j(\omega \cdot \mathbf{h}) + \psi_j(0) \right).$$

By (F.6) we have the next equality. We want to show that this value is sufficiently small:

$$(F.7) \quad \|f_1\|_{U^{s+1}(\mathbb{F}_p^n)}^{2^{s+1}} - \mathbb{E}_{y \in Y} \|f_1(\psi_1(- + y))\|_{\square^A(\nu_A, y; \overline{X}_A)}^{2^{s+1}} \\ = \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{k} \in \mathbb{F}_p^n} \left(\prod_{\omega \in \{0,1\}^{s+1}} \mathcal{C}^{|\omega|} f_1(\mathbf{z} + \omega \cdot \mathbf{k} + \psi_1(0)) \cdot (1 - W(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{k})) \right).$$

By the triangle inequality, its absolute value is bounded as:

$$(F.8) \quad \leq \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{k} \in \mathbb{F}_p^n} \left(\prod_{\omega \in \{0,1\}^{s+1}} \nu(\mathbf{z} + \omega \cdot \mathbf{k} + \psi_1(0)) \cdot |1 - W(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{k})| \right).$$

We use the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality in the following form: for non-negatively valued functions X, Y , we have $|\mathbb{E} XY| \leq (\mathbb{E} X)^{1/2} (\mathbb{E} X|Y|^2)^{1/2}$. The absolute value of (F.8) is bounded as:

$$(F.9) \quad \leq \left(\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{k}} \prod_{\omega \in \{0,1\}^{s+1}} \nu(\mathbf{z} + \omega \cdot \mathbf{k} + \psi_1(0)) \right)^{1/2} \\ \cdot \left(\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{k}} \prod_{\omega \in \{0,1\}^{s+1}} \nu(\mathbf{z} + \omega \cdot \mathbf{k} + \psi_1(0)) \cdot |1 - W(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{k})|^2 \right)^{1/2}.$$

By expanding $|1 - W(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{k})|^2$, we are reduced to showing the next estimate.

Lemma F.8. *For $a = 0, 1, 2$, we have*

$$\left| 1 - \mathbb{E} \left(\prod_{\omega \in \{0,1\}^{s+1}} \nu(\mathbf{z} + \omega \cdot \mathbf{k} + \psi_1(0)) \cdot W(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{k})^a \right) \right| < \rho.$$

Admitting Lemma F.8 for a while, we obtain

$$(\text{L.H.S. of (F.9)}) < (1 + \rho)^{1/2} (4\rho)^{1/2} < 3\rho^{1/2}.$$

This establishes a bound on the right-hand side of (F.7). We conclude

$$\mathbb{E}_{y \in Y} \|f_1(\psi_1(- + y))\|_{\square^A(\nu_{A,y}, \bar{X}_A)}^{2^{s+1}} = \|f_1\|_{\mathbb{U}^{s+1}(\mathbb{F}_p^n)}^{2^{s+1}} + O_1(\rho^{1/2})$$

(with the implied constant in O_1 being ≤ 3). By (F.5) we will conclude

$$\left| \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{F}_p^d} \prod_{j=1}^t f_j \circ \psi_j \right| < 2 \cdot \left(\|f_1\|_{\mathbb{U}^{s+1}(\mathbb{F}_p^n)}^{2^{s+1}} + 3\rho^{1/2} \right)^{1/2^{s+1}} < 4 \cdot \left(\delta^{2^{s+1}} + \rho^{1/2} \right)^{1/2^{s+1}}.$$

Either $\delta^{2^{s+1}} \leq \rho^{1/2}$ or the other way around, this is bounded as:

$$\leq 4(2\delta^{2^{s+1}})^{1/2^{s+1}} + 4(2\rho^{1/2})^{1/2^{s+1}} \leq 8\delta + 8\rho^{1/2^{s+2}}.$$

This shows the assertion of Proposition F.6. In the above argument, we had to assume p exceeds finitely many quantities of the form $O_{d,n}(L^{O_n(1)})$. Let N_0 be the maximum of them.

This completes the proof of Proposition F.6 except that we have assumed Lemma F.8. \square

The proof of Proposition F.6 above depended on Lemma F.8, which we now prove:

Proof of Lemma F.8. Our task is to show that the next value ($a = 0, 1, 2$) is close to 1:

$$(F.10) \quad \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{k}} \left(\prod_{\omega \in \{0,1\}^{s+1}} \nu(\mathbf{z} + \omega \cdot \mathbf{k} + \psi_1(0)) \cdot W(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{k})^a \right).$$

Recall by definition

$$W(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{k}) = \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{v} \mapsto \mathbf{z}} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{h} \mapsto \mathbf{k}} \prod_{j \neq 1} \prod_{\omega \in \{0,1\}^{\Omega(j)}} \nu \left(\dot{\psi}_j(\mathbf{v}) + \dot{\psi}_j(\omega \cdot \mathbf{h}) + \psi_j(0) \right).$$

Let us consider the hardest case $a = 2$. By expanding $W(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{k})^2$ we get

$$\begin{aligned} W(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{k})^2 &= \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{v}, \tilde{\mathbf{v}} \mapsto \mathbf{z}} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{h}, \tilde{\mathbf{h}} \mapsto \mathbf{k}} \prod_{j \neq 1} \prod_{\omega \in \{0,1\}^{\Omega(j)}} \nu \left(\dot{\psi}_j(\mathbf{v}) + \dot{\psi}_j(\omega \cdot \mathbf{h}) + \psi_j(0) \right) \\ &\quad \nu \left(\dot{\psi}_j(\tilde{\mathbf{v}}) + \dot{\psi}_j(\omega \cdot \tilde{\mathbf{h}}) + \psi_j(0) \right) \end{aligned}$$

Substituting this in (F.10) we end up with an expression of the form

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{v} \in V} \prod_{\phi: \text{finitely many}} \nu(\phi(\mathbf{v}))$$

where the average is over the vector space

$$\begin{aligned} V &:= (\mathbb{F}_p^d \times_{\mathbb{F}_p^n} \mathbb{F}_p^d) \oplus (\overline{X} \times_{\mathbb{F}_p^n} \overline{X}) \\ &= \left\{ (\mathbf{v}, \tilde{\mathbf{v}}; \mathbf{h}, \tilde{\mathbf{h}}) \mid \dot{\psi}_1(\mathbf{v}) = \dot{\psi}_1(\tilde{\mathbf{v}}) \text{ and } \dot{\psi}_1(\mathbf{h}) = \dot{\psi}_1(\tilde{\mathbf{h}}) \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

and ϕ runs through the following set of affine-linear maps

(I) for each $\omega \in \{0, 1\}^{s+1}$,

$$\psi_{1,\omega}: (\mathbf{v}, \tilde{\mathbf{v}}; \mathbf{h}, \tilde{\mathbf{h}}) \mapsto \dot{\psi}_1(\mathbf{v}) + \dot{\psi}_1(\omega \cdot \mathbf{h}) + \psi_1(0)$$

(which equals $\dot{\psi}_1(\tilde{\mathbf{v}}) + \dot{\psi}_1(\omega \cdot \tilde{\mathbf{h}}) + \psi_1(0)$);

(II) for each pair j, ω of $j \in \{2, \dots, t\}$ and $\omega \in \{0, 1\}^{\Omega(j)}$,

$$\psi_{j,\omega}: (\mathbf{v}, \tilde{\mathbf{v}}; \mathbf{h}, \tilde{\mathbf{h}}) \mapsto \dot{\psi}_j(\mathbf{v}) + \dot{\psi}_j(\omega \cdot \mathbf{h}) + \psi_j(0);$$

(III) for each pair $\tilde{j}, \tilde{\omega}$ of $\tilde{j} \in \{2, \dots, t\}$ and $\tilde{\omega} \in \{0, 1\}^{\Omega(\tilde{j})}$,

$$\tilde{\psi}_{\tilde{j},\tilde{\omega}}: (\mathbf{v}, \tilde{\mathbf{v}}; \mathbf{h}, \tilde{\mathbf{h}}) \mapsto \dot{\psi}_{\tilde{j}}(\tilde{\mathbf{v}}) + \dot{\psi}_{\tilde{j}}(\tilde{\omega} \cdot \tilde{\mathbf{h}}) + \psi_{\tilde{j}}(0).$$

(The number of affine-linear maps is $2^{s+1} + 2 \sum_{j=2}^t 2^{|\Omega(j)|} \leq t2^{s+1}$. They have coefficients $\leq L$. Via the surjection $\mathbb{Z}^{d'} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}^d$ at the beginning of the proof of Proposition F.6, this means coefficients $\leq O_{d,n}(L^{O_n(1)})$. The dimension of the source is $\leq 4d' \leq 4(s+2)d$.)

In order to be able to use the $(t2^{s+1}, 4(s+2)d, O_{d,n}(L^{O_n(1)}))$ -linear forms condition assumed for ν , we want to show that the linear parts of the \mathbb{Z} -coefficient versions of the above maps:

- (1) have finite cokernels, and
- (2) the kernels do not contain each other.

We omit the tedious but elementary verification of these facts. The procedure is more complicated but similar to [15, pp. 1826–27].¹¹ This completes the proof of Lemma F.8 and therefore Proposition F.6. \square

Now we want to upgrade Proposition F.6 by adding a Lipschitz function into the picture. Embed the abelian group \mathbb{F}_p into \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{F}_p &= \mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z} \cong \left(\frac{1}{p}\mathbb{Z} \right) / \mathbb{Z} \hookrightarrow \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} \\ x \pmod{p\mathbb{Z}} &\leftrightarrow \frac{x}{p} \pmod{\mathbb{Z}} \end{aligned}$$

and regard a function on $(\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z})^d$ as a function on \mathbb{F}_p^d through this embedding.

Equip $(\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z})^d$ with the l^∞ -metric, where the metric on \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} is induced from the standard one on \mathbb{R} through the quotient map $\mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}$. This allows us to talk about Lipschitz constants of functions on $(\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z})^d$.

Proposition F.9. *Let $t, d, L, n > 0$ be positive integers. Let $N_0 = O_{d,n}(L^{O_n(1)})$ be as in Proposition F.6.*

Let $M, X > 0$ be further positive parameters. Let $F: (\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z})^d \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ be a 1-bounded Lipschitz function with Lipschitz constant $\leq M$.

Let $\psi_1, \dots, \psi_t: \mathbb{Z}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}^n$ be affine-linear maps with $\|\dot{\psi}_i\| \leq L$ such that

¹¹Note that in *loc. cit.* they make an oversimplification after the sentence “ \mathbb{C} is empty” at 2/3 of p. 1826 based on the false premise $\{0, 1\}^\emptyset = \emptyset$, but luckily the case of the only element $\omega_\emptyset \in \{0, 1\}^\emptyset$ can also be worked out.

- (1) $\text{coker}(\psi_i)$ are all finite;
 (2) Cauchy–Schwarz complexity $\leq s$.

Let $p > N_0$ be a prime number and $f_1, \dots, f_t: \mathbb{F}_p^n \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ be functions whose absolute values are pointwise bounded by a function ν satisfying the $(t2^{s+1}, 4(s+2)d, \text{O}_{d,n}(\text{L}^{\text{O}_n(1)}))$ -linear forms condition in scale $\geq N_0$ with error $\leq \rho$. Assume $\|f_i\|_{\text{U}^{s+1}(\mathbb{F}_p^n)} \leq \delta$ for some index i and $\delta > 0$.

Then we have

$$\left| \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{F}_p^d} F \cdot \prod_{i=1}^t f_i \circ (\psi_i \otimes \mathbb{F}_p) \right| \ll_d X^d \left(\delta + \rho^{1/2^{s+2}} \right) + M \cdot \frac{\log X}{X}.$$

For the proof we need some input from Fourier analysis. For a “frequency”

$$\xi \in \text{Hom} \left(\left(\frac{1}{p} \mathbb{Z}/\mathbb{Z} \right)^d, \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} \right) = (\mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z})^d,$$

denote by e_ξ the function

$$e_\xi: (\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z})^d \rightarrow \mathbb{C} \\ \underline{x} \mapsto e^{2\pi i \xi(\underline{x})}.$$

The elementary Fourier analysis says that the functions e_ξ form a \mathbb{C} -basis of the vector space $\text{Map}(\mathbb{F}_p^d, \mathbb{C})$. In general, the expression of a function $\mathbb{F}_p^d \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ as a linear combination of e_ξ 's can contain at most p^d terms. The next assertion offers a way to approximate a given Lipschitz function by a linear combination containing less terms.

Proposition F.10 (see [10, Lemma A.9]). *Let $M, X > 0$ be arbitrary positive numbers. If $F: (\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z})^d \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ is a 1-bounded Lipschitz function with Lipschitz constant $\leq M$, then there is a decomposition*

$$F|_{\mathbb{F}_p^d} = \sum_{\xi \in I} c_\xi e_\xi + H,$$

where $I \subset (\mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z})^d$ is a subset of size $\text{O}_d(X^d)$, the coefficients satisfy $|c_\xi| \leq 1$, and $H: \mathbb{F}_p^d \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ is a function that satisfies $\|H\|_\infty \leq \text{O}_d \left(M \cdot \frac{\log X}{X} \right)$.

Proof of Proposition F.9. By Proposition F.10, we have

$$(F.11) \quad \left| \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{F}_p^d} F \cdot \prod_{i=1}^t f_i \circ (\psi_i \otimes \mathbb{F}_p) \right| \leq \sum_{\xi \in I} \left| \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{F}_p^d} e_\xi \prod_{i=1}^t f_i \circ (\psi_i \otimes \mathbb{F}_p) \right| \\ + \left| \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{F}_p^d} H \cdot \prod_{i=1}^t f_i \circ (\psi_i \otimes \mathbb{F}_p) \right|.$$

The second term in the right-hand side can be bounded as

$$\left| \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{F}_p^d} H \cdot \prod_{i=1}^t f_i \circ (\psi_i \otimes \mathbb{F}_p) \right| \leq \text{O}_d \left(M \frac{\log X}{X} \right) \left| \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{F}_p^d} \prod_{i=1}^t \nu \circ (\psi_i \otimes \mathbb{F}_p) \right|$$

and by Proposition F.6 we know $\left| \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{F}_p^d} \prod_{i=1}^t \nu \circ (\psi_i \otimes \mathbb{F}_p) \right| = \text{O}_1(1)$ (note that the linear forms condition implies $\|\nu\|_{\text{U}^{s+1}(\mathbb{F}_p^n)} = (1 + \text{O}_1(\rho))^{1/2^{s+2}} = \text{O}_1(1)$). So the

second term in the right-hand side of (F.11) can be absorbed in the $O_d\left(M^{\frac{\log X}{X}}\right)$ term of the conclusion of Proposition F.9.

Next, we show that the first term in the right-hand side of (F.11) is an $O_d(X^d)(\delta + \rho^{1/2^{s+2}})$. There are two cases to consider depending on the nature of ξ . To formulate them, note that the homomorphism $\xi: \left(\frac{1}{p}\mathbb{Z}/\mathbb{Z}\right)^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}$ can be regarded as an \mathbb{F}_p -linear map $\xi: \mathbb{F}_p^d \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_p$ via the isomorphism $\frac{1}{p}\mathbb{Z}/\mathbb{Z} \cong \mathbb{F}_p$.

Case 1. $\ker(\xi) \not\supseteq \bigcap_{i=1}^t \ker(\psi_i)$.

Take a 1-dimensional \mathbb{F}_p -subspace $\ell \subset \bigcap_{i=1}^t \ker(\psi_i)$ not contained in $\ker(\xi)$. Take a direct sum decomposition $\mathbb{F}_p^d = \ell \oplus V$. By writing the average $\mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{F}_p^d}$ as the successive average over $\mathbf{v} \in V$ and $\mathbf{w} \in \ell$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{F}_p^d} \left(e_{\xi} \prod_{i=1}^t f_i \circ (\psi_i \otimes \mathbb{F}_p) \right) &= \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{v} \in V} \left(\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{w} \in \ell} e_{\xi}(\mathbf{v} + \mathbf{w}) \prod_{i=1}^t f_i(\psi_{i, \mathbb{F}_p}(\mathbf{v} + \mathbf{w})) \right) \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{v} \in V} 0 = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Case 2. $\ker(\xi) \supseteq \bigcap_{i=1}^t \ker(\psi_i)$.

Note the following elementary fact.

Claim F.11. *Under the assumption of Case 2 (that $\ker(\xi) \supseteq \bigcap_{i=1}^t \ker(\psi_i)$), there are linear maps $\eta_i: \mathbb{F}_p^n \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_p$ such that $\xi = \sum_{i=1}^t \eta_i \circ \psi_i$.*

Proof. Let $\text{pr}_j: \mathbb{F}_p^n \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_p$ be the j^{th} projection. The assumption is equivalent to the membership relation $\xi \in \langle \text{pr}_j \circ \psi_i \rangle_{i,j}$ where the right-hand side is the \mathbb{F}_p -span in the dual space $(\mathbb{F}_p^n)^*$. So there are $a_{i,j} \in \mathbb{F}_p$ such that $\xi = \sum_{i,j} a_{i,j} \text{pr}_j \circ \psi_i$. Then $\eta_i := \sum_j a_{i,j} \text{pr}_j$ give desired maps, completing the proof of Claim F.11. \square

Using Claim F.11, consider the functions $f'_i: \mathbb{F}_p^n \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ defined by

$$f'_i(\mathbf{y}) = f_i(\mathbf{y}) \cdot \exp(2\pi i \eta_i(\mathbf{y})/p).$$

For every $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{F}_p^d$ we have

$$\prod_{i=1}^t f'_i(\psi_i(\mathbf{x})) = \left(\prod_{i=1}^t f_i(\mathbf{x}) \right) \cdot \exp\left(\frac{2\pi i}{p} \sum_{i=1}^t \eta_i(\psi_i(\mathbf{x})) \right).$$

By the choice of η_i , we have

$$\sum_{i=1}^t \eta_i(\psi_i(\mathbf{x})) = \sum_{i=1}^t \eta_i(\psi_i(\mathbf{x}) + \psi_i(0)) = \xi(\mathbf{x}) + \sum_{i=1}^t \eta_i(\psi_i(0)),$$

the second term of which is a constant independent of \mathbf{x} . Therefore we have (with c a complex number of absolute value 1):

$$\prod_{i=1}^t f'_i(\psi_i(\mathbf{x})) = \prod_{i=1}^t f_i(\psi_i(\mathbf{x})) \cdot e_{\xi}(\mathbf{x}) \cdot c.$$

We apply Proposition F.6 to the functions f'_i , which have the same Gowers norms as f_i by [15, (B.11) in Appendix B]. We conclude

$$\left| \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{F}_p^d} e_{\xi} \prod_{i=1}^t f_i \circ (\psi_i \otimes \mathbb{F}_p) \right| = \left| \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{F}_p^d} \prod_{i=1}^t f'_i \circ (\psi_i \otimes \mathbb{F}_p) \right| \ll_1 (\delta + \rho^{1/2^{s+2}}).$$

By Cases 1 and 2, for every ξ we obtain $\left| \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{F}_p^d} e_{\xi} \prod_{i=1}^t f_i \circ (\psi_i \otimes \mathbb{F}_p) \right| = O_1(\delta + \rho^{1/2^{s+2}})$. Noting $|\mathbb{I}| = O_d(X^d)$, it follows that

$$\sum_{\xi \in \mathbb{I}} \left| \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{F}_p^d} e_{\xi} \prod_{i=1}^t f_i \circ (\psi_i \otimes \mathbb{F}_p) \right| = O_d(X^d)(\delta + \rho^{1/2^{s+2}}),$$

completing the proof of Proposition F.9. \square

Now we consider the situation where the sum is taken over a given convex body $\Omega \subset (\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z})^d$. As always, we embed $\mathbb{F}_p^d \hookrightarrow (\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z})^d$.

Proposition F.12. *Let $t, d, L, n > 0$ be positive integers. Let $N_0 = O_{d,n}(L^{O_n(1)})$ be as in Proposition F.9 (which uses the one from Proposition F.6).*

Let $\Omega \subset [-1/3, 1/3]^d$ be a convex body which we regard as a subset of $(\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z})^d$. Let $1_{\Omega}: (\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z})^d \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ be its indicator function.

Let $\psi_1, \dots, \psi_t: \mathbb{Z}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}^n$ be affine-linear maps with $\|\dot{\psi}_i\| \leq L$ such that

- (1) *coker*(ψ_i) are all finite;
- (2) *Cauchy–Schwarz complexity* $\leq s$.

Let $p > N_0$ be a prime number and $f_1, \dots, f_t: \mathbb{F}_p^n \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ be functions whose absolute values are pointwise bounded by a function ν satisfying the $(t2^{s+1}, 4(s+2)d, O_{d,n}(L^{O_n(1)}))$ -linear forms condition in scale $\geq N_0$ with error $\leq \rho$. Also, assume $\|f_i\|_{U^{s+1}(\mathbb{F}_p^n)} \leq \delta$ for some index i and $\delta > 0$.

Then, for any positive numbers $M, X > 0$, we have

$$\left| \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{F}_p^d} 1_{\Omega} \cdot \prod_{i=1}^t f_i \circ (\psi_i \otimes \mathbb{F}_p) \right| \ll_d X^d (\delta + \rho^{1/2^{s+2}}) + 2^t X^d \rho^{1/2^{s+1}} + 2^t M \frac{\log X}{X} + \frac{1}{M}.$$

Proof. There is a decomposition

$$1_{\Omega} = F_M + G_M$$

where F_M, G_M are 1-bounded functions such that F_M is Lipschitz with Lipschitz constant $\leq M$ and $|G_M|$ is dominated by a non-negatively valued Lipschitz function G'_M with Lipschitz constant $\leq M$ and having support $\subset (\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z})^d$ of volume $O_d(1/M)$. (For example, writing d for the metric on $(\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z})^d$, we can take $F_M(x) := \min\{0, 1 - M \cdot d(\Omega, x)\}$, $G_M := 1_{\Omega} - F_M$ and $G'_M(x) := \min\{0, 1 - M \cdot d(\partial\Omega, x)\}$ as in [15, p. 1820].)

By the triangle inequality, we have

$$(F.12) \quad \left| \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{F}_p^d} 1_{\Omega} \cdot \prod_{i=1}^t f_i \circ (\psi_i \otimes \mathbb{F}_p) \right| \leq \left| \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{F}_p^d} F_M \cdot \prod_{i=1}^t f_i \circ (\psi_i \otimes \mathbb{F}_p) \right| + \left| \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{F}_p^d} G_M \cdot \prod_{i=1}^t f_i \circ (\psi_i \otimes \mathbb{F}_p) \right|.$$

By Proposition F.9, the first term in the right-hand side is $\ll_d X^d (\delta + \rho^{1/2^{s+1}}) + M \frac{\log X}{X}$.

The second term in the right-hand side is bounded as:

$$(F.13) \quad \leq \left| \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{F}_p^d} G'_M \cdot \prod_{i=1}^t \nu \circ (\psi_i \otimes \mathbb{F}_p) \right|.$$

Write ν as the sum $\nu = 1 + (\nu - 1)$. The product in (F.13) expands into the sum of 2^t terms. If g_i denotes either 1 or $\nu - 1$, they are of the following form:

$$\left| \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{F}_p^d} G'_M \cdot \prod_{i=1}^t g_i \circ (\psi_i \otimes \mathbb{F}_p) \right|.$$

By the linear forms condition satisfied by ν , we know $\|\nu - 1\|_{U^{s+1}(\mathbb{F}_p^n)} \leq (2^{2^{s+1}}\rho)^{1/2^{s+1}} = 2\rho^{1/2^{s+1}}$. Therefore except the case $g_i = 1$ for all i (there are $2^t - 1$ such possibilities), we have by Proposition F.9

$$\left| \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{F}_p^d} G'_M \cdot \prod_{i=1}^t g_i \circ (\psi_i \otimes \mathbb{F}_p) \right| \ll_d X^d \rho^{1/2^{s+1}} + M \frac{\log X}{X}.$$

When $g_i = 1$ for all i , we have

$$\left| \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{F}_p^d} G'_M \right| \leq \text{vol}(\text{Supp } G'_M) = O_d(1/M)$$

by the assumption on the support of G'_M . It follows that we have

$$\left| \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{F}_p^d} G'_M \cdot \prod_{i=1}^t \nu \circ (\psi_i \otimes \mathbb{F}_p) \right| \ll_d 2^t X^d \rho^{1/2^{s+1}} + 2^t M \frac{\log X}{X} + \frac{1}{M}.$$

Combining the bounds that we have obtained for the right-hand side of (F.12), we conclude

$$\left| \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{F}_p^d} 1_\Omega \cdot \prod_{i=1}^t f_i \circ (\psi_i \otimes \mathbb{F}_p) \right| \ll_d X^d (\delta + \rho^{1/2^{s+2}}) + 2^t X^d \rho^{1/2^{s+1}} + 2^t M \frac{\log X}{X} + \frac{1}{M}.$$

This completes the proof of Proposition F.12. \square

Remark F.13. Assume, more weakly than convexity, that $\Omega \subset [-1/3, 1/3]^d$ regarded as a subset of \mathbb{R}^d has boundary of Lipschitz class $\text{Lip}(d, Z, L)$ for some $Z, L \geq 1$. (See Definition E.2 for this condition.) Then the conclusion of Proposition F.12 stays valid if we replace the term $1/M$ by ZL^{d-1}/M . This is because the bound $\text{Vol}(\text{Supp}(G'_M)) \ll_d 1/M$ gets replaced by $\ll_d ZL^{d-1}/M$ as any set of Lipschitz class $\text{Lip}(d, Z, L)$ has $1/M$ -neighborhood of volume $\ll_d \varepsilon ZL^{d-1}/M$.

We are now ready to prove our main result of this section. For the convenience of reference, let us reproduce verbatim the generalized von Neumann theorem that we want to prove:

Theorem F.4 (reproduced). *Let $t, d, L, n > 0$ be positive parameters. Then there exists $N_0 = O_{d,n}(L^{O_n(1)})$ such that for all $N > N_0$, the following holds:*

Let $\psi_1, \dots, \psi_t: \mathbb{Z}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}^n$ be affine-linear maps, $\|\psi_i\|_N \leq L$, having Cauchy-Schwarz complexity $\leq s$. Let $f_1, \dots, f_t: \mathbb{Z}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ be functions satisfying:

- (1) $\|f_i\|_{U^{s+1}([- (d+1)LN, (d+1)LN]^n)} \leq \delta$ for some i and positive $\delta > 0$.
- (2) *We have a pointwise bound $|f_i| \leq \nu$ on $[\pm (d+1)LN]^n$ for all i where $\nu: \mathbb{Z}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ is a function satisfying the $(t2^{s+1}, 4(s+2)d, O_{d,n}(L^{O_n(1)}))$ -linear forms condition in scale $\geq N$ with error $< \rho$ for some positive ρ .*

Let $\Omega \subset [-N, N]^d \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ be a convex body.

Then for any positive value $M, X > 0$ we have

$$\left| \mathbb{E}_{[-N, N]^d} 1_\Omega \prod_{i=1}^t (f_i \circ \psi_i) \right| \ll_{d, n, s} L^d \left(X^d (\delta + \rho^{1/2^{s+2}} + 2^t \rho^{1/2^{s+1}}) + \frac{1}{M} + M \frac{\log X}{X} \right).$$

Proof of Theorem F.4. By the assumption $\|\psi_i\|_N \leq L$, we have

$$\psi_i([\pm N]^d) \subset [\pm(d+1)LN]^n.$$

Let p be a prime number satisfying $2(d+1)LN \leq p \leq 4(d+1)LN$, which exists by Bertrand's postulate (Chebyshev's theorem).

Let $\iota: [\pm(d+1)LN]^n \hookrightarrow \mathbb{F}_p^n$ be the restriction of the mod p map $\mathbb{Z}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_p^n$ and $\iota_i f_i: \mathbb{F}_p^n \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ be the zero-extension of the map $f_i|_{[\pm(d+1)LN]^n}$. Namely, on the image of ι , the map $\iota_i f_i$ carries the point $\iota(\mathbf{x})$ to $f_i(\mathbf{x})$, and takes the value 0 outside $\iota([\pm(d+1)LN]^n)$. By [15, Lemma B.5], we have

$$(F.14) \quad \|\iota_i f_i\|_{U^{s+1}(\mathbb{F}_p^n)} = O_{s, n}(1) \|f_i\|_{U^{s+1}([\pm(d+1)LN]^n)}.$$

As $[\pm N]^d \hookrightarrow \mathbb{F}_p^d$ is also an injection, we can regard $\Omega \cap \mathbb{Z}^d$ as a subset of \mathbb{F}_p^d . Let us write $\Omega \cap \mathbb{F}_p^d$ when it is convenient to distinguish. By the commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} \Omega \cap \mathbb{Z}^d & \subset & [\pm N]^d & \xrightarrow{\psi_i} & [\pm(d+1)LN]^n \\ & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \iota \\ & & \mathbb{F}_p^d & \xrightarrow{\psi_i \otimes \mathbb{F}_p} & \mathbb{F}_p^n \\ \Omega \cap \mathbb{F}_p^d & \subset & \mathbb{F}_p^d & \xrightarrow{\psi_i \otimes \mathbb{F}_p} & \mathbb{F}_p^n \xrightarrow{\iota_i f_i} \mathbb{C} \end{array}$$

we can rewrite the average in question in the following way.

$$\begin{aligned} (F.15) \quad \left| \mathbb{E}_{[-N, N]^d} 1_\Omega \prod_{i=1}^t (f_i \circ \psi_i) \right| &= \frac{1}{(2N+1)^d} \left| \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in \Omega} \prod_{i=1}^t f_i(\psi_i(\mathbf{x})) \right| \\ &= \frac{1}{(2N+1)^d} \left| \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in \Omega} \prod_{i=1}^t \iota_i f_i(\psi_i \otimes \mathbb{F}_p(\mathbf{x})) \right| \\ &= \frac{p^d}{(2N+1)^d} \left| \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{F}_p^d} 1_{\Omega \cap \mathbb{F}_p^d} \prod_{i=1}^t (\iota_i f_i) \circ (\psi_i \otimes \mathbb{F}_p) \right| \\ &\ll_d L^d \left| \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{F}_p^d} 1_{\Omega \cap \mathbb{F}_p^d} \prod_{i=1}^t (\iota_i f_i) \circ (\psi_i \otimes \mathbb{F}_p) \right|, \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality follows from the assumption $p \leq 4(d+1)LN$. Let $\delta_{\mathbb{F}_p} := \max_{1 \leq i \leq t} \|\iota_i f_i\|_{U^{s+1}(\mathbb{F}_p^n)}$. The right-most term in (F.15) can be bounded thanks to Proposition F.12:

$$\ll_d \left(X^d (\delta_{\mathbb{F}_p} + \rho^{1/2^{s+2}} + 2^t \rho^{1/2^{s+1}}) + \frac{1}{M} + 2^t M \frac{\log X}{X} \right).$$

By (F.14), we have $\delta_{\mathbb{F}_p} \ll_{n, s} \delta$. This gives us a further bound

$$\ll_{n, s} \left(X^d (\delta + \rho^{1/2^{s+2}} + 2^t \rho^{1/2^{s+1}}) + \frac{1}{M} + 2^t M \frac{\log X}{X} \right),$$

completing the proof of Theorem F.4. \square

Remark F.14. If we assume, more weakly than convexity, that $\Omega \subset [-N, N]^d$ has boundary of Lipschitz class $\text{Lip}(d, Z, LN)$ for some $Z, L \geq 1$, then the conclusion of Theorem F.4 stays valid if we replace the term $1/M$ by ZL^{d-1}/M . See Remark F.13.

APPENDIX G. VERIFICATION OF THE LOCALIZED VARIANT OF MAIN RESULTS

In this appendix we supply a proof of Theorem 13.1, which is about simultaneous prime values in $\mathcal{O}_K[S^{-1}]$.

The idea the following: suppose for example that we want to estimate the sum $\sum_{n \in [1, N]} \Lambda_{\mathbb{Z}[1/6]}(n)$, where $\Lambda_{\mathbb{Z}[1/6]}$ is a variant of the von Mangoldt function which assigns to n the value $\log p$ if $n = 2^a 3^b p^k$ for some $a, b \geq 0, k \geq 1$ and prime $p \neq 2, 3$, and 0 otherwise. We can morally estimate the sum as follows, where in practice the sum in $a, b \geq 0$ should be truncated at some large enough threshold:

$$(G.1) \quad \sum_{n \in [1, N]} \Lambda_{\mathbb{Z}[1/6]}(n) = \sum_{a, b \geq 0} \left(\sum_{\substack{n \in [1, 2^{-a} 3^{-b} N] \\ \text{coprime to } 6}} \Lambda_{\mathbb{Z}[1/6]}(2^a 3^b n) \right) \\ \doteq \sum_{a, b \geq 0} \left(\sum_{n \in [1, 2^{-a} 3^{-b} N]} \Lambda(n) \right),$$

then we apply Prime Number Theorem:

$$\doteq \sum_{a, b \geq 0} 2^{-a} 3^{-b} N \\ = N \sum_{a \geq 0} 2^{-a} \sum_{b \geq 0} 3^{-b} = N \cdot 2 \cdot \frac{3}{2} = 3N.$$

In general one finds $\sum_{n \in [1, N]} \Lambda_{\mathbb{Z}[1/f]}(n) \doteq (f/\varphi(f)) \cdot N$.

Our actual arguments are more involved because we want to estimate the sum of products $\sum_x \prod_{i=1}^t \Lambda_{\mathcal{O}_K[S^{-1}]}^{\mathfrak{a}}(\psi_i(x))$ and so we go through the W -tricked Gowers norm estimate.

G.1. Preliminary discussions. Under the setting of Theorem 13.1, let $\mathfrak{a}_0 \subset \mathfrak{a}[S^{-1}]$ be the (finitely generated) \mathcal{O}_K -submodule generated by the subset $\bigcup_{i=1}^t \psi_i(\mathbb{Z}^d)$. By condition (13.1) we know $\mathfrak{a}_0[S^{-1}] = \mathfrak{a}[S^{-1}]$. As the statement of Theorem 13.1 only depends on $\mathfrak{a}[S^{-1}]$, we may assume that $\mathfrak{a}_0 = \mathfrak{a}$, in particular the maps ψ_i land in $\mathfrak{a} \subset \mathfrak{a}[S^{-1}]$. By the torsion cokernel assumptions, the set of maps

$$\psi_i: \mathbb{Z}^d \rightarrow \mathfrak{a} \quad (i = 1, \dots, t)$$

has finite complexity (say $s \geq 1$) in the sense of Appendix F.

We want to repeat the arguments of §12 for the function $\Lambda_{\mathcal{O}_K[S^{-1}]}^{\mathfrak{a}}$ in place of $\Lambda_K^{\mathfrak{a}}$. When actuating the W -trick, we continue to use the values $w = (\log \log N)^{1/3}$ and $W := P(w)$.

A pseudorandom majorant for the W -tricked $\Lambda_{\mathcal{O}_K[S^{-1}]}^{\mathfrak{a}}$ can be constructed parallelly to the one for $\Lambda_K^{\mathfrak{a}}$. See Theorem C.6.

We want to establish:

Proposition G.1. *Assume that $N \gg_{s,K,S} 1$ is large enough that w is larger than all the residue characteristics of the primes $\mathfrak{p} \in S$. For every $b \in [0, W-1]_{\mathfrak{a}}^n$ coprime to W in $\mathfrak{a}[S^{-1}]$, we have*

$$\left\| \frac{1}{\text{res}_{s=1}(\zeta_K(s))} - \frac{\varphi_K(W)}{W^n} \Lambda_{\mathcal{O}_K[S^{-1}]}^{\mathfrak{a}} \right\|_{U^{s+1}(\mathfrak{a} \cap \frac{[\pm N]_{\mathfrak{a}}^n - b}{W})} \ll_{s,K,S} (\log \log N)^{-1/O_{s,n}(1)}.$$

Its proof will be completed at the end of §G.4. It turns out to be convenient to make use of a Cramér model, which we define in the next subsection.

G.2. The Cramér model in the localized setting. Let us continue to use the quantities $Q = e^{\sqrt{\log N}/O_s(1)} \in \mathbb{R}$ and $P(Q) = \prod_{p < Q} p \in \mathbb{N}$, which vary with $N > 1$. We may assume that $N \gg_S 1$ is large enough that Q is larger than all the residue characteristics of the primes $\mathfrak{p} \in S$.

Definition G.2. Let $\Lambda_{\mathcal{O}_K[S^{-1}],Q}: \text{Ideals}_{\mathcal{O}_K[S^{-1}]} \cup \{(0)\} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ be the Q -Cramér model of the von Mangoldt function defined by

$$\mathfrak{a} \mapsto \begin{cases} \frac{P(Q)^n}{\varphi_K(P(Q))} \cdot \frac{1}{\text{res}_{s=1}(\zeta_K(s))} & \text{if } \mathfrak{a} + (P(Q)) = (1) \text{ in } \mathcal{O}_K[S^{-1}], \\ 0 & \text{if not.} \end{cases}$$

For a non-zero fractional ideal \mathfrak{a} of \mathcal{O}_K , define $\Lambda_{\mathcal{O}_K[S^{-1}]}^{\mathfrak{a}}$

We are not using the decoration ‘‘Cramér’’ anymore because we will not introduce other models.

Our trick, as we saw in (G.1), is to deduce everything from the case of \mathcal{O}_K using the following sum description. Note that for our purposes, we may replace the von Mangoldt function $\Lambda_{\mathcal{O}_K[S^{-1}]}^{\mathfrak{a}}$ by the function $\Lambda_{\mathcal{O}_K[S^{-1}]}^{\mathfrak{a}}$ which is defined using the modification $\Lambda'_{\mathcal{O}_K[S^{-1}]}$ of $\Lambda_{\mathcal{O}_K[S^{-1}]}$ where we set the values at higher prime powers \mathfrak{p}^k ($k \geq 2$) to be zero because the contribution of such prime ideals is negligible.

For $\mathfrak{q} \in \text{Ideals}_K$, let us say it is *supported in* S and write

$$|\mathfrak{q}| \subset S$$

when all the prime divisors of \mathfrak{a} are in S . We say \mathfrak{q} is *coprime to* S if no prime divisor of \mathfrak{q} is in S .

Lemma G.3. *For all non-zero fractional ideal \mathfrak{a} over \mathcal{O}_K , the following equality of functions on \mathfrak{a} holds:*

$$(G.2) \quad \Lambda_{\mathcal{O}_K[S^{-1}],Q}^{\mathfrak{a}} = \sum_{\substack{\mathfrak{q} \in \text{Ideals}_K \\ |\mathfrak{p}| \subset S}} 1_{\mathfrak{q}\mathfrak{a}} \Lambda_{\text{Cramér},Q}^{\mathfrak{q}\mathfrak{a}}.$$

Also, except at points $x \in \mathfrak{a}$ such that the ideal $x\mathfrak{a}^{-1} \subset \mathcal{O}_K$ is supported on S , the following holds:

$$(G.3) \quad \Lambda'_{\mathcal{O}_K[S^{-1}]}^{\mathfrak{a}} = \sum_{\substack{\mathfrak{q} \in \text{Ideals}_K \\ |\mathfrak{p}| \subset S}} 1_{\mathfrak{q}\mathfrak{a}} \Lambda_K^{\mathfrak{q}\mathfrak{a}}.$$

There are only $\ll_K (\log N)^{|S|+n}$ such exceptional points in a cube $[\pm N]_{\mathfrak{a}}^n$ with respect to a norm-length compatible basis, and the difference of both sides at such points are $\ll_{K,S} 1$.

Furthermore, there is a constant C_K depending only on K such that on the cube $[\pm N]_{\mathfrak{a}}^n$ in \mathfrak{a} (with respect to any norm-length compatible basis), the values of the right-hand sides do not change if we restrict the sum $\sum_{\mathfrak{q}}$ to those \mathfrak{q} satisfying $\mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{q}) \leq C_K N^n$.

Proof. For $x \in \mathfrak{a}$, For the Cramér model, the value of both sides of (G.2) are non-zero precisely when the ideal $x\mathfrak{a}^{-1} + P(Q)$ of \mathcal{O}_K is supported on S and the non-zero values are both $\frac{P(Q)^n}{\varphi_K(P(Q))}$.

For the equality (G.3), the value $\Lambda'_{\mathcal{O}_K[S^{-1}]}(x)$ at $x \in \mathfrak{a}$ is non-zero precisely when $x\mathfrak{a}^{-1}$ has the form $\mathfrak{q}\mathfrak{p}$ where \mathfrak{q} is an ideal of \mathcal{O}_K satisfying $|\mathfrak{q}| \subset S$ and \mathfrak{p} is a prime ideal away from S . When this is the case, the value of $1_{\mathfrak{q}\mathfrak{a}}\Lambda_K^{\mathfrak{q}\mathfrak{a}}$ at x is non-zero precisely for this \mathfrak{q} and the non-zero values of both sides coincide and equal $\log \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{p})$. The right-hand side is non-zero precisely when $x\mathfrak{a}^{-1}$ has the form $\mathfrak{q}\mathfrak{p}$ where \mathfrak{q} is supported on S and \mathfrak{p} is *any* prime ideal. The event that the left-hand side is zero but the right-hand side is non-zero happens precisely when $x\mathfrak{a}^{-1}$ is a non-unit ideal supported on S (*vice versa* does not happen); the value of the right-hand side is then $\sum_{\mathfrak{p} \in S \text{ such that } x \in \mathfrak{p}\mathfrak{a}} \log \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{p})$, which is $\leq |S| \max_{\mathfrak{p} \in S} \log \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{p})$.

For the bound of the number of points violating (G.3), there are $\ll_K (\log N)^{|S|}$ ideals supported on S and having norm $\leq C_K N^n$. For each such ideal, there are $\ll_K (\log N)^{n-1}$ points corresponding to it in the cube $[\pm N]_{\mathfrak{a}}^n$ by the consideration of the \mathcal{O}_K^\times -action.

For the existence of a claimed constant $C_K > 1$, note that by Proposition 3.4 all the elements $x \in [\pm N]_{\mathfrak{a}}^n$ have norm $\ll_K N^n$. Hence the existence of a non-zero element $x \in [\pm N]_{\mathfrak{a}}^n \cap \mathfrak{q}\mathfrak{a}$ implies $\mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{q}) \leq \mathbf{N}(x\mathfrak{a}^{-1}) \ll_K N^n$. \square

Remark G.4. The constant function obviously fails to satisfy the conclusion of Lemma G.3. This is why the Cramér model is more convenient here.

G.3. von Mangoldt and Cramér are close over $\mathcal{O}_K[S^{-1}]$ —Fubini type inequality. Now we are in a position to state and prove an intermediate step toward Proposition G.1, namely the comparison of the von Mangoldt function to its Cramér model:

Proposition G.5. *For any $N \gg_{s,K,S} 1$, any non-zero ideal \mathfrak{a} over \mathcal{O}_K equipped with a norm-length compatible basis and any $b \in \mathfrak{a}$ such that $b\mathcal{O}_K[S^{-1}] + W\mathfrak{a}[S^{-1}] = \mathfrak{a}[S^{-1}]$, we have*

$$\left\| \frac{\varphi_K(W)}{W^n} \left(\Lambda_{\mathcal{O}_K[S^{-1}]}^{\mathfrak{a}} - \Lambda_{\mathcal{O}_K[S^{-1},Q]}^{\mathfrak{a}} \right) (W(-) + b) \right\|_{U^{s+1} \left(\mathfrak{a} \cap \frac{[\pm N]_{\mathfrak{a}}^n - b}{W} \right)} \ll_{s,K,S} (\log \log N)^{-1/O_{s,n}(1)}.$$

To prove this, we need to recall a Fubini type inequality of the Gowers norm. Let $f: G \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ be a finitely supported function on an abelian group G . Its *unnormalized Gowers uniformity norm* $\|f\|_{\tilde{U}^{s+1}(G)} \geq 0$ is defined by:

$$\left(\|f\|_{\tilde{U}^{s+1}(G)} \right)^{2^{s+1}} := \sum_{x \in G, \underline{h} \in G^{s+1}} \prod_{\omega \in \{0,1\}^{s+1}} \mathcal{C}^{|\omega|} f(x + \omega \cdot \underline{h}).$$

When $A \subset G$ is a finite subset and $f: G \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ is a function, we already defined the (*normalized*) Gowers norm $\|f\|_{U^{s+1}(A)}$ in Definition 2.1. The relationship of the

normalized and unnormalized norms is:

$$\|f\|_{U^{s+1}(A)} = \|f\mathbf{1}_A\|_{\tilde{U}^{s+1}(G)} / \|\mathbf{1}_A\|_{\tilde{U}^{s+1}(G)}.$$

In particular, if F is a *finite* group and we set $A = F$, we have

$$\|f\|_{U^{s+1}(F)} = \|f\|_{\tilde{U}^{s+1}(F)} \cdot |F|^{-(s+2)/2^{s+1}}.$$

The following Fubini type inequality is formulated naturally using this unnormalized norm.

Lemma G.6 ([30, Lemma 4.1]). *Let $f: G \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ be a finitely supported function on an abelian group G and let $H \subset G$ be a subgroup. Then*

$$\|f\|_{\tilde{U}^{s+1}(G)} \leq \left\| \left(a \pmod{H} \mapsto \|f(a + (-))\|_{\tilde{U}^{s+1}(H)} \right) \right\|_{\tilde{U}^{s+1}(G/H)}.$$

We are interested in a situation where $G \cong \mathbb{Z}^n$ and A is the intersection $A = \mathbb{Z}^n \cap \Omega$ where $\Omega \subset [\pm N]^n$ is a convex set whose volume is typically comparable to N^n , say

$$\text{Vol}(\Omega) \geq N^n / C$$

for some $C > 1$. (By abuse of notation, let us write Ω also for the intersection $A = \mathbb{Z}^n \cap \Omega$ when there is no risk of confusion.) In this situation we have $\|\mathbf{1}_\Omega\|_{\tilde{U}^{s+1}(G)} \asymp_{s,n,C} \text{Vol}(\Omega)^{(s+2)/2^{s+1}}$ when $N \gg_{s,n,C} 1$.

Also, let us assume that $H \subset G$ has finite index and the support of f is contained in H . The above relations give the following inequality for the normalized Gowers norm:

$$\begin{aligned} \|f\|_{U^{s+1}(\Omega)} &\asymp_{s,n} \text{Vol}(\Omega)^{-(s+2)/2^{s+1}} \|f\mathbf{1}_\Omega\|_{\tilde{U}^{s+1}(G)} \\ &\leq \text{Vol}(\Omega)^{-(s+2)/2^{s+1}} \left\| \left(a \pmod{H} \mapsto \begin{cases} \|f\mathbf{1}_{\Omega \cap H}\|_{\tilde{U}^{s+1}(H)} & \text{if } a = 0 \\ 0 & \text{if not} \end{cases} \right) \right\|_{\tilde{U}^{s+1}(G/H)} \\ &= \text{Vol}(\Omega)^{-(s+2)/2^{s+1}} \|f\mathbf{1}_{\Omega \cap H}\|_{\tilde{U}^{s+1}(H)} \|\mathbf{1}_{\{0\}}\|_{\tilde{U}^{s+1}(G/H)} \\ &= \text{Vol}(\Omega)^{-(s+2)/2^{s+1}} \|f\mathbf{1}_{\Omega \cap H}\|_{\tilde{U}^{s+1}(H)} \\ &= \text{Vol}(\Omega)^{-(s+2)/2^{s+1}} \|\mathbf{1}_{\Omega \cap H}\|_{\tilde{U}^{s+1}(H)} \|f\|_{U^{s+1}(H \cap \Omega)}. \end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, assume that $|G/H| \leq N^n$ and that H has a basis consisting of vectors of l^2 -lengths in $[\frac{1}{C}|G/H|^{1/n}, C|G/H|^{1/n}]$ with respect to the chosen basis $G \cong \mathbb{Z}^n$ (by possibly enlarging the constant $C > 1$). Then by Proposition E.1 we have

$$\|\mathbf{1}_{\Omega \cap H}\|_{\tilde{U}^{s+1}(H)} \asymp_{s,n,C} (\text{Vol}(\Omega)/|G/H|)^{(s+2)/2^{s+1}}.$$

Therefore under these assumptions we obtain

$$(G.4) \quad \|f\|_{U^{s+1}(\Omega)} \ll_{s,n,C} |G/H|^{-(s+2)/2^{s+1}} \|f\|_{U^{s+1}(H \cap \Omega)}.$$

Even if $|G/H| > N^n$, it is certainly true that $\|\mathbf{1}_{\Omega \cap H}\|_{\tilde{U}^{s+1}(H)} \ll_{s,n,C} (\text{Vol}(\Omega)/N^n)^{(s+2)/2^{s+1}}$ so that we still have

$$(G.5) \quad \|f\|_{U^{s+1}(\Omega)} \ll_{s,n,C} N^{-n(s+2)/2^{s+1}} \|f\|_{U^{s+1}(H \cap \Omega)}$$

when $|G/H| > N^n$.

Proof of Proposition G.5. We apply §G.3 to the following W -tricked situation (this means we are using the above general facts in the rescaled way $N \rightsquigarrow N/W$). For each \mathfrak{q} , consider the following function $1_\Omega f_{\mathfrak{q}}: \mathfrak{a} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$, where

$$f_{\mathfrak{q}} := 1_{\mathfrak{q}\mathfrak{a}} \frac{\varphi_K(W)}{W^n} (\Lambda_K^{\mathfrak{q}\mathfrak{a}} - \Lambda_{\text{Cramér},Q}^{\mathfrak{q}\mathfrak{a}})(W(-) + b)$$

and $\Omega := \frac{[\pm N]_{\mathfrak{a} \otimes_{\mathbb{R}} \mathbb{R}}^n - b}{W}$. When $\mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{q}) < N^n/W^n$, by (G.4) we have

$$\|f_{\mathfrak{q}}\|_{U^{s+1}(\mathfrak{a} \cap \Omega)} \ll_{s,K} \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{q})^{-(s+2)/2^{s+1}} \|f_{\mathfrak{q}}\|_{U^{s+1}(\mathfrak{q}\mathfrak{a} \cap \Omega)}.$$

We give $\mathfrak{q}\mathfrak{a}$ a norm-length compatible basis. By norm-length compatibility, we know that the set $\Omega \cap \mathfrak{q}\mathfrak{a}$ is contained in $[\pm O_K(1) \frac{N}{W\mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{q})^{1/n}}]_{\mathfrak{q}\mathfrak{a}}^n$. By (the proof of) Lemma 12.2, under the assumption $\mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{q}) < N^n/W^n$ we have

$$\|f_{\mathfrak{q}}\|_{U^{s+1}(\mathfrak{q}\mathfrak{a} \cap \Omega)} \ll_{s,K} (\log \log N)^{-1/O_{s,n}(1)}.$$

Therefore we conclude

$$(G.6) \quad \|f_{\mathfrak{q}}\|_{U^{s+1}(\mathfrak{a} \cap \frac{[\pm N]_{\mathfrak{a} \otimes_{\mathbb{R}} \mathbb{R}}^n - b}{W})} \ll_{s,K} \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{q})^{-(s+2)/2^{s+1}} (\log \log N)^{-1/O_{s,n}(1)}$$

under the assumption $\mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{q}) < N^n/W^n$.

By Lemma G.3 and the triangle inequality, we obtain (noting that the points violating (G.3) in the lemma contribute only an $O_{s,K,S}(N^{-1/O_s(1)})$ to the Gowers norm)

$$(G.7) \quad \left\| \frac{\varphi_K(W)}{W^n} (\Lambda_{\mathcal{O}_K[S^{-1}]}^{\mathfrak{a}} - \Lambda_{\mathcal{O}_K[S^{-1},Q]}^{\mathfrak{a}})(W(-) + b) \right\|_{U^{s+1}(\mathfrak{a} \cap \Omega)} \\ \leq \sum_{\substack{\mathfrak{q} \\ |\mathfrak{q}| \leq S \\ \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{q}) \leq N^n/W^n}} \|f_{\mathfrak{q}}\|_{U^{s+1}(\mathfrak{a} \cap \Omega)} + \sum_{\substack{\mathfrak{q} \\ |\mathfrak{q}| \leq S \\ N^n/W^n < \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{q}) < O_K(1)N^n}} \|f_{\mathfrak{q}}\|_{U^{s+1}(\mathfrak{a} \cap \Omega)} \\ + O_{s,K,S}(N^{-1/O_s(1)}).$$

The first sum can be bounded using (G.6) as follows:

$$\sum_{\substack{\mathfrak{q} \\ |\mathfrak{q}| \leq S \\ \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{q}) \leq N^n/W^n}} \|f_{\mathfrak{q}}\|_{U^{s+1}(\mathfrak{a} \cap \Omega)} \\ \ll_{s,K} \sum_{\substack{\mathfrak{q} \\ |\mathfrak{q}| \leq S}} \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{q})^{-(s+2)/2^{s+1}} (\log \log N)^{-1/O_{s,n}(1)} \\ = \prod_{\mathfrak{p} \in S} \left(1 - \frac{1}{\mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{p})^{(s+2)/2^{s+1}}} \right)^{-1} (\log \log N)^{-1/O_{s,n}(1)} \\ = O_{K,S}(1) (\log \log N)^{-1/O_{s,n}(1)}.$$

For the second sum, we use (G.5) and the pointwise bound $\|f_{\mathfrak{q}}\|_{U^{s+1}(\mathfrak{q}\mathfrak{a}\cap\Omega)} \leq \|f_{\mathfrak{q}}\|_{\infty} \ll_K \log N$ (Proposition 6.3) to get:

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\substack{\mathfrak{q} \\ |\mathfrak{q}| \subset S \\ N^n/W^n < \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{q}) < O_K(1)N^n}} \|f_{\mathfrak{q}}\|_{U^{s+1}(\mathfrak{a}\cap\Omega)} \\ \ll_{s,K} \sum_{\substack{\mathfrak{q} \\ |\mathfrak{q}| \subset S \\ N^n/W^n < \mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{q}) < O_K(1)N^n}} \left(\frac{N}{W}\right)^{-n(s+2)/2^{s+1}} \log N, \end{aligned}$$

and as there are $\ll_K (\log N)^{|S|}$ ideals \mathfrak{q} satisfying $|\mathfrak{q}| \subset S$ and $\mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{q}) < O_K(1)N^n$, this last sum is:

$$\ll_K (\log N)^{|S|} \left(\frac{N}{W}\right)^{-n(s+2)/2^{s+1}} \log N < N^{-1/O_s(1)}.$$

By plugging these two bounds in (G.7), the proof of Proposition G.5 is now complete. \square

G.4. End of Gowers norm bound. On the other hand, it is rather straightforward to compare the Cramér model and the constant function.

Proposition G.7. *For any $b \in [0, W-1]_{\mathfrak{a}}^n$ coprime to W in $\mathcal{O}_K[S^{-1}]$, we have*

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \frac{1}{\text{res}_{s=1}(\zeta_K(s))} - \frac{\varphi_K(W)}{W^n} \Lambda_{\mathcal{O}_K[S^{-1}], \mathcal{Q}}(W(-) + b) \right\|_{U^{s+1}(\mathfrak{a}\cap\frac{[\pm N]_{\mathfrak{a}}^n - b}{W})} \\ \ll_{s,K} (\log \log N)^{-1/O_{s,n}(1)}. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. One first establishes a variant of Proposition 5.2 (with the same error term) with $\Lambda_{\text{Cramér}, z}^{\mathfrak{a}}$ replaced by $\Lambda_{\mathcal{O}_K[S^{-1}], \mathcal{Q}}^{\mathfrak{a}}$ and the $\beta_p(\psi_1, \dots, \psi_t)$ factors in the leading term replaced by

$$\beta_{p, S^{-1}}(\psi_1, \dots, \psi_t) := \left(\frac{p^n}{\varphi_K(p)} \right)^t \left(1 - \frac{1}{p^d} \left| \bigcup_{i=1}^t \bigcup_{\substack{\mathfrak{p}|p \\ \mathfrak{p} \text{ coprime to } S}} \psi_{i, \mathfrak{p}}^{-1}(0) \right| \right),$$

where

$$\psi_{i, \mathfrak{p}}: \mathbb{Z}^d/p\mathbb{Z}^d \rightarrow \mathfrak{a}/\mathfrak{p}\mathfrak{a}$$

is the affine-linear map induced by ψ_i . Of course we have $\beta_{p, S^{-1}}(\psi_1, \dots, \psi_t) = \beta_p(\psi_1, \dots, \psi_t)$ if p is coprime to S in \mathcal{O}_K . We indicate what modifications are needed. We will be using the next related quantity given for each prime number p :

$$g_{S^{-1}}(p) := \left| \bigcup_{i=1}^t \bigcup_{\substack{\mathfrak{p}|p \\ \text{coprime to } S}} \psi_{i, \mathfrak{p}}^{-1}(0) \right| / p^d,$$

which again coincides with $g(p)$ in the proof of Proposition 5.2 if p is coprime to S in \mathcal{O}_K . Write

$$T := \prod_{p \text{ not coprime to } S \text{ in } \mathcal{O}_K} p \in \mathbb{N}.$$

To verify the variant, one applies the Fundamental Lemma D.2 of Sieve Theory to the monoid $\text{Ideals}_{\mathbb{Z}[T^{-1}]}$ together with the following data. Set

$$\Sigma := \{\underline{x} \in \Omega \cap \mathbb{Z}^d \mid \psi_i(\underline{x}) \text{ coprime to } T \text{ in } \mathfrak{a}[S^{-1}] \text{ for all } i\}.$$

Here $y \in \mathfrak{a}[S^{-1}]$ is said to be *coprime to* T if $y\mathcal{O}_K[S^{-1}] + T\mathfrak{a}[S^{-1}] = \mathfrak{a}[S^{-1}]$. Define the “norm map” $\mathbf{N}_{T^{-1}}^{\psi_1, \dots, \psi_t} : \mathbb{Z}^d \rightarrow \text{Ideals}_{\mathbb{Z}[T^{-1}]} \cup \{(0)\}$ by

$$\underline{x} \mapsto \left(\prod_{i=1}^t \mathbf{N}(\psi_i(\underline{x})\mathfrak{a}^{-1}) \right) \cdot \mathbb{Z}[T^{-1}].$$

For each $m \in \text{Ideals}_{\mathbb{Z}[T^{-1}]}$, let Σ_m be the fiber of Σ over m and set $a_m := |\Sigma_m|$.

For square-free $f \in \text{Ideals}_{\mathbb{Z}[T^{-1}]}$ (which we represent by a positive integer coprime to T), one can see parallelly to the proof of Proposition 5.2 that a_m 's and the multiplicative extension $g : \text{Ideals}_{\mathbb{Z}[T^{-1}]} \rightarrow [0, 1]$ of $g(p)$'s satisfy the condition (D.3) in Fundamental Lemma D.2 with $X = \prod_{p|T} (1 - g(p)) \cdot \text{Vol}(\Omega)$ and $r_f = O_{d, M_1, M_2}(f \text{TN}^{d-1})$.

This establishes the variant of Proposition 5.2 for $\Lambda_{\mathcal{O}_K[S^{-1}], \mathbb{Q}}^{\mathfrak{a}}$.

The assertion of Proposition G.7 now follows parallelly to Corollary 5.4. \square

Combining Propositions G.5 and G.7, the proof of Proposition G.1 is now complete.

G.5. End of proof of Theorem 13.1. Now we have enough tools to repeat the proof of Theorem 12.1 in our localized setting. Let us indicate how the computation of the main term goes.

Recall from the statement of Theorem 13.1 that we want to evaluate:

$$\sum_{\underline{x} \in \mathbb{Z}^d \cap \Omega} \prod_{i=1}^t \Lambda_{\mathcal{O}_K[S^{-1}]}^{\mathfrak{a}}(\psi_i(\underline{x})).$$

Dividing the source into W^d residue classes mod $W\mathbb{Z}^d$, this equals

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{\underline{a} \in [0, W-1]^d} \sum_{\underline{x} \in \Omega \cap (W\mathbb{Z}^d + \underline{a})} \prod_{i=1}^t \Lambda_{\mathcal{O}_K[S^{-1}]}^{\mathfrak{a}}(\psi_i(\underline{x})) \\ &= \sum_{\underline{a} \in [0, W-1]^d} \sum_{\underline{y} \in \frac{\Omega - \underline{a}}{W} \cap \mathbb{Z}^d} \prod_{i=1}^t \Lambda_{\mathcal{O}_K[S^{-1}]}^{\mathfrak{a}}(W\psi_i(\underline{y}) + \psi_i(\underline{a})). \end{aligned}$$

Thanks to Proposition G.1 and Theorem C.6, the von Neumann theorem F.4 is applicable, which allows us to replace the function $\prod_{i=1}^t \Lambda_{\mathcal{O}_K[S^{-1}]}^{\mathfrak{a}}(W(-) + \psi_i(\underline{a}))$ by the constant

$$\left(\frac{W^n}{\varphi_K(W)} \frac{1}{\text{res}_{s=1}(\zeta_K(s))} \right)^t$$

if $\psi_i(\underline{a})$ ($1 \leq i \leq t$) are all coprime to W in $\mathfrak{a}[S^{-1}]$ for the given \underline{a} , and by 0 if not. The previous sum is approximated by

$$\frac{1}{\operatorname{res}_{s=1}(\zeta_K(s))^t} \sum_{\underline{a} \in [0, W-1]^d} \left(\prod_{i=1}^t \frac{W^n}{\varphi_K(W)} 1_{\psi_i(\underline{a}) \text{ coprime to } W \text{ in } \mathfrak{a}[S^{-1}]} \right) \sum_{\underline{y} \in \frac{\Omega - \underline{a}}{W} \cap \mathbb{Z}^d} 1.$$

The sum $\sum_{\underline{y}} 1$ is approximately $\operatorname{Vol}(\Omega)/W^d$ for all \underline{a} . Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} &= \frac{\operatorname{Vol}(\Omega)}{\operatorname{res}_{s=1}(\zeta_K(s))^t} \left(\frac{W^n}{\varphi_K(W)} \right)^t \mathbb{E}_{\underline{a} \in [0, W-1]^d} \left[\prod_{i=1}^t 1_{\psi_i(\underline{a}) \text{ coprime to } W \text{ in } \mathfrak{a}[S^{-1}]} \right] \\ &= \frac{\operatorname{Vol}(\Omega)}{\operatorname{res}_{s=1}(\zeta_K(s))^t} \prod_{p|W} \beta_{p, S^{-1}}(\psi_1, \dots, \psi_t), \end{aligned}$$

where the product over $p \mid W$ does not change much when extended to the product over all the primes p . This completes the proof of Theorem 13.1.

REFERENCES

1. Paul T. Bateman and Roger A. Horn, *A heuristic asymptotic formula concerning the distribution of prime numbers*, Mathematics of Computation **16** (1962), no. 79, 363–367, <https://doi.org/10.1090/S0025-5718-1962-0148632-7>.
2. J. W. S. Cassels and A. Fröhlich (eds.), *Algebraic Number Theory*, Academic Press Inc. (London) Ltd, 1967, <https://www.lms.ac.uk/publications/algebraic-number-theory>.
3. David Conlon, Jacob Fox, and Yufei Zhao, *A relative Szemerédi theorem*, Geom. Funct. Anal. **25** (2015), no. 3, 733–762, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00039-015-0324-9>.
4. L. E. Dickson, *A new extension of Dirichlet’s theorem on prime numbers*, Messenger of Mathematics **33** (1904), 155–161.
5. John Friedlander and Henryk Iwaniec, *Opera de Cribro*, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2010, <https://bookstore.ams.org/coll-57>.
6. Christina Giannitsi, Ben Krause, Michael T. Lacey, Hamed Mousavi, and Yaghoub Rahimi, *Average over the Gaussian primes: Goldbach’s conjecture and improving estimates*, arXiv **2309.14249v1** (2023), 36 pages, <https://arxiv.org/abs/2309.14249>.
7. W.T. Gowers, *A new proof of Szemerédi’s theorem*, GAFA, Geom. funct. anal. **11** (2001), 465–588, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00039-001-0332-9>.
8. Ben Green, *Roth’s theorem in the primes*, Ann. of Math. (2) **161** (2005), no. 3, 1609–1636, <https://doi.org/10.4007/annals.2005.161.1609>. MR 2180408
9. Ben Green and Terence Tao, *The primes contain arbitrarily long arithmetic progressions*, Ann. of Math. (2) **167** (2008), no. 2, 481–547, <https://doi.org/10.4007/annals.2008.167.481>.
10. ———, *Quadratic uniformity of the Möbius function*, Annales de l’Institut Fourier **58** (2008), no. 6, 1863–1935 (en), <http://www.numdam.org/articles/10.5802/aif.2401/>. MR 2473624
11. ———, *The Möbius function is strongly orthogonal to nilsequences*, Ann. of Math. **175** (2012), no. 2, 541–566, <https://doi.org/10.4007/annals.2012.175.2.3>.
12. ———, *The quantitative behaviour of polynomial orbits on nilmanifolds*, Ann. of Math. **175** (2012), no. 2, 465–540, <https://doi.org/10.4007/annals.2012.175.2.2> (mind the Erratum).
13. ———, *On the quantitative distribution of polynomial nilsequences - erratum*, Ann. of Math. **179** (2014), no. 3, 1175–1183, (arXiv version <https://arxiv.org/abs/1311.6170> is more detailed, which we site).
14. Ben Green, Terence Tao, and Tamar Ziegler, *An inverse theorem for the Gowers $U^{s+1}[N]$ -norm*, Ann. of Math. (2) **176** (2012), 1231–1372, <http://dx.doi.org/10.4007/annals.2012.176.2.11>.
15. Benjamin Green and Terence Tao, *Linear equations in primes*, Ann. of Math. (2) **171** (2010), no. 3, 1753–1850, <https://doi.org/10.4007/annals.2010.171.1753>. MR 2680398
16. G. H. Hardy and J. E. Littlewood, *Some problems of ‘Partitio numerorum’; iii: On the expression of a number as a sum of primes*, Acta Mathematica **44** (1923), no. 1, 1–70, <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02403921>.

17. Yonatan Harpaz, Alexei N. Skorobogatov, and Olivier Wittenberg, *The Hardy–Littlewood conjecture and rational points*, *Comp. Math.* **150** (2014), 2095–2111, <https://doi.org/10.1112/S0010437X14007568>.
18. Henryk Iwaniec and Emmanuel Kowalski, *Analytic Number Theory*, Colloquium Publications, vol. 53, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2004, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1090/coll/053>.
19. Wataru Kai, *Notes on Mitsui’s Prime Number Theorem with Siegel zeros*, arXiv <https://arxiv.org/abs/2209.11816> (2022), 38 pages.
20. Wataru Kai, Masato Mimura, Akihiro Munemasa, Shin-ichiro Seki, and Kiyoto Yoshino, *Constellations in prime elements of number fields*, arXiv <https://arxiv.org/abs/2012.15669> (2020), 149 pages.
21. Freddie Manners, *Quantitative bounds in the inverse theorem for the Gowers U^{s+1} -norms over cyclic groups*, arXiv <https://arxiv.org/abs/1811.00718v1> (2018), 123 pages.
22. Takayoshi Mitsui, *Generalized prime number theorem*, *Jpn. J. Math.* **26** (1956), 1–42, https://doi.org/10.4099/jjm1924.26.0_1.
23. Hugh L. Montgomery and Robert C. Vaughan, *Multiplicative Number Theory I. Classical Theory*, Cambridge University Press, 2006, www.cambridge.org/9780521849036.
24. Jürgen Neukirch, *Algebraic Number Theory*, Grundlehren der Mathematischen Wissenschaften [Fundamental Principles of Mathematical Sciences], vol. 322, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1999, Translated from the German by Norbert Schappacher, <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-662-03983-0>.
25. Michael Rosen, *A generalization of Mertens’ theorem*, *J. Ramanujan Math. Soc.* **14** (1999), no. 1, 1–19, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/266272896_A_generalization_of_Mertens%27_theorem.
26. Imre Z. Ruzsa, *On an additive property of squares and primes*, *Acta Arith.* **49** (1988), 281–289, <https://doi.org/10.4064/aa-49-3-281-289>.
27. Andrzej Schinzel and Waclaw Sierpiński, *Sur certaines hypothèses concernant les nombres premiers*, *Acta Arith.* **4** (1958), no. 3, 185–208, <http://eudml.org/doc/206115>; Errata, *ibid.* **5**, no. 2, p. 259 (1959) <https://doi.org/10.4064/aa-5-2-259>, *ibid.* **7**, no. 1, 1–8 (1961) <https://doi.org/10.4064/aa-7-1-1-8>.
28. Wenbo Sun, *Sarnak’s conjecture for nilsequences on arbitrary number fields and applications*, *Advances in Mathematics* **415** (2023), 91 pages, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aim.2023.108883> <https://arxiv.org/abs/1902.09712>.
29. Terence Tao, *Higher Order Fourier Analysis*, Graduate Studies in Mathematics, vol. 142, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2012, <https://terrytao.wordpress.com/books/higher-order-fourier-analysis/>.
30. Terence Tao and Joni Teräväinen, *Quantitative bounds for Gowers uniformity of the Möbius and von Mangoldt functions*, arXiv <https://arxiv.org/abs/2107.02158> (2021), 56 pages.
31. Alfred Weiss, *The least prime ideal*, *J. Reine Angew. Math.* **338** (1983), 56–94, <https://eudml.org/doc/152493>.
32. Martin Widmer, *Counting primitive points of bounded height*, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **362** (2010), no. 9, 4793–4829, <https://doi.org/10.1090/S0002-9947-10-05173-1>.
33. ———, *Lipschitz class, narrow class, and counting lattice points*, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* **140** (2011), no. 2, 677–689, <https://www.ams.org/journals/proc/2012-140-02/S0002-9939-2011-10926-2>.

MATHEMATICAL INSTITUTE, TOHOKU UNIVERSITY, AOBA 6-3, 980-8578 SENDAI, JAPAN
 Email address: kaiw@tohoku.ac.jp