

Local solubility of ternary cubic forms

Golo Wolff*

October 20, 2024

Abstract

We consider cubic forms

$$\phi_{a,b}(x, y, z) = ax^3 + by^3 - z^3$$

with coefficients $a, b \in \mathbb{Z}$. We give an asymptotic formula for how many of these forms are locally soluble everywhere, i.e. we give an asymptotic formula for the number of pairs of integers (a, b) that satisfy $1 \leq a \leq A$, $1 \leq b \leq B$ and some mild conditions, such that $\phi_{a,b}$ has a non-zero solution in \mathbb{Q}_p for all primes p .

1 Introduction

The idea for this paper is based on a paper [2] by John Friedlander and Henryk Iwaniec. In their paper the authors give an asymptotic formula for the number of ternary quadratic forms $ax^2 + by^2 - z^2$ with integer coefficients $1 \leq a \leq A$, $1 \leq b \leq B$ that are locally soluble everywhere and thus have a non-zero rational solution due to the Minkowski local-global principle for indefinite quadratic forms. They restrict to counting pairs (a, b) which are square-free, coprime and odd. We intend to modify their argument and prove a similar result in the cubic case.

Our setup is the following. Let $\phi_{a,b}(x, y, z) = ax^3 + by^3 - z^3$ have coefficients $a, b \in \mathbb{Z}$ and let $N(A, B)$ denote the number of integer pairs (a, b) that satisfy the following conditions:

- $1 \leq a \leq A$, $1 \leq b \leq B$,
- $\phi_{a,b}$ has a non-zero solution locally everywhere,
- a, b are square-free, coprime and not divisible by three.

Then we get the following asymptotic.

Theorem 1.1. *Let $0 < \delta < 1$. For $A, B \geq \exp((\log AB)^\delta)$ we have*

$$N(A, B) = c_2 \cdot \frac{AB}{(\log A)^{\frac{1}{3}}(\log B)^{\frac{1}{3}}} \left(1 + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{\log A} + \frac{1}{\log B}\right) \right),$$

where c_2 is the constant

$$c_2 = \left(\Gamma\left(\frac{2}{3}\right)\right)^{-2} \prod_p \left(1 + \frac{2}{3^{\omega_1(p)}p}\right) \left(1 - \frac{1}{p}\right)^{\frac{4}{3}}.$$

*ETH Zürich, Switzerland, gwolff@student.ethz.ch

For the cubic case of this paper we have no analogue to the local-global principle used by Friedlander and Iwaniec in the quadratic case. With the tools of our paper it is not possible to infer that $\phi_{a,b}$ has a rational solution, even if it is locally soluble everywhere. As an immediate consequence of Theorem 1.1, we only achieve an upper bound on the number of forms that have a global solution.

Corollary 1.2. *Let $0 < \delta < 1$ and $A, B \geq \exp((\log AB)^\delta)$. Then the number of cubic forms $\phi_{a,b}$ that have a global solution is bounded from above by*

$$c_3 \cdot \frac{AB}{(\log A)^{\frac{1}{3}}(\log B)^{\frac{1}{3}}} \left(1 + \frac{1}{\log A} + \frac{1}{\log B} \right),$$

if we assume the same restrictions on the coefficients a, b as in the definition of $N(A, B)$. The leading constant c_3 may depend on δ .

Furthermore

$$\limsup_{A, B \rightarrow \infty} N(A, B) \left(\frac{AB}{(\log A)^{\frac{1}{3}}(\log B)^{\frac{1}{3}}} \right)^{-1} \leq c_2.$$

Note that the condition $A, B \geq \exp((\log AB)^\delta)$ intuitively means that A, B are not extremely different in size. It implies, for example, that $(\log B)^{1/\delta} \geq \log A \geq (\log B)^\delta$ and it is mainly required for the way that we have bounded the error terms in the proof of Theorem 1.1.

Acknowledgements

I thank my supervisor Peter Koymans, not only for spending many hours on helping me with this paper, but also for teaching me analytic number theory and mathematics in general.

I wish to acknowledge everybody. It is society as a whole which provides us with the possibility for abstract mathematical research.

2 Tools

This section contains two tools used in the proof of Theorem 1.1 and its preliminary lemmas.

The first tool is a large sieve result taken from [5, Prop. 4.3] and it requires a setup that will be repeated here, because we have to verify this setup in the proof of Lemma 3.4.

Let K be a number field and let l be a prime number. If \mathfrak{f} is an ideal, we write $S_{\mathfrak{f}}$ for the subset of $\alpha \in \mathcal{O}_K$ coprime with \mathfrak{f} . We also write $N(w)$ for the absolute norm of an element. Let $M \geq 1$ be an integer. Suppose that we are given a map $\gamma : S_{M\mathcal{O}_K} \times S_{M\mathcal{O}_K} \rightarrow \{0\} \cup \{\zeta_l^i : i = 0, \dots, l-1\}$ and a subset A_{bad} of $\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ satisfying the following properties.

(P1) Multiplicativity: we have

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma(w, z_1 z_2) &= \gamma(w, z_1) \gamma(w, z_2) \text{ for all } w, z_1 \text{ and } z_2, \\ \gamma(w_1 w_2, z) &= \gamma(w_1, z) \gamma(w_2, z) \text{ for all } w_1, w_2 \text{ and } z. \end{aligned}$$

(P2) Periodicity: if $z_1, z_2, w \in S_{M\mathcal{O}_K}$ satisfy $z_1 \equiv z_2 \pmod{N(w)}$ and $z_1 \equiv z_2 \pmod{M}$, then we have $\gamma(w, z_1) = \gamma(w, z_2)$. Furthermore, if $N(w) \notin A_{\text{bad}}$, then we have

$$\sum_{\substack{\xi \pmod{MN(w)} \\ \gcd(\xi, M) = (1)}} \gamma(w, \xi) = 0$$

(P3) Bad count: we have

$$\sum_{\substack{n \in A_{\text{bad}} \\ n \leq X}} 1 \leq C_1 X^{1-C_2}$$

for some absolute constants $C_1 > 0$ and $0 < C_2 < 1$.

Decompose $\mathcal{O}_K^* = T \oplus V$, where T is torsion and V is free. Such a decomposition is not unique, but we will fix one such decomposition. Fix a fundamental domain $\mathcal{D} \subseteq \mathcal{O}_K$ as in [6, Section 3.3] for the action¹ of V on \mathcal{O}_K .

We will consider bilinear sums of the type

$$B(X, Y, \delta, \epsilon, t_1, t_2) = \sum_{\substack{w \in t_1 \mathcal{D}(X) \\ w \equiv \delta \pmod{M}}} \sum_{\substack{z \in t_2 \mathcal{D}(Y) \\ z \equiv \epsilon \pmod{M}}} \alpha_w \beta_z \gamma(w, z)$$

where $(\alpha_w)_w$ and $(\beta_z)_z$ are sequences of complex numbers bounded in absolute value by 1, δ and ϵ are invertible congruence classes modulo M , t_1 and t_2 are fixed elements of T (so $t_i \mathcal{D}$ is a translate of the fundamental domain) and $X, Y \geq 2$ are real numbers. Here we use the notation $(t_i \mathcal{D})(X)$ for the subset of $\alpha \in t_i \mathcal{D}$ with $N(\alpha) \leq X$. Then we have the following proposition, taken from [5, Prop 4.3].

Proposition 2.1. *Assume $X \leq Y$. Then we have*

$$|B(X, Y, \delta, \epsilon, t_1, t_2)| \ll (X^{-\frac{C_2}{3n}} + Y^{-\frac{1}{6n}}) XY (\log XY)^{C_K},$$

where $n = [K : \mathbb{Q}]$ and C_K is a constant depending only on K . The implied constant depends only on K, M and the constants C_1, C_2 .

The second tool is a theorem on sums of multiplicative functions taken from [4, Theorem 13.2, p. 134].

Theorem 2.2. *Let $Q > 2$ be a parameter and let f be a multiplicative function such that there exists $\alpha \in \mathbb{C}$ with*

$$\sum_{p \leq x} f(p) \log(p) = \alpha x + \mathcal{O}_A \left(\frac{x}{\log(x)^A} \right) \quad (x \geq Q) \quad (2.1)$$

for all $A > 0$. Moreover, suppose for all n that $|f(n)| \leq \tau_k(n)$ for some positive real number k . Fix $\epsilon > 0$ and $J \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$. Then we have

$$\sum_{n \leq x} f(n) = x \sum_{j=0}^{J-1} c_j \frac{\log(x)^{\alpha-j-1}}{\Gamma(\alpha-j)} + \mathcal{O} \left(\frac{x(\log Q)^{2k+J-1}}{(\log x)^{J+1-\text{Re}(\alpha)}} \right)$$

for $x \geq \exp((\log Q)^{1+\epsilon})$ and some explicit constants c_j . The implied constant depends at most on k, J, ϵ and the implied constant in equation (2.1) for A large enough in terms of k, J and ϵ only. Furthermore, we have

$$c_0 = \prod_p \left(1 + \frac{f(p)}{p} + \frac{f(p^2)}{p^2} + \dots \right) \left(1 - \frac{1}{p} \right)^\alpha$$

and $c_j \ll_{j,k} (\log Q)^{j+2k}$.

¹For the number field $\mathbb{Q}[\zeta_3]$ required in Lemma 3.4 V is trivial, hence there is only one choice for \mathcal{D} . The reader may skip looking up [6, Section 3.3].

Remark 2.3. Note that the above theorem is typeset under the convention that “ $\frac{1}{\infty} = 0$ ”. If for example $\alpha \in \mathbb{Z}_{\leq 0}$, then poles of the gamma function appear in the denominator of every summand of the main term. In this case we consider the sum to be empty and the main term to vanish.

3 Proof of the theorem

The proof of the theorem will need four lemmas. Two of the lemmas detect solutions of $\phi_{a,b}$ in \mathbb{Q}_p , the other two lemmas are character oscillation results.

3.1 Lemmas to detect solutions

The following two lemmas answer the question how to detect a solution of $\phi_{a,b}$ in \mathbb{Q}_p . The first lemma implies that for all primes $p \nmid ab$, $\phi_{a,b}$ has a solution in \mathbb{Q}_p , except for the special case $p = 3$. The second lemma states that for primes $p \mid ab$ we can express the solubility of $\phi_{a,b}$ in \mathbb{Q}_p through cubic characters.

Lemma 3.1. *Let (a, b) be any pair of integers with $3 \nmid ab$. Then $\phi_{a,b}$ has a non-zero solution*

i) in \mathbb{Q}_p if $p \nmid ab$ and $p \neq 3$,

ii) in \mathbb{Q}_3 if and only if (a, b) is congruent modulo 27 to an “admissible pair” from the “list of admissible pairs” compiled in the appendix A.

Proof of Lemma 3.1. We first prove statement *i)* for primes $p \geq 11$ and afterwards for the smaller primes. The strategy is to show that $\phi_{a,b}$ has a solution in \mathbb{F}_p that can be lifted to a solution in \mathbb{Z}_p with Hensel’s lemma [1, Theorem 2.1].

For $p \nmid ab$ and $p \geq 11$, $\phi_{a,b}$ is a non-singular cubic curve of genus 1, so we may use the Hasse-Weil bound [7] to infer that there are at least 4 projective solutions over \mathbb{F}_p . For the cubic $\phi_{a,b}$ this implies that there is at least one solution $(x_0, y_0, z_0) \in \mathbb{F}_p^3$ with $z_0 \neq 0$. Pick a lift of this triple $(\tilde{x}, \tilde{y}, \tilde{z}) \in \mathbb{Z}_p$ and define $f(z) := \phi_{a,b}(\tilde{x}, \tilde{y}, z) = a\tilde{x}^3 + b\tilde{y}^3 - z^3 \in \mathbb{Z}_p[z]$. Note that by definition $f(z)$ reduces to $\phi_{a,b}(x_0, y_0, z)$ in \mathbb{F}_p , so we have $z_0 \not\equiv 0 \pmod{p}$, $f(z_0) \equiv 0 \pmod{p}$ and $f'(z_0) = -3z_0^2 \not\equiv 0 \pmod{p}$. Thus we may apply Hensel’s lemma [1, Thm 2.1] to lift z_0 to a non-zero solution of $f(z) = \phi_{a,b}(\tilde{x}, \tilde{y}, z)$ in \mathbb{Z}_p .

If $p \nmid ab$ and $p = 2, 5, 7$, proving that $\phi_{a,b}$ has a solution in \mathbb{Q}_p is similar. Instead of the Hasse-Weil bound, we use a small computer program (code in Appendix A) to check all possible values of $x, y, z \in \mathbb{F}_p$ until we find a solution of $\phi_{a,b}$ in \mathbb{F}_p . Indeed for all pairs $(a, b) \in \mathbb{F}_p^2$ we find a solution of $\phi_{a,b}$ with at least one non-zero coordinate and it can then be lifted to a solution in \mathbb{Z}_p with Hensel’s lemma similarly to the previous case.

We now turn to statement *ii)*. For a solution in \mathbb{Q}_3 we cannot apply the same version of Hensel’s lemma as in the previous cases, as the derivative of $\phi_{a,b}$ is zero modulo 3. We use a stronger version of Hensel’s lemma for this case and will prove the following: $\phi_{a,b}$ has a solution in \mathbb{Z}_3 if and only if $\phi_{a,b}$ has a solution mod 27 with at least one coordinate not congruent to 0 modulo 3. We will call the pairs (a, b) such that $\phi_{a,b}$ has a solution mod 27 “admissible pairs”.

Suppose $\phi_{a,b}$ has a solution $(x_0, y_0, z_0) \pmod{27}$ with at least one coordinate that is not congruent to 0 mod 3. Assume that $z_0 \not\equiv 0 \pmod{3}$, in the other cases the argument works analogously. Lift the triple (x_0, y_0, z_0) to $(\tilde{x}, \tilde{y}, \tilde{z}) \in \mathbb{Z}_3$ and define $f(z) := \phi_{a,b}(\tilde{x}, \tilde{y}, z) =$

$a\tilde{x}^3 + b\tilde{y}^3 - z^3 \in \mathbb{Z}_3[z]$. Then z_0 is a solution mod 27 of $f(z) \equiv ax_0^3 + by_0^3 - z^3 \pmod{27}$ (and also mod 3). Using these properties of z_0 , we obtain $|f(z_0)|_3 \leq \frac{1}{27} < \frac{1}{9} = |3z_0|_3^2 = |f'(z_0)|_3^2$. Thus we may apply a stronger version of Hensel's lemma [1, Thm 4.1] to lift the solution z_0 from \mathbb{F}_3 to a solution of $f(z)$ in \mathbb{Z}_3 .

Conversely, if $\phi_{a,b}$ has a solution in \mathbb{Z}_3 we may scale it by a power of 3 such that all coordinates have non-negative valuation but at least one them has valuation 0. The scaled triple remains a solution of $\phi_{a,b}$ because $\phi_{a,b}$ is homogeneous. The triple then reduces to a solution of $\phi_{a,b} \pmod{27}$ and the coordinate with valuation 0 is not congruent to 0 mod 3. \square

In the appendix A we have compiled a “list of admissible pairs”. $\phi_{a,b}$ has a solution mod 27 with one coordinate not congruent to 0 mod 3 if and only if (a, b) is congruent modulo 27 to one of the pairs given in that list. The list was compiled with a computer program that simply iterates through all possible values of $x, y, z \pmod{27}$ until it finds a solution to $\phi_{a,b}(x, y, z) = ax^3 + by^3 - z^3$ that meets the requirement.

Lemma 3.2. *i) Let (a, b) be a pair of coprime, square-free integers with $3 \nmid ab$.*

For all primes $p \equiv 2 \pmod{3}$ with $p \mid ab$, $\phi_{a,b}$ has a solution in \mathbb{Q}_p .

ii) For all primes $p \equiv 1 \pmod{3}$ we can construct a cubic character χ_p of modulus p that satisfies the following:

Let (a, b) be a pair of coprime, square-free integers with $3 \nmid ab$. If $p \mid a$, we have

$$\frac{1}{3}(1 + \chi_p(b) + \chi_p^2(b)) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \phi_{a,b} \text{ has a non-zero solution in } \mathbb{Q}_p \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Analogously if $p \mid b$,

$$\frac{1}{3}(1 + \chi_p(a) + \chi_p^2(a)) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \phi_{a,b} \text{ has a non-zero solution in } \mathbb{Q}_p \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Proof of Lemma 3.2. Let (a, b) be a pair of coprime, square-free integers with $3 \nmid ab$. Assume for this proof that $p \mid a$ and thus by co-primality that $p \nmid b$. The analogue argument works for $p \mid b, p \nmid a$. We will first show that $\phi_{a,b}$ has a solution (x_1, y_1, z_1) in \mathbb{Q}_p if and only if $\phi_{a,b} \equiv by^3 - z^3 \pmod{p}$ has a solution (x_0, y_0, z_0) in \mathbb{F}_p that is not one of the trivial solutions $(x_0, 0, 0)$. Afterwards we will give criteria for the existence of a non-trivial solution mod p and construct the cubic character χ_p .

If $\phi_{a,b}$ has a solution (x_1, y_1, z_1) in \mathbb{Q}_p , we can assume that - after scaling by a power of p - the valuations of x_1, y_1, z_1 are non-negative but at least one valuation is zero. Furthermore comparing the valuations of the terms on both sides of the equation $ax_1^3 + by_1^3 - z_1^3 = 0$ shows that at least one of y_1 and z_1 need to have valuation zero. Thus (x_1, y_1, z_1) reduces to a non-trivial solution of $\phi_{a,b} \equiv by^3 - z^3 \pmod{p}$.

Conversely if $\phi_{a,b} \equiv by^3 - z^3 \pmod{p}$ has a solution (x_0, y_0, z_0) in \mathbb{F}_p with $y_0 \neq 0$ or $z_0 \neq 0$, it can be lifted to \mathbb{Z}_p with Hensel's Lemma [1, Thm 2.1], as in the proof of *i)* in the previous lemma.

In \mathbb{F}_p , $\phi_{a,b}(x, y, z) \equiv by^3 - z^3$ has a non-trivial solution (a solution that is not of the form $(x_0, 0, 0)$) $\iff z^3 = by^3$ has a solution in \mathbb{F}_p with $z \neq 0 \iff b$ is a cube in \mathbb{F}_p . For primes

$p \equiv 2 \pmod{3}$ this is always the case because for these primes cubing is an isomorphism of \mathbb{F}_p . This proves *i*). For primes $p \equiv 1 \pmod{3}$ we will construct a cubic character χ_p which satisfies

$$\begin{cases} \chi_p(b) = 1, & \text{if } b \text{ is a cube mod } p \\ \chi_p(b) \in \{\zeta_3, \zeta_3^2\}, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (3.1)$$

Then $\frac{1}{3}(1 + \chi_p(b) + \chi_p^2(b))$ is the indicator function of “ b is a cube modulo p ”, i.e. of “ $\phi_{a,b}$ has a solution in \mathbb{Q}_p ”.

For primes $p \equiv 1 \pmod{3}$ there are exactly two characters that satisfy the conditions in (3.1) and they can be constructed as follows. The multiplicative group $G := \mathbb{F}_p^*$ is a cyclic group of order $3k$ and thus has a subgroup H of index 3 (if g generates G , then g^3 is a generator of H). The coset $1 \cdot H$ in G/H contains all cubes modulo p and thus we may define a character that maps elements of H to $1 \in \mathbb{C}$ and the elements of the other two cosets to ζ_3 and ζ_3^2 respectively. The two characters obtained this way are of order 3, conductor p and complex conjugates of each other. \square

3.2 Lemmas on sums of characters

As just shown in the proof above, there are precisely two characters for each prime $p \equiv 1 \pmod{3}$ that satisfy property *ii*) of Lemma 3.2. We now make a choice among these two for the rest of this paper.

Any prime $p \equiv 1 \pmod{3}$ splits completely in $\mathbb{Q}[\zeta_3] = \mathbb{Q}[\frac{-1+\sqrt{-3}}{2}] = \mathbb{Q}[\sqrt{-3}]$, i.e. $p = \pi_p \overline{\pi_p}$ with $\pi_p \in \mathbb{Z}[\zeta_3]$ prime and $\text{im}(\pi_p) > 0$. Note that the 3rd power residue symbols

$$\left(\frac{\cdot}{\pi_p}\right)_{\mathbb{Z}[\zeta_3],3} \quad \text{and} \quad \left(\frac{\cdot}{\overline{\pi_p}}\right)_{\mathbb{Z}[\zeta_3],3}$$

are cubic characters when interpreted as a function in the top argument and restricted to the rational integers. Furthermore these cubic characters have modulus p , map integers that are cubes modulo p to 1 and are distinct. We conclude that on the rational integers, these two power residue symbols correspond to the two possible choices for χ_p above.

Definition 3.3. For rational primes $p \equiv 1 \pmod{3}$ define χ_p to be the cubic character

$$\chi_p(\cdot) := \left(\frac{\cdot}{\pi_p}\right)_{\mathbb{Z}[\zeta_3],3} : \mathbb{Z} \mapsto \mathbb{C}.$$

Here $(\frac{\cdot}{\cdot})_{\mathbb{Z}[\zeta_3],3}$ is the 3rd power residue symbol and $\pi_p \in \mathbb{Z}[\zeta_3]$ is the prime over $p = \pi_p \overline{\pi_p}$ with $\text{im}(\pi_p) > 0$. Note that χ_p satisfies *ii*) of Lemma 3.2.

Multiplicatively extend the above definition to square-free integers whose prime factors are all equivalent to 1 mod 3, i.e. for square-free $d \in \mathbb{Z}$ with $p \mid d \implies p \equiv 1 \pmod{3}$, define

$$\pi_d := \prod_{p \mid d} \pi_p \quad \text{and} \quad \chi_d := \prod_{p \mid d} \chi_p$$

in the same way that the power residue symbol can be extended

$$\chi_d(\cdot) = \left(\frac{\cdot}{\pi_d}\right)_{\mathbb{Z}[\zeta_3],3} := \prod_{p \mid d} \left(\frac{\cdot}{\pi_p}\right)_{\mathbb{Z}[\zeta_3],3}.$$

Lastly we ease notation a bit and simply write $(\frac{\cdot}{\cdot})_3$ for the cubic power residue symbol.

For the proof of the main theorem we need character oscillation results. The first such result is a “double oscillation result”, derived from Proposition 2.1.

Lemma 3.4. *Let $s, t \in \{0, 1, 2\}$ but $(s, t) \neq (0, 0)$. Then there exist constants $0 < \kappa_1 < 1$ and $\kappa_2 > 0$ such that*

$$\left| \sum_{\substack{1 < d \leq A \\ p|d \implies \\ p \equiv 1 \pmod{3}}} \sum_{\substack{1 < e \leq B \\ p|e \implies \\ p \equiv 1 \pmod{3}}} \alpha_d \beta_e \chi_d(e)^s \chi_e(d)^t \right| \ll (A^{-\kappa_1} + B^{-\kappa_1}) AB (\log AB)^{\kappa_2}$$

where α_d, β_e are non-zero complex numbers with absolute value bounded by one, that may depend on d and e respectively.

Remark 3.5. *Intuitively the values of non trivial characters seem to oscillate randomly as one varies the argument, thus summing a wide range of characters over a wide range of arguments (that are not chosen in an overly picky manner) should lead to some cancellation. The above lemma is a result quantifying this intuition for the special case that we need.*

Proof of Lemma 3.4. As remarked before this result derives from Proposition 2.1. We replace the Dirichlet characters by the respective power residue symbols.

$$\chi_d(e)^s \chi_e(d)^t = \left(\frac{e}{\pi_d} \right)_3^s \left(\frac{d}{\pi_e} \right)_3^t = \left(\frac{N(\pi_e)}{\pi_d} \right)_3^s \left(\frac{N(\pi_d)}{\pi_e} \right)_3^t$$

Here $N(\cdot)$ denotes the norm in $\mathbb{Q}[\zeta_3]$. We now choose the correct setup to apply Proposition 2.1. Let $K = \mathbb{Q}[\zeta_3]$ and $\mathcal{O}_K = \mathbb{Z}[\zeta_3]$ the ring of integers. Recall that $\mathbb{Z}[\zeta_3]$ is a PID, in which rational primes equivalent to 1 modulo 3 split, rational primes equivalent to 2 modulo 3 are inert and $3 = (1 - \zeta_3)(1 - \zeta_3^2)$. As a consequence $N(z) \equiv 1 \pmod{3}$ for all primes except $1 - \zeta_3$, i.e. the 3rd power residue symbol is defined on all elements coprime to 3. Furthermore the ring of integers is a lattice with 6 units, $\{\pm 1, \pm \zeta_3, \pm \zeta_3^2\}$. Let $l = 3$, $M = 27$, let A_{bad} be the set of squarefull integers and let $S_{27\mathcal{O}_K}$ denote the set of elements in \mathcal{O}_K that are coprime to $M\mathcal{O}_K = 27\mathcal{O}_K$. In other words $S_{27\mathcal{O}_K}$ is the set of integers coprime to 3. Define the following function

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma : S_{27\mathcal{O}_K} \times S_{27\mathcal{O}_K} &\longrightarrow \{0, \zeta_3, \zeta_3^2, 1\} \\ \gamma(w, z) &= \left(\frac{N(z)}{w} \right)_3^s \left(\frac{N(w)}{z} \right)_3^t. \end{aligned}$$

We check that γ , together with the chosen parameters, satisfies the requirements in 2.1.

P1) Multiplicativity: $\gamma(w_1 w_2, z) = \gamma(w_1, z) \gamma(w_2, z)$ and $\gamma(w, z_1 z_2) = \gamma(w, z_1) \gamma(w, z_2)$ follow from the multiplicativity of the norm and the multiplicativity of the power residue symbol in both its arguments.

P2) Periodicity: For $z_1 \equiv z_2 \pmod{N(w)}$ and $z_1 \equiv z_2 \pmod{27}$ we also have $z_1 \equiv z_2 \pmod{w}$, so

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\frac{N(z_1)}{w} \right)_3 \left(\frac{N(w)}{z_1} \right)_3 &= \left(\frac{N(z_1)}{w} \right)_3 \left(\frac{uz_1}{N(w)} \right)_3 \\ &= \left(\frac{N(z_2)}{w} \right)_3 \left(\frac{uz_2}{N(w)} \right)_3 = \left(\frac{N(z_2)}{w} \right)_3 \left(\frac{N(w)}{z_2} \right)_3 \end{aligned}$$

and thus $\gamma(w, z_1) = \gamma(w, z_2)$. We again used multiplicativity of the norm and power residue symbol but now additionally cubic reciprocity. To see why cubic reciprocity may be applied, note that elements coprime to three may be multiplied by units to be primary. Thus in the above chain of equalities u is some unit such that uz_1 is primary. Additionally, the power residue symbol $\left(\frac{N(w)}{z_1}\right)_3$ depends not on z_1 , but the ideal generated by z_1 , and the ideal does not change if the generator is multiplied by a unit.

Furthermore, if $N(w) \notin A_{\text{bad}}$, then we have

$$\sum_{\substack{\xi \bmod MN(w) \\ \gcd(\xi, M) = (1)}} \gamma(w, \xi) = \sum_{\substack{\xi \bmod 27N(w) \\ \gcd(\xi, 27) = (1)}} \left(\frac{N(\xi)}{w}\right)_3^s \left(\frac{N(w)}{\xi}\right)_3^t = 0$$

The latter equality follows immediately from the orthogonality of characters if we can show that

$$\xi \mapsto \left(\frac{N(\xi)}{w}\right)_3^s \left(\frac{N(w)}{\xi}\right)_3^t = \left(\frac{\xi \bar{\xi}}{w}\right)_3^s \left(\frac{w \bar{w}}{\xi}\right)_3^t \quad (3.2)$$

is a nontrivial character on the finite abelian group $\mathcal{O}_K/27N(w)\mathcal{O}_K$. Clearly this is a character (see property P1), what remains is non-triviality. We construct an element $z \in \mathcal{O}_K$ such that the character does not evaluate to 1 at z .

A calculation using cubic reciprocity for units and the prime $1 - \zeta_3$ shows that if $z \equiv 1 \pmod{27}$ and $w \in S_{27\mathcal{O}_K}$ we may use $\left(\frac{z}{w}\right)_3 = \left(\frac{w}{z}\right)_3$ independently of the congruence class of $w \pmod{27}$. Thus we restrict to $z \equiv 1 \pmod{27}$, so we may freely apply cubic reciprocity. We have another useful relation for the third power residue symbol:

$$\left(\left(\frac{x}{y}\right)_3\right)^2 = \overline{\left(\frac{x}{y}\right)_3} = \left(\frac{\bar{x}}{\bar{y}}\right)_3.$$

Using both relations, we rewrite equation (3.2) for $z \equiv 1 \pmod{27}$ as

$$z \mapsto \left(\frac{z}{w}\right)_3^{s+t} \left(\frac{\bar{z}}{w}\right)_3^{2s+t}.$$

Since the linear map $\varphi : \mathbb{F}_3^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_3^2$, given by $(s, t) \mapsto (s + t, 2s + t)$ is invertible, it follows that $(s + t, 2s + t)$ is also not congruent to $(0, 0)$ modulo 3. Hence it suffices to show for every two integers s', t' , not both congruent to 0 modulo 3, that

$$z \mapsto \left(\frac{z}{w}\right)_3^{s'} \left(\frac{\bar{z}}{w}\right)_3^{t'}.$$

is not principal on the subgroup of integers $z \equiv 1 \pmod{27}$.

Recall that we are assuming $N(w) \notin A_{\text{bad}} = \{\text{squarefull integers}\}$, so let p be a prime dividing $N(w)$ with multiplicity one. Then there exists a prime π of $\mathbb{Z}[\zeta_3]$ such that π divides w but $\bar{\pi}$ does not. Write g_1 for an element of $\mathbb{Z}[\zeta_3]/\pi\mathbb{Z}[\zeta_3]$ with $\left(\frac{g_1}{\pi}\right)_3 = \zeta_3$ and write g_2 for an element of $\mathbb{Z}[\zeta_3]/\bar{\pi}\mathbb{Z}[\zeta_3]$ with $\left(\frac{g_2}{\bar{\pi}}\right)_3 = \zeta_3$. By the Chinese remainder theorem, we may find for every two integers c, d some integer z , depending on c and d , that satisfies

$$z \equiv 1 \pmod{27}, \quad z \equiv 1 \pmod{\frac{N(w)}{p}}$$

$$z \equiv g_1^c \pmod{\pi}, \quad z \equiv g_2^d \pmod{\bar{\pi}}.$$

Then the character, evaluated at this choice of z , becomes

$$\left(\frac{z}{w}\right)_3^{s'} \left(\frac{\bar{z}}{w}\right)_3^{t'} = \left(\frac{z}{\pi}\right)_3^{s'} \left(\frac{\bar{z}}{\pi}\right)_3^{t'} \left(\frac{z}{w'}\right)_3^{s'} \left(\frac{\bar{z}}{w'}\right)_3^{t'} = \zeta_3^{s'c} \cdot \zeta_3^{2t'd} = \zeta_3^{s'c+2t'd},$$

where $w := \pi w'$ and $\left(\frac{z}{w'}\right)_3^{s'} \left(\frac{\bar{z}}{w'}\right)_3^{t'} = 1$ because of the condition $z \equiv 1 \pmod{\frac{N(w)}{p}}$. For a good choice of c, d the last expression is not 1 and the proof is finished.

P3) Bad count: $A_{\text{bad}} = \{\text{squarefull integers}\}$ satisfies the required bound with $C_2 = \frac{1}{2}$, if C_1 is sufficiently large (one could choose $C_1 = \zeta(\frac{3}{2})/\zeta(3)$, see [3])

$$\sum_{\substack{n \in A_{\text{bad}} \\ n \leq X}} 1 \leq C_1 X^{1-C_2} \ll X^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

We have checked that γ satisfies all requirements. We continue following the setup of Proposition 2.1.

All units $\mathcal{O}_K^* = \mathbb{Z}[\zeta_3]^* = \{\pm 1, \pm\zeta_3, \pm\zeta_3^2\}$ in $K = \mathbb{Q}[\zeta_3]$ are torsion, hence in a decomposition $\mathbb{Z}[\zeta_3]^* = T \oplus V$ into torsion T and free part V (as in Dirichlet's unit theorem), V is the trivial group. Consequently there is only one choice for a fundamental domain $\mathcal{D} \subseteq \mathcal{O}_K$ for the action of V on \mathcal{O}_K , that is $\mathcal{D} = \mathcal{O}_K$.

We are ready to rewrite the sum and apply Proposition 2.1

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \sum_{\substack{1 < d \leq A \\ p|d \implies \\ p \equiv 1 \pmod{3}}} \sum_{\substack{1 < e \leq B \\ p|e \implies \\ p \equiv 1 \pmod{3}}} \alpha_d \beta_e \chi_d(e)^s \chi_e(d)^t \right| = \left| \sum_{\substack{w \in \mathcal{O}_K \\ 1 < N(w) \leq A}} \sum_{\substack{z \in \mathcal{O}_K \\ 1 < N(z) \leq B}} \alpha'_w \beta'_z \left(\frac{N(z)}{w}\right)_3^s \left(\frac{N(w)}{z}\right)_3^t \right| \\ &= \left| \sum_{\substack{w \in \mathcal{O}_K \\ 1 < N(w) \leq A}} \sum_{\substack{z \in \mathcal{O}_K \\ 1 < N(z) \leq B}} \alpha'_w \beta'_z \gamma(w, z) \right| \leq \sum_{\substack{\delta, \epsilon \pmod{27} \\ \text{invertible}}} \left| \sum_{\substack{w \in \mathcal{O}_K \\ 1 < N(w) \leq A \\ w \equiv \delta \pmod{27}}} \sum_{\substack{z \in \mathcal{O}_K \\ 1 < N(z) \leq B \\ z \equiv \epsilon \pmod{27}}} \alpha'_w \beta'_z \gamma(w, z) \right| \\ &= \sum_{\substack{\delta, \epsilon \pmod{27} \\ \text{invertible}}} |\mathcal{B}(A, B, \delta, \epsilon, 1, 1)| \ll (A^{-\frac{1}{12}} + B^{-\frac{1}{12}}) AB \log(AB)^{\kappa_2}. \end{aligned}$$

Here $\kappa_2 > 0$ is a constant and α'_w, β'_z are complex numbers bounded by one, accounting for α_d, β_e from before and ensuring that the only summands appearing are the same ones as in the original sum. More precisely, α'_w and β'_z also include the indicator functions of “the rational prime factors of $N(w)$ and $N(z)$ are all equivalent to 1 mod 3” and “the imaginary parts of all prime factors of w and z are greater or equal to 0”. \square

The second oscillation result is a “single oscillation result”. It derives from a theorem on sums of multiplicative functions from Koukoulopoulos' book [4, Thm. 13.2, p.134]. It is included in the tools section of this paper, see Theorem 2.2.

Lemma 3.6. *Let $i \in \{1, 2\}$, let $m > 2$, $B > 0$ and $M \geq 1$. Let $0 < d_2, d_3 \leq (\log B)^M$ be coprime, square-free integers, that are only divisible by primes equivalent to 1 mod 3 and not both equal to 1. Then for all $C > 0$*

$$\left| \sum_{\substack{B^{1/m} < e \leq B \\ p|e \implies p \equiv i \pmod{3}}} \mu^2(e) \frac{\chi_{d_2}(e) \chi_{d_3}^2(e)}{3^{\omega(e)}} \right| \ll_{C, m, M} \frac{B}{(\log B)^C}.$$

Furthermore we obtain the same bound if we omit the factor $\frac{1}{3^{\omega(e)}}$,

$$\left| \sum_{\substack{B^{1/m} < e \leq B \\ p|e \implies p \equiv i \pmod{3}}} \mu^2(e) \chi_{d_2}(e) \chi_{d_3}^2(e) \right| \ll_{C,m,M} \frac{B}{(\log B)^C}.$$

Proof of Lemma 3.6. We show how to bound the sum

$$\sum_{\substack{B^{1/m} < e \leq B \\ p|e \implies p \equiv 1 \pmod{3}}} \mu^2(e) \frac{\chi_{d_2}(e) \chi_{d_3}^2(e)}{3^{\omega(e)}},$$

but throughout the proof it will be clear that omitting the factor $\frac{1}{3^{\omega(e)}}$ or changing the summation condition “ $p | e \implies p \equiv 1 \pmod{3}$ ” to “ $p | e \implies p \equiv 2 \pmod{3}$ ” does not change the bound.

As remarked before, the lemma derives from a result on sums of multiplicative functions, Theorem 2.2. We now choose the correct parameters to apply the theorem to our character sum. Let $\alpha = 0, k = 1, Q = \exp((3 \log B)^{\frac{1}{100}})$, J some large integer to be specified later and $\epsilon > 0$ some real number to be specified later. Define the function

$$f(n) = \mu^2(n) \frac{\chi_{d_2}(n) \chi_{d_3}^2(n)}{3^{\omega(n)}} \mathbb{1}_{\{p|n \implies p \equiv 1 \pmod{3}\}}.$$

Note that $f(n)$ is multiplicative and bounded in absolute value by one; in particular $|f(n)| \leq \tau_k(n) = \tau_1(n)$. We want to verify that $f(n)$ satisfies condition (2.1) of 2.2, i.e. we wish to show that for all $A' > 0$ and $x \geq Q$,

$$\sum_{p \leq x} f(p) \log(p) = \mathcal{O}_{A'} \left(\frac{x}{(\log x)^{A'}} \right).$$

So let $x \geq Q$ and $A' > 0$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{p \leq x} f(p) \log(p) &= \sum_{\substack{p \leq x \\ p \equiv 1 \pmod{3}}} \frac{\chi_{d_2}(p) \chi_{d_3}^2(p)}{3} \log p \\ &= \sum_{\substack{b \in (\mathbb{Z}/3d_2d_3\mathbb{Z})^* \\ b \equiv 1 \pmod{3}}} \sum_{\substack{p \leq x \\ p \equiv b \pmod{3d_2d_3}}} \frac{\chi_{d_2}(p) \chi_{d_3}^2(p)}{3} \log p \\ &= \sum_{\substack{b \in (\mathbb{Z}/3d_2d_3\mathbb{Z})^* \\ b \equiv 1 \pmod{3}}} \frac{\chi_{d_2}(b) \chi_{d_3}^2(b)}{3} \sum_{\substack{p \leq x \\ p \equiv b \pmod{3d_2d_3}}} \log p \\ &= \sum_{\substack{b \in (\mathbb{Z}/3d_2d_3\mathbb{Z})^* \\ b \equiv 1 \pmod{3}}} \frac{\chi_{d_2}(b) \chi_{d_3}^2(b)}{3} \left(\frac{x}{\phi(3d_2d_3)} + \mathcal{O} \left(x \exp(-C_N (\log x)^{\frac{1}{2}}) \right) \right). \end{aligned}$$

We applied the Siegel–Walfisz theorem in the last step, defining $N = 200M$ and using that $3d_2d_3 \leq (3 \log B)^{2M} = (\log Q)^{200M} \leq (\log x)^N$. Here $C_N > 0$ is some constant depending on

N , coming from the Siegel–Walfisz theorem. Since d_2, d_3 are coprime and not both equal to 1, $\chi_{d_2}\chi_{d_3}^2$ is not the trivial character. By orthogonality of characters, we get

$$\sum_{\substack{b \in (\mathbb{Z}/3d_2d_3\mathbb{Z})^* \\ b \equiv 1 \pmod{3}}} \frac{\chi_{d_2}(b)\chi_{d_3}^2(b)}{3} = 0,$$

thus

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{p \leq x} f(p) \log(p) &= \mathcal{O}\left(d_2 d_3 x \exp\left(-C_N(\log x)^{\frac{1}{2}}\right)\right) \\ &= \mathcal{O}\left(x \exp\left(-C'_N(\log x)^{\frac{1}{2}}\right)\right) = \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{x}{(\log x)^{A'}}\right). \end{aligned}$$

Note that for $\epsilon = 1$, we have $B \geq \exp((\log Q)^{1+\epsilon}) = \exp((3 \log B)^{\frac{2}{100}})$, so we may apply Theorem 2.2 to our sum as follows

$$\begin{aligned} &\left| \sum_{\substack{B^{1/m} < e \leq B \\ p|e \Rightarrow p \equiv 1 \pmod{3}}} \mu^2(e) \frac{\chi_{d_2}(e)\chi_{d_3}^2(e)}{3^{\omega(e)}} \right| \\ &\leq \left| \sum_{\substack{1 \leq e \leq B \\ p|e \Rightarrow p \equiv 1 \pmod{3}}} \mu^2(e) \frac{\chi_{d_2}(e)\chi_{d_3}^2(e)}{3^{\omega(e)}} \right| + \left| \sum_{\substack{1 \leq e \leq B^{1/m} \\ p|e \Rightarrow p \equiv 1 \pmod{3}}} \mu^2(e) \frac{\chi_{d_2}(e)\chi_{d_3}^2(e)}{3^{\omega(e)}} \right| \\ &\leq \left| \sum_{e \leq B} f(e) \right| + B^{1/m} = \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{B(\log Q)^{J+1}}{(\log B)^{J+1}}\right) + B^{1/m}. \end{aligned}$$

In the last step we used Theorem 2.2 with the parameters specified at the start of the proof and importantly followed the convention in Remark 2.3. To end the proof, we check that the above bound is as strong as required in the lemma,

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathcal{O}\left(\frac{B(\log Q)^{J+1}}{(\log B)^{J+1}}\right) + B^{1/m} = \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{B((3 \log B)^{\frac{J+1}{100}})}{(\log B)^{J+1}}\right) + B^{1/m} \\ &= \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{B}{(\log B)^{\frac{99}{100}(J+1)}}\right) = \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{B}{(\log B)^C}\right), \end{aligned}$$

where J is chosen large enough in terms of C . Closer inspection of the proof and the statements of Siegel–Walfisz and Theorem 2.2 reveals that the implied constant depends at most on C , m and M . \square

3.3 Proof of Theorem 1.1

The larger idea of the proof is to rewrite $N(A, B)$ as a sum over cubic characters, split the sum into several ranges and then apply character summation results. The main term will come from the case where all characters are principal.

We rewrite $N(A, B)$. Observe that Lemma 3.1 and Lemma 3.2 imply that for “admissible” pairs (a, b) of coprime, square-free integers, not divisible by three, $\phi_{a,b}$ is locally soluble

everywhere except possibly at primes that satisfy $p \mid ab$ and $p \equiv 1 \pmod{3}$. Furthermore Lemma 3.2 provides an indicator function for “ $\phi_{a,b}$ has a solution in \mathbb{Q}_p ” for such primes

$$\begin{aligned} N(A, B) &= \sum_{\substack{a \leq A, b \leq B \\ \gcd(ab, 3) = 1, \gcd(a, b) = 1 \\ a, b \text{ square-free} \\ (a, b) \text{ admissible pair}}} \mathbb{1}_{\{\phi_{a,b} \text{ is locally soluble everywhere}\}} \\ &= \sum_{\substack{a \leq A, b \leq B \\ (a, b) \text{ admissible pair}}} \mu^2(3ab) \prod_{\substack{p \mid a \\ p \equiv 1 \pmod{3}}} \frac{1}{3} (1 + \chi_p(b) + \chi_p^2(b)) \prod_{\substack{p \mid b \\ p \equiv 1 \pmod{3}}} \frac{1}{3} (1 + \chi_p(a) + \chi_p^2(a)). \end{aligned}$$

We collect the prime factors of a and b into new variables, according to their residue class mod 3. Define $a = a_1 a_2$ and $b = b_1 b_2$, where

$$\begin{cases} p \mid a_1 b_1 \implies p \equiv 1 \pmod{3}, \\ p \mid a_2 b_2 \implies p \equiv 2 \pmod{3}. \end{cases}$$

For improved readability collect the summation conditions into the “ \flat ” symbol:

$$\sum_{\substack{a_1 a_2 \leq A, b_1 b_2 \leq B \\ (a_1 a_2, b_1 b_2) \text{ is an admissible pair} \\ p \mid a_i b_i \implies p \equiv i \pmod{3} \text{ for } i \in \{1, 2\}}} := \sum_{\substack{a_1 a_2 \leq A \\ b_1 b_2 \leq B \\ \flat}}.$$

With the new notation and variable names we have

$$\begin{aligned} N(A, B) &= \sum_{\substack{a_1 a_2 \leq A \\ b_1 b_2 \leq B \\ \flat}} \frac{\mu^2(3a_1 a_2 b_1 b_2)}{3^{\omega(a_1 b_1)}} \prod_{p \mid a_1} (1 + \chi_p(b_1 b_2) + \chi_p^2(b_1 b_2)) \prod_{p \mid b_1} (1 + \chi_p(a_1 a_2) + \chi_p^2(a_1 a_2)) \\ &= \sum_{\substack{a_1 a_2 \leq A \\ b_1 b_2 \leq B \\ \flat}} \frac{\mu^2(3a_1 a_2 b_1 b_2)}{3^{\omega(a_1 b_1)}} \sum_{d_1 d_2 d_3 = a_1} \chi_{d_2}(b_1 b_2) \chi_{d_3}^2(b_1 b_2) \sum_{e_1 e_2 e_3 = b_1} \chi_{e_2}(a_1 a_2) \chi_{e_3}^2(a_1 a_2) \\ &= \sum_{\substack{d_1 d_2 d_3 a_2 \leq A \\ e_1 e_2 e_3 b_2 \leq B \\ \flat}} \frac{\mu^2(3d_1 d_2 d_3 a_2 e_1 e_2 e_3 b_2)}{3^{\omega(d_1 d_2 d_3 e_1 e_2 e_3)}} \chi_{d_2}(e_1 e_2 e_3 b_2) \chi_{d_3}^2(e_1 e_2 e_3 b_2) \chi_{e_2}(d_1 d_2 d_3 a_2) \chi_{e_3}^2(d_1 d_2 d_3 a_2). \end{aligned} \tag{3.3}$$

Note that we implicitly also replaced a_1 with $d_1 d_2 d_3$ and b_1 with $e_1 e_2 e_3$ in the summation conditions \flat .

The “big character sum” (3.3) is of the right type to apply oscillation results. In what follows we will call the summation variables d_2, d_3, e_2, e_3 “indices”, because they appear in the indices of the characters $\chi_{d_2}, \chi_{d_3}, \chi_{e_2}, \chi_{e_3}$. Throughout the proof we use a parameter V (that will be chosen as a large power of $(\log AB)$ at the end of the proof) to partition the range of summation in (3.3). There are four cases: With the first and second case, we deal with all summation ranges where at least one of the indices is larger than V . The third case covers the ranges where all indices are smaller than V , but not all characters are trivial. In the fourth case all indices are equal to one, i.e. all characters are trivial, and we obtain the

main term of the theorem. All cases except the fourth are bounded such that they fit into the error term.

For the first case assume that at least one index (one of the variables d_2, d_3, e_2, e_3) in (3.3) is larger than V , say $d_2 > V$, and that at least one of the variables inside the argument of the respective character is larger than V , say $e_1 > V$. To clarify, there are 12 “sub-cases” of case one, i.e. 12 ranges of summation that may all be bounded in the same way. We choose to show the argument for the “sub-case” $d_2 > V, e_1 > V$. We apply the triangle inequality to isolate χ_{d_2} and use Lemma 3.4 to obtain the following contribution to $N(A, B)$,

$$\begin{aligned}
|N(A, B)_{d_2 > V, e_1 > V}| &\leq \sum_{\substack{d_1 d_3 a_2 \leq A \\ e_2 e_3 b_2 \leq B \\ b}} \left| \sum_{\substack{V < d_2 \leq \frac{A}{d_1 d_3 a_2} \\ V < e_1 \leq \frac{B}{e_2 e_3 b_2} \\ b}} \frac{\mu^2(3d_1 d_2 d_3 a_2 e_1 e_2 e_3 b_2)}{3^{\omega(d_1 d_2 d_3 e_1 e_2 e_3)}} \chi_{d_2}(e_1 e_2 e_3 b_2) \right| \\
&\leq \sum_{\substack{d_1 d_3 a_2 \leq A \\ e_2 e_3 b_2 \leq B \\ b}} \frac{\mu^2(d_1 d_3 a_2 e_2 e_3 b_2)}{3^{\omega(d_1 d_3 e_2 e_3)}} \left| \sum_{\substack{V < d_2 \leq \frac{A}{d_1 d_3 a_2} \\ V < e_1 \leq \frac{B}{e_2 e_3 b_2} \\ b}} \alpha_{d_2} \beta_{e_1} \chi_{d_2}(e_1) \right| \\
&\ll \sum_{\substack{d_1 d_3 a_2 \leq A \\ e_2 e_3 b_2 \leq B \\ b}} \frac{\mu^2(d_1 d_3 a_2 e_2 e_3 b_2)}{3^{\omega(d_1 d_3 e_2 e_3)}} \frac{A}{d_1 d_3 a_2} \frac{B}{e_1 e_3 b_2} \left(\left(\frac{A}{d_1 d_3 a_2} \right)^{-\kappa_1} + \left(\frac{B}{e_1 e_3 b_2} \right)^{-\kappa_1} \right) \log(AB)^{\kappa_2} \\
&\ll \frac{AB \log(AB)^{\kappa_2}}{V^{\kappa_1}} \sum_{\substack{d_1 d_3 a_2 \leq A \\ e_2 e_3 b_2 \leq B \\ b}} \frac{1}{3^{\omega(d_1 d_3 e_2 e_3)}} \frac{\mu^2(d_1 d_3 a_2 e_2 e_3 b_2)}{d_1 d_3 a_2 e_1 e_3 b_2},
\end{aligned}$$

where α_{d_2} and β_{e_1} are complex numbers with absolute values ≤ 1 , absorbing the summation condition “admissible pair”, the factor $\frac{1}{3^{\omega(d_2 e_1)}} \chi_{d_2}(e_2 e_3 b_2)$ and the fact that e_1, d_2 are square-free.

To evaluate the last sum, remember that the remaining summation conditions are $p \mid d_1 d_3 e_2 e_3 \implies p \equiv 1 \pmod{3}$ and $p \mid a_2 b_2 \implies p \equiv 2 \pmod{3}$. We make two variable substitutions, $m := d_1 d_3 e_2 e_3$ and $n := a_2 b_2$,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{\substack{d_1 d_3 a_2 \leq A \\ e_2 e_3 b_2 \leq B \\ b}} \frac{1}{3^{\omega(d_1 d_3 e_2 e_3)}} \frac{\mu^2(d_1 d_3 a_2 e_2 e_3 b_2)}{d_1 d_3 a_2 e_1 e_3 b_2} \leq \sum_{\substack{m \leq AB \\ n \leq AB \\ b}} \frac{4^{\omega(m)} 2^{\omega(n)} \mu^2(mn)}{3^{\omega(m)} mn} \\
&\leq \sum_{\substack{m \leq AB \\ p \mid m \implies p \equiv 1 \pmod{3}}} \left(\frac{4}{3} \right)^{\omega(m)} \frac{\mu^2(m)}{m} \sum_{\substack{n \leq AB \\ p \mid n \implies p \equiv 2 \pmod{3}}} \frac{\mu^2(n)}{n} \ll (\log AB)^{\frac{4}{3}} (\log AB),
\end{aligned}$$

where in the last step we used that $f(m) := \left(\frac{4}{3}\right)^{\omega(m)} \mu^2(m)$ is a multiplicative function, thus $\sum_{m \leq AB} \frac{f(m)}{m} \leq \prod_{p \leq AB} \left(1 + \frac{f(p)}{p} + \frac{f(p^2)}{p^2} + \dots\right) = \prod_{p \leq AB} \left(1 + \frac{4}{3p}\right) \ll \prod_{p \leq AB} \left(1 + \frac{1}{p}\right)^{\frac{4}{3}} \ll (\log AB)^{\frac{4}{3}}$. Overall for the sub-case $d_2 > V, e_1 > V$ and all analogous sub-cases we get a contribution to $N(A, B)$ of

$$\mathcal{O}\left(\frac{AB(\log AB)^{\kappa_2 + \frac{7}{3}}}{V^{\kappa_1}}\right). \tag{3.4}$$

For the second case, assume that one of the indices in (3.3) is larger than V but none of the variables in the argument of that character are larger than V . We will show the sub-case that $d_2 > V$ and $e_1, e_2, e_3, b_2 \leq V$, but our argument works the same for the other sub-cases. We use the triangle inequality and bound trivially

$$\begin{aligned}
|N(A, B)_{\substack{d_2 > V \\ e_1, e_2, e_3, b_2 \leq V}}| &\leq \sum_{\substack{e_1 e_2 e_3 b_2 \leq B \\ e_1, e_2, e_3, b_2 \leq V}} \sum_{\substack{d_1 d_2 d_3 a_2 \leq A \\ b}} \frac{\mu^2(3d_1 d_2 d_3 a_2 e_1 e_2 e_3 b_2)}{3^{\omega(d_1 d_2 d_3 e_1 e_2 e_3)}} \\
&\leq V^4 \sum_{\substack{d_1 d_2 d_3 a_2 \leq A \\ p|d_1 d_2 d_3 \implies p \equiv 1 \pmod{3} \\ p|a_2 \implies p \equiv 2 \pmod{3}}} \frac{\mu^2(d_1 d_2 d_3 a_2)}{3^{\omega(d_1 d_2 d_3)}} \\
&= V^4 \sum_{n \leq A} \mu^2(n) \\
&\leq V^4 A.
\end{aligned}$$

For all four analogous sub-cases where one of the indices is large, but none of the respective arguments, we get a contribution to $N(A, B)$ of

$$\mathcal{O}(V^4 A + V^4 B). \quad (3.5)$$

With the previous two cases we have fully dealt with the summation ranges where at least one of the indices in the big character sum (3.3) is large. We now turn to the summation range where all indices are small, i.e. $d_2, d_3, e_2, e_3 \leq V$.

For the third case assume that $d_2, d_3, e_2, e_3 \leq V$, but not $d_2 = d_3 = e_2 = e_3 = 1$, i.e. that at least one index is larger than one. We choose $1 < d_2 \leq V$, but there are four equivalent sub-cases. We want to apply a single oscillation result 3.6 to the character $\chi_{d_2}(e_1 e_2 e_3 b_2)$. More specifically we would like to apply it to a sum of the form $\sum_{e_1 \leq \frac{B}{e_2 e_3 b_2}} \frac{\chi_{d_2}(e_1)}{3^{\omega(e_1)}}$ to obtain a $\log\left(\frac{B}{e_2 e_3 b_2}\right)^{-C}$ saving compared to the trivial bound. If no further restrictions are placed on e_1 , the $\log\left(\frac{B}{e_2 e_3 b_2}\right)^{-C}$ saving becomes poor when $e_2 e_3 b_2$ is close to B . Thus we need to divide the third case into two further ranges: one where $e_1, b_2 \leq B^{1/k}$ (call this case 3a) and one where $e_1 > B^{1/k}$ or $b_2 > B^{1/k}$ (call this case 3b). Here k is some integer greater than 2 that can be chosen later for convenience ($k = 4$ works for example).

So we turn to case 3a, i.e. we assume $d_2, d_3, e_2, e_3 \leq V$, $d_2 > 1$, $b_2, e_1 \leq B^{1/k}$. Then we may bound trivially, similarly to case 2:

$$\begin{aligned}
|N(A, B)_{\substack{d_2, d_3, e_2, e_3 \leq V \\ d_2 > 1 \\ e_1, b_2 \leq B^{1/k}}}| &\leq \sum_{\substack{e_1 e_2 e_3 b_2 \leq B \\ e_1, b_2 \leq B^{1/k} \\ e_2, e_3 \leq V}} \sum_{\substack{d_1 d_2 d_3 a_2 \leq A \\ b}} \frac{\mu^2(3d_1 d_2 d_3 a_2 e_1 e_2 e_3 b_2)}{3^{\omega(d_1 d_2 d_3 e_1 e_2 e_3)}} \\
&\leq B^{2/k} V^2 \sum_{\substack{d_1 d_2 d_3 a_2 \leq A \\ p|d_1 d_2 d_3 \implies p \equiv 1 \pmod{3} \\ p|a_2 \implies p \equiv 2 \pmod{3}}} \frac{\mu^2(d_1 d_2 d_3 a_2)}{3^{\omega(d_1 d_2 d_3)}} \\
&\leq B^{2/k} V^2 \sum_{n \leq A} \mu^2(n)
\end{aligned}$$

$$\leq B^{2/k} V^2 A.$$

For all cases analogous to 3a, we get a contribution to $N(A, B)$ of

$$\mathcal{O}\left(ABV^2\left(A^{\frac{2-k}{k}} + B^{\frac{2-k}{k}}\right)\right). \quad (3.6)$$

We turn to case 3b, i.e. we assume $d_2, d_3, e_2, e_3 \leq V$, $d_2 > 1$ and that at least one of b_2, e_1 is larger than $B^{1/k}$. We choose to show the argument for $e_1 > B^{1/k}$, but Lemma 3.6 is flexible enough to deal with the slightly different sub-case $b_2 > B^{1/k}$ in just the same way. Let $C > 0$ be a parameter to be chosen later. Then we have,

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| N(A, B)_{\substack{d_2, d_3, e_2, e_3 \leq V \\ d_2 > 1 \\ e_1 > B^{1/k}}} \right| \\ & \leq \sum_{\substack{d_1 d_2 d_3 a_2 \leq A \\ e_2 e_3 b_2 \leq B \\ d_3, e_2, e_3 \leq V \\ 1 < d_2 \leq V \\ \mathfrak{b}}} \frac{\mu^2(3d_1 d_2 d_3 a_2 e_2 e_3 b_2)}{3^{\omega(d_1 d_2 d_3 e_2 e_3)}} \left| \sum_{\substack{B^{1/k} < e_1 \leq \frac{B}{e_2 e_3 b_2} \\ p|e_1 \implies p \equiv 1 \pmod{3}}} \mu^2(e_1) \frac{\chi_{d_2}(e_1) \chi_{d_3}^2(e_1)}{3^{\omega(e_1)}} \right| \\ & \ll_C \sum_{\substack{d_1 d_2 d_3 a_2 \leq A \\ \mathfrak{b}}} \sum_{\substack{e_2 e_3 b_2 \leq B \\ \mathfrak{b}}} \frac{\mu^2(3d_1 d_2 d_3 a_2 e_2 e_3 b_2)}{3^{\omega(d_1 d_2 d_3)} 3^{\omega(e_2 e_3)}} \frac{B}{e_2 e_3 b_2} (\log(B^{1/k}))^{-C} \\ & \ll_C \frac{B}{(\log B)^C} \sum_{\substack{d_1 d_2 d_3 a_2 \leq A \\ \mathfrak{b}}} \frac{\mu^2(3d_1 d_2 d_3 a_2)}{3^{\omega(d_1 d_2 d_3)}} \sum_{\substack{e_2 e_3 b_2 \leq B \\ \mathfrak{b}}} \frac{\mu^2(3e_2 e_3 b_2)}{3^{\omega(e_2 e_3)}} \frac{1}{e_2 e_3 b_2} \\ & \ll_C \frac{B}{(\log B)^C} \sum_{m \leq A} \sum_{n \leq B} \frac{1}{n} \\ & \ll_C \frac{AB}{(\log B)^{C-1}}. \end{aligned}$$

Here we applied Lemma 3.6 to evaluate the character sum in the second line and used that $B^{1/k} < \frac{B}{e_2 e_3 b_2}$, hence $\log(B^{1/k})^{-C} > \log\left(\frac{B}{e_2 e_3 b_2}\right)^{-C}$. Note that in the second line, d_2, d_3 are bounded by a large power of $\log B$ as required in Lemma 3.6 because of the assumption that $A, B \geq \exp((\log AB)^\delta)$ and the fact that V is a power of $\log AB$ (yet to be chosen). For all sub-cases analogous to 3b we get a contribution to $N(A, B)$ of

$$\mathcal{O}\left(ABV^2\left(\frac{1}{(\log A)^{C-1}} + \frac{1}{(\log B)^{C-1}}\right)\right). \quad (3.7)$$

This leaves us with the fourth and last range of summation, the range where $d_2 = d_3 = e_2 = e_3 = 1$, i.e. all characters in the big character sum (3.3) are trivial. This range constitutes the main contribution to $N(A, B)$.

For the fourth case, assume $d_2 = d_3 = e_2 = e_3 = 1$. Then the big character sum simplifies to

$$N(A, B)_{\substack{d_2=d_3=1 \\ e_2=e_3=1}} = \sum_{\substack{d_1 a_2 \leq A \\ e_1 b_2 \leq B \\ \mathfrak{b}}} \frac{\mu^2(3d_1 a_2 e_1 b_2)}{3^{\omega(d_1 e_1)}} = \sum_{m \leq A} \frac{\mu^2(3m)}{3^{\omega_1(m)}} \sum_{\substack{n \leq B \\ (m, n) \text{ admissible}}} \frac{\mu^2(3mn)}{3^{\omega_1(n)}}$$

$$= \sum_{m \leq A} g(m) \sum_{\substack{n \leq B \\ (m,n) \text{ admissible}}} g_m(n). \quad (3.8)$$

Here we defined $\omega_1(n)$ to be the function that counts the number of prime divisors of n which are congruent to 1 mod 3, $\omega_1(n) := \#\{p \text{ prime} : p \equiv 1 \pmod{3} \text{ and } p \mid n\}$. Furthermore we define the functions

$$g_m(n) := \frac{\mu^2(3mn)}{3^{\omega_1(n)}} \quad \text{and} \quad g(m) := \frac{\mu^2(3m)}{3^{\omega_1(m)}}$$

and note that they are multiplicative. In order to evaluate the sum (3.8), we want to apply a theorem on sums of multiplicative functions, Theorem 2.2. But in order to apply the theorem we first have to deal with the summation condition “ (m, n) admissible”, which is not multiplicative.

Denote by $G = (\mathbb{Z}/27\mathbb{Z})^*$ the multiplicative group modulo 27 and by $\widehat{G} = (\widehat{\mathbb{Z}/27\mathbb{Z}})^*$ the group of characters modulo 27. Using orthogonality of characters, we may express the indicator function of a pair (m, n) being admissible as follows,

$$\mathbf{1}_{\{(m,n) \text{ admissible}\}} = \frac{1}{\phi(27)^2} \sum_{\substack{\delta, \epsilon \pmod{27} \\ (\delta, \epsilon) \text{ admissible}}} \sum_{\chi, \chi' \in G} \chi(\delta^{-1}m) \chi'(\epsilon^{-1}n).$$

We use this expression to rewrite (3.8)

$$\begin{aligned} N(A, B)_{\substack{d_2=d_3=1 \\ e_2=e_3=1}} &= \sum_{m \leq A} g(m) \sum_{\substack{n \leq B \\ (m,n) \text{ admissible}}} g_m(n) \\ &= \frac{1}{\phi(27)^2} \sum_{\substack{\delta, \epsilon \pmod{27} \\ (\delta, \epsilon) \text{ admissible}}} \sum_{\chi, \chi' \in G} \chi(\delta^{-1}) \chi'(\epsilon^{-1}) \sum_{m \leq A} \chi(m) g(m) \sum_{n \leq B} \chi'(n) g_m(n). \end{aligned} \quad (3.9)$$

The sum $\sum_{n \leq B} \chi'(n) g_m(n)$ is now of the right shape for an application of Theorem 2.2, so we check that the multiplicative function $\chi'(n) g_m(n)$ satisfies the requirement (2.1) for any choice of χ' and m . There are three possibilities we treat separately;

- i) χ' is the trivial character,
- ii) χ' is non-trivial on G but trivial on the index two subgroup $H = \{z \in G : z \equiv 1 \pmod{3}\}$,
- iii) χ' is non-trivial on H .

i) If χ' is the trivial character, we show that $\chi'(n) g_m(n) = g_m(n)$ satisfies condition (2.1) with parameters $\alpha = 2/3$, $k = 1$, $J = 2$, $Q = \exp((\log B)^{\frac{1}{100}})$, $\epsilon = 1$. For all $x \geq Q$ and all $A' > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{p \leq x} \chi'(p) g_m(p) \log p &= \sum_{\substack{p \leq x \\ p \equiv 1 \pmod{3}}} \frac{1}{3} \log p + \sum_{\substack{p \leq x \\ p \equiv 2 \pmod{3}}} \log p - \sum_{p \mid m} \frac{1}{3^{\omega_1(p)}} \log p \\ &= \frac{1}{3} \cdot \frac{1}{\phi(3)} x + \frac{1}{\phi(3)} x + \mathcal{O}(x \exp(-C_W (\log x)^{1/2})) - \mathcal{O}(\omega(m) \log m) \\ &= \frac{2}{3} x + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{x}{(\log x)^{A'}}\right). \end{aligned}$$

In the second line we have applied the Siegel–Walfisz theorem and $C_W > 0$ is some constant coming from this theorem. Since we will apply Siegel–Walfisz multiple times in the remainder of the proof and the associated constants will always just be absorbed into $\mathcal{O}\left(\frac{x}{(\log x)^{A'}}\right)$, we will abuse notation and call them C_W every time. Note that we used that $\log m \leq \log A$ and the assumption that $A, B \geq \exp((\log AB)^\delta)$ to bound the second error term.

In case that χ' is trivial, applying Theorem 2.2 (with the parameters chosen above) to the sum $\sum \chi'(n)g_m(n)$ yields

$$\sum_{n \leq B} \chi'(n)g_m(n) = \frac{B}{(\log B)^{\frac{1}{3}}\Gamma(\frac{2}{3})}c_0(m) + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{B}{(\log B)^{\frac{4}{3}}}\right), \quad (3.10)$$

where

$$c_0(m) = \prod_p \left(1 + \frac{g(p)}{p}\right) \left(1 - \frac{1}{p}\right)^{\frac{2}{3}} \prod_{p|m} \left(1 + \frac{g(p)}{p}\right)^{-1}.$$

ii) If χ' is non-trivial on G but trivial on H , there is a small difference to case i) when showing that $\chi'(n)g_m(n)$ satisfies condition (2.1). Note that if χ' is trivial on the index 2 subgroup H but non-trivial on $2H$, then χ' takes values in $\{+1, -1\}$. Upon closer inspection there is only one character that satisfies these properties; χ' has to be equal to 1 on H and equal to -1 on $2H$. Thus the sum over primes $p \equiv 2 \pmod{3}$ evaluates to

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\substack{p \leq x \\ p \equiv 2 \pmod{3}}} \chi'(p) \log p &= \sum_{\substack{\delta \pmod{27} \\ \delta \equiv 2 \pmod{3}}} \chi'(\delta) \sum_{\substack{p \leq x \\ p \equiv \delta \pmod{27}}} \log p \\ &= -9 \left(\frac{1}{\phi(27)}x + \mathcal{O}(x \exp(-C_W(\log x)^{1/2})) \right) \\ &= -\frac{1}{2}x + \mathcal{O}(x \exp(-C_W(\log x)^{1/2})). \end{aligned}$$

Here we applied the Siegel–Walfisz theorem, and C_W is some constant coming from this application. The sum over primes $p \equiv 1 \pmod{3}$ and the sum over primes that divide m can be treated the same as in i). Thus (for Q as in i)) we obtain that for all $x \geq Q$ and $A' > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{p \leq x} \chi'(p)g_m(p) \log p &= \frac{1}{6}x - \frac{1}{2}x + \mathcal{O}(x \exp(-C_W(\log x)^{1/2})) - \mathcal{O}(\omega(m) \log m) \\ &= -\frac{1}{3}x + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{x}{(\log x)^{A'}}\right). \end{aligned}$$

In case that χ' is non-trivial on G but trivial on H , applying Theorem 2.2 (with $\alpha = -1/3$ and otherwise the same parameters as in i)) to the sum $\sum \chi'(n)g_m(n)$ yields

$$\sum_{n \leq B} \chi'(n)g_m(n) = \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{B}{(\log B)^{\frac{4}{3}}}\right). \quad (3.11)$$

iii) If χ' is non-trivial on H , $\chi'(n)g_m(n)$ satisfies condition (2.1) with $\alpha = 0$, $k = 1$, $Q = \exp((\log B)^{\frac{1}{100}})$, $\epsilon = 1$ and $J = 1$. We split the sum as we did in i),

$$\sum_{p \leq x} \chi'(p)g_m(p) \log p = \sum_{\substack{p \leq x \\ p \equiv 1 \pmod{3}}} \frac{1}{3}\chi'(p) \log p + \sum_{\substack{p \leq x \\ p \equiv 2 \pmod{3}}} \chi'(p) \log p - \sum_{p|m} \frac{1}{3^{\omega_1(p)}}\chi'(p) \log p.$$

However, χ' is now non-trivial and we get a cancellation of the main term due to orthogonality of characters. For the sum over $p \equiv 2 \pmod{3}$ we get that for all $x \geq Q$ and $A' > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\substack{p \leq x \\ p \equiv 2 \pmod{3}}} \chi'(p) \log p &= \sum_{\substack{\delta \pmod{27} \\ \delta \equiv 2 \pmod{3}}} \chi'(\delta) \sum_{\substack{p \leq x \\ p \equiv \delta \pmod{27}}} \log p \\ &= \chi'(2) \sum_{\xi \in H} \chi'(\xi) \left(\frac{1}{\phi(27)} x + \mathcal{O}(x \exp(-C_W(\log x)^{1/2})) \right) \\ &= \mathcal{O}(x \exp(-C_W(\log x)^{1/2})) \\ &= \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{x}{(\log x)^{A'}}\right). \end{aligned}$$

The sum over $p \equiv 1 \pmod{3}$ can be bounded analogously and the sum over $p \mid m$ fits into the same error term, as shown in i). Thus $\chi'(n)g_m(n)$ satisfies condition (2.1) with $\alpha = 0$. Applying Theorem 2.2 (with parameters $\alpha = 0$, $k = 1$, $Q = \exp((\log B)^{\frac{1}{100}})$, $\epsilon = 1$ and $J = 1$) yields

$$\sum_{n \leq B} \chi'(n)g_m(n) = \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{B(\log Q)^{J+1}}{(\log B)^{J+1}}\right) = \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{B}{(\log B)^{\frac{4}{3}}}\right). \quad (3.12)$$

Importantly we have followed the convention in Remark 2.3.

Combining (3.10), (3.11) and (3.12), we see that (3.9) becomes

$$\begin{aligned} N(A, B)_{\substack{d_2=d_3=1 \\ e_2=e_3=1}} &= \frac{1}{\phi(27)^2} \sum_{\substack{\delta, \epsilon \pmod{27} \\ (\delta, \epsilon) \text{ admissible}}} \sum_{\chi, \chi' \in G} \chi(\delta^{-1}) \chi'(\epsilon^{-1}) \\ &\quad \sum_{m \leq A} \chi(m)g(m) \left(\mathbb{1}_{\{\chi'=\chi_0\}} \frac{B}{(\log B)^{\frac{1}{3}} \Gamma(\frac{2}{3})} c_0(m) + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{B}{(\log B)^{\frac{4}{3}}}\right) \right), \end{aligned} \quad (3.13)$$

where $\mathbb{1}_{\{\chi'=\chi_0\}}$ is the indicator function of χ' being trivial and

$$c_0(m) = \prod_p \left(1 + \frac{g(p)}{p}\right) \left(1 - \frac{1}{p}\right)^{\frac{2}{3}} \prod_{p \mid m} \left(1 + \frac{g(p)}{p}\right)^{-1}.$$

To evaluate the sum over m in (3.13), one can perform a calculation that is analogous to the above. Again one has to distinguish three cases, depending on the (non-)triviality of the character χ , and use a combination of Siegel–Walfisz and Theorem 2.2. The main term comes from the summand where χ and χ' are both trivial. All other combinations of characters lead to smaller contributions that fit into the error term (as in cases ii) and iii) above), so the sum over m becomes

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{m \leq A} \chi(m)g(m) \left(\mathbb{1}_{\{\chi'=\chi_0\}} \frac{B}{(\log B)^{\frac{1}{3}} \Gamma(\frac{2}{3})} c_0(m) + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{B}{(\log B)^{\frac{4}{3}}}\right) \right) \\ &= \mathbb{1}_{\{\chi=\chi'=\chi_0\}} c_1 \frac{AB}{(\log A)^{\frac{1}{3}} (\log B)^{\frac{1}{3}} (\Gamma(\frac{2}{3}))^2} + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{AB}{(\log A)^{\frac{1}{3}} (\log B)^{\frac{1}{3}}} \left(\frac{1}{\log A} + \frac{1}{\log B}\right)\right). \end{aligned} \quad (3.14)$$

Here c_1 is the constant

$$c_1 = \prod_p \left(1 + \frac{2}{3^{\omega_1(p)}p}\right) \left(1 - \frac{1}{p}\right)^{\frac{4}{3}}.$$

Substituting (3.14) into (3.13) we finally obtain the contribution of case 4 to $N(A, B)$

$$N(A, B)_{\substack{d_2=d_3=1 \\ e_2=e_3=1}} = c_2 \frac{AB}{(\log A)^{\frac{1}{3}}(\log B)^{\frac{1}{3}}} \left(1 + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{\log A} + \frac{1}{\log B}\right)\right), \quad (3.15)$$

where

$$c_2 = c_1 \cdot \left(\Gamma\left(\frac{2}{3}\right)\right)^{-2} = \left(\Gamma\left(\frac{2}{3}\right)\right)^{-2} \prod_p \left(1 + \frac{2}{3^{\omega_1(p)}p}\right) \left(1 - \frac{1}{p}\right)^{\frac{4}{3}}.$$

We end the proof by choosing the parameters V , C and k in terms of κ_1 , κ_2 and δ , such that the contributions of cases one to three fit into the error term of the theorem, which is the error term in (3.15). As remarked before, k can be chosen as any integer larger than 2, we choose $k = 4$. A calculation shows that

$$V = (\log AB)^{\frac{\kappa_2+4}{\kappa_1}} \quad \text{and} \quad C = 1 + \frac{1}{\delta} \left(\frac{2\kappa_2+8}{\kappa_1} + \frac{5}{3}\right)$$

are sufficient to bound the contributions (3.4) and (3.7) of cases 1 and 3b, and that the contributions (3.5) and (3.6) of cases 2 and 3a are compatible with these choices. Note that we have made extensive use of the assumption that $A, B \geq \exp((\log AB)^\delta)$ in the calculation of V and C .

References

- [1] K. Conrad. *Hensel's Lemma*, Expository paper from Keith Conrad's homepage, <https://kconrad.math.uconn.edu/blurbs/gradnumthy/hensel.pdf>, Last accessed 23.10.2024.
- [2] J. Friedlander and H. Iwaniec. *Ternary quadratic forms with rational zeros*, Journal de théorie des nombres de Bordeaux 22(1) (2010), 97–113.
- [3] S.W. Golomb. *Powerful Numbers*, The American Mathematical Monthly 77, no. 8 (1970), 848–852.
- [4] D. Koukoulopoulos. *The distribution of prime numbers*, Graduate Studies in Mathematics 203, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2019. xii + 356 pp. ISBN: 978-1-4704-4754-0; 978-1-4704-6285-7
- [5] P. Koymans, N. Rome. *Weak approximation on the norm one torus*, Compositio Mathematica 160 (2024), 1304–1348.
- [6] P. Koymans, N. Rome. *On the 16-Rank of Class Groups of $\mathbb{Q}(\sqrt{-2p})$ for primes $p \equiv 1 \pmod{4}$* , International Mathematics Research Notices 23 (2019), 7406–7427.
- [7] A. Weil. *Numbers of solutions of equations in finite fields*, Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. 55 (1949), 497–508.

A List of admissible pairs and code

In the proof of Lemma 3.1 we use two small pieces of code to check for solutions of $\phi_{a,b}$ in \mathbb{F}_p for $p = 2, 5, 7$ (where $p \nmid ab$) and in $\mathbb{Z}/27\mathbb{Z}$. The code was written in the IDE Jupyter, based on Python.

The following code iterates over forms $\phi_{a,b} \bmod p$ and triples $(x, y, z) \bmod p$ until it finds a non-zero solution of $\phi_{a,b}$. We use this to confirm that all forms have a solution in \mathbb{F}_p for $p = 2, 5, 7$.

```
import itertools as it
Allsolvable = 0
p = 7 # can choose p=2,5,7 here

for a,b in it.product(range(1,p), repeat=2):
    for x,y,z in it.product(range(p), repeat=3):
        if (x,y,z) != (0,0,0) and (a*(x**3)+b*(y**3)-(z**3))%p == 0:
            Allsolvable += 1
            break

if Allsolvable == (p-1)**2:
    print('All forms have a non-zero solution mod',p, '.')
```

As shown in the proof of Lemma 3.1, a form $\phi_{a,b}$ with coefficients (a, b) not divisible by three has a solution in \mathbb{Q}_3 iff it has a solution $(x, y, z) \bmod 27$ that is not equivalent to $(0, 0, 0) \bmod 3$. The following code iterates over coefficient pairs (a, b) and triples $(x, y, z) \bmod 27$ to compile the list of pairs (a, b) such that $\phi_{a,b}$ has a solution in \mathbb{Q}_3 .

```
import itertools as it
Admissible_pairs = []

for a,b in it.product(range(27), repeat=2):
    if a%3 == 0 or b%3 == 0:
        continue
    for x,y,z in it.product(range(27), repeat=3):
        if x%3 + y%3 + z%3 == 0:
            continue
        elif (a*(x**3)+b*(y**3)-(z**3))%27 == 0:
            Admissible_pairs.append([a,b])
            break

print(Admissible_pairs)
```

The list produced by this code is given below. We call it the list of admissible pairs.

(1,1)	(1,2)	(1,4)	(1,5)	(1,7)	(1,8)	(1,10)	(1,11)	(1,13)
(1,14)	(1,16)	(1,17)	(1,19)	(1,20)	(1,22)	(1,23)	(1,25)	(1,26)
(2,1)	(2,2)	(2,7)	(2,8)	(2,10)	(2,11)	(2,16)	(2,17)	(2,19)
(2,20)	(2,25)	(2,26)	(4,1)	(4,4)	(4,5)	(4,8)	(4,10)	(4,13)
(4,14)	(4,17)	(4,19)	(4,22)	(4,23)	(4,26)	(5,1)	(5,4)	(5,5)
(5,8)	(5,10)	(5,13)	(5,14)	(5,17)	(5,19)	(5,22)	(5,23)	(5,26)
(7,1)	(7,2)	(7,7)	(7,8)	(7,10)	(7,11)	(7,16)	(7,17)	(7,19)
(7,20)	(7,25)	(7,26)	(8,1)	(8,2)	(8,4)	(8,5)	(8,7)	(8,8)
(8,10)	(8,11)	(8,13)	(8,14)	(8,16)	(8,17)	(8,19)	(8,20)	(8,22)

(8,23)	(8,25)	(8,26)	(10,1)	(10,2)	(10,4)	(10,5)	(10,7)	(10,8)
(10,10)	(10,11)	(10,13)	(10,14)	(10,16)	(10,17)	(10,19)	(10,20)	(10,22)
(10,23)	(10,25)	(10,26)	(11,1)	(11,2)	(11,7)	(11,8)	(11,10)	(11,11)
(11,16)	(11,17)	(11,19)	(11,20)	(11,25)	(11,26)	(13,1)	(13,4)	(13,5)
(13,8)	(13,10)	(13,13)	(13,14)	(13,17)	(13,19)	(13,22)	(13,23)	(13,26)
(14,1)	(14,4)	(14,5)	(14,8)	(14,10)	(14,13)	(14,14)	(14,17)	(14,19)
(14,22)	(14,23)	(14,26)	(16,1)	(16,2)	(16,7)	(16,8)	(16,10)	(16,11)
(16,16)	(16,17)	(16,19)	(16,20)	(16,25)	(16,26)	(17,1)	(17,2)	(17,4)
(17,5)	(17,7)	(17,8)	(17,10)	(17,11)	(17,13)	(17,14)	(17,16)	(17,17)
(17,19)	(17,20)	(17,22)	(17,23)	(17,25)	(17,26)	(19,1)	(19,2)	(19,4)
(19,5)	(19,7)	(19,8)	(19,10)	(19,11)	(19,13)	(19,14)	(19,16)	(19,17)
(19,19)	(19,20)	(19,22)	(19,23)	(19,25)	(19,26)	(20,1)	(20,2)	(20,7)
(20,8)	(20,10)	(20,11)	(20,16)	(20,17)	(20,19)	(20,20)	(20,25)	(20,26)
(22,1)	(22,4)	(22,5)	(22,8)	(22,10)	(22,13)	(22,14)	(22,17)	(22,19)
(22,22)	(22,23)	(22,26)	(23,1)	(23,4)	(23,5)	(23,8)	(23,10)	(23,13)
(23,14)	(23,17)	(23,19)	(23,22)	(23,23)	(23,26)	(25,1)	(25,2)	(25,7)
(25,8)	(25,10)	(25,11)	(25,16)	(25,17)	(25,19)	(25,20)	(25,25)	(25,26)
(26,1)	(26,2)	(26,4)	(26,5)	(26,7)	(26,8)	(26,10)	(26,11)	(26,13)
(26,14)	(26,16)	(26,17)	(26,19)	(26,20)	(26,22)	(26,23)	(26,25)	(26,26)

There are 252 admissible pairs out of $18^2 = 324$ pairs $(a, b) \pmod{27}$ that satisfy $3 \nmid ab$. For any $a \pmod{27}$ there are either 12 or 18 admissible pairs of the form (a, \cdot) .