

# NOTE ON THE CONTRIBUTION OF LOW ZEROS TO WEIL’S EXPLICIT FORMULA FOR MINIMAL DISCRIMINANTS

SAMI OMAR

### *Abstract*

The bulk of this paper consists of tables giving lower bounds for discriminants of number fields up to 48. The lower bounds are obtained by using two different inequalities for the discriminant, one due to Odlyzko, and the other due to Serre. These inequalities are derived from Weil’s explicit formula by choosing suitable weight functions. The bounds are compared with actual values of the discriminants, and the relative errors are computed. The computations show that, at least for the values computed, the bounds obtained via Odlyzko’s inequality are better than those obtained via Serre’s inequality, and are generally within a few percentage points of the true value. This difference can be attributed to a difference in the weighting given to the contribution of low zeros by the two inequalities.

### 1. Introduction

Let  $K$  be a number field of degree  $n$  and signature  $(r_1, r_2)$ . We denote by  $d_K$  the discriminant of  $K$ . In 1890, Minkowski proved the inequality [9]

$$|d_K| > \frac{\pi}{3} \left(\frac{3\pi}{4}\right)^{n-1}, \tag{1}$$

which shows that the absolute values of discriminants grow to infinity with the degree. Other mathematicians (for example, Mulholland; see [3]) improved this lower bound by using geometric methods. Several years later, using analytic methods and more particularly the Landau identity on the Dedekind zeta function, Stark and Odlyzko obtained better lower bounds. All these identities, as Serre noticed, are only special cases of Weil’s explicit formulae relative to the choice of positive functions,  $F$ . These formulae relate the discriminant of a number field to two sums: the first sum is positive and runs over all the prime ideals of the field, whereas the other sum runs over all the non-trivial zeros of the Dedekind zeta function attached to the field. In the absence of any knowledge about the location of these zeros, we make this sum positive in order to obtain a lower bound for the discriminant. Since non-trivial zeros of the Dedekind zeta function appear in explicit formulae, it is not surprising that the results obtained are better if we assume the generalised Riemann hypothesis (GRH).

Under (GRH), by considering the function  $F_y(x) = e^{-yx^2}$ , where  $y > 0$  (used by Serre), Poutou (see [7]) established the inequality:

$$\frac{1}{n} \ln(|d_K|) \geq \ln(8\pi) + \gamma + \frac{r_1}{n} \frac{\pi}{2} - \frac{3}{\ln(n)}, \tag{2}$$

where  $\gamma = 0.57721566\dots$  is the Euler constant.

Received 17 November 2000, revised 16 October 2001; published 29th January 2002.

2000 Mathematics Subject Classification 11R42

© 2002, Sami Omar

If we consider Odlyzko's even function, defined for  $x \geq 0$  by:

$$F_y(x) = \begin{cases} (1 - x\sqrt{y}) \cos(\pi x\sqrt{y}) + \frac{1}{\pi} \sin(\pi x\sqrt{y}), & \text{for } x \in [0, 1/\sqrt{y}] \\ 0, & \text{for } x > 1/\sqrt{y}, \end{cases}$$

we obtain a better estimate (in  $1/\ln(n)^2$  instead of  $1/\ln(n)$ ):

$$\frac{1}{n} \ln(|d_K|) \geq \ln(8\pi) + \gamma + \frac{r_1 \pi}{n} - \frac{2\pi^2(\lambda(3) + \frac{r_1}{n}\beta(3))}{\ln(n)^2}, \tag{3}$$

where

$$\lambda(3) = 1 + \frac{1}{3^3} + \frac{1}{5^3} + \frac{1}{7^3} + \dots = 1.05179\dots,$$

and

$$\beta(3) = 1 - \frac{1}{3^3} + \frac{1}{5^3} - \frac{1}{7^3} + \dots = \frac{\pi^3}{32} = 0.96894\dots$$

An open problem (see [4]) is to compute, for each degree and signature, the fields  $K_{\min}$  having discriminant  $d_{K_{\min}}$  of minimal absolute value. For these fields, we can compare the value  $\ln |d_{K_{\min}}|$  to Odlyzko's bound  $B_o$  for the corresponding degree and signature. For degrees less than or equal to 7, the fields of the minimal discriminants are known. At this time, beyond degree 9, there is a table of the smallest known discriminants of totally imaginary number fields of degree up to 80 (see [1]). We compute the error

$$e = \frac{|d_{K_{\min}}|^{1/n} - \exp(B_o/n)}{\exp(B_o/n)},$$

and we notice that the relative error does not exceed 7% except for the totally real number field of degree 7 of minimal discriminant, for which the error is 14.9%.

It should be noted that this error is due on the one hand to local corrections coming from the decomposition of ideals in the number field, and on the other hand to the contribution of the zeros of the Dedekind zeta function. For the computation of low zeros, there is a formula of Friedman–Lavrik (see [2]) implemented by Tollis (see [10]), but computations are restricted to number fields of degree less than 7. In [5], we compute low zeros by using Weil's explicit formula. More precisely, we reverse the construction that was used by Serre and Odlyzko to bound discriminants, in order to use it when the discriminant of the field is known. Therefore, we estimate the first zero of the Dedekind zeta function of totally imaginary fields of degree less than 30 having the smallest known discriminant. Unfortunately, this method is not efficient for computing high zeros, and in any case requires the computation of the norms of many prime ideals. It is therefore easier to compute the norms of prime ideals by using efficient algorithms for factoring the minimal polynomial modulo rational primes, and to obtain the contribution of the zeros by substitution in Weil's explicit formula. Hence, one relevant question, asked by Odlyzko in [4], concerns the relative contributions of prime ideals and zeros to the explicit formula for minimal discriminants. In the following section, Weil's explicit formula is stated, as is a lower bound for the discriminant that is derived from this formula, which forms the basis of the numerical computations.

## 2. Weil's identity

Consider functions  $F : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , which are even and satisfy the following conditions.

- (A)  $F$  is continuous and continuously differentiable everywhere except at a finite number of points  $a_i$ , where  $F(x)$  and  $F'(x)$  have only a discontinuity of the first kind, such that  $F(a_i) = \frac{1}{2}(F(a_i + 0) + F(a_i - 0))$ .

(B) There is a number  $b > 0$  such that  $F(x)$  and  $F'(x)$  are  $O(e^{-(1/2+b)|x|})$  as  $|x| \rightarrow \infty$ . Then the Mellin transform of  $F$ :

$$\Phi(s) = \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} F(x)e^{(s-1/2)x} dx$$

is holomorphic in every strip  $-a \leq \sigma \leq 1 + a$  where  $0 < a < b$  and  $a < 1$ , and we have the following result, established by Weil (see [7] and [8]).

**Theorem (Weil).** Let  $F$  satisfy the conditions (A) and (B) above. Then the sum  $\sum \Phi(\rho)$  running over the non-trivial zeros  $\rho = \beta + i\gamma$  of  $\zeta_K(s)$  with  $|\gamma| < T$  tends to a limit as  $T$  tends to infinity, and this limit is given by the formula:

$$\sum_{\rho} \Phi(\rho) = \Phi(0) + \Phi(1) - 2 \sum_{p,m} \frac{\ln(N(\mathfrak{p}))}{N(\mathfrak{p})^{m/2}} F(m \ln(N(\mathfrak{p}))) + F(0) [\ln(|d_K|) - n \ln(2\pi)] - r_1 J(F) - n I(F), \tag{4}$$

where

$$J(F) = \int_0^{+\infty} \frac{F(x)}{2 \operatorname{ch}(x/2)} dx \quad \text{and} \quad I(F) = \int_0^{+\infty} \left( \frac{F(x)}{2 \operatorname{sh}(x/2)} - \frac{e^{-x}}{x} \right) dx.$$

**Consequences.** If we consider positive functions  $F$  depending on a positive parameter  $y$ , such that  $F(0) = 1$  and for which the Fourier transform is also positive, we get the inequality:

$$\ln(|d_K|) \geq -\Phi(0) - \Phi(1) + n(\ln(2\pi) + I(F)) + r_1 J(F). \tag{5}$$

In the case where  $F$  is either Serre's or Odlyzko's function, we determine the optimal value of  $y$  that gives the best lower bound for  $\ln(|d_K|)$ , obtaining inequalities (2) and (3).

### 3. Key to Table 1

The values given in Table 1 are presented in the following way. We denote by  $n$  the degree of an imaginary field of small discriminant, as given in [1]. We compute the optimal values of  $y$  that give the GRH Odlyzko bounds  $B_o$  and the Serre bounds  $B_s$ , respectively. Note that these bounds are slightly better than the published ones. We also compute the percentage  $E_o$  of the root discriminant  $|d_{K_{min}}|^{1/n}$  above  $\exp(B_o/n)$ , as well as  $v_o$ , the contribution of the ideal primes, and  $E'_o$ , the percentage above  $\exp((B_o + v_o)/n)$ . Similarly, we compute the percentage  $E_s$  of the root discriminant above  $\exp(B_s/n)$ , the contribution  $v_s$  of the ideal primes, and the percentage  $E'_s$  above  $\exp((B_s + v_s)/n)$ .

### 4. Comments

The computational results in Table 1 indicate that the contribution of the zeros to the explicit formulae for minimal discriminants is larger than the contribution of the prime ideals, but that both of them seem to be of comparable magnitude. Evidently, by selecting Odlyzko's function, we obtain GRH bounds that are much closer to the discriminants of existing fields than with Serre's function. However, the contribution of the zeros to the latter function is smaller than in the case of a function with bounded support, such as that of Odlyzko. Actually Serre's function concentrates the sum over the zeros only on the very low zeros, which is roughly the main idea used for computing low zeros in [5], and the order  $n_\chi$  of a zero of an Artin  $L$ -function at the central point  $s$  is equal to  $\frac{1}{2}$  (see [6]).

Table 1: The contribution of zeros to the Odlyzko–Serre bounds

<b>n = 8</b>					
$y_o$	=	0.09576	$y_s$	=	0.478
$B_o$	=	13.9766614	$B_s$	=	13.79148
$E_o$	=	0.855589%	$E_s$	=	3.217392%
$v_o$	=	0.0211467	$v_s$	=	0.114526
$E'_o$	=	0.589344%	$E'_s$	=	1.750274%
<b>n = 10</b>					
$y_o$	=	0.07544	$y_s$	=	0.379
$B_o$	=	19.0660226	$B_s$	=	18.81308
$E_o$	=	0.939466%	$E_s$	=	3.525133%
$v_o$	=	0.0201688	$v_s$	=	0.151892
$E'_o$	=	0.736087%	$E'_s$	=	1.9645%
<b>n = 12</b>					
$y_o$	=	0.06308	$y_s$	=	0.319
$B_o$	=	24.3415208	$B_s$	=	24.01669
$E_o$	=	0.843225%	$E_s$	=	3.610240%
$v_o$	=	0.0115306	$v_s$	=	0.180580
$E'_o$	=	0.746373%	$E'_s$	=	2.0627%
<b>n = 14</b>					
$y_o$	=	0.05477	$y_{_s}$	=	0.277
$B_o$	=	29.7576430	$B_s$	=	29.35786
$E_o$	=	0.581082%	$E_s$	=	3.494613%
$v_o$	=	0.0180307	$v_s$	=	0.212350
$E'_o$	=	0.451625%	$E'_s$	=	1.9366%
<b>n = 16</b>					
$y_o$	=	0.04879	$y_s$	=	0.248
$B_o$	=	35.2848987	$B_s$	=	34.80769
$E_o$	=	1.163917%	$E_s$	=	4.226583%
$v_o$	=	0.0468898	$v_s$	=	0.281873
$E'_o$	=	0.867879%	$E'_s$	=	2.4064%
<b>n = 18</b>					
$y_o$	=	0.04427	$y_s$	=	0.225
$B_o$	=	40.9029186	$B_s$	=	40.34632
$E_o$	=	1.377733%	$E_s$	=	4.561493%
$v_o$	=	0.0669201	$v_s$	=	0.347252
$E'_o$	=	0.981985%	$E'_s$	=	2.5636%
<b>n = 20</b>					
$y_o$	=	0.04073	$y_s$	=	0.208
$B_o$	=	46.5969446	$B_s$	=	45.95933
$E_o$	=	1.572763%	$E_s$	=	4.863109%
$v_o$	=	0.1166656	$v_s$	=	0.491621
$E'_o$	=	0.981985%	$E'_s$	=	2.3168%

Continued on the following page

Table 1, continued

<b>n = 22</b>					
$y_o$	=	0.03787	$y_s$	=	0.194
$B_o$	=	52.3558796	$B_s$	=	51.63586
$E_o$	=	1.853671%	$E_s$	=	5.242294%
$v_o$	=	0.2399226	$v_s$	=	0.525236
$E'_o$	=	0.748933%	$E'_s$	=	2.7759%
<b>n = 24</b>					
$y_o$	=	0.03551	$y_s$	=	0.182
$B_o$	=	58.1711296	$B_s$	=	57.367554
$E_o$	=	1.348998%	$E_s$	=	4.799842%
$v_o$	=	0.0784337	$v_s$	=	0.468384
$E'_o$	=	1.018323%	$E'_s$	=	2.7743%
<b>n = 26</b>					
$y_o$	=	0.03352	$y_s$	=	0.172
$B_o$	=	64.0358757	$B_s$	=	63.147700
$E_o$	=	5.788320%	$E_s$	=	9.464547%
$v_o$	=	0.6124699	$v_s$	=	0.948136
$E'_o$	=	3.325436%	$E'_s$	=	5.5446%
<b>n = 28</b>					
$y_o$	=	0.03183	$y_s$	=	0.164
$B_o$	=	69.9446011	$B_s$	=	68.970908
$E_o$	=	1.135052%	$E_s$	=	4.713863%
$v_o$	=	0.0904462	$v_s$	=	0.541031
$E'_o$	=	0.808890%	$E'_s$	=	2.7099%
<b>n = 30</b>					
$y_o$	=	0.03036	$y_s$	=	0.156
$B_o$	=	75.8927614	$B_s$	=	74.832739
$E_o$	=	1.720601%	$E_s$	=	5.379056%
$v_o$	=	0.0865725	$v_s$	=	0.635029
$E'_o$	=	1.427484%	$E'_s$	=	3.1718%
<b>n = 32</b>					
$y_o$	=	0.02908	$y_s$	=	0.150
$B_o$	=	81.8765639	$B_s$	=	80.729609
$E_o$	=	1.113499%	$E_s$	=	4.825654%
$v_o$	=	0.1139595	$v_s$	=	0.634821
$E'_o$	=	0.775468%	$E'_s$	=	2.7665%
<b>n = 36</b>					
$y_o$	=	0.02694	$y_s$	=	0.139
$B_o$	=	93.9387309	$B_s$	=	92.615850
$E_o$	=	1.709112%	$E_s$	=	5.516104%
$v_o$	=	0.1994260	$v_s$	=	0.812826
$E'_o$	=	1.147241%	$E'_s$	=	3.1604%

Continued on the following page

Table 1, continued

<b>n = 40</b>					
$y_o$	=	0.02521	$y_s$	=	0.131
$B_o$	=	106.110512	$B_s$	=	104.609693
$E_o$	=	1.543488%	$E_s$	=	5.425825%
$v_o$	=	0.2045192	$v_s$	=	0.867687
$E'_o$	=	1.025623%	$E'_s$	=	3.1635%
<b>n = 48</b>					
$y_o$	=	0.02260	$y_s$	=	0.118
$B_o$	=	130.724149	$B_s$	=	128.862258
$E_o$	=	1.005948%	$E_s$	=	5.000888%
$v_o$	=	0.1173174	$v_s$	=	0.942677
$E'_o$	=	0.759379%	$E'_s$	=	2.9588%

References

1. H. COHEN, F. DIAZ Y DIAZ and M. OLIVIER, 'A table of totally complex number fields of small discriminants', *Algorithmic number theory*, Lecture Notes in Comput. Sci. 1423 (Ed. J. Buhler, Springer, Berlin, 1998) 381–391. 2, 3
2. H. COHEN, *Advanced topics in computational number theory*, Grad. Texts in Math. 193 (Springer, New York, 2000). 2
3. H. P. MULHOLLAND, 'On the product of  $n$  complex homogeneous linear forms', *J. London Math. Soc.* 35 (1960) 241–250. 1
4. A. M. ODLYZKO, 'Bounds for discriminants and related estimates for class numbers, regulators and zeros of zeta functions: A survey of recent results', *J. Théor. Nombres Bordeaux* (1990) 119–141. 2, 2
5. S. OMAR, 'Localization of the first zero of the Dedekind zeta function', *Math. Comp.* 70 (2001) 1607–1616. 2, 3
6. S. OMAR, 'On Artin  $L$ -functions for octic quaternion fields', *Experiment. Math.* 10 (2001) 237–245. 3
7. G. POITOU, 'Minors de discriminants', *Séminaire Bourbaki*, 28e année (1975/1976), Exp. 479, Lecture Notes in Math. 567 (Springer, Berlin, 1977) 136–153. 1, 3
8. G. POITOU, 'Sur les petits discriminants', *Séminaire Delange–Pisot–Poitou*, 18e année (1976/1977), Théorie des Nombres Fasc. 1, Exp. 6 (Secrétariat Math., Paris, 1977). 3
9. P. SAMUEL, *Théorie algébrique des nombres* (Hermann, Paris, 1967). 1
10. E. TOLLIS, 'Zeros of Dedekind zeta functions in the critical strip', *Math. Comp.* 66 (1997) 1295–1321. 2

Sami Omar [omar@math.u-bordeaux.fr](mailto:omar@math.u-bordeaux.fr)

UFR Mathématiques

Université Bordeaux I - France

Laboratoire A2X

351, Cours de la Libération

33405 Talence

France