

# IMPROVING THE TRIVIAL BOUND FOR $\ell$ -TORSION IN CLASS GROUPS

ROBERT J. LEMKE OLIVER AND ASIF ZAMAN

ABSTRACT. For any number field  $K$  with  $D_K = |\text{Disc}(K)|$  and any integer  $\ell \geq 2$ , we improve over the commonly cited trivial bound  $|\text{Cl}_K[\ell]| \leq |\text{Cl}_K| \ll_{[K:\mathbb{Q}],\varepsilon} D_K^{1/2+\varepsilon}$  on the  $\ell$ -torsion subgroup of the class group of  $K$  by showing that  $|\text{Cl}_K[\ell]| = o_{[K:\mathbb{Q}],\ell}(D_K^{1/2})$ . In fact, we obtain an explicit log-power saving. This is the first general unconditional saving over the trivial bound that holds for all  $K$  and all  $\ell$ .

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Let  $K \neq \mathbb{Q}$  be a number field of degree  $[K : \mathbb{Q}]$  and absolute discriminant  $D_K = |\text{Disc}(K)|$ . Let  $\text{Cl}_K$  be the class group of  $K$ . For integers  $\ell \geq 2$ , the  $\ell$ -torsion of the class group satisfies

$$(1.1) \quad |\text{Cl}_K[\ell]| \leq |\text{Cl}_K| \ll_{[K:\mathbb{Q}]} D_K^{1/2} (\log D_K)^{[K:\mathbb{Q}]-1}$$

by a result of Landau. This trivial bound can be refined. By the class number formula, we have that

$$(1.2) \quad |\text{Cl}_K| \asymp_{[K:\mathbb{Q}]} \frac{\kappa_K D_K^{1/2}}{R_K},$$

where  $\kappa_K$  is the residue of the Dedekind zeta function  $\zeta_K(s)$  at  $s = 1$ , and  $R_K$  is the regulator of  $K$ . A theorem of Landau implies that

$$(1.3) \quad \kappa_K \ll_{[K:\mathbb{Q}]} (\log D_K)^{[K:\mathbb{Q}]-1},$$

and a theorem of Silverman [Sil84] (cf. Akhtari–Vaaler [AV23]) implies that

$$(1.4) \quad R_K \gg_{[K:\mathbb{Q}]} (\log D_K)^{r_K - \rho_K},$$

where  $r_K$  is the rank of the unit group of  $K$  and  $\rho_K$  is the maximum rank of the unit group over all proper subfields of  $K$ . This combination yields a refinement over (1.1) of the form

$$(1.5) \quad |\text{Cl}_K[\ell]| \leq |\text{Cl}_K| \ll_{[K:\mathbb{Q}]} D_K^{1/2} (\log D_K)^{[K:\mathbb{Q}] - r_K + \rho_K - 1}.$$

Improvements over this refined trivial bound<sup>1</sup> have generated significant interest in many cases, and often take a power-savings form

$$(1.6) \quad |\text{Cl}_K[\ell]| \ll_{[K:\mathbb{Q}],\ell,\Delta} D_K^\Delta$$

for some fixed  $0 < \Delta < 1/2$  whose value depends on  $\ell$ ,  $[K : \mathbb{Q}]$ , and the subfield structure of  $K$ . The so-called “ $\ell$ -torsion conjecture” posits that *any* fixed  $\Delta > 0$  is admissible. This question was first asked by Brumer–Silverman [BS96].

Unconditional pointwise progress towards this conjecture has been restricted to certain degrees  $[K : \mathbb{Q}]$ , integers  $\ell$ , or subfield structures. Table 1 below summarizes the progress made

<sup>1</sup>The literature on  $\ell$ -torsion in class groups typically refers to the “trivial bound” as either Landau’s bound (1.1) or the cruder bound  $|\text{Cl}_K[\ell]| \ll_{[K:\mathbb{Q}],\varepsilon} D_K^{1/2+\varepsilon}$  for  $\varepsilon > 0$ .

by Bhargava–Shankar–Taniguchi–Thorne–Tsimmerman–Zhao [BST<sup>+</sup>20], Ellenberg–Venkatesh [EV07], Gauss, Heath-Brown [HB24], Helfgott–Venkatesh [HV06], Klüners–Wang [KW22], Pierce [Pie05, Pie06] and Wang [Wan21, Wan20]. There has also been substantial interest in unconditional progress *on average* over families of number fields, such as [HBP17, EPW17, Wid18, FW18, PTBW20, An20, FW21, TZ23, LOWW21, LOTZ24, KT24, LOS24]. For further discussion, we refer the reader to the excellent survey article of Pierce [Pie23] and very recent work of Heath-Brown [HB24].

TABLE 1. Pointwise progress towards  $\ell$ -torsion conjecture according to (1.6)

SOURCE	$\Delta >$	$[K : \mathbb{Q}]$	$\ell$	OTHER RESTRICTIONS
Gauss	0	2	2	
[Pie05, Pie06]	$1/2 - 1/56$	2	3	
[HV06]	$1/2 - 0.0582\dots$	2	3	
[EV07]	$1/2 - 1/6$	2, 3	3	
[HB24]	$1/2 - 1/2\ell$	2, 3	prime	$p \mid D_K \implies p \leq D_K^{\delta_\ell}$
[HB24]	$1/2 - 1/4\ell$	3	prime	pure cubic extension
[BST <sup>+</sup> 20]	$1/2 - 0.2215\dots$	3, 4	2	
[EV07]	$1/2 - 1/168$	4	3	$\text{Gal}(\tilde{K}/\mathbb{Q}) \cong A_4$ or $S_4$
[EV07]	$1/2 - \delta$	4	3	$\text{Gal}(\tilde{K}/\mathbb{Q}) \cong C_4, V_4,$ or $D_4$
[BST <sup>+</sup> 20]	$1/2 - 1/2[K : \mathbb{Q}]$	$\geq 5$	2	
[KW22]	0	$p^r$	$p^s$	$\text{Gal}(\tilde{K}/\mathbb{Q}) \cong G$ , any $p$ -group $G$
[Wan21, Wan20]	$1/2 - \delta_{G,\ell}$	powerful	$\geq 2$	$\text{Gal}(K/\mathbb{Q}) \cong G$ , many <sup>2</sup> nilpotent groups $G$

The purpose of this article is to give a uniform improvement over (1.5) weaker than (1.6).

**Corollary 1.** *If  $K \neq \mathbb{Q}$  is a number field, and  $\ell \geq 2$  is an integer, then*

$$|\text{Cl}_K[\ell]| \ll_{[K:\mathbb{Q}],\ell} D_K^{1/2} (\log D_K)^{-r_K + \rho_K - 1} (\log \log D_K)^{3[K:\mathbb{Q}]/2}.$$

This result follows immediately from a new inverse relationship between the size of the  $\ell$ -torsion subgroup of the class group and the class group itself, provided that the class group is close to extremal size.

**Theorem 1.** *Let  $K \neq \mathbb{Q}$  be a number field. Let  $\ell \geq 2$  be an integer. There exists a sufficiently small constant  $\delta = \delta_{[K:\mathbb{Q}],\ell} > 0$  such that if*

$$(1.7) \quad |\text{Cl}_K| = V_K^{[K:\mathbb{Q}]} D_K^{1/2} (\log D_K)^{-r_K + \rho_K - 1} (\log \log D_K)^{3[K:\mathbb{Q}]/2},$$

for some  $V_K \geq [K : \mathbb{Q}]/\delta$  then

$$|\text{Cl}_K[\ell]| \ll_{[K:\mathbb{Q}],\ell} |\text{Cl}_K| (\log D_K)^{-\delta V_K}.$$

*Remark.* Notice  $V_K \ll_{[K:\mathbb{Q}]} (\log D_K)(\log \log D_K)^{-3/2}$  according to (1.5).

Our argument is soft and based on a particularly fruitful lemma of Ellenberg–Venkatesh. The basic principle is that if there are *many* small non-inert unramified primes in  $K$ , then we save over the trivial bound. A refined version of their lemma (Lemma 3) illustrates a

<sup>2</sup>More precisely, this includes all nilpotent groups  $G$  where each Sylow subgroup is not cyclic or quaternion.

contrasting principle: if the residue of the Dedekind zeta function  $\zeta_K(s)$  is small, then we also save over the trivial bound. We exploit that this residue is small precisely when  $K$  has *few* small non-inert unramified primes. By balancing the effects of these conflicting principles, we unconditionally save over the trivial bound. The residue's relationship to the class number via (1.2) is our source for the inverse relationship in Theorem 1.

This observation also has conditional consequences which illustrate its limitations. The classic conditional benchmark is again due to Ellenberg and Venkatesh [EV07] who showed that the generalized Riemann hypothesis (GRH) implies any fixed

$$(1.8) \quad \Delta > \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2\ell([K:\mathbb{Q}] - 1)}$$

is admissible in (1.6). Heath-Brown [HB24] very recently showed how one might relax their GRH hypothesis with a subconvexity hypothesis to deduce a number of intriguing results. While his focus was on quadratic and cubic fields  $K$ , the argument applies to any number field as remarked therein. Combined with our observations, we obtain the following result.

**Theorem 2.** *Let  $K \neq \mathbb{Q}$  be a number field. Fix an integer  $\ell \geq 2$  and real  $\Delta > \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2\ell([K:\mathbb{Q}] - 1)}$ . If there exists  $A \geq 1$  and  $0 < \eta < 1$  such that*

$$(1.9) \quad |\zeta_K(\frac{1}{2} + it)| \ll_{[K:\mathbb{Q}], \ell, A, \eta} D_K^{\frac{1-\eta}{4\ell([K:\mathbb{Q}] - 1)}} |1 + it|^A \quad \text{for } t \in \mathbb{R},$$

then

$$|\text{Cl}_K[\ell]| \ll_{[K:\mathbb{Q}], \ell, A, \eta, \Delta} D_K^\Delta.$$

The implied constant is effective unless  $K$  has a quadratic subfield and  $\Delta \leq \frac{1}{2} - \frac{\eta}{4\ell([K:\mathbb{Q}] - 1)}$ .

Theorem 2 recovers (1.8) under a subconvexity hypothesis which is notably weaker than GRH or the generalized Lindelöf hypothesis (and one can weaken our hypothesis even further as shown in [HB24]), but the implied constants are ineffective if  $K$  contains a quadratic subfield. Indeed, as shown in Section 4, this ineffective form follows quickly from Heath-Brown's arguments and the ineffective Brauer–Siegel theorem. By supplementing this argument with our observations leading to Theorem 1, we are able to deduce the effective power savings described in Theorem 2 for all number fields. See Remark 8 for more details on achieving effective power savings.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We would like to thank Roger Heath-Brown, Greg Martin, Lillian Pierce, Paul Pollack, Arul Shankar, Jesse Thorner, Jacob Tsimerman, Caroline Turnage-Butterbaugh, and Jiuya Wang for their encouragement and comments. RJLO was partially supported by NSF grant DMS-2200760. AZ was partially supported by NSERC grant RGPIN-2022-04982.

## 2. PRELIMINARIES

For a number field  $K$ , denote:

- $[K:\mathbb{Q}]$  to be the degree of  $K$
- $\mathcal{O}_K$  to be the ring of integers of  $K$
- $N = \text{Nm}_{K/\mathbb{Q}}$  to be the absolute norm on ideals
- $\mathfrak{d}_K$  to be the absolute different ideal of  $K$
- $D_K = N\mathfrak{d}_K = |\text{Disc}(K/\mathbb{Q})|$  to be the norm of the absolute different ideal
- $\zeta_K(s)$  to be the Dedekind zeta function of  $K$

- $\kappa_K$  to be the residue of  $\zeta_K(s)$  at  $s = 1$

The letters  $\mathfrak{m}, \mathfrak{n}$  will be reserved to denote integral ideals of  $K$  whereas  $\mathfrak{p}$  will be reserved for prime ideals of  $K$ . Similarly, letters  $m, n$  will denote rational integers and the letter  $p$  will denote a rational prime.

We begin by recording the key lemma of Ellenberg–Venkatesh including a refinement involving  $\kappa_K$  and a new observation of Heath-Brown [HB24, Lemma 3].

**Lemma 3.** *Let  $K \neq \mathbb{Q}$  be a number field. Fix an integer  $\ell \geq 2$  and  $0 < \eta < 1$ . If  $M$  is the number of integral ideals  $\mathfrak{n}$  of  $K$  such that  $\mathfrak{n}$  is relatively prime to the different ideal  $\mathfrak{d}_K$ , its norm  $N\mathfrak{n}$  is a squarefree integer, and  $N\mathfrak{n} \leq D_K^{\frac{1-\eta}{2\ell([K:\mathbb{Q}]-1)}}$ , then*

$$|\mathrm{Cl}_K[\ell]| \ll_{\eta, \ell, [K:\mathbb{Q}]} \frac{\kappa_K \sqrt{D_K}}{M}.$$

*Proof.* Using the notation of Lemma 3 in Ellenberg–Venkatesh [EV07], they showed

$$|\mathrm{Cl}_K[\ell]| \ll_{\eta, \ell, [K:\mathbb{Q}]} \frac{\mathrm{vol}(\widetilde{\mathrm{Cl}}_K)}{\mathrm{vol}(P_\ell/P)}.$$

They estimate  $\mathrm{vol}(\widetilde{\mathrm{Cl}}_K)$ , the volume of the Arakelov class group, from above by the class number of  $K$  times the regulator of  $K$ , times some constant depending at most on the degree of  $K$ . By the class number formula, this quantity is at most  $\ll_{[K:\mathbb{Q}]} \kappa_K \sqrt{D_K}$ . The volume  $\mathrm{vol}(P_\ell/P)$  was shown to be bounded below by the number of prime ideals  $\mathfrak{p}$  of degree one which do not ramify over  $\mathbb{Q}$  with norm  $N\mathfrak{p} \leq D_K^{\frac{1-\eta}{2\ell([K:\mathbb{Q}]-1)}}$ . Heath-Brown observed that  $\mathrm{vol}(P_\ell/P)$  can instead be bounded below by the number of integral ideals  $\mathfrak{n}$  satisfying the assumptions stated in the lemma.  $\square$

The Dedekind zeta function  $\zeta_K(s)$  can be written in two forms. First, it can be written over the number field  $K$  using ideals as

$$(2.1) \quad \zeta_K(s) = \sum_{\mathfrak{n} \subseteq \mathcal{O}_K} (N\mathfrak{n})^{-s} = \prod_{\mathfrak{p}} \left(1 - (N\mathfrak{p})^{-s}\right)^{-1} \quad \text{for } \Re(s) > 1,$$

where the product runs over prime ideals  $\mathfrak{p}$  of  $K$ . Second, it can be written over the base field  $\mathbb{Q}$  using integers as

$$(2.2) \quad \zeta_K(s) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \lambda_K(n) n^{-s} = \prod_p \left(1 + \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \frac{\lambda_K(p^j)}{p^{js}}\right) \quad \text{for } \Re(s) > 1,$$

where  $\lambda_K$  is a multiplicative function on the positive integers satisfying

$$(2.3) \quad \lambda_K(n) = \sum_{N\mathfrak{n}=n} 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \lambda_K(p^j) \leq [K:\mathbb{Q}]^j$$

for all  $n, j \geq 1$  and primes  $p$ . The second equality holds because at most  $[K:\mathbb{Q}]$  prime ideals  $\mathfrak{p}$  lie above a rational prime  $p$ . We shall use the latter form (2.2) to count ideals with squarefree norm and without prime ideals dividing the different.

Let  $\mu$  be the classical Möbius function on the integers, so  $\mu^2$  is the indicator function on squarefree integers. Define the non-negative multiplicative function  $\lambda_K^{\flat}$  by

$$(2.4) \quad \lambda_K^{\flat}(n) := \mu^2(n) \sum_{\substack{N\mathfrak{n}=n \\ (n, \mathfrak{d}_K)=1}} 1, \quad \text{so} \quad 0 \leq \lambda_K^{\flat}(n) \leq \lambda_K(n)$$

for all  $n \geq 1$ . At all primes  $p$ , we have that

$$(2.5) \quad 0 \leq \lambda_K(p) - \lambda_K^b(p) \leq \frac{[K : \mathbb{Q}]}{2}$$

since

$$\lambda_K(p) - \lambda_K^b(p) = |\{\mathfrak{p} : N\mathfrak{p} = p \text{ and } \mathfrak{p} \mid \mathfrak{d}_K\}| = \sum_{\substack{N\mathfrak{p}=p \\ e_{\mathfrak{p}} \geq 2}} 1 \leq \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\mathfrak{p} \subseteq (p)} e_{\mathfrak{p}} f_{\mathfrak{p}} = \frac{[K : \mathbb{Q}]}{2}.$$

where  $e_{\mathfrak{p}}$  and  $f_{\mathfrak{p}}$  are respectively the ramification index and inertia degree of  $\mathfrak{p}$  over  $(p)$ . In particular, at unramified primes,

$$(2.6) \quad \lambda_K^b(p) = \lambda_K(p) \quad \text{when } p \nmid D_K.$$

**Lemma 4.** *Let  $K \neq \mathbb{Q}$  be a number field. For  $x \geq 3$  and  $s \in \mathbb{C}$ , define*

$$(2.7) \quad H_K(s, x) := \prod_{p \leq x} \left(1 + \frac{\lambda_K^b(p)}{p^s}\right) \left(1 + \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \frac{\lambda_K(p^j)}{p^{js}}\right)^{-1}.$$

Then  $H_K(s, x)$  is entire,

$$H_K(1, x) \gg_{[K:\mathbb{Q}]} (\log \log D_K)^{-[K:\mathbb{Q}]/2},$$

and there exists a constant  $C = C_{[K:\mathbb{Q}]} > 0$  such that for  $t \in \mathbb{R}$ ,

$$|H_K(\frac{1}{2} + it, x)| \ll_{[K:\mathbb{Q}]} (e^{(\log D_K)^{1/2}} \log x)^C.$$

*Proof.* Since

$$\left(1 + \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \frac{\lambda_K(p^j)}{p^{js}}\right)^{-1} = \prod_{\mathfrak{p} \mid (p)} (1 - (N\mathfrak{p})^{-s}),$$

the function  $H_K(s, x)$  is a finite product of entire functions and hence entire. For the bounds on  $H_K(s, x)$ , we start with an estimate for each local factor. For all primes  $p$  and  $\Re(s) > 1/4$ , we have uniformly that

$$\left(1 + \frac{\lambda_K^b(p)}{p^s}\right) \left(1 + \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \frac{\lambda_K(p^j)}{p^{js}}\right)^{-1} = 1 - \frac{\lambda_K(p) - \lambda_K^b(p)}{p^s} + O_{[K:\mathbb{Q}]}(p^{-2\Re(s)})$$

by (2.2) and the inequality  $0 \leq \lambda_K^b(p) \leq \lambda_K(p)$  from (2.4). The expansion  $\log(1 + u) = u + O(u^2)$  for  $|u| < 1/2$  gives

$$(2.8) \quad H_K(s, x) = \exp\left(-\sum_{p \leq x} \frac{\lambda_K(p) - \lambda_K^b(p)}{p^s} + O_{[K:\mathbb{Q}]} \left(\sum_{p \leq x} p^{-2\Re(s)}\right)\right).$$

At  $s = 1$ , we have by (2.5), (2.6), and the prime number theorem that

$$\sum_{p \leq x} \frac{\lambda_K(p) - \lambda_K^b(p)}{p} \leq \frac{[K : \mathbb{Q}]}{2} \sum_{p \mid D_K} \frac{1}{p} \leq \frac{[K : \mathbb{Q}]}{2} \log \log \log D_K + O_{[K:\mathbb{Q}]}(1).$$

The lower bound for  $H_K(1, x)$  now follows from (2.8) with the observation  $\sum_{p \leq x} p^{-2} \ll 1$ . At  $s = \frac{1}{2} + it$  for  $t \in \mathbb{R}$ , we again have by (2.5), (2.6), and the prime number theorem that

$$\sum_{p \leq x} \frac{|\lambda_K(p) - \lambda_K^b(p)|}{p^{1/2}} \leq \frac{[K : \mathbb{Q}]}{2} \sum_{p \mid D_K} \frac{1}{p^{1/2}} \ll_{[K:\mathbb{Q}]} (\log D_K)^{1/2}.$$

The last estimate is crude but sufficient. The upper bound for  $|H_K(\frac{1}{2} + it, x)|$  now follows from (2.8) and the estimate  $\sum_{p \leq x} p^{-1} \ll \log \log x$  following from Mertens' formula.  $\square$

We also record a classic convexity estimate and an explicit test function.

**Lemma 5.** *Let  $K$  be a number field. Fix  $\delta > 0$ . For  $t \in \mathbb{R}$ ,*

$$|\zeta_K(\frac{1}{2} + it)| \ll_{[K:\mathbb{Q}], \delta} (D_K |1 + it|^{[K:\mathbb{Q}]})^{1/4 + \delta}.$$

*Proof.* See, for example, Rademacher [Rad60].  $\square$

**Lemma 6.** *For an integer  $k \geq 1$ , define  $\varphi_k : [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$  by*

$$\varphi_k(t) = \begin{cases} \frac{t \log(1/t)^k}{k!} & 0 < t \leq 1, \\ 0 & t = 0 \text{ or } t > 1. \end{cases}$$

*Its maximum value is  $\varphi_k(e^{-k}) \leq 1$  and its Mellin transform  $\widehat{\varphi}_k(s)$  is given by*

$$\widehat{\varphi}_k(s) = \frac{1}{(s+1)^{k+1}} \quad \text{for } s \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{-1\}.$$

*Proof.* This can be verified by a routine induction and calculus.  $\square$

### 3. PROOF OF THEOREM 1

Let  $K \neq \mathbb{Q}$  be a number field and  $\ell \geq 2$  be an integer. Fix

$$(3.1) \quad \eta = 1/2, \quad y = D_K^{\frac{1-\eta}{2\ell([K:\mathbb{Q}]-1)}} \quad \text{and} \quad x = y^{8\ell[K:\mathbb{Q}]}.$$

Note  $D_K^2 \leq x \leq D_K^3$ . Using (2.4), define the prime ideal counting function

$$\pi_K^{\flat}(y) := \sum_{p \leq y} \lambda_K^{\flat}(p) = |\{\mathfrak{p} : N\mathfrak{p} \leq y, \mathfrak{p} \nmid \mathfrak{d}_K, N\mathfrak{p} = p \text{ for some prime } p\}|$$

so, by a less refined application of Lemma 3, we have that

$$|\text{Cl}_K[\ell]| \ll_{[K:\mathbb{Q}], \ell} \frac{\kappa_K D_K^{1/2}}{1 + \pi_K^{\flat}(y)}.$$

Let  $\pi_{\mathbb{Q}}$  be the classical prime counting function. Observe  $0 \leq \pi_K^{\flat}(y) \leq [K:\mathbb{Q}]\pi_{\mathbb{Q}}(y)$  by (2.3) and (2.4), so

$$(3.2) \quad [K:\mathbb{Q}](\pi_{\mathbb{Q}}(z) - 1) \leq \pi_K^{\flat}(y) \leq [K:\mathbb{Q}]\pi_{\mathbb{Q}}(z) \quad \text{for some } 2 \leq z \leq y.$$

Since  $\pi_{\mathbb{Q}}(z) \gg z/\log z$ , it follows that

$$(3.3) \quad |\text{Cl}_K[\ell]| \ll_{[K:\mathbb{Q}], \ell} \frac{\log z}{z} \cdot \kappa_K D_K^{1/2}.$$

Our goal is therefore to estimate  $\kappa_K$  in terms of the unknown parameter  $z$ , and then take the supremum of the above bound over all possible values of  $2 \leq z \leq y$ .

We begin by defining the sum

$$S(x) := \sum_{n \leq x} \lambda_K^{\flat}(n) \varphi_k(n/x),$$

where  $k = [K : \mathbb{Q}] - 1 \geq 1$  and  $\varphi_k$  is given by Lemma 6. By (2.2), (2.4), and (2.7), it follows by Mellin inversion that

$$\begin{aligned} S(x) &= \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{(2)} \zeta_K(s) H_K(s, x) \frac{x^s}{(s+1)^{[K:\mathbb{Q}]}} ds \\ &= \frac{\kappa_K H_K(1, x)}{2^{[K:\mathbb{Q}]}} x + \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \zeta_K(\tfrac{1}{2} + it) H_K(\tfrac{1}{2} + it, x) \frac{x^{1/2+it}}{(3/2+it)^{[K:\mathbb{Q}]}} dt. \end{aligned}$$

Applying Lemma 5 with  $\delta = \frac{1}{8}$ , the upper bound on  $H_K(\frac{1}{2} + it, x)$  from Lemma 4, and  $\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} (9/4 + t^2)^{-\frac{5}{16}[K:\mathbb{Q}]} dt \ll 1$ , we deduce for some constant  $C = C_{[K:\mathbb{Q}]} > 0$  that

$$S(x) = \frac{\kappa_K H_K(1, x)}{2^{[K:\mathbb{Q}]}} x + O_{[K:\mathbb{Q}]} \left( D_K^{3/8} x^{1/2} (e^{(\log D_K)^{1/2}} \log x)^C \right).$$

Rearranging and applying the lower bound on  $H_K(1, x)$  from Lemma 4, we find that

$$\begin{aligned} (3.4) \quad \kappa_K &\ll_{[K:\mathbb{Q}]} \left( \frac{S(x)}{x} + \frac{D_K^{3/8}}{x^{1/2}} (e^{(\log D_K)^{1/2}} \log x)^C \right) (\log \log D_K)^{[K:\mathbb{Q}]/2} \\ &\ll_{[K:\mathbb{Q}]} \frac{S(x)}{x} (\log \log D_K)^{[K:\mathbb{Q}]/2} + D_K^{-1/2} \end{aligned}$$

where the secondary terms have been absorbed into the  $D_K^{-1/2}$  term since  $D_K^2 \leq x \leq D_K^3$ . It remains to estimate  $S(x)$ .

As  $\varphi_k(t) \leq 1$  for all  $t \geq 0$  by Lemma 6 and  $\lambda_K^b$  is multiplicative, we may write

$$(3.5) \quad S(x) \leq \sum_{n \leq x} \lambda_K^b(n) = \sum_{\substack{m \leq x \\ p|m \Rightarrow p \leq y}} \lambda_K^b(m) \sum_{\substack{n \leq x/m \\ p|n \Rightarrow p > y}} \lambda_K^b(n).$$

For every squarefree integer  $n \leq x$  free of prime factors less than  $y$ , we have by multiplicativity of  $\lambda_K^b$  that

$$\lambda_K^b(n) = \prod_{p|n} \lambda_K^b(p) \leq [K : \mathbb{Q}]^{8\ell[K:\mathbb{Q}]}$$

since  $\lambda_K^b(p) \leq [K : \mathbb{Q}]$  by (2.3) and (2.4), and  $|\{p : p | n\}| \leq 8\ell[K : \mathbb{Q}]$  by (3.1). For fixed  $m \leq x$ , it follows that

$$\sum_{\substack{n \leq x/m \\ p|n \Rightarrow p > y}} \lambda_K^b(n) \ll_{[K:\mathbb{Q}], \ell} \sum_{\substack{n \leq x/m \\ p|n \Rightarrow p > y}} 1 \ll_{[K:\mathbb{Q}], \ell} \mathbf{1}_{\{m \leq x\}} + \frac{x}{\log y} \frac{\mathbf{1}_{\{m \leq x/y\}}}{m}.$$

Overall, as  $\log y \asymp_{[K:\mathbb{Q}], \ell} \log x$  by (3.1), this implies by (3.5) that

$$(3.6) \quad S(x) \ll_{[K:\mathbb{Q}], \ell} \sum_{\substack{m \leq x \\ p|m \Rightarrow p \leq y}} \lambda_K^b(m) + \frac{x}{\log x} \sum_{\substack{m \leq x/y \\ p|m \Rightarrow p \leq y}} \frac{\lambda_K^b(m)}{m}.$$

We proceed to estimate the righthand and lefthand sum in (3.6). The righthand sum can be bounded via (3.2), the inequalities  $\lambda_K^b(p) \leq [K : \mathbb{Q}]$  and  $\log(1+u) < u$  for  $u > 0$ , and the prime number theorem to yield

$$\sum_{\substack{m \leq x/y \\ p|m \Rightarrow p \leq y}} \frac{\lambda_K^b(m)}{m} \leq \prod_{p \leq y} \left( 1 + \frac{\lambda_K^b(p)}{p} \right) \leq \exp \left( \sum_{p \leq z} \frac{[K : \mathbb{Q}]}{p} \right) \ll_{[K:\mathbb{Q}]} (\log z)^{[K:\mathbb{Q}]}.$$

For the lefthand sum, we apply Rankin's trick with a yet-to-be-specified parameter  $\frac{3}{4} \leq \alpha < 1$  and use (3.2) again to see that

$$\sum_{\substack{m \leq x \\ p|m \implies p \leq y}} \lambda_K^b(m) \leq \sum_{\substack{m \leq x \\ p|m \implies p \leq y}} \lambda_K^b(m) \left(\frac{x}{m}\right)^\alpha \leq x^\alpha \prod_{p \leq y} \left(1 + \frac{\lambda_K^b(p)}{p^\alpha}\right).$$

We similarly have that

$$\prod_{p \leq y} \left(1 + \frac{\lambda_K^b(p)}{p^\alpha}\right) \leq \exp\left(\sum_{p \leq z} \frac{[K:\mathbb{Q}]}{p^\alpha}\right) \leq \exp\left(O\left(\frac{[K:\mathbb{Q}]z^{1-\alpha}}{(1-\alpha)\log z}\right)\right)$$

by the prime number theorem.

Collecting these estimates in (3.6), we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} S(x) &\ll_{[K:\mathbb{Q}],\ell} x \exp\left(- (1-\alpha)\log x + O\left(\frac{[K:\mathbb{Q}]z^{1-\alpha}}{(1-\alpha)\log z}\right)\right) + \frac{x}{\log x}(\log z)^{[K:\mathbb{Q}]} \\ &\ll_{[K:\mathbb{Q}],\ell} x \exp\left(-\frac{\log x}{\log z}\right) + \frac{x}{\log x}(\log z)^{[K:\mathbb{Q}]} \\ &\ll_{[K:\mathbb{Q}],\ell} \frac{x}{\log x}(\log z)^{[K:\mathbb{Q}]} \end{aligned}$$

upon choosing  $\alpha = \max\{1 - (\log z)^{-1}, 3/4\}$  in the second step. Note the third step applies the weak bound  $e^{-u} \ll u^{-1}$  for  $u = \frac{\log x}{\log z} \geq 8\ell[K:\mathbb{Q}]$  as  $2 \leq z \leq y = x^{1/8\ell[K:\mathbb{Q}]}$  by (3.1). By (3.4) and the observation  $D_K^2 \leq x \leq D_K^3$  from (3.1), it follows that

$$\kappa_K \ll_{[K:\mathbb{Q}],\ell} (\log z)^{[K:\mathbb{Q}]} (\log D_K)^{-1} (\log \log D_K)^{[K:\mathbb{Q}]/2}$$

for  $2 \leq z \leq y = D_K^{\frac{1}{4\ell([K:\mathbb{Q}]-1)}}$ . From (1.2) and (1.4), we have that

$$|\text{Cl}_K| \ll_{[K:\mathbb{Q}],\ell} (\log z)^{[K:\mathbb{Q}]} \cdot D_K^{1/2} (\log D_K)^{-r_K + \rho_K - 1} (\log \log D_K)^{[K:\mathbb{Q}]/2}.$$

Since  $V_K$  satisfies (1.7), this implies  $V_K \log \log D_K \ll_{[K:\mathbb{Q}],\ell} \log z$  in which case

$$z \geq (\log D_K)^{3\delta V_K},$$

where  $\delta = \delta_{[K:\mathbb{Q}],\ell} > 0$  is sufficiently small.

Combining these observations with (3.3), we obtain that

$$|\text{Cl}_K[\ell]| \ll_{[K:\mathbb{Q}],\ell} z^{-1} (\log z)^{[K:\mathbb{Q}]+1} D_K^{1/2} (\log D_K)^{-1} (\log \log D_K)^{[K:\mathbb{Q}]/2}$$

for some unknown  $z$  satisfying  $(\log D_K)^{3\delta V_K} \leq z \leq y$ . The supremum of this bound occurs when  $z \asymp_{[K:\mathbb{Q}],\ell} (\log D_K)^{3\delta V_K}$ . We conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} |\text{Cl}_K[\ell]| &\ll_{[K:\mathbb{Q}],\ell} V_K^{[K:\mathbb{Q}]+1} D_K^{1/2} (\log D_K)^{-2\delta V_K - r_K + \rho_K - 1} (\log \log D_K)^{3[K:\mathbb{Q}]/2+1} \\ &\ll_{[K:\mathbb{Q}],\ell} |\text{Cl}_K| \cdot V_K (\log D_K)^{-2\delta V_K} \log \log D_K \end{aligned}$$

from the inequality  $\delta V_K \geq [K:\mathbb{Q}] \geq r_K - \rho_K$  and the definition of  $V_K$  in (1.7). As

$$V_K (\log D_K)^{-2\delta V_K} \log \log D_K \ll_{[K:\mathbb{Q}],\ell} (\log D_K)^{-\delta V_K},$$

this completes the proof of Theorem 1.  $\square$



## 4. PROOF OF THEOREM 2

We proceed similarly to the proof of Theorem 1 but we shall take advantage of the assumption on integrality (instead of primality) appearing in Lemma 3. Let  $K \neq \mathbb{Q}$  be a number field and  $\ell \geq 2$  be an integer. Fix

$$(4.1) \quad 0 < \delta < \eta/2, \quad x = D_K^{\frac{1-\delta/2}{2\ell([K:\mathbb{Q}]-1)}}$$

according to assumption (1.9). Define the integral ideal counting function

$$N_K^b(x) := \sum_{n \leq x} \lambda_K^b(n) = |\{\mathfrak{n} \subseteq \mathcal{O}_K : N\mathfrak{n} \leq x, N\mathfrak{n} \text{ squarefree, } \mathfrak{p} \mid \mathfrak{n} \implies \mathfrak{p} \nmid \mathfrak{d}_K\}|$$

so, by a full application of Lemma 3,

$$(4.2) \quad |\text{Cl}_K[\ell]| \ll_{[K:\mathbb{Q}], \ell} \frac{\kappa_K}{N_K^b(x)} D_K^{1/2}.$$

Given assumption (1.9) with constant  $A \geq 1$ , we begin by defining the sum

$$S(x) := \sum_{n \leq x} \lambda_K^b(n) \varphi_k(n/x).$$

where  $k = \lceil A \rceil + 1$  and  $\varphi_k$  is given by Lemma 6. Since  $\varphi_k(t) \leq 1$ , it follows that

$$(4.3) \quad S(x) \leq \sum_{n \leq x} \lambda_K^b(n) = N_K^b(x).$$

On the other hand, by Mellin inversion,

$$\begin{aligned} S(x) &= \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{(2)} \zeta_K(s) H_K(s, x) \frac{x^s}{(s+1)^{k+1}} ds \\ &= \frac{\kappa_K H_K(1, x)}{2^{[K:\mathbb{Q}]}} x + \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \zeta_K(\tfrac{1}{2} + it) H_K(\tfrac{1}{2} + it, x) \frac{x^{1/2+it}}{(3/2 + it)^{k+1}} dt. \end{aligned}$$

By assumption (1.9), the upper bound on  $H_K(\frac{1}{2} + it, x)$  from Lemma 4, and the bound  $\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} (9/4 + t^2)^{-1} dt \ll 1$ , we deduce for some constant  $C = C_{[K:\mathbb{Q}]} > 0$  that

$$S(x) = \frac{\kappa_K H_K(1, x)}{2^{[K:\mathbb{Q}]}} x + O_{[K:\mathbb{Q}], \ell, A, \eta} \left( D_K^{\frac{1-\eta}{4\ell([K:\mathbb{Q}]-1)}} x^{1/2} (e^{(\log D_K)^{1/2}} \log x)^C \right).$$

Dividing both sides by  $x$  and applying our choice in (4.1), we find that

$$(4.4) \quad \frac{S(x)}{x} = \frac{\kappa_K H_K(1, x)}{2^{[K:\mathbb{Q}]}} + O_{[K:\mathbb{Q}], \ell, A, \eta, \delta} \left( D_K^{\frac{-\eta+\delta}{4\ell([K:\mathbb{Q}]-1)}} \right).$$

We now deduce Theorem 2 by proving:

- (i) an ineffective bound for  $\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2\ell([K:\mathbb{Q}]-1)} < \Delta < \frac{1}{2}$  and all number fields  $K$ ;
- (ii) an effective bound for  $\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2\ell([K:\mathbb{Q}]-1)} < \Delta < \frac{1}{2}$  and all  $K$  without a quadratic subfield;
- (iii) an effective bound for  $\frac{1}{2} - \frac{\eta}{4\ell([K:\mathbb{Q}]-1)} < \Delta < \frac{1}{2}$  and all number fields  $K$ .

For cases (i) and (ii), we directly combine (4.4) with (4.2) and (4.3) to see that

$$|\text{Cl}_K[\ell]| \ll_{[K:\mathbb{Q}], \ell} \frac{D_K^{1/2}}{x} \cdot \left( H_K(1, x) + O_{[K:\mathbb{Q}], \ell, A, \eta, \delta} \left( \kappa_K^{-1} D_K^{\frac{-\eta+\delta}{4\ell([K:\mathbb{Q}]-1)}} \right) \right)^{-1}.$$

Since  $x$  satisfies (4.1) and  $H_K(1, x) \gg_{[K:\mathbb{Q}]} (\log \log D_K)^{-[K:\mathbb{Q}]/2}$  by Lemma 4, it suffices to give a suitable lower bound for the residue  $\kappa_K$ . Case (i) follows by applying the ineffective Brauer–Siegel bound in the form

$$\kappa_K \gg_{[K:\mathbb{Q}], \ell, \delta} D_K^{\frac{-\delta/2}{2\ell([K:\mathbb{Q}]-1)}}.$$

Case (ii) follows by applying an effective lower bound of Stark [Sta74] in the form

$$\kappa_K \gg_{[K:\mathbb{Q}]} (\log D_K)^{-1}.$$

For case (iii), we instead give an upper bound for the residue. We rearrange (4.4) and again apply the lower bound on  $H_K(1, x)$  from Lemma 4 to deduce that

$$\kappa_K \ll_{[K:\mathbb{Q}], \ell, A, \eta, \delta} \frac{S(x)}{x} (\log \log D_K)^{[K:\mathbb{Q}]/2} + D_K^{\frac{-\eta+\delta}{4\ell([K:\mathbb{Q}]-1)}}$$

for all number fields  $K$ . By (4.2), we find that

$$|\text{Cl}_K[\ell]| \ll_{[K:\mathbb{Q}], \ell, A, \eta, \delta} \frac{D_K^{1/2}}{x} \frac{S(x)}{N_K^b(x)} (\log \log D_K)^{[K:\mathbb{Q}]/2} + D_K^{\frac{1}{2} - \frac{\eta-\delta}{4\ell([K:\mathbb{Q}]-1)}}.$$

This yields case (iii) with our choice of  $x$  in (4.1) and that  $S(x) \leq N_K^b(x)$  by (4.3).  $\square$

*Remark 7.* The distinction between the outcomes in Theorems 1 and 2 can be seen by comparing (3.5) and (4.3). The subconvexity hypothesis (1.9) in Theorem 2 allows us to count integral ideals below the key threshold  $x \approx D_K^{1/2\ell([K:\mathbb{Q}]-1)}$  from Lemma 3, so every non-zero term in  $S(x)$  contributes to the desired savings via (4.3). Without this hypothesis, we can only count integral ideals below  $x \approx D^{1/2}$  so the key threshold  $y \approx D_K^{1/2\ell([K:\mathbb{Q}]-1)}$  in Section 3 corresponds to the  $y$ -smooth norms  $m$  (i.e.,  $p \mid m \implies p \leq y$ ) contributing to  $S(x)$  via (3.5). If very few  $y$ -smooth norms exist, then the  $y$ -rough norms  $n$  (i.e.,  $p \mid n \implies p > y$ ) form the bulk of the contribution to  $S(x)$  and do not necessarily provide any savings via the quantity  $M$  in Lemma 3. This  $y$ -rough contribution appears to be our bottleneck to bounding the residue  $\kappa_K$  by more than  $1/\log y$  in the unconditional setting of Theorem 1.

*Remark 8.* If  $K$  contains a quadratic subfield, then one might ask whether the ineffective form of Theorem 2 can still be made effective by again applying an effective Brauer–Siegel theorem due to Stark [Sta74]. We do not see how to do this immediately since (4.4) requires

$$\kappa_K \gg_{[K:\mathbb{Q}], \ell, A, \eta, \delta} D_K^{\frac{-\eta+\delta}{4\ell([K:\mathbb{Q}]-1)}}$$

to ensure  $S(x) \neq 0$  whereas Stark’s theorem shows  $\kappa_K \gg_{[K:\mathbb{Q}]} D_K^{-\frac{1}{[K:\mathbb{Q}]}}$  for such fields  $K$ . As  $\eta < 1$ , this lower bound is insufficient for all integers  $\ell \geq 2$ . This lower bound barrier is notoriously difficult and tied to Landau–Siegel zeros. Our alternative argument allows us to avoid this requirement and hence establish an effective form of Theorem 2.

## REFERENCES

- [An20] C. An.  $\ell$ -torsion in class groups of certain families of  $D_4$ -quartic fields. *J. Théor. Nombres Bordeaux*, 32(1):1–23, 2020.
- [AV23] S Akhtari and J. D. Vaaler. Lower bounds for regulators of number fields in terms of their discriminants. *J. Théor. Nombres Bordeaux*, 35(1):259–282, 2023.
- [BS96] A. Brumer and J. H. Silverman. The number of elliptic curves over  $\mathbb{Q}$  with conductor  $N$ . *Manuscripta Math.*, 91(1):95–102, 1996.

- [BST<sup>+</sup>20] M. Bhargava, A. Shankar, T. Taniguchi, F. Thorne, J. Tsimerman, and Y. Zhao. Bounds on 2-torsion in class groups of number fields and integral points on elliptic curves. *J. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 33(4):1087–1099, 2020.
- [EPW17] J. S. Ellenberg, L. B. Pierce, and M. M. Wood. On  $\ell$ -torsion in class groups of number fields. *Algebra Number Theory*, 11(8):1739–1778, 2017.
- [EV07] J. S. Ellenberg and A. Venkatesh. Reflection principles and bounds for class group torsion. *Int. Math. Res. Not. IMRN*, (1):Art. ID rnm002, 18, 2007.
- [FW18] C. Frei and M. Widmer. Average bounds for the  $\ell$ -torsion in class groups of cyclic extensions. *Res. Number Theory*, 4(3):Paper No. 34, 25, 2018.
- [FW21] C. Frei and M. Widmer. Averages and higher moments for the  $\ell$ -torsion in class groups. *Math. Ann.*, 379(3-4):1205–1229, 2021.
- [HB24] D. R. Heath-Brown.  $\ell$ -Torsion in Class Groups via Dirichlet  $L$ -functions, 2024.
- [HBP17] D. R. Heath-Brown and L. B. Pierce. Averages and moments associated to class numbers of imaginary quadratic fields. *Compos. Math.*, 153(11):2287–2309, 2017.
- [HV06] H. A. Helfgott and A. Venkatesh. Integral points on elliptic curves and 3-torsion in class groups. *J. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 19(3):527–550, 2006.
- [KT24] P. Koymans and J. Thorner. Bounds for moments of  $\ell$ -torsion in class groups. *Math. Ann.*, 390(2):3221–3237, 2024.
- [KW22] J. Klüners and J. Wang.  $\ell$ -torsion bounds for the class group of number fields with an  $\ell$ -group as Galois group. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 150(7):2793–2805, 2022.
- [LOS24] R. J. Lemke Oliver and A. Smith. Faithful Artin induction and the Chebotarev density theorem, 2024.
- [LOTZ24] R. J. Lemke Oliver, J. Thorner, and A. Zaman. An approximate form of Artin’s holomorphy conjecture and non-vanishing of Artin  $L$ -functions. *Invent. Math.*, 235(3):893–971, 2024.
- [LOWW21] R. J. Lemke Oliver, J. Wang, and M. M. Wood. The average size of 3-torsion in class groups of 2-extensions, 2021.
- [Pie05] L. B. Pierce. The 3-part of class numbers of quadratic fields. *J. London Math. Soc. (2)*, 71(3):579–598, 2005.
- [Pie06] L. B. Pierce. A bound for the 3-part of class numbers of quadratic fields by means of the square sieve. *Forum Math.*, 18(4):677–698, 2006.
- [Pie23] L. B. Pierce. Counting problems: class groups, primes, and number fields. In *ICM—International Congress of Mathematicians. Vol. 3. Sections 1–4*, pages 1940–1965. EMS Press, Berlin, 2023.
- [PTBW20] L. B. Pierce, C. L. Turnage-Butterbaugh, and M. M. Wood. An effective Chebotarev density theorem for families of number fields, with an application to  $\ell$ -torsion in class groups. *Invent. Math.*, 219(2):701–778, 2020.
- [Rad60] H. Rademacher. On the Phragmén-Lindelöf theorem and some applications. *Math. Z.*, 72:192–204, 1959/1960.
- [Sil84] J. H. Silverman. An inequality relating the regulator and the discriminant of a number field. *J. Number Theory*, 19(3):437–442, 1984.
- [Sta74] H. M. Stark. Some effective cases of the Brauer-Siegel theorem. *Invent. Math.*, 23:135–152, 1974.
- [TZ23] J. Thorner and A. Zaman. A zero density estimate for Dedekind zeta functions. *Int. Math. Res. Not. IMRN*, (8):6739–6761, 2023.
- [Wan20] J. Wang. Pointwise Bound for  $\ell$ -torsion in Class Groups II: Nilpotent Extensions, 2020.
- [Wan21] J. Wang. Pointwise bound for  $\ell$ -torsion in class groups: elementary abelian extensions. *J. Reine Angew. Math.*, 773:129–151, 2021.
- [Wid18] M. Widmer. Bounds for the  $\ell$ -torsion in class groups. *Bull. Lond. Math. Soc.*, 50(1):124–131, 2018.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, TUFTS UNIVERSITY, MEDFORD, MA 02155  
*Email address:* robert.lemke\_oliver@tufts.edu

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO, TORONTO, ONTARIO, CANADA M5S 2E4  
*Email address:* asif.zaman@utoronto.ca