

CENTRAL LIMIT THEOREMS FOR LATTICE POINT COUNTING ON TESSELLATED DOMAINS

SOURAV DAS

ABSTRACT. Following the approach of Björklund and Gorodnik, we have considered the discrepancy function for lattice point counting on domains that can be nicely tessellated by the action of a diagonal semigroup. We have shown that suitably normalized discrepancy functions for lattice point counting on certain tessellated domains satisfy a non-degenerate central limit theorem. Furthermore, we have also addressed the same problem for affine and congruence lattice point counting, proving analogous non-degenerate central limit theorems for them. The main ingredients of the proofs are the method of cumulants and quantitative multiple mixing estimates.

1. INTRODUCTION

One of the central problems in the geometry of numbers is the lattice point counting problem in certain domains of the Euclidean space. Minkowski's first theorem is one of the fundamental results in the geometry of numbers, which says that a centrally symmetric convex set C of \mathbb{R}^k with $\text{vol}(C) > 2^k$ contains a non-zero integer point. This theorem can be extended for a general lattice $g\mathbb{Z}^k$ for some $g \in \text{GL}_k(\mathbb{R})$. Before proceeding further, let us set a few notations. The space of all unimodular lattices of \mathbb{R}^k is denoted by X_k , which is naturally identified with $\text{SL}_k(\mathbb{R})/\text{SL}_k(\mathbb{Z})$, which supports a natural $\text{SL}_k(\mathbb{R})$ -invariant measure μ_k coming from the Haar measure on $\text{SL}_k(\mathbb{R})$ such that $\mu_k(X_k) = 1$. Throughout this article, given a finite set B , we denote the number of elements of B by $|B|$. In 1945, Siegel ([20]) proved a probabilistic result of the first of its kind in the geometry of numbers. Suppose that Ω is a measurable subset of \mathbb{R}^k , not containing zero. Then Siegel's mean value theorem ([20]) states that if we choose an unimodular lattice Λ at random, on average Λ contains $\text{vol}(\Omega)$ many points of Ω . Along the same lines, Roger ([17]) gives formulas for higher moments for the counting function $|\Lambda \cap \Omega|$. To date, Siegel's mean value theorem and Roger's formulas have applications in numerous number theoretic and ergodic problems, such as lattice point counting, Oppenheim-type problems related to quadratic forms, effective ergodic theorems, and more.

There has been extensive study to understand the behavior of the error term $|\Lambda \cap \Omega| - \text{vol}(\Omega)$ of lattice point counting problems for a varying, sufficiently nice family of domains. Let $\{\Omega_T\}$ be an increasing family of finite volume Borel subsets of \mathbb{R}^k such that $\text{vol}(\Omega_T) \rightarrow \infty$ as $T \rightarrow \infty$. In [18], Schmidt prove that for μ_k almost every unimodular lattice Λ ,

$$|\Lambda \cap \Omega_T| = \text{vol}(\Omega_T) + O\left(\text{vol}(\Omega_T)^{1/2} \log^2(\text{vol}(\Omega_T))\right). \quad (1.1)$$

Note that Schmidt's result was much more general than this; for simplicity, we are considering it in this form. The key ingredient in proving (1.1) is Roger's second moment formula (in particular the discrepancy bound). One must note that we can view Schmidt's result as an analog of the Law of Large Numbers. This motivates the question of whether other probabilistic limit laws, such as the central limit theorem, the law of iterated logarithm, etc., also hold for the above kind of lattice point counting problems. In the paper [9], Björklund and Gorodnik studied the discrepancy functions given by

$$D_T(\Lambda) = |\Lambda \cap \Omega_T| - \text{vol}(\Omega_T).$$

2020 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 11P61, 11J83, 60F05.

Key words and phrases. Lattice point counting, Central limit theorem, affine lattice, congruence lattice.

and affirmatively answered the above question by proving that suitably normalized discrepancy functions satisfy a non-degenerate central limit theorem for domains defined by products of linear forms. Our current project is devoted to proving certain central limit theorems for discrepancy functions of unimodular lattices, affine unimodular lattices, and congruence unimodular lattices for domains, which can be nicely tessellated by means of the action of a diagonal subgroup. The domains we have considered appear naturally in lattice point counting problems and Diophantine approximations, and have applications in spiraling of Diophantine approximates (see [2, 5, 7] and Remark 1.4). It is worth mentioning a few recent works in this context. Recently K. Holm proved a central limit theorem for symplectic lattice point counting in [16]. Using the method of cumulants and quantitative multiple mixing estimate, Björklund and Gorodnik ([7]) proved a central limit theorem for Diophantine approximations. Prior to this, the results of this paper for unweighted cases were proved by Dolgopyat, Fayad, and Vinogradov in [10], although their approach was completely different from [7]. In a very recent paper [1], Aggarwal and Ghosh extended the results of [7] for inhomogeneous Diophantine approximation and Diophantine approximation with congruence conditions.

1.1. The space of affine unimodular lattices. We denote the space of affine unimodular lattices of \mathbb{R}^k by $X_{k,a}$.

$$X_{k,a} \cong \mathrm{SL}_k(\mathbb{R}) \ltimes \mathbb{R}^k / \mathrm{SL}_k(\mathbb{Z}) \ltimes \mathbb{Z}^k.$$

$\mathrm{SL}_k(\mathbb{R}) \ltimes \mathbb{R}^k$ acts naturally on $X_{k,a}$, which is given by

$$((g, \mathbf{v}), \Lambda) \mapsto g\Lambda + \mathbf{v}, \quad \text{for } (g, \mathbf{v}) \in \mathrm{SL}_k(\mathbb{R}) \ltimes \mathbb{R}^k \text{ and } \Lambda \in X_{k,a}.$$

Note that $X_{k,a}$ supports a natural $\mathrm{SL}_k(\mathbb{R}) \ltimes \mathbb{R}^k$ -invariant probability measure $\mu_{k,a}$, coming from the left-invariant Haar measure on $\mathrm{SL}_k(\mathbb{R}) \ltimes \mathbb{R}^k$.

Let $G_k = \mathrm{SL}_k(\mathbb{R})$ and $G_{k,a} = \mathrm{SL}_k(\mathbb{R}) \ltimes \mathbb{R}^k$. Then $G_{k,a}$ can be identified as a subgroup of G_{k+1} in view of the map $h : G_{k,a} \rightarrow G_{k+1}$ defined by

$$(g, \mathbf{v}) \mapsto \begin{bmatrix} g & \mathbf{v} \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \quad \text{for } (g, \mathbf{v}) \in G_{k,a}.$$

Clearly h induces an injective map $\tilde{h} : X_{k,a} \rightarrow X_{k+1}$. Furthermore there is surjection $\pi : G_{k,a} \rightarrow G_k$ given by

$$\pi(g, \mathbf{v}) = g \quad \text{for all } (g, \mathbf{v}) \in G_{k,a}.$$

π also induces a surjection $\tilde{\pi} : X_{k,a} \rightarrow X_k$. It is easy to observe that $\tilde{\pi}$ is measure preserving.

1.2. The space of congruence lattices. Let $(\mathbf{v}, N) \in \mathbb{Z}^k \times \mathbb{N}$ be such that $\gcd(\mathbf{v}, N) = 1$. Denote the space of all affine unimodular lattices of \mathbb{R}^k of the form $g(\mathbb{Z}^k + \frac{\mathbf{v}}{N})$ by $X_{k,c}$. We can identify $X_{k,c}$ with the homogeneous space $\mathrm{SL}_k(\mathbb{R})/\Gamma_{\mathbf{v},N}$ via

$$g(\mathbb{Z}^k + \frac{\mathbf{v}}{N}) \mapsto g\Gamma_{\mathbf{v},N},$$

where $\Gamma_{\mathbf{v},N} = \{g \in \mathrm{SL}_k(\mathbb{Z}) : g\mathbf{v} \equiv \mathbf{v} \pmod{N}\}$. Since $\Gamma_{\mathbf{v},N}$ is a lattice in $\mathrm{SL}_k(\mathbb{R})$, there exists a $\mathrm{SL}_k(\mathbb{R})$ -invariant measure $\mu_{k,c}$ on $X_{k,c}$ coming from the Haar measure on $\mathrm{SL}_k(\mathbb{R})$ such that $\mu_{k,c}(X_{k,c}) = 1$.

1.3. Main results. First, we note that (1.1) is also true for almost every affine and congruence unimodular lattices of \mathbb{R}^k . The proof of these results follows the same streamline as of [18, Theorem 1] just replace the use of discrepancy bounds for unimodular lattices with the analogous bounds for the affine and congruence unimodular lattices. In this article, we are interested in studying the discrepancy functions on X_k , $X_{k,a}$, and $X_{k,c}$ for the domains of the following type.

Let $c_1, \dots, c_m \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ and $u_1, \dots, u_m \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ be such that $u_1 + \dots + u_m = n$. Now for $T > 0$, we consider the domains of the form

$$\Omega_T = \{(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \in \mathbb{R}^m \times \mathbb{R}^n : 1 \leq \|\mathbf{y}\| \leq T, |x_i| \|\mathbf{y}\|^{u_i} < c_i \text{ for } i = 1, \dots, m\}, \quad (1.2)$$

where $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_m)$, $\|\cdot\|$ be a norm on \mathbb{R}^n and $|\cdot|$ is the usual absolute value on \mathbb{R} . Let

$$N_\xi(0, \sigma^2) := \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi\sigma}} \int_{-\infty}^{\xi} e^{-\frac{x^2}{2\sigma}} dx,$$

denotes the normal distribution with mean 0 and variance σ^2 , $\zeta(x) = \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{m^x}$ denotes the Riemann zeta function and

$$\omega_n = \int_0^{2\pi} \int_0^\pi \cdots \int_0^\pi S(\theta_1, \dots, \theta_{n-1}) d\theta_1 \cdots d\theta_{n-1}, \quad (1.3)$$

where $r^{n-1}S(\theta_1, \dots, \theta_{n-1})drd\theta_1 \cdots d\theta_{n-1}$ is the spherical volume element on \mathbb{R}^n .

Theorem 1.1. *Let Ω_T be as in (1.2) and $m+n \geq 5$. Then \exists a $\sigma_u > 0$ such that*

$$\mu_{m+n} \left\{ \Lambda \in X_{m+n} : \frac{|\Lambda \cap \Omega_T| - \text{vol}(\Omega_T)}{\text{vol}(\Omega_T)^{1/2}} < \xi \right\} \rightarrow N_\xi(0, \sigma_u^2) \text{ as } T \rightarrow \infty,$$

where

$$\sigma_u^2 := 2 \left(\frac{2\zeta(m+n-1)}{\zeta(m+n)} - 1 \right).$$

Theorem 1.2. *Let Ω_T be as in (1.2) and $m+n \geq 5$. Then*

$$\mu_{m+n,a} \left\{ \Lambda \in X_{m+n,a} : \frac{|\Lambda \cap \Omega_T| - \text{vol}(\Omega_T)}{\text{vol}(\Omega_T)^{1/2}} < \xi \right\} \rightarrow N_\xi(0, 1) \text{ as } T \rightarrow \infty. \quad (1.4)$$

Theorem 1.3. *Let Ω_T be as in (1.2) and $m+n \geq 5$. Then \exists a $\sigma_c > 0$ such that*

$$\mu_{m+n,c} \left\{ \Lambda \in X_{m+n,c} : \frac{|\Lambda \cap \Omega_T| - \text{vol}(\Omega_T)}{\text{vol}(\Omega_T)^{1/2}} < \xi \right\} \rightarrow N_\xi(0, \sigma_c^2) \text{ as } T \rightarrow \infty,$$

where

$$\sigma_c^2 := \frac{2}{\zeta_N(m+n)} \left(1 + \frac{2}{\zeta_N(m+n)} \sum_{s \in C_N} \sum_{s_2 \geq 1} \frac{s_2 - 1}{(Ns_2 + s)^{m+n}} \right),$$

$$C_N = \{s \in \mathbb{Z} : 0 \leq s < N \text{ and } \gcd(s, N) = 1\},$$

and

$$\zeta_N(x) = \sum_{\substack{s_1 \geq 1 \\ \gcd(s_1, N) = 1}} s^{-x}.$$

Remark 1.4.

- (1) With minor modifications, we can easily prove versions of Theorem 1.1, 1.2 and 1.3 for domains of the form Ω'_T . Here, for $T, b > 0$ and a Borel measurable subset $A \subseteq \mathbb{S}^{m-1}$, we define Ω'_T as:

$$\Omega'_T = \left\{ (\mathbf{x}, y) \in \mathbb{R}^m \times \mathbb{R} : \frac{\mathbf{x}}{\|\mathbf{x}\|} \in A, 1 \leq |y| \leq T, \|\mathbf{x}\|^m |y| < b \text{ for } i = 1, \dots, m \right\}.$$

Note that domains of this form naturally appear in problems of Diophantine approximation. More specifically, these domains are closely related to the spiraling of approximations. For more details see the interesting paper by Athreya, Ghosh, and Tseng [5]. This theme was further explored over number fields by Alam and Ghosh in [2]. It is worth mentioning that the study of spiraling of Diophantine approximants in [5] is related to counting lattice points in the domains of the form Ω'_T . The crucial thing is to notice that the domains Ω'_T admit an approximate tessellation by means of an action by a diagonal element of $\text{SL}_{m+1}(\mathbb{R})$ (and for $T = 2^M$, $M \in \mathbb{N}$, Ω'_T possesses an exact tessellation). Thus, one can apply the methods of this article to easily derive analogous central limit theorems for domains Ω'_T . This can be viewed as a central limit theorem for spiraling.

- (2) We give a detailed proof of Theorem 1.2. For the proof of Theorem 1.1 and 1.3 we omit some details, as they are analogous to the proof of Theorem 1.2. We indicate the necessary changes required in the proofs of Theorem 1.1 and 1.3.

1.4. Outline of the proof of the above Theorems. To prove the above theorems, we closely follow the strategy of Björklund and Gorodnik ([7]). We provide a brief outline of the proof for Theorem 1.2, noting that the proofs of the other two theorems follow a similar strategy. By an easy reduction, we can show that it is enough to prove Theorem 1.2 for T of the form 2^M , with $M \in \mathbb{N}$. If $T = 2^M$, Ω_T can be nicely tessellated by means of the action of a diagonal subgroup of $SL_{m+n}(\mathbb{R})$. To handle the case of $T = 2^M$, we use the method of cumulants and a powerful theorem of Fréchet and Shohat (Theorem 2.8), which gives a criterion under which a sequence of bounded measurable functions on a probability space converge in distribution to the normal distribution. However, we cannot directly apply Theorem 2.8 to the functions

$$\Lambda \mapsto \frac{|\Lambda \cap \Omega_T| - \text{vol}(\Omega_T)}{\text{vol}(\Omega_T)^{1/2}}, \text{ where } T = 2^M \text{ with } M \in \mathbb{N},$$

because these functions are typically unbounded. To address this issue, we exploit the tessellation property of our domain to observe that, for $T = 2^M$, the conclusion of Theorem 1.2 can be reformulated (see Theorem 2.6) in terms of $SL_{m+n}(\mathbb{R}) \times \mathbb{R}^{m+n}$ -translates of the Siegel transform $\hat{\chi}$ of the indicator function χ of Ω_2 . Furthermore, we can approximate $\hat{\chi}$ by a family of smooth and bounded C_c^∞ functions on the space of affine unimodular lattices of \mathbb{R}^{m+n} . We show that it is sufficient to prove the central limit theorem for $SL_{m+n}(\mathbb{R}) \times \mathbb{R}^{m+n}$ -translates of the smooth approximation to $\hat{\chi}$ (see Proposition 2.17). We then verify the CLT criteria of Fréchet and Shohat for these bounded functions. This amounts to showing that the variance is finite and that the cumulant of order r ($r \geq 3$) for these functions tends to 0 as $M \rightarrow \infty$. In the computation of cumulants, the main tools are the quantitative multiple mixing estimate of [6, Theorem 1.1] and a combinatorial tool developed by Björklund and Gorodnik in [8, Proposition 6.2] to analyze the cumulants.

Acknowledgement: The author is grateful to his advisor, Prof. Arijit Ganguly, for helpful discussions and continuous encouragement. Part of this work was done when the author was visiting the University of Zürich to attend the Zürich Dynamics School and the Zürich dynamics conference in June 2023. The author thanks the University of Zürich for their generous hospitality. Thanks are also due to Prof. Micheal Björklund and Prof. Alexander Gorodnik for helpful discussions during the Zürich dynamics conference.

2. PROOF OF THE CLT FOR AFFINE UNIMODULAR LATTICES

To begin with, we show that it is enough to prove Theorem 1.2 for the case $T = 2^M$ with $M \in \mathbb{N}$.

Proposition 2.1. *Suppose that Theorem 1.2 holds true for T of the form 2^M with $M \in \mathbb{N}$. Then Theorem 1.2 holds true in its full generality.*

Proof. First, let us compute the volume of Ω_T . Let $d\mathbf{x}$ and $d\mathbf{y}$ be the usual Lebesgue measure on \mathbb{R}^m and \mathbb{R}^n respectively.

$$\begin{aligned} \text{vol}(\Omega_T) &= \int \int_{\Omega_T} d\mathbf{x} d\mathbf{y} \\ &= \int_{1 \leq \|\mathbf{y}\| \leq T} \left(\int_{-\frac{c_1}{\|\mathbf{y}\|^{u_1}}}^{\frac{c_1}{\|\mathbf{y}\|^{u_1}}} \cdots \int_{-\frac{c_m}{\|\mathbf{y}\|^{u_m}}}^{\frac{c_m}{\|\mathbf{y}\|^{u_m}}} dx_1 \cdots dx_m \right) d\mathbf{y} \\ &= \int_{1 \leq \|\mathbf{y}\| \leq T} \frac{2^m c_1 \cdots c_m}{\|\mathbf{y}\|^n} d\mathbf{y} \end{aligned}$$

Now we change the Cartesian coordinates $\mathbf{y} = (y_1, \dots, y_n)$ of \mathbb{R}^n to spherical coordinates $(r, \theta_1, \dots, \theta_{n-1})$. Let $r^{n-1} S(\theta_1, \dots, \theta_{n-1}) dr d\theta_1 \cdots d\theta_{n-1}$ be the spherical volume element on \mathbb{R}^n and

$$\omega_n = \int_0^{2\pi} \int_0^\pi \cdots \int_0^\pi S(\theta_1, \dots, \theta_{n-1}) d\theta_1 \cdots d\theta_{n-1}.$$

Then in view of the above coordinate change, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\text{vol}(\Omega_T) &= 2^m c_1 \dots c_m \omega_n \int_1^T \frac{1}{r^n} r^{n-1} dr \\ &= 2^m c_1 \dots c_m \omega_n \log T.\end{aligned}$$

Given any real parameter $T > 0$ there exists $M = M(T) \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ such that $\frac{T}{2} < 2^M \leq T \leq 2^{M+1}$. Now for any affine lattice $\Lambda \in X_{m+n,a}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{|\Lambda \cap \Omega_T| - \text{vol}(\Omega_T)}{\text{vol}(\Omega_T)^{1/2}} &= \frac{|\Lambda \cap \Omega_{2^M}| - \text{vol}(\Omega_{2^M})}{\text{vol}(\Omega_T)^{1/2}} + \frac{|\Lambda \cap (\Omega_T \setminus \Omega_{2^M})|}{\text{vol}(\Omega_T)^{1/2}} - \frac{\text{vol}(\Omega_T \setminus \Omega_{2^M})}{\text{vol}(\Omega_T)^{1/2}} \\ &= a_T X_T + Y_T - Z_T,\end{aligned}$$

where

$$a_T = \left(\frac{\text{vol}(\Omega_{2^M})}{\text{vol}(\Omega_T)} \right)^{1/2}, X_T = \frac{|\Lambda \cap \Omega_{2^M}| - \text{vol}(\Omega_{2^M})}{\text{vol}(\Omega_{2^M})^{1/2}}, Y_T = \frac{|\Lambda \cap (\Omega_T \setminus \Omega_{2^M})|}{\text{vol}(\Omega_T)^{1/2}}, Z_T = \frac{\text{vol}(\Omega_T \setminus \Omega_{2^M})}{\text{vol}(\Omega_T)^{1/2}}.$$

By assumption X_T converges in distribution to $N(0, \sigma^2)$ as $T \rightarrow \infty$. Hence in order to show (1.4), it is enough to show that $a_T \rightarrow 1$, $Y_T \rightarrow 0$ and $Z_T \rightarrow 0$ as $T \rightarrow \infty$.

Note that $a_T = \left(\frac{M \log 2}{\log T} \right)^{1/2}$ and also we have

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{T}{2} &< 2^M \leq T \\ \implies \log T - \log 2 &< M \log 2 \leq \log T \\ \implies \left(1 - \frac{\log 2}{\log T} \right)^{1/2} &< a_T \leq 1 \\ \implies a_T &\rightarrow 1 \text{ as } T \rightarrow \infty.\end{aligned}$$

$$Z_T = \gamma_{m,n} \frac{\log T - \log 2^M}{(\log T)^{1/2}} = \gamma_{m,n} \frac{\log \frac{T}{2^M}}{(\log T)^{1/2}} \leq \gamma_{m,n} \frac{\log 4}{(\log T)^{1/2}} \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } T \rightarrow \infty,$$

where $\gamma_{m,n}$ is a constant depending upon m and n .

Since $\text{vol}(\Omega_T \setminus \Omega_{2^M}) \leq \log 2$ for all T , we must have $Y_T \rightarrow 0$. Hence we are done. \square

Siegel transform is one of the main tools in the study of lattice point counting problems. Throughout this section we denote the set of all affine unimodular lattices on \mathbb{R}^{m+n} by X_a , μ_a denotes the measure $\mu_{m+n,a}$ defined in the last section, and $l := m+n$. Let $f : \mathbb{R}^l \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a Borel measurable function with compact support. The Siegel transform of f is $\hat{f} : X_a \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ defined by

$$\hat{f}(\Lambda) = \sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda \setminus \{0\}} f(\lambda) \text{ for } \Lambda \in X_a.$$

Let us record the analog of Siegel's mean value theorem and Roger's second order moment formula for affine lattices. We refer to [4], [11], and [14] for the proof of the following proposition.

Proposition 2.2. *For $f \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^l) \cap L^2(\mathbb{R}^l)$, we have the following:*

$$\int_{X_a} \hat{f}(\Lambda) d\mu_a(\Lambda) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^l} f(\mathbf{x}) d\mathbf{x}$$

$$\int_{X_a} \hat{f}(\Lambda)^2 d\mu_a(\Lambda) = \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^l} f(\mathbf{x}) d\mathbf{x} \right)^2 + \int_{\mathbb{R}^l} f(\mathbf{x})^2 d\mathbf{x},$$

where $d\mathbf{x}$ is the usual Lebesgue measure on \mathbb{R}^l

Siegel transform of bounded functions are typically unbounded and the following function has a close relationship with the growth of the Siegel transform.

Definition 2.3. Let Λ be any lattice of \mathbb{R}^l and covolume of Λ is $d(\Lambda) < \infty$. We define

$$\alpha_l(\Lambda) := \sup_V \{d(V \cap \Lambda)^{-1} : V \cap \Lambda \text{ is a lattice in } V\}, \quad (2.5)$$

where the supremum is taken over all non-zero subspaces V of \mathbb{R}^l .

An immediate consequence of Mahler's compactness criterion shows that α_l is a proper map on X_l . We define $\alpha_{l,a} : X_a \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by

$$\alpha_{l,a}(\Lambda) = \alpha_{l+1}(\tilde{h}(\Lambda)) = \alpha_l(\tilde{\pi}(\Lambda)), \quad (2.6)$$

where α_l is given by (2.5) and $\tilde{h}, \tilde{\pi}$ are defined in Subsection 1.1. A routine verification shows that the above definition indeed makes sense. Let us recall the following propositions, which will be useful later.

Proposition 2.4. [1, Proposition 3.14] *Let $g : \mathbb{R}^l \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a bounded function with compact support. Then*

$$|\hat{g}(\Lambda)| \ll_{\text{supp}(g)} \|g\|_\infty \cdot \alpha_{l,a}(\Lambda) \quad \forall \Lambda \in X_a,$$

where \hat{g} denotes the Siegel transform of g on the space of all affine unimodular lattices of \mathbb{R}^l .

Proposition 2.5. [1, Proposition 3.17] *Let $\alpha_{l,a}$ be the function defined on X_a by (2.5). Then $\alpha_{l,a} \in L^p(X_a)$ for $1 \leq p < l$ and*

$$\mu_a(\{\alpha_{l,a} \geq L\}) \ll_p L^{-p} \quad \forall p < l.$$

Now we reformulate our problem using the Siegel transform. Let χ_{Ω_T} denotes the indicator function of Ω_T . For $T = 2^M$ and $\Lambda \in X_a$, we have

$$|\Lambda \cap \Omega_{2^M}| = \hat{\chi}_{\Omega_{2^M}}(\Lambda) \quad \text{and} \quad \text{vol}(\Omega_{2^M}) = \int_{X_a} \hat{\chi}_{\Omega_{2^M}}(\Lambda) d\mu_a(\Lambda)$$

Note that our domain Ω_{2^M} can be tessellated by the action of a diagonal element of $\text{SL}_l(\mathbb{R})$. Let

$$c_0 = \text{diag}(2^{u_1}, \dots, 2^{u_m}, 2^{-1}, \dots, 2^{-1})$$

and

$$c = (\text{diag}(2^{u_1}, \dots, 2^{u_m}, 2^{-1}, \dots, 2^{-1}), 0) \in \text{SL}_l(\mathbb{R}) \times \mathbb{R}^n.$$

Then

$$\Omega_{2^M} = \bigsqcup_{k=0}^{M-1} c_0^{-k} \Omega_2.$$

Hence

$$|\Lambda \cap \Omega_{2^M}| = \sum_{k=0}^{M-1} \hat{\chi}_{\Omega_2}(c^k \Lambda)$$

and

$$\text{vol}(\Omega_{2^M}) = \int_{X_a} \sum_{k=0}^{M-1} \hat{\chi}_{\Omega_2}(c^k \Lambda) d\mu_a(\Lambda) = \sum_{k=0}^{M-1} \text{vol}(\Omega_2) = M \cdot \text{vol}(\Omega_2)$$

From now on we will denote χ_{Ω_2} by χ . From the above discussion, it is clear that the following Theorem is equivalent to Theorem 1.2.

Theorem 2.6. *Under the hypothesis of Theorem 1.2,*

$$H_M := \frac{1}{\sqrt{M}} \left(\sum_{k=0}^{M-1} \hat{\chi} \circ c^k - M \cdot \text{vol}(\Omega_2) \right) \longrightarrow N(0, \eta^2) \text{ in distribution as } M \rightarrow \infty, \quad (2.7)$$

where $\eta = \text{vol}(\Omega_2)^{1/2}$ and $N(0, \eta^2)$ denotes the normal distribution with mean 0 and variance η^2 .

We prove Theorem 2.6 using the CLT criteria of Fréchet and Shohat. Let us first recall the notion of a *cumulant*.

Definition 2.7. Let (Y, ν) be a probability space. For $\psi_1, \dots, \psi_r \in L^\infty(Y)$, their *joint cumulant* of order r is defined by

$$\text{Cum}_{[r]}(\psi_1, \dots, \psi_r) = \sum_{\mathcal{P}} (-1)^{|\mathcal{P}|-1} (|\mathcal{P}| - 1)! \prod_{I \in \mathcal{P}} \int_Y \prod_{i \in I} \psi_i \, d\nu,$$

where \mathcal{P} is the set of all partition of the set $\{1, \dots, r\}$.

For a partition \mathcal{Q} of $\{1, \dots, r\}$, the *conditional joint cumulant* of $\psi_1, \dots, \psi_r \in L^\infty(Y)$ with respect to \mathcal{Q} is defined as

$$\text{Cum}_{[r]}(\psi_1, \dots, \psi_r | \mathcal{Q}) = \sum_{\mathcal{P}} (-1)^{|\mathcal{P}|-1} (|\mathcal{P}| - 1)! \prod_{I \in \mathcal{P}} \prod_{J \in \mathcal{Q}} \int_Y \prod_{i \in I \cap J} \psi_i \, d\nu.$$

For $\psi \in L^\infty(Y)$, we define

$$\text{Cum}_{[r]}(\psi) := \text{Cum}_{[r]}(\psi, \dots, \psi).$$

Note that $\text{Cum}_{[r]}$ is multi linear in the functions ψ_1, \dots, ψ_r . We now state the CLT criteria of Fréchet and Shohat from [13].

Theorem 2.8. *Let (Y, ν) be a probability space and $\{\Psi_M\}$ be a sequence of real-valued measurable bounded functions on Y satisfying*

$$\int_Y \Psi_M \, d\nu = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \sigma^2 := \lim_{M \rightarrow \infty} \int_Y \Psi_M^2 < \infty$$

and

$$\lim_{M \rightarrow \infty} \text{Cum}_{[r]}(\Psi_M) = 0 \quad \text{for all } r \geq 3.$$

Then for every $\xi \in \mathbb{R}$

$$\nu(\{\Psi_M < \xi\}) \rightarrow N_\xi(0, \sigma^2) \quad \text{as } M \rightarrow \infty.$$

Proposition 2.9. *Let $\psi_1, \dots, \psi_r \in L^\infty(Y, \mu)$ and \mathcal{Q} be any partition of $\{1, \dots, r\}$ with $|\mathcal{Q}| \geq 2$. Then we have*

$$\text{Cum}_{[r]}(\psi_1, \dots, \psi_r | \mathcal{Q}) = 0.$$

Before proceeding further, we recall the notion of operator norm on $G_a := \text{SL}_l(\mathbb{R}) \times \mathbb{R}^l$ and the Sobolev norms on the space $C_c^\infty(X_a)$. G_a is a connected semisimple Lie group with trivial centre. G_a carries a right-invariant Riemannian metric which descends to the quotient G_a/Γ_a , where $\Gamma_a := \text{SL}_l(\mathbb{Z}) \times \mathbb{Z}^l$. Let ρ_{G_a} be the right-invariant distance function on G_a induced by the right-invariant Riemannian metric and ρ_{X_a} be the corresponding distance function on G_a/Γ_a .

Definition 2.10. Let $\|\cdot\|$ be the norm on the Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g} = \text{Lie}(G_a)$ coming from the Riemannian metric on G_a . We define the submultiplicative operator norm $\|\cdot\|_{\text{op}}$ on G_a by

$$\|g\|_{\text{op}} := \max\{\|\text{Ad}(g)Y\| : Y \in \mathfrak{g}, \|Y\| = 1\} \quad \forall g \in G_a.$$

In other words, the operator norm of g is just the operator norm of the adjoint map $\text{Ad}(g) : \mathfrak{g} \rightarrow \mathfrak{g}$. Now we record the following lemma which will be useful later. The proof of the following lemma can be found in [6, Lemma 2.1].

Lemma 2.11.

(i) *For all $g \in G_a$, \exists constants $c_1 \geq 1$ and $c_2 > 0$ such that*

$$c_1^{-1} \log \|g\|_{\text{op}} - c_2 \leq \rho_{G_a}(g, e) \leq c_1 \log \|g\|_{\text{op}} + c_2,$$

where e is the identity element of G_a .

(ii) *Let $c = (\text{diag}(2^{u_1}, \dots, 2^{u_m}, 2^{-1}, \dots, 2^{-1}), 0) \in G_a$. Then $\exists \lambda > 1$ such that for any $q \in \mathbb{N}$,*

$$\|c^q\|_{\text{op}} \geq \lambda^q.$$

Every $Z \in \text{Lie}(G_a)$ gives rise to a first order differential operator \mathcal{D}_Z on $C_c^\infty(X_a)$ defined by

$$\mathcal{D}_Z(\psi)(x) := \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \frac{\psi(\exp(tZ)x) - \psi(x)}{t} \quad \forall \psi \in C_c^\infty(X_a).$$

If $\{Z_1, \dots, Z_r\}$ be a fix ordered basis of $\text{Lie}(G_a)$, then every element of the universal enveloping algebra $\mathcal{U}(\text{Lie}(G_a))$ of $\text{Lie}(G_a)$ can be written as a linear combination of monomials $Z_1^{n_1} \dots Z_r^{n_r}$ in the basis elements. Hence we extend the differential operator to $\mathcal{U}(\text{Lie}(G_a))$ by defining it for monomials $Y = Z_1^{n_1} \dots Z_r^{n_r}$ as

$$\mathcal{D}_Y = \mathcal{D}_{Z_1}^{n_1} \dots \mathcal{D}_{Z_r}^{n_r}.$$

The degree of \mathcal{D}_Y is defined as $\deg(Y) := n_1 + \dots + n_r$. Now we define a family of Sobolev norms on $C_c^\infty(X_a)$.

Definition 2.12. Let $d \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\psi \in C_c^\infty(X_a)$. We define the following

$$\|\psi\|_{C^d} := \max\{\|\mathcal{D}_Y \psi\|_\infty : Y \in \mathcal{U}(\text{Lie}(G_a)) \text{ is a monomial, } \deg(Y) \leq d\},$$

$$S_k(\psi) := \max\{\|\psi\|_\infty, \|\psi\|_{C^d}\}.$$

Lemma 2.13. *The family of Sobolev norms on $C_c^\infty(X_a)$ satisfies the following properties.*

(1) For any $\psi \in C_c^\infty(X_a)$ and $g \in G_a$,

$$S_k(\psi \circ g) \ll_k \|g\|_{op}^k S_k(\psi).$$

(2) For any $\psi_1, \psi_2 \in C_c^\infty(X_a)$,

$$S_k(\psi_1 \psi_2) \ll_k S_k(\psi_1) S_k(\psi_2).$$

Proof. The proof of these properties of Sobolev norms is very standard. Hence we leave the details to interested readers. \square

Next, we recall the quantitative exponential mixing of all orders for Lie groups from [6], which will be very instrumental in the computation of cumulants later. The following is a particular case of [6, Theorem 1.1].

Theorem 2.14. *For all integer $r \geq 2$ and all sufficiently large q , there exists $\delta = \delta(r, q) > 0$ such that for all $\psi_1, \dots, \psi_r \in C_c^\infty(X_a)$ and $g_1, \dots, g_r \in G_a$*

$$\left| \int_{X_a} (\psi_1 \circ g_1) \dots (\psi_r \circ g_r) d\mu_a - \prod_{i=1}^r \left(\int_{X_a} \psi_i d\mu_a \right) \right| \ll_{r,q} e^{-\delta \min_{i \neq j} \rho_{G_a}(g_i, g_j)} S_q(\psi_1) \dots S_q(\psi_r).$$

To apply Theorem 2.14 in the computation of cumulants, we need to approximate $\hat{\chi}$ by smooth functions. For that first we approximate χ (following [7, Section 6]) by a family of non-negative smooth functions $f_\varepsilon \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{m+n})$ such that $\text{supp } f_\varepsilon \subseteq (\Omega_2)_\varepsilon$, and

$$\chi \leq f_\varepsilon \leq 1, \quad \|f_\varepsilon\|_{C^k} \ll \varepsilon^{-k}, \quad \|\chi - f_\varepsilon\|_1 \ll \varepsilon, \quad \|\chi - f_\varepsilon\|_2 \ll \sqrt{\varepsilon}, \quad (2.8)$$

where $(\Omega_2)_\varepsilon$ is an ε -neighbourhood of the set Ω_2 .

For simplicity from now on by α we denote the function $\alpha_{a,l}$ on X_a defined by (2.6).

Lemma 2.15. *For every $b > 0$, there is a family of smooth functions $\{\eta_L\} \in C_c^\infty(X_a)$ such that, for every $L > 0$*

$$0 \leq \eta_L \leq 1, \quad \eta_L = 1 \text{ on } \{\alpha \leq b^{-1}L\}, \quad \eta_L = 0 \text{ on } \{\alpha > bL\}, \quad \|\eta_L\|_{C^k} \ll 1.$$

Proof. The proof of this Lemma is analogous to [7, Lemma 4.11]. \square

The truncated Siegel transform of a bounded function $f : \mathbb{R}^{m+n} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ with compact support is defined as

$$\hat{f}^{(L)} := \hat{f} \cdot \eta_L.$$

Lemma 2.16. *If $f \in C_c^\infty(X_a)$, then the truncated Siegel transform $\hat{f}^{(L)} \in C_c^\infty(X_a)$ and also we have*

$$\begin{aligned} \|\hat{f}^{(L)}\|_\infty &\ll_{\text{supp}(f)} L \|f\|_\infty, \\ \|\hat{f}^{(L)}\|_{C^k} &\ll_{\text{supp}(f)} L \|f\|_{C^k}, \\ \|\hat{f} - \hat{f}^{(L)}\|_1 &\ll_{\text{supp}(f),p} L^{-p} \|f\|_\infty \quad \forall p < m + n - 1, \\ \|\hat{f} - \hat{f}^{(L)}\|_2 &\ll_{\text{supp}(f),p} L^{-(p-1)/2} \|f\|_\infty \quad \forall p < m + n - 1 \\ S_k(\hat{f}_\varepsilon^{(L)}) &\ll_k \varepsilon^{-k} L, \end{aligned}$$

where f_ε is given by (2.8).

Proof. The proof of the first four inequalities follows from [7, Lemma 4.12]. For the last inequality, consider

$$\begin{aligned} S_k(\hat{f}_\varepsilon^{(L)}) &= \max \left\{ \|\hat{f}_\varepsilon^{(L)}\|_\infty, \|\hat{f}_\varepsilon^{(L)}\|_{C^k} \right\} \\ &\ll_{\text{supp}(f_\varepsilon)} \max \{ L \|f_\varepsilon\|_\infty, L \|f_\varepsilon\|_{C^k} \} \\ &\ll \max \{ L, L\varepsilon^{-k} \}, \text{ using (2.8)} \\ &= \varepsilon^{-k} L. \end{aligned}$$

□

Now we are going to approximate $\hat{\chi}$ by means of truncated Siegel transforms of f_ε , where f_ε are given by (2.8). Next we approximate H_M by $H_M^{(\varepsilon,L)}$ such that $\|H_M - H_M^{(\varepsilon,L)}\|_1 \rightarrow 0$. Then H_M and $H_M^{(\varepsilon,L)}$ converge to the same limit in distribution. Due to the approximation, we get two sequences $\varepsilon(M)$ and $L(M)$ which depends on M . At the end we give explicit choices of these sequences.

Proposition 2.17. *Define*

$$H_M^{(\varepsilon,L)} := \frac{1}{\sqrt{M}} \left(\sum_{k=0}^{M-1} \hat{f}_\varepsilon^{(L)} \circ c^k - M \int_{X_a} \hat{f}_\varepsilon^{(L)} d\mu_a \right),$$

where $\hat{f}_\varepsilon^{(L)} = \hat{f}_\varepsilon \eta_L \in C_c^\infty(X_a)$ are smooth approximations to $\hat{\chi}$. Then to prove Theorem 2.6 it is enough to show that

$$H_M^{(\varepsilon,L)} \rightarrow N(0, \eta^2) \text{ in distribution as } M \rightarrow \infty,$$

where $\eta = \text{vol}(\Omega_2)^{1/2}$.

Proof. First note that to prove this proposition it is enough to show that

$$\begin{aligned} \|H_M^{(\varepsilon,L)} - H_M\|_1 &\rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } M \rightarrow \infty. \\ \|H_M^{(\varepsilon,L)} - H_M\|_1 &= \left\| \frac{1}{\sqrt{M}} \left(\sum_{k=0}^{M-1} (\hat{f}_\varepsilon^{(L)} - \hat{\chi}) \circ c^k - M \int_{X_a} (\hat{f}_\varepsilon^{(L)} - \hat{\chi}) d\mu_a \right) \right\|_1 \\ &\leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{M}} \sum_{k=0}^{M-1} \left\| (\hat{f}_\varepsilon^{(L)} - \hat{\chi}) \circ c^k \right\|_1 + \sqrt{M} \left\| \hat{f}_\varepsilon^{(L)} - \hat{\chi} \right\|_1 \\ &= 2\sqrt{M} \left\| \hat{f}_\varepsilon^{(L)} - \hat{\chi} \right\|_1, \text{ by using } G_a\text{-invariance of } \mu \\ &\leq 2\sqrt{M} \left(\left\| \hat{f}_\varepsilon - \hat{f}_\varepsilon^{(L)} \right\|_1 + \left\| \hat{f}_\varepsilon - \hat{\chi} \right\|_1 \right) \\ &\ll \sqrt{M} (L^{-(l-2)/2} + \varepsilon), \end{aligned}$$

by using (2.8), Lemma 2.16, the fact that $f_\varepsilon \leq 1$ and the family $\{\text{supp } f_\varepsilon\}_\varepsilon$ is uniformly bounded.

To get our desired result we choose the parameters ε and L as functions of M such that as $M \rightarrow \infty$,

$$\varepsilon = o(M^{-1/2}) \quad \text{and} \quad M = o(L^{l-2}). \quad (2.14)$$

□

Lemma 2.18. $\|H_M^{(\varepsilon, L)} - H_M\|_2 \rightarrow 0$ as $M \rightarrow \infty$.

Proof. By computations analogous to the proof of Proposition 2.17, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \|H_M^{(\varepsilon, L)} - H_M\|_2 &\leq \sqrt{M} \left(\|\hat{f}_\varepsilon^{(L)} - \hat{\chi}\|_2 + \|\hat{f}_\varepsilon^{(L)} - \hat{\chi}\|_1 \right) \\ &\leq \sqrt{M} \left(\|\hat{f}_\varepsilon - \hat{f}_\varepsilon^{(L)}\|_2 + \|\hat{f}_\varepsilon - \hat{\chi}\|_2 + \|\hat{f}_\varepsilon - \hat{f}_\varepsilon^{(L)}\|_1 + \|\hat{f}_\varepsilon - \hat{\chi}\|_1 \right) \\ &\ll \sqrt{M} \left(L^{-(l-3)/2} + \left(\|f_\varepsilon - \chi\|_1^2 + \|f_\varepsilon - \chi\|_2^2 \right)^{1/2} + L^{-(l-2)} + \varepsilon \right) \\ &\ll \sqrt{M} \left(L^{-(l-3)/2} + \left(\varepsilon^2 + \sqrt{\varepsilon^2} \right)^{1/2} + L^{-(l-2)} + \varepsilon \right) \\ &\ll \sqrt{M} \left(L^{-(l-3)/2} + \varepsilon + \sqrt{\varepsilon} + L^{-(l-2)} + \varepsilon \right), \end{aligned}$$

where in the third line we have used Roger's second moment formula, Lemma 2.16 and (2.8). Beyond that repeated use of Lemma 2.16 and (2.8) gives us the above inequality.

Given the above inequality if we choose the parameters ε and L such that

$$\varepsilon = o(M^{-1}) \quad \text{and} \quad M = o(L^{l-3}), \quad (2.15)$$

then $\|H_M^{(\varepsilon, L)} - H_M\|_2 \rightarrow 0$ as $M \rightarrow \infty$. Note that (2.15) imply (2.14). Hence We choose the parameters ε and L satisfying (2.15) at the end of this section after considering all other things. □

In view of the Proposition (2.17), Theorem 2.6 (hence Theorem 1.2) is equivalent to showing central limit theorem for $H_M^{(\varepsilon, L)}$.

Theorem 2.19. *Under the hypothesis of Theorem 1.2,*

$$H_M^{(\varepsilon, L)} \rightarrow N(0, \eta^2) \text{ in distribution as } M \rightarrow \infty,$$

where $\eta = \text{vol}(\Omega_2)^{1/2}$.

To prove Theorem 2.19 we use the CLT criteria of Fréchet and Shohat. By using Theorem 2.8, we immediately get Theorem 2.19 if we can prove that for some choice of parameters ε and L

$$\sigma^2 := \lim_{M \rightarrow \infty} \|H_M^{(\varepsilon, L)}\|_2^2 < \infty \quad (2.16)$$

$$\lim_{M \rightarrow \infty} \text{Cum}_{[r]} \left(H_M^{(\varepsilon, L)} \right) = 0 \quad \text{for all } r \geq 3. \quad (2.17)$$

Computation of variance: First note that in view of the triangle inequality we have

$$\|H_M\|_2 - \|H_M - H_M^{(\varepsilon, L)}\|_2 \leq \|H_M^{(\varepsilon, L)}\|_2 \leq \|H_M\|_2 + \|H_M - H_M^{(\varepsilon, L)}\|_2,$$

where H_M is given by (2.7). Hence in order to show (2.16) it is enough to show that

$$\lim_{M \rightarrow \infty} \|H_M\|_2^2 < \infty \quad (2.18)$$

and

$$\|H_M - H_M^{(\varepsilon, L)}\|_2 \rightarrow 0. \quad (2.19)$$

Also if we can show (2.18) and (2.19), we get the expression of variance as

$$\sigma^2 = \lim_{M \rightarrow \infty} \|H_M^{(\varepsilon, L)}\|_2^2 = \lim_{M \rightarrow \infty} \|H_M\|_2^2.$$

Recall that

$$H_M = \frac{1}{\sqrt{M}} \sum_{k=0}^{M-1} (\hat{\chi} \circ c^k - \text{vol}(\Omega_2)) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{M}} \sum_{k=0}^{M-1} \phi_k,$$

where $\phi_k = \hat{\chi} \circ c^k - \text{vol}(\Omega_2)$.

$$\begin{aligned} \|H_M\|_2^2 &= \frac{1}{M} \sum_{k_1, k_2=0}^{M-1} \int_{X_a} \phi_{k_1} \phi_{k_2} d\mu_a = \frac{1}{M} \sum_{k_1, k_2=0}^{M-1} \int_{X_a} \phi_{k_1-k_2} \phi_0 d\mu_a \\ &= \frac{1}{M} \sum_{\pm k=0}^{M-1} (M - |k|) \int_{X_a} \phi_k \phi_0 d\mu_a \\ &= \sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} \chi_{B_M} \left(1 - \frac{|k|}{M}\right) \int_{X_a} \phi_k \phi_0 d\mu_a, \end{aligned}$$

where $B_M := \{k \in \mathbb{Z} : |k| \leq M-1\}$. Now by using the dominated convergence theorem, we get that that

$$\lim_{M \rightarrow \infty} \|H_M\|_2^2 = \sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} \int_{X_a} \phi_k \phi_0 d\mu_a$$

Roger's second order moment formula gives

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{X_a} \phi_k \phi_0 d\mu_a &= \int_{X_a} \hat{\chi} \cdot (\hat{\chi} \circ c^k) d\mu_a - \text{vol}(\Omega_2)^2 \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \left(\int_{X_a} (\hat{\chi} + \hat{\chi} \circ c^k)^2 d\mu_a - 2 \int_{X_a} \hat{\chi}^2 d\mu_a - 2 \text{vol}(\Omega_2)^2 \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \left(\left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^l} (\chi + \chi \circ c^k) \right)^2 + \int_{\mathbb{R}^l} (\chi + \chi \circ c^k)^2 - 2 \left(\left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^l} \chi \right)^2 + \int_{\mathbb{R}^l} \chi^2 \right) - 2 \text{vol}(\Omega_2)^2 \right) \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^l} \chi \cdot (\chi \circ c^k) d\mathbf{x} \\ &= \text{vol}(\Omega_2 \cap c^{-k} \Omega_2). \end{aligned}$$

Hence

$$\lim_{M \rightarrow \infty} \|H_M\|_2^2 = \sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} \text{vol}(\Omega_2 \cap c^{-k} \Omega_2) = \text{vol}(\Omega_2) < \infty,$$

since $\text{vol}(\Omega_2 \cap c^{-k} \Omega_2) = 0$ for all nonzero integer k .

Computation of cumulants:

First, let us write

$$H_M^{(\varepsilon, L)} := \frac{1}{\sqrt{M}} \sum_{k=0}^{M-1} \psi_k,$$

where $\psi_k = \hat{f}_\varepsilon^{(L)} \circ c^k - \mu_a \left(\hat{f}_\varepsilon^{(L)} \right)$ and $\mu_a \left(\hat{f}_\varepsilon^{(L)} \right) = \int_{X_a} \hat{f}_\varepsilon^{(L)} d\mu_a$.

By the multilinearity of $\text{cum}_{[r]}$ we get that

$$\text{cum}_{[r]} \left(H_M^{(\varepsilon, L)} \right) = \frac{1}{M^{r/2}} \sum_{k_1, \dots, k_r=0}^{M-1} \text{cum}_{[r]}(\psi_{k_1}, \dots, \psi_{k_r}) \quad (2.22)$$

Now we want to decompose the sum of (2.22) into sub-sums according to our convenience following [8, Proposition 6.2] and [7, Eq. (3.8)].

Proposition 2.20. *Let $r \in \mathbb{N}$ with $r \geq 3$. Let $0 \leq \alpha < \beta$ and a partition \mathcal{Q} of $\{1, \dots, r\}$ be given, and $\mathbf{k} = (k_1, \dots, k_r) \in \mathbb{R}_+^r$. We define*

$$\Delta(\alpha) := \{\mathbf{k} \in \mathbb{R}_+^r : |k_i - k_j| \leq \alpha \forall i, j\}$$

and

$$\Delta_{\mathcal{Q}}(\alpha, \beta) = \left\{ \mathbf{k} \in \mathbb{R}_+^r : \max_{I \in \mathcal{Q}} \max_{i, j \in I} \{|k_i - k_j|\} \leq \alpha \text{ and } \min_{I, J \in \mathcal{Q}, I \neq J} \min_{i \in I, j \in J} \{|k_i - k_j|\} > \beta \right\}.$$

Then, given $0 = \alpha_0 < \beta_1 < \alpha_1 = (3+r)\beta_1 < \beta_2 < \dots < \beta_r < \alpha_{r-1} = (3+r)\beta_{r-1} < \beta_r$, we have

$$\mathbb{R}_+^r = \Delta(\beta_r) \cup \left(\bigcup_{j=0}^{r-1} \bigcup_{|\mathcal{Q}| \geq 2} \Delta_{\mathcal{Q}}(\alpha_j, \beta_{j+1}) \right).$$

Intersecting with $\{0, 1, \dots, M-1\}^r$, we get that

$$\{0, 1, \dots, M-1\}^r = \Omega(\beta_r, M) \cup \left(\bigcup_{j=0}^{r-1} \bigcup_{|\mathcal{Q}| \geq 2} \Omega_{\mathcal{Q}}(\alpha_j, \beta_{j+1}, M) \right),$$

where

$$\Omega(\beta_r, M) := \{0, 1, \dots, M-1\}^r \cap \Delta(\beta_r),$$

and

$$\Omega_{\mathcal{Q}}(\alpha_j, \beta_{j+1}, M) := \{0, 1, \dots, M-1\}^r \cap \Delta_{\mathcal{Q}}(\alpha_j, \beta_{j+1}).$$

To estimate the cumulant (2.22), the strategy involves separately estimating the sums over $\Omega(\beta_r, M)$ and $\Omega_{\mathcal{Q}}(\alpha_j, \beta_{j+1}, M)$. After accounting for all other factors, the sequences $\{\alpha_j\}$ and $\{\beta_j\}$ are chosen at the final step.

Case: 1 Summing over $\Omega(\beta_r, M)$.

Suppose the index $\mathbf{k} = (k_1, \dots, k_r)$ runs over $\Omega(\beta_r, M)$. Then

$$|k_i - k_j| \leq \beta_r \text{ for all } i, j.$$

Given this, we have

$$|\Omega(\beta_r, M)| \ll M\beta_r^{r-1}$$

We claim that

$$\frac{1}{M^{r/2}} \sum_{(k_1, \dots, k_r) \in \Omega(\beta_r, M)} |\text{cum}_{[r]}(\psi_{k_1}, \dots, \psi_{k_r})| \ll_r M^{1-r/2} \beta_r^{r-1} \left\| \hat{f}_{\varepsilon}^{(L)} \right\|_{\infty}^{(r-l)^+} \quad (2.23)$$

where $(r-l)^+ = \max\{0, r-l\}$.

To prove (2.23), it is enough to show that

$$\int_{X_a} |\psi_{k_1} \dots \psi_{k_r}| d\mu_a \ll_r \left\| \hat{f}_{\varepsilon}^{(L)} \right\|_{\infty}^{(r-l)^+} \quad (2.24)$$

First, consider the case $r \leq l$. In this case we apply the generalized Hölder inequality to the l functions $\psi_{k_1}, \dots, \psi_{k_r}, 1, \dots, 1$ to get

$$\int_{X_a} |\psi_{k_1} \dots \psi_{k_r}| d\mu_a \ll \|\psi_{k_1}\|_l \dots \|\psi_{k_r}\|_l \quad (2.25)$$

Now for any k

$$\begin{aligned} \|\psi_k\|_l &\leq \left\| \hat{f}_{\varepsilon}^{(L)} \right\|_l + \mu_a \left(\hat{f}_{\varepsilon}^{(L)} \right), \text{ by using } G_a\text{-invariance of } \mu_a \\ &\leq \|\alpha_{l,a}\|_l + \|\hat{f}_{\varepsilon}\|_1, \text{ by Proposition 2.4} \\ &\leq \|\alpha_{l,a}\|_l + \|\hat{f}_{\varepsilon} - \chi\|_1 + \|\chi\|_1 \\ &\ll \|\alpha_{l,a}\|_l + \varepsilon + \text{vol}(\Omega_2) \end{aligned}$$

By (2.25) and (2.26), we get

$$\int_{X_a} |\psi_{k_1} \dots \psi_{k_r}| d\mu_a \ll 1$$

This shows that (2.24) holds if $r \leq l$. Next we consider the case when $r > l$. In this case

$$\begin{aligned}
 \int_{X_a} |\psi_{k_1} \cdots \psi_{k_r} \psi_{k_{r+1}} \cdots \psi_{k_l}| d\mu_a &\leq \|\psi_{k_{r+1}} \cdots \psi_{k_l}\|_\infty \int_{X_a} |\psi_{k_1} \cdots \psi_{k_r}| d\mu_a \\
 &\leq 2^{r-l} \left\| \hat{f}_\varepsilon^{(L)} \right\|_\infty^{r-l} \|\psi_{k_1}\|_l \cdots \|\psi_{k_r}\|_l \\
 &\ll 2^{r-l} \left\| \hat{f}_\varepsilon^{(L)} \right\|_\infty^{r-l}, \text{ using above estimate for } \|\psi_k\|_l \\
 &\ll \left\| \hat{f}_\varepsilon^{(L)} \right\|_\infty^{r-l}.
 \end{aligned}$$

Therefore (2.24) holds and hence we get our desired result.

Case: 2 Summing over $\Omega_\Omega(\alpha_j, \beta_{j+1}, \mathbf{M})$ with $|\Omega| \geq 2$.

Suppose that $\Omega = \{J_1, \dots, J_d\}$ with $d \geq 2$. Given an arbitrary subset I of $\{1, \dots, r\}$ first we want to show that

$$\int_{X_a} \prod_{i \in I} \psi_{k_i} d\mu_a \approx \prod_{t=0}^d \int_{X_a} \prod_{i \in I \cap J_t} \psi_{k_i} d\mu_a. \quad (2.26)$$

If $I \subseteq J_t$ (hence $I \cap J_t$ is empty for all indices t except one) for some $t = 1, \dots, d$, then it is easy to observe that equality holds in (2.26). In other cases, we will show that equality in (2.26) holds with an error term.

If $I = I_1 \sqcup \cdots \sqcup I_s$, where each I_t is nonempty and $I_t \in \{I \cap J : J \in \Omega\}$ for $t = 1, \dots, s$. Let $g = \hat{f}_\varepsilon^{(L)} - \mu_a(\hat{f}_\varepsilon^{(L)})$, $\mathbf{f} = \hat{f}_\varepsilon^{(L)}$ and $k_{I_j} := \max\{k_i : i \in I_j\}$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}
 \int_{X_a} \prod_{i \in I} \psi_{k_i} d\mu_a &= \int_{X_a} \prod_{i \in I} g \circ c^{k_i} d\mu_a \\
 &= \int_{X_a} \prod_{j=1}^s \left(\prod_{i \in I_j} g \circ c^{k_i} \right) d\mu_a \\
 &= \int_{X_a} \prod_{j=1}^s \left(\prod_{i \in I_j} g \circ c^{k_i - k_{I_j}} \right) \circ c^{k_{I_j}} d\mu_a \\
 &= \int_{X_a} \prod_{j=1}^s \left(\sum_{K_j \subseteq I_j} (-\mu_a(\mathbf{f}))^{|K_j|} \prod_{i \in I_j \setminus K_j} \mathbf{f} \circ c^{k_i - k_{I_j}} \right) \circ c^{k_{I_j}} d\mu_a \\
 &= \int_{X_a} \sum_{K_j \subseteq I_j, j=1, \dots, s} (-\mu_a(\mathbf{f}))^{\sum_{d=1}^s |K_d|} \prod_{j=1}^s \left(\prod_{i \in I_j \setminus K_j} \mathbf{f} \circ c^{k_i - k_{I_j}} \right) \circ c^{k_{I_j}} d\mu_a \\
 &= \sum_{K_j \subseteq I_j, j=1, \dots, s} (-\mu_a(\mathbf{f}))^{\sum_{d=1}^s |K_d|} \int_{X_a} \prod_{j=1}^s \left(\prod_{i \in I_j \setminus K_j} \mathbf{f} \circ c^{k_i - k_{I_j}} \right) \circ c^{k_{I_j}} d\mu_a
 \end{aligned}$$

Let $\mathbf{f}_{K_j} := \prod_{i \in I_j \setminus K_j} \mathbf{f} \circ c^{k_i - k_{I_j}}$ for $j = 1, \dots, s$. Then from above we have

$$\int_{X_a} \prod_{i \in I} \psi_{k_i} d\mu_a = \sum_{K_j \subseteq I_j, j=1, \dots, s} (-\mu_a(\mathbf{f}))^{\sum_{d=1}^s |K_d|} \int_{X_a} \prod_{j=1}^s \mathbf{f}_{K_j} \circ c^{k_{I_j}} d\mu_a. \quad (2.27)$$

We want to use the quantitative estimate for higher order correlations, i.e., Theorem 2.14 to compute the above integral. Before that let us compute a few other things. Using Lemma 2.13,

we get

$$\begin{aligned}
\prod_{j=1}^s S_q(\mathbf{f}_{K_j}) &= \prod_{j=1}^s S_q \left(\prod_{i \in I_j \setminus K_j} \mathbf{f} \circ c^{k_i - k_{I_j}} \right) \\
&\ll \prod_{j=1}^s \left(\prod_{i \in I_j \setminus K_j} S_q \left(\mathbf{f} \circ c^{k_i - k_{I_j}} \right) \right) \\
&\ll \prod_{j=1}^s S_q(\mathbf{f})^{|I_j \setminus K_j|} \prod_{i \in I_j \setminus K_j} \left\| (c^{-1})^{k_{I_j} - k_i} \right\|_{\text{op}}^q \\
&\ll \prod_{j=1}^s S_q(\mathbf{f})^{|I_j \setminus K_j|} \left\| c^{-1} \right\|_{\text{op}}^{q|I_j \setminus K_j| \alpha_j}, \text{ since } k_{I_j} - k_i \leq \alpha_j \ \forall i \in I_j \setminus K_j \\
&\ll S_q(\mathbf{f})^r \left\| c^{-1} \right\|_{\text{op}}^{qr \alpha_j}.
\end{aligned}$$

Hence

$$\prod_{j=1}^s S_q(\mathbf{f}_{K_j}) \ll S_q(\mathbf{f})^r e^{qr \alpha_j \tau}, \text{ where } \tau = \log \|c^{-1}\|_{\text{op}} > 0. \quad (2.28)$$

Using (2.27), (2.28) and Theorem 2.14, we get

$$\int_{X_a} \prod_{i \in I} \psi_{k_i} d\mu_a = \sum_{K_j \subseteq I_j, j=1, \dots, s} (-\mu_a(\mathbf{f}))^{\sum_{d=1}^s |K_d|} \left(\prod_{j=1}^s \int_{X_a} \mathbf{f}_{K_j} d\mu_a + O_{q,r}(E') \right) \quad (2.29)$$

where

$$E' = e^{-\delta \min_{i \neq j} \rho_{G_a}(c^{k_{I_i}}, c^{k_{I_j}})} \prod_{j=1}^s S_q(\mathbf{f}_{K_j}) \ll e^{-\delta \min_{i \neq j} \rho_{G_a}(1, c^{k_{I_j} - k_{I_i}})} S_q(\mathbf{f})^r e^{qr \alpha_j \tau} \quad (2.30)$$

First note that for any $i \neq j$, $|k_{I_j} - k_{I_i}| > \beta_{j+1}$. Suppose that $k_{I_j} - k_{I_i} > 0$. Then using Lemma 2.11, we get $0 < D_1 \leq 1, D_2 > 0$ such that

$$\rho_{G_a} \left(1, c^{k_{I_j} - k_{I_i}} \right) \geq D_1 \log \|c^{k_{I_j} - k_{I_i}}\|_{\text{op}} - D_2 \geq D_1 \beta_{j+1} \log \lambda - D_2. \quad (2.31)$$

Let $\delta' = \delta D_1 \log \lambda$. Combining (2.30) and (2.31) we get that

$$E' \ll e^{-\delta' \beta_{j+1}} S_q(\mathbf{f})^r e^{qr \alpha_j \tau} = e^{-(\delta' \beta_{j+1} - qr \alpha_j \tau)} S_q(\mathbf{f})^r$$

Now if we let $E = e^{-(\delta' \beta_{j+1} - qr \alpha_j \tau)} S_q(\mathbf{f})^r$, then from (2.29) we get

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{X_a} \prod_{i \in I} \psi_{k_i} d\mu_a &= \sum_{K_j \subseteq I_j, j=1, \dots, s} (-\mu_a(\mathbf{f}))^{\sum_{d=1}^s |K_d|} \prod_{j=1}^s \int_{X_a} \mathbf{f}_{K_j} d\mu_a + O_{q,r}(E) \\
&= \prod_{j=1}^s \sum_{K_j \subseteq I_j} (-\mu_a(\mathbf{f}))^{|K_j|} \int_{X_a} \mathbf{f}_{K_j} d\mu_a + O_{q,r}(E) \\
&= \prod_{j=1}^s \int_{X_a} \prod_{i \in I_j} (g \circ c^{k_i}) d\mu_a + O_{q,r}(E) \\
&= \prod_{j=1}^s \int_{X_a} \prod_{i \in I_j} \psi_{k_i} d\mu_a + O_{q,r}(E)
\end{aligned}$$

Hence finally for any $\mathbf{k} = (k_1, \dots, k_r) \in \Omega_{\Omega}(\alpha_j, \beta_{j+1}, M)$ with $|\Omega| \geq 2$, we have

$$\int_{X_a} \prod_{i \in I} \psi_{k_i} d\mu_a = \prod_{t=0}^d \int_{X_a} \prod_{i \in I \cap J_t} \psi_{k_i} d\mu_a + O_{q,r}(E),$$

where $E = e^{-(\delta' \beta_{j+1} - qr \alpha_j \tau)} S_q(\mathbf{f})^r$. Now summing the above estimate over all partitions \mathcal{P} of $\{1, \dots, r\}$ and denoting an element of \mathcal{P} by I , we get

$$\text{cum}_{[r]}(\psi_{k_1}, \dots, \psi_{k_r}) = \text{cum}_{[r]}(\psi_{k_1}, \dots, \psi_{k_r} | \mathcal{Q}) + O_{q,r}(E)$$

Now by using Proposition 2.9, we get

$$|\text{cum}_{[r]}(\psi_{k_1}, \dots, \psi_{k_r})| \ll_{q,r} E$$

Final estimate on the cumulants:

Combining all the estimates, we get

$$\text{cum}_{[r]} \left(H_M^{(\varepsilon, L)} \right) \ll M^{1-r/2} \beta_r^{r-1} L^{(r-l)^+} + \varepsilon^{-qr} L^r M^{r/2} \max_j \left\{ e^{-(\delta' \beta_{j+1} - qr \alpha_j \tau)} \right\} \quad (2.33)$$

Now we choose the parameters α_j and β_j such that the right hand side of (2.33) goes to zero as $M \rightarrow \infty$. We do this by choosing a single parameter $\eta > 0$. We define the parameters inductively by

$$\beta_1 = \eta \quad \text{and} \quad \beta_{j+1} = \max\{\eta + (3+r)\beta_j, \eta + (\delta')^{-1} r(3+r)q\tau\}$$

for $j = 1, \dots, r-1$.

The above choice of β_{j+1} fulfills the requirement, i.e., $\alpha_j = (3+r)\beta_j < \beta_{j+1}$ of Proposition 2.20. Also we have

$$\delta' \beta_{j+1} - qr \tau \alpha_j \geq \delta' \eta > 0.$$

By induction, it easily follows that $\beta_r \ll_r \eta$. Hence from (2.33) we get

$$\text{cum}_{[r]} \left(H_M^{(\varepsilon, L)} \right) \ll M^{1-r/2} \eta^{r-1} L^{(r-l)^+} + \varepsilon^{-qr} L^r M^{r/2} e^{-\delta' \eta}.$$

Further we want to choose parameters ε and L such that

$$M^{1-r/2} \eta^{r-1} L^{(r-l)^+} \rightarrow 0 \quad (2.34)$$

and

$$\varepsilon^{-qr} L^r M^{r/2} e^{-\delta' \eta} \rightarrow 0 \quad (2.35)$$

as $M \rightarrow \infty$.

We take the parameter $\eta = C_r \log M$ for some constant $C_r > 0$.

If $r-l < 0$, then $L^{(r-l)^+} = 0$. Hence in this case (2.34) follows by our choice of the parameter η as above, since $r \geq 3$, $1-r/2 \leq -1/2$ and $\eta^{r-1} = o(M^{1/2})$.

Now assume that $r-l > 0$. Then if we choose the parameter $L = M^d$ for some real number d (we will make the choice of d later), (2.34) holds provided $1-r/2+d(r-l) > 0$. Hence d must satisfy

$$d < \frac{r-2}{2(r-l)}.$$

We also want (2.15) to hold and this forces $d(l-3) > 1$. Therefore we can find the suitable choice of d if and only if $\frac{1}{l-3} < \frac{r-2}{2(r-l)}$, i.e., $r(l-5) + 6 > 0$. This holds since by assumption $l \geq 5$.

Finally, the only things remaining to choose are C_r and ε . Choose $\varepsilon = N^{-2}$. Then (2.35) holds if $r(2q+d+1/2) - \delta' C_r < 0$ and this holds if $C_r > \frac{r}{\delta'}(2q+d+1/2)$. Hence for such a choice of C_r , ε and L , (2.34) and (2.35) holds. This completes the proof of (2.17) for $r \geq 3$. Now as an immediate application of Theorem 2.8, Theorem 2.19 follows.

3. PROOF OF THE CLT FOR CONGRUENCE UNIMODULAR LATTICES

Throughout this section, we will denote the set of all congruence unimodular lattices on \mathbb{R}^l by X_c , where $l = m+n$. Let $g: \mathbb{R}^l \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a Borel measurable function with compact support. The Siegel transform of g is $\hat{g}: X_c \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ defined by

$$\hat{g}(\Lambda) = \sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda \setminus \{0\}} g(\lambda) \quad \text{for } \Lambda \in X_c.$$

Now let us record the analogs of Siegel's transform and Roger's second moment formula for congruence lattice from [15]. The proof of the same can also be found in [3].

Proposition 3.1. [15, Theorem 3.2]. *Let $g : \mathbb{R}^l \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a bounded Borel measurable function with compact support. Then*

$$\int_{X_c} \hat{g}(\Lambda) d\mu_c(\Lambda) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^l} g(\mathbf{x}) d\mathbf{x}$$

$$\int_{X_c} \hat{g}(\Lambda)^2 d\mu_c(\Lambda) = \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^l} g(\mathbf{x}) d\mathbf{x} \right)^2 + \frac{1}{\zeta_N(m+n)} \sum_{\substack{s_1 \geq 1 \\ \gcd(s_1, N) = 1}} \sum_{\substack{s_2 \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{0\} \\ s_2 \equiv s_1 \pmod{N}}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^l} g(s_1 \mathbf{x}) g(s_2 \mathbf{x}) d\mathbf{x},$$

where ζ_N is defined in Theorem 1.3.

By arguments similar to the previous section it is easy to see that Theorem 1.3 is equivalent to the following theorem.

Theorem 3.2. *Under the hypothesis of Theorem 1.3,*

$$R_M := \frac{1}{\sqrt{M}} \sum_{k=0}^{M-1} (\hat{\chi} \circ c_0^k - M \cdot \text{vol}(\Omega_2)) \rightarrow N(0, \eta^2 \sigma_c^2) \text{ in distribution as } M \rightarrow \infty, \quad (3.1)$$

where σ_c^2 is given by Theorem 1.3, $\eta = \text{vol}(\Omega_2)^{1/2}$ and $\hat{\chi}$ is the Siegel transform of χ_{Ω_2} on X_c .

Again as we have seen in the case of affine unimodular lattices, here also Theorem 3.2 is equivalent to proving the following theorem.

Theorem 3.3. *Under the hypothesis of Theorem 1.3,*

$$R_M^{(\varepsilon, L)} := \frac{1}{\sqrt{M}} \left(\sum_{k=0}^{M-1} \hat{g}_\varepsilon^{(L)} \circ c_0^k - M \int_{X_c} \hat{g}_\varepsilon^{(L)} d\mu_c \right) \rightarrow N(0, \eta^2 \sigma_c^2) \text{ in distribution as } M \rightarrow \infty,$$

where $\hat{g}_\varepsilon^{(L)} = \hat{g}_\varepsilon \eta_L \in C_c^\infty(X_c)$ are smooth approximations to $\hat{\chi}$, σ_c^2 is given by Theorem 1.3 and $\eta = \text{vol}(\Omega_2)^{1/2}$.

Again we use the CLT criteria of Fréchet and Shohat to prove Theorem 3.3. Proving Theorem 3.3 amounts to show that for some choice of parameters ε and L

$$\sigma^2 := \lim_{M \rightarrow \infty} \|R_M^{(\varepsilon, L)}\|_2^2 < \infty \quad (3.2)$$

$$\lim_{M \rightarrow \infty} \text{Cum}_{[r]} \left(R_M^{(\varepsilon, L)} \right) = 0 \quad \text{for all } r \geq 3. \quad (3.3)$$

The computation of cumulant (i.e., Equation (3.3)) is analogous to the affine case (with appropriate modifications) discussed in detail in the previous section. Hence we omit the details here. Rather we do the computation of variance for the congruence case.

Computation of variance:

First note that given the triangle inequality, we have

$$\|R_M\|_2 - \|R_M - R_M^{(\varepsilon, L)}\|_2 \leq \|R_M^{(\varepsilon, L)}\|_2 \leq \|R_M\|_2 + \|R_M - R_M^{(\varepsilon, L)}\|_2,$$

where R_M is given by (3.1). Hence in order to show (3.2) it is enough to show that

$$\lim_{M \rightarrow \infty} \|R_M\|_2^2 < \infty \quad (3.4)$$

and

$$\|R_M - R_M^{(\varepsilon, L)}\|_2 \rightarrow 0. \quad (3.5)$$

Also if we can show (3.4) and (3.5), we get the expression of variance as

$$\sigma^2 = \lim_{M \rightarrow \infty} \|R_M^{(\varepsilon, L)}\|_2^2 = \lim_{M \rightarrow \infty} \|R_M\|_2^2.$$

Recall that

$$R_M = \frac{1}{\sqrt{M}} \sum_{k=0}^{M-1} (\hat{\chi} \circ c_0^k - \text{vol}(\Omega_2)) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{M}} \sum_{k=0}^{M-1} \phi_k,$$

where $\phi_k = \hat{\chi} \circ c_0^k - \text{vol}(\Omega_2)$.

$$\begin{aligned} \|R_M\|_2^2 &= \frac{1}{M} \sum_{k_1, k_2=0}^{M-1} \int_{X_c} \phi_{k_1} \phi_{k_2} d\mu_c = \frac{1}{M} \sum_{k_1, k_2=0}^{M-1} \int_{X_c} \phi_{k_1-k_2} \phi_0 d\mu_c \\ &= \frac{1}{M} \sum_{\pm k=0}^{M-1} (M-|k|) \int_{X_c} \phi_k \phi_0 d\mu_c \\ &= \sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} \chi_{B_M} \left(1 - \frac{|k|}{M}\right) \int_{X_c} \phi_k \phi_0 d\mu_c, \end{aligned}$$

where $B_M := \{k \in \mathbb{Z} : |k| \leq M-1\}$. Again using the dominated convergence theorem, we get

$$\lim_{M \rightarrow \infty} \|R_M\|_2^2 = \sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} \int_{X_c} \phi_k \phi_0 d\mu_c.$$

Now Roger's second order moment formula gives

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{X_c} \phi_k \phi_0 d\mu_c &= \int_{X_c} \hat{\chi} \cdot (\hat{\chi} \circ c_0^k) d\mu_c - \text{vol}(\Omega_2)^2 \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \left(\int_{X_c} (\hat{\chi} + \hat{\chi} \circ c_0^k)^2 d\mu_c - 2 \int_{X_c} \hat{\chi}^2 d\mu_c - 2 \text{vol}(\Omega_2)^2 \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \left(\left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^l} (\chi + \chi \circ c_0^k) d\mathbf{x} \right)^2 - 2 \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^l} \chi d\mathbf{x} \right)^2 - 2 \text{vol}(\Omega_2)^2 \right) \\ &+ \frac{1}{2\zeta_N(m+n)} \sum_{\substack{s_1 \geq 1 \\ \gcd(s_1, N) = 1}} \sum_{\substack{s_2 \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{0\} \\ s_2 \equiv s_1 \pmod{N}}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^l} ((\chi + \chi \circ c_0^k)(s_1 \mathbf{x})(\chi + \chi \circ c_0^k)(s_2 \mathbf{x}) \\ &- 2\chi(s_1 \mathbf{x})\chi(s_2 \mathbf{x})) d\mathbf{x} \\ &= \frac{1}{\zeta_N(m+n)} \left(\sum_{\substack{s_1 \geq 1 \\ \gcd(s_1, N) = 1}} \sum_{\substack{s_2 \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{0\} \\ s_2 \equiv s_1 \pmod{N}}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^l} (\chi \circ c_0^k)(s_1 \mathbf{x})\chi(s_2 \mathbf{x}) d\mathbf{x} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Hence

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{M \rightarrow \infty} \|R_M\|_2^2 &= \frac{2}{\zeta_N(m+n)} \sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} \sum_{\substack{s_1 \geq 1 \\ \gcd(s_1, N) = 1}} \sum_{\substack{s_2 \geq 1 \\ s_2 \equiv s_1 \pmod{N}}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^l} (\chi \circ c_0^k)(s_1 \mathbf{x})\chi(s_2 \mathbf{x}) d\mathbf{x} \\ &= \frac{2}{\zeta_N(m+n)} \sum_{\substack{s_1 \geq 1 \\ \gcd(s_1, N) = 1}} \sum_{\substack{s_2 \geq 1 \\ s_2 \equiv s_1 \pmod{N}}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^l} \left(\sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} \chi \circ c_0^k \right) (s_1 \mathbf{x})\chi(s_2 \mathbf{x}) d\mathbf{x}. \end{aligned}$$

Now let

$$\Omega = \{(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \in \mathbb{R}^m \times \mathbb{R}^n : |x_i| \|\mathbf{y}\|^{u_i} < c_i \text{ for } i = 1, \dots, m\}.$$

Then by changing the coordinates to spherical coordinates, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{\mathbb{R}^l} \left(\sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} \chi \circ c_0^k \right) (s_1 \mathbf{x}) \chi(s_2 \mathbf{x}) \, d\mathbf{x} &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^l} \chi_{\Omega}(s_1 \mathbf{x}) \chi(s_2 \mathbf{x}) \, d\mathbf{x} \\
&= \text{vol} \left(s_1^{-1} \Omega \cap s_2^{-1} \Omega \right) \\
&= \int_{1/s_2 \leq \|\mathbf{y}\| \leq 2/s_2} \prod_{i=1}^m \left(\frac{2c_i}{\max\{s_1, s_2\}^{1+u_i} \|\mathbf{y}\|^{u_i}} \right) \, d\mathbf{y} \\
&= \frac{2^m c_1 \dots c_m \omega_n}{\max\{s_1, s_2\}^{m+n}} \int_{1/s_2}^{2/s_2} \frac{1}{r^n} r^{n-1} \, dr
\end{aligned}$$

Hence

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^l} \left(\sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} \chi \circ c_0^k \right) (s_1 \mathbf{x}) \chi(s_2 \mathbf{x}) \, d\mathbf{x} = 2^m (\log 2) \max\{s_1, s_2\}^{-m-n} c_1 \dots c_n \omega_n, \quad (3.9)$$

where ω_n is given by (1.3).

Let $C_N = \{s \in \mathbb{Z} : 0 \leq s < N \text{ and } \gcd(s, N) = 1\}$. In view of (3.9), we finally get that

$$\begin{aligned}
\sigma^2 &= \frac{2^{m+1} (\log 2) c_1 \dots c_n \omega_n}{\zeta_N(m+n)} \sum_{\substack{s_1 \geq 1 \\ \gcd(s_1, N) = 1}} \sum_{\substack{s_2 \geq 1 \\ s_2 \equiv s_1 \pmod{N}}} \max\{s_1, s_2\}^{-m-n} \\
&= \frac{2^{m+1} (\log 2) c_1 \dots c_n \omega_n}{\zeta_N(m+n)} \sum_{s \in C_N} \sum_{s_1, s_2 \geq 1} \max\{Ns_1 + s, Ns_2 + s\}^{-m-n} \\
&= \frac{2^{m+1} (\log 2) c_1 \dots c_n \omega_n}{\zeta_N(m+n)} \sum_{s \in C_N} \left(\sum_{s_1 \geq 1} (Ns_1 + s)^{-m-n} + 2 \sum_{1 \leq s_1 < s_2} (Ns_2 + s)^{-m-n} \right) \\
&= \frac{2^{m+1} (\log 2) c_1 \dots c_n \omega_n}{\zeta_N(m+n)} \left(\zeta_N(m+n) + 2 \sum_{s \in C_N} \sum_{s_2 \geq 1} \frac{s_2 - 1}{(Ns_2 + s)^{m+n}} \right) \\
&= \frac{2^{m+1} (\log 2) c_1 \dots c_n \omega_n}{\zeta_N(m+n)} \left(1 + \frac{2}{\zeta_N(m+n)} \sum_{s \in C_N} \sum_{s_2 \geq 1} \frac{s_2 - 1}{(Ns_2 + s)^{m+n}} \right)
\end{aligned}$$

4. PROOF OF THE CLT FOR UNIMODULAR LATTICES

As mentioned earlier we denote the set of all unimodular lattices of \mathbb{R}^l by X_l , where $l = m + n$. Let $h : \mathbb{R}^l \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a Borel measurable function with compact support. The Siegel transform of h is $\hat{h} : X_l \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ defined by

$$\hat{h}(\Lambda) = \sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda \setminus \{0\}} h(\lambda) \quad \text{for } \Lambda \in X_l.$$

We recall Siegel's integral formula and Roger's second moment formula for the space of unimodular lattices from [20, 17].

Proposition 4.1. *Let $h : \mathbb{R}^l \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a bounded Riemann integrable function with compact support and $F : \mathbb{R}^l \times \mathbb{R}^l \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a non-negative measurable function. Then*

$$\int_{X_l} \hat{h}(\Lambda) \, d\mu_l(\Lambda) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^l} h(\vec{z}) \, d\vec{z}$$

and

$$\int_{X_l} \sum_{\vec{z}_1, \vec{z}_2 \in P(\mathbb{Z}^l)} F(g\vec{z}_1, g\vec{z}_2) \, d\mu_l(g\mathbb{Z}^l) = \zeta(l)^{-2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^l \times \mathbb{R}^l} F(\vec{z}_1, \vec{z}_2) \, d\vec{z}_1 \, d\vec{z}_2 + \zeta(l)^{-1} \int_{\mathbb{R}^l} (F(\vec{z}, \vec{z}) + F(\vec{z}, -\vec{z})) \, d\vec{z},$$

where ζ denotes the Riemann's ζ -function, $P(\mathbb{Z}^l)$ denotes the set of all primitive integral vectors in \mathbb{Z}^l and $d\vec{z}$ denotes the Lebesgue measure on \mathbb{R}^l

Again by arguments similar to Section 2, it is easy to see that Theorem 1.1 is equivalent to the following theorem.

Theorem 4.2. *Under the hypothesis of Theorem 1.1,*

$$G_M^{(\varepsilon, L)} := \frac{1}{\sqrt{M}} \left(\sum_{k=0}^{M-1} \hat{h}_\varepsilon^{(L)} \circ c_0^k - M \int_{X_l} \hat{h}_\varepsilon^{(L)} d\mu_l \right) \rightarrow N(0, \eta^2 \sigma_u^2) \text{ in distribution as } M \rightarrow \infty,$$

where $\hat{h}_\varepsilon^{(L)} = \hat{h}_\varepsilon \eta_L \in C_c^\infty(X_l)$ are smooth approximations to $\hat{\chi}$, σ_u^2 is given by Theorem 1.1 and $\eta = \text{vol}(\Omega_2)^{1/2}$.

By the CLT criteria of Fréchet and Shohat, proving Theorem 4.2 amounts to show that for some choice of parameters ε and L

$$\sigma^2 := \lim_{M \rightarrow \infty} \|G_M^{(\varepsilon, L)}\|_2^2 < \infty$$

$$\lim_{M \rightarrow \infty} \text{Cum}_{[r]} \left(G_M^{(\varepsilon, L)} \right) = 0 \quad \text{for all } r \geq 3. \quad (4.1)$$

The computation of cumulant (i.e., Equation (4.1)) is analogous to the affine case (with appropriate modifications) discussed in detail in Section 2. Hence we skip the details here. Rather we do the computation of the variance.

Computation of variance: By an easy reduction we have that

$$\sigma^2 = \lim_{M \rightarrow \infty} \|G_M^{(\varepsilon, L)}\|_2^2 = \lim_{M \rightarrow \infty} \|G_M\|_2^2 < \infty,$$

where

$$G_M = \frac{1}{\sqrt{M}} \sum_{k=0}^{M-1} \phi_k \quad \text{and} \quad \phi_k = \hat{\chi} \circ c_0^k - \text{vol}(\Omega_2).$$

Also arguments similar to Section 2 give us

$$\sigma^2 = \lim_{M \rightarrow \infty} \|H_M\|_2^2 = \sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} \int_{X_l} \phi_k \phi_0 d\mu_l = \sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} \left(\int_{X_l} \hat{\chi} \cdot (\hat{\chi} \circ c_0^k) d\mu_l - \text{vol}(\Omega_2)^2 \right).$$

Now by applying Roger's second order moment formula to the function

$$F_k(\vec{z}_1, \vec{z}_2) := \sum_{s_1, s_2 \in \mathbb{N}} \chi(s_1 c_0^k \vec{z}_1) \chi(s_2 \vec{z}_2), \quad (\vec{z}_1, \vec{z}_2) \in \mathbb{R}^l \times \mathbb{R}^l,$$

we get

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{X_l} \hat{\chi} \cdot (\hat{\chi} \circ c_0^k) d\mu_l &= \sum_{\vec{z}_1, \vec{z}_2 \in P(\mathbb{Z}^l)} F_k(g\vec{z}_1, g\vec{z}_2) d\mu_l(g\mathbb{Z}^l) \\ &= \text{vol}(\Omega_2)^2 + \zeta(l)^{-1} \sum_{s_1, s_2 \in \mathbb{N}} \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^l} \chi(s_1 c_0^k \vec{z}) \chi(s_2 \vec{z}) d\vec{z} + \int_{\mathbb{R}^l} \chi(s_1 c_0^k \vec{z}) \chi(-s_2 \vec{z}) d\vec{z} \right) \\ &= \text{vol}(\Omega_2)^2 + 2\zeta(l)^{-1} \sum_{s_1, s_2 \in \mathbb{N}} \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^l} \chi(s_1 c_0^k \vec{z}) \chi(s_2 \vec{z}) d\vec{z} \right), \end{aligned}$$

since

$$\begin{aligned} \zeta(l)^{-2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^l \times \mathbb{R}^l} F_k(\vec{z}_1, \vec{z}_2) d\vec{z}_1 d\vec{z}_2 &= \zeta(l)^{-2} \sum_{s_1, s_2 \in \mathbb{N}} \text{vol} \left(\frac{1}{s_1} c_0^{-k} \Omega_2 \right) \text{vol} \left(\frac{1}{s_2} \Omega_2 \right) \\ &= \zeta(l)^{-2} \text{vol}(\Omega_2)^2 \sum_{s_1, s_2 \in \mathbb{N}} \frac{1}{s_1} \frac{1}{s_2} \\ &= \text{vol}(\Omega_2)^2. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\sigma^2 &= 2\zeta(l)^{-1} \sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} \sum_{s_1, s_2 \in \mathbb{N}} \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^l} \chi(s_1 c_0^k \vec{z}) \chi(s_2 \vec{z}) d\vec{z} \right) \\
&= 2\zeta(l)^{-1} \sum_{s_1, s_2 \in \mathbb{N}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^l} \left(\sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} \chi \circ c_0^k \right) (s_1 \vec{z}) \chi(s_2 \vec{z}) d\vec{z} \\
&= 2^{m+1} \zeta(l)^{-1} (\log 2) c_1 \dots c_n \omega_n \sum_{s_1, s_2 \in \mathbb{N}} \max\{s_1, s_2\}^{-l}, \text{ by using (3.9)} \\
&= 2^{m+1} \zeta(l)^{-1} (\log 2) c_1 \dots c_n \omega_n \left(\sum_{s=1}^{\infty} s^{-l} + 2 \sum_{1 \leq s_1 < s_2} s_2^{-l} \right) \\
&= 2^{m+1} \zeta(l)^{-1} (\log 2) c_1 \dots c_n \omega_n \left(\zeta(l) + 2 \sum_{s_2 \geq 1} \frac{s_2 - 1}{s_2^l} \right) \\
&= 2^{m+1} \zeta(l)^{-1} (\log 2) c_1 \dots c_n \omega_n (2\zeta(l-1) - \zeta(l)) \\
&= 2^{m+1} (\log 2) c_1 \dots c_n \omega_n \left(\frac{2\zeta(l-1)}{\zeta(l)} - 1 \right).
\end{aligned}$$

REFERENCES

- [1] G. Aggarwal, A. Ghosh, *Two central limit theorems in Diophantine approximations*, <https://arxiv.org/abs/2306.02304>
- [2] M. Alam and A. Ghosh, *Equidistribution on homogeneous spaces and the distribution of approximates in Diophantine approximation*. Trans. Amer. Math. Soc., 373(5):3357–3374, 2020.
- [3] M. Alam, A. Ghosh, and J. Han. *Higher moment formulae and limiting distributions of lattice points*. To appear in the J. of the Inst. of Math. of Jussieu, 2023. preprint, <https://arxiv.org/abs/2111.00848>.
- [4] J. S. Athreya, *Random affine lattices, Geometry*, groups and dynamics, 2015, pp. 169–174. MR3379825
- [5] J. S. Athreya, A. Ghosh, J. Tseng, *Spiraling of approximations and spherical averages of Siegel transforms*, J. Lond. Math. Soc. 91(2), 383–404 (2015)
- [6] M. Björklund, M. Einsiedler, A. Gorodnik, *Quantitative multiple mixing*, J. Eur. Math. Soc., 22 (2020).
- [7] M. Björklund, A. Gorodnik, *Central limit theorems for Diophantine approximants*, Math. Ann., 374 (2019).
- [8] M. Björklund, A. Gorodnik, *Central limit theorems for group actions which are exponentially mixing of all orders*, J. Anal. Math., 141 (2020), 457–482
- [9] M. Björklund, A. Gorodnik, *Central limit theorems for generic lattice point counting*, Selecta Mathematica (2023).
- [10] D. Dolgopyat, B. Fayad, and I. Vinogradov, *Central limit theorems for simultaneous Diophantine approximations*, J. Éc. polytech. Math. 4 (2017), 1–36. MR3583273
- [11] D. El-Baz, J. Marklof, and I. Vinogradov, *The distribution of directions in an affine lattice: two-point correlations and mixed moments*, Int. Math. Res. Not. IMRN 5 (2015), 1371–1400. MR3340360
- [12] A. Eskin, G. Margulis and S. Mozes, *Upper bounds and asymptotics in a quantitative version of the Oppenheim conjecture*, Ann. of Math., 147 (1998), 93–141.
- [13] M. Fréchet, J. Shohat, *A proof of the generalized second-limit theorem in the theory of probability*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc., 33 (1931), 533–543.
- [14] A. Ghosh and J. Han, *Values of inhomogeneous forms at S -integral points*, Mathematika 68 (2022), no. 2, 565–593. MR4418458
- [15] A. Ghosh, D. Kelmer, and S. Yu, *Effective density for inhomogeneous quadratic forms I: Generic forms and fixed shifts*, Int. Math. Res. Not. IMRN 6 (2022), 4682–4719. MR4391899
- [16] K. Holm, *Central limit theorem for counting functions related to symplectic lattices and bounded sets*, Discrete and Continuous Dynamical Systems Vol. 43, No. 10, October 2023, pp. 3667–3705.
- [17] C. Rogers, *Mean values over the space of lattices*, Acta Math. 94 (1955) 249–287.
- [18] W. M. Schmidt, *A metrical theorem in geometry of numbers*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc., 95 (1960), 516–529
- [19] W. M. Schmidt, *Asymptotic formulae for point lattices of bounded determinant and subspaces of bounded height*, Duke Math J., 35 (1968), 327–339
- [20] C. Siegel, *A mean value theorem in geometry of numbers*, Ann. Math. 46 (1945) 340–347.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS AND STATISTICS, INDIAN INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY KANPUR, KANPUR, 208016, INDIA

Email address: iamsouravdas1@gmail.com, souravd@iitk.ac.in