

## NOTES ON THE DISTRIBUTION OF ROOTS MODULO A PRIME OF A POLYNOMIAL II

YOSHIYUKI KITAOKA

Author is retired, Asahi, JAPAN

**ABSTRACT.** Let  $f(x)$  be a monic polynomial with integer coefficients and  $0 \leq r_1 \leq \dots \leq r_n < p$  its roots modulo a prime  $p$ . We generalize a conjecture on the distribution of roots  $r_i$  with additional congruence relations  $r_i \equiv R_i \pmod{L}$  from the case that  $f$  has no non-trivial linear relation among roots to the case that  $f$  has a non-trivial linear relation.

*Communicated by Shigeki Akiyama*

In this note, a polynomial means always a monic one over the ring  $\mathbb{Z}$  of integers and the letter  $p$  denotes a prime number, unless specified. Let

$$f(x) = x^n + a_{n-1}x^{n-1} + \dots + a_0 \quad (1)$$

be a polynomial of degree  $n$ . As in the previous paper, we put

$$\text{Spl}_X(f) := \{p \leq X \mid f(x) \text{ is fully splitting modulo } p\}$$

for a positive number  $X$  and  $\text{Spl}(f) := \text{Spl}_\infty(f)$ . Moreover, we require the following conditions on the local roots  $r_1, \dots, r_n \in \mathbb{Z}$  of  $f(x) \equiv 0 \pmod{p}$  for a prime  $p \in \text{Spl}(f)$ :

$$f(x) \equiv \prod_{i=1}^n (x - r_i) \pmod{p}, \quad (2)$$

$$0 \leq r_1 \leq r_2 \leq \dots \leq r_n < p. \quad (3)$$

The condition (2) is the definition of  $p \in \text{Spl}(f)$ . We can determine local roots  $r_i$  uniquely with the global ordering (3). If  $f(x), f'(x)$  are relatively prime

---

© 2019 BOKU-University of Natural Resources and Life Sciences and Mathematical Institute, Slovak Academy of Sciences.

2010 Mathematics Subject Classification: 11K.

Keywords: distribution, polynomial, roots modulo a prime.

Licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution-NC-ND 4.0 International Public License.

in  $\mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z}[x]$  and  $a_0 \not\equiv 0 \pmod{p}$ , then (3) is equivalent to  $0 < r_1 < \cdots < r_n < p$ . From now on, local roots  $r_i$  are supposed to satisfy conditions (2) and (3).

Let  $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n \in \mathbb{C}$  be roots of a polynomial  $f$  in (1) and we fix their numbering once and for all. Define a vector space  $\text{LR}$  over  $\mathbb{Q}$  by

$$\text{LR} := \left\{ (l_1, \dots, l_{n+1}) \in \mathbb{Q}^{n+1} \mid \sum_{i=1}^n l_i \alpha_i = l_{n+1} \right\}. \quad (4)$$

The vector  $(1, \dots, 1, -a_{n-1})$  is always in  $\text{LR}$ , hence  $t := \dim_{\mathbb{Q}} \text{LR} \geq 1$ . We say that a polynomial  $f$  has a non-trivial linear relation among roots if  $t > 1$ . Put

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Pr}_D(f, X) &:= \frac{\#\{p \in \text{Spl}_X(f) \mid (r_1/p, \dots, r_n/p) \in D\}}{\#\text{Spl}_X(f)}, \\ \text{Pr}_D(f) &:= \lim_{X \rightarrow \infty} \text{Pr}_D(f, X), \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

for a set  $D \subset [0, 1]^n$  with  $D = \overline{D}^\circ$ . Here we assume the existence of the limit, and so on. We stated the following Expectations 1, 1', 1'', 2 in [K1] :

**EXPECTATION 1.** If  $f$  has no non-trivial linear relation among roots, then

$$\text{Pr}_D(f) = \frac{\text{vol}(D \cap \hat{\mathfrak{D}}_n)}{\text{vol}(\hat{\mathfrak{D}}_n)},$$

where

$$\hat{\mathfrak{D}}_n := \left\{ (x_1, \dots, x_n) \in [0, 1]^n \mid 0 \leq x_1 \leq \cdots \leq x_n < 1, \sum_{i=1}^n x_i \in \mathbb{Z} \right\}.$$

Here,  $\hat{\mathfrak{D}}_n$  is contained in the union of hyperplanes  $\{(x_1, \dots, x_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid \sum_{i=1}^n x_i \in \mathbb{Z}\}$  and  $\text{vol}$  is the volume as an  $(n-1)$ -dimensional set. Let us consider a general polynomial, that is a polynomial which may have a non-trivial linear relation among roots, i.e.  $t \geq 1$ . Let

$$\hat{\mathbf{m}}_j := (m_{j,1}, \dots, m_{j,n}, m_j) \quad (j = 1, \dots, t)$$

be a  $\mathbb{Z}$ -basis of  $\text{LR} \cap \mathbb{Z}^{n+1}$  and put  $\mathbf{m}_j := (m_{j,1}, \dots, m_{j,n})$ . Since the conditions  $(l_1, \dots, l_{n+1}) \in \text{LR}$  and  $l_1, \dots, l_n \in \mathbb{Z}$  imply  $l_{n+1} \in \mathbb{Z}$  by roots  $\alpha_i$  being algebraic integers, the set of vectors  $\mathbf{m}_1, \dots, \mathbf{m}_t$  is a  $\mathbb{Z}$ -basis of

$$\left\{ (l_1, \dots, l_n) \in \mathbb{Z}^n \mid \sum_{i=1}^n l_i \alpha_i \in \mathbb{Q} \right\}.$$

Proposition 1 in [K1] says that for a sufficiently large prime  $p \in \text{Spl}(f)$ , there is at least one permutation  $\sigma \in S_n$  dependent on  $p$  such that

$$\sum_{i=1}^n m_{j,i} r_{\sigma(i)} \equiv m_j \pmod{p} \quad (1 \leq j \leq t), \quad (6)$$

## DISTRIBUTION OF ROOTS OF A POLYNOMIAL

hence we have for some permutation  $\sigma$  and integers  $k_j$  ( $j = 1, \dots, t$ ) dependent on a prime  $p$

$$\sum_{i=1}^n m_{j,i} r_{\sigma(i)} = m_j + k_j p \quad (1 \leq \forall j \leq t). \quad (7)$$

Once we take and fix bases  $\hat{\mathbf{m}}_j$ , the possibility of integers  $k_j$  is finite by  $0 \leq r_i < p$ .

If  $f$  has no non-trivial linear relation, then  $t = 1$ ,  $\hat{\mathbf{m}}_1 = (1, \dots, 1, -a_{n-1})$  and (7) is, for a sufficiently large  $p \in \text{Spl}(f)$ ,

$$\sum_i r_i = -a_{n-1} + kp \quad (1 \leq k < n).$$

Correlating with (6), we put, for a permutation  $\sigma \in S_n$ ,

$$\text{Spl}_X(f, \sigma) := \left\{ p \in \text{Spl}_X(f) \left| \sum_{i=1}^n m_{j,i} r_{\sigma(i)} \equiv m_j \pmod{p} \quad (1 \leq \forall j \leq t) \right. \right\} \quad (8)$$

and

$$\mathfrak{D}(f, \sigma) := \left\{ (x_1, \dots, x_n) \in [0, 1)^n \left| \begin{array}{l} 0 \leq x_1 \leq \dots \leq x_n < 1, \\ \sum_{i=1}^n m_{j,i} x_{\sigma(i)} \in \mathbb{Z} \quad (1 \leq \forall j \leq t) \end{array} \right. \right\}. \quad (9)$$

It is obvious that  $\dim \mathfrak{D}(f, \sigma) \leq n - t$ . If  $f$  has no non-trivial linear relation among roots, then it is easy to see that  $\text{Spl}_X(f, \sigma) = \text{Spl}_X(f)$  and  $\mathfrak{D}(f, \sigma) = \hat{\mathfrak{D}}_n$  for any permutation  $\sigma$ . The following is a generalization of Expectation 1.

**EXPECTATION 1'.**

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Pr}_D(f, \sigma) &:= \lim_{X \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\#\{p \in \text{Spl}_X(f, \sigma) \mid (r_1/p, \dots, r_n/p) \in D\}}{\#\text{Spl}_X(f, \sigma)} \\ &= \frac{\text{vol}(D \cap \mathfrak{D}(f, \sigma))}{\text{vol}(\mathfrak{D}(f, \sigma))} \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

for a permutation  $\sigma$  if  $\dim \mathfrak{D}(f, \sigma) = n - t$ , and  $\text{vol}$  is the volume as an  $(n - t)$ -dimensional set.

The expectation on the density of the set  $\text{Spl}_\infty(f, \sigma)$  is

**EXPECTATION 1''.**

$$\text{Pr}(f, \sigma) := \lim_{X \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\#\text{Spl}_X(f, \sigma)}{\#\text{Spl}_X(f)} = c^{-1} \cdot \text{vol}(\mathfrak{D}(f, \sigma)), \quad (11)$$

where the constant  $c$  is independent of  $\sigma$ .

The explicit value of  $c$  is given in Proposition 4 in the subsection 2.3 and by using it, Expectation 1 is generalized to a polynomial with a non-trivial linear relation among roots (see (30) in the subsection 2.4).

To state the distribution of roots  $r_i$  with congruence conditions

$$r_i \equiv R_i \pmod{L} \quad (i = 1, \dots, n) \quad (12)$$

for given integers  $L (\geq 2)$  and  $R_i$ , we introduced notations

$$\Pr_X(f, L, \{R_i\}) := \frac{\#\{p \in \text{Spl}_X(f) \mid r_i \equiv R_i \pmod{L} \ (1 \leq i \leq n)\}}{\#\text{Spl}_X(f)} \quad (13)$$

and

$$\Pr(f, L, \{R_i\}) := \lim_{X \rightarrow \infty} \Pr_X(f, L, \{R_i\}), \quad (14)$$

and proposed the following to a polynomial without non-trivial linear relation among roots.

**EXPECTATION 2.**

$$\Pr(f, L, \{R_i\}) = \frac{1}{L^{n-1}} \sum_{k, q} \frac{E_n(k)}{[\mathbb{Q}(\zeta_L) : \mathbb{Q}(f) \cap \mathbb{Q}(\zeta_{L/d})]}, \quad (15)$$

where  $k, q$  run over a set of integers satisfying

$$1 \leq k \leq n-1, \quad d := (k, L),$$

and

$$\begin{cases} q \in (\mathbb{Z}/L\mathbb{Z})^\times, \\ a_{n-1} + \sum_{i=1}^n R_i \equiv kq \pmod{L}, \\ [[q]] = [[1]] \text{ on } \mathbb{Q}(f) \cap \mathbb{Q}(\zeta_{L/d}). \end{cases}$$

Here  $E_n(k)$  is the volume of the set  $\{\mathbf{x} \in [0, 1)^{n-1} \mid k-1 < x_1 + \dots + x_{n-1} \leq k\}$  and it is also given as  $E_n(k) = A(n-1, k)/(n-1)!$ , using Eulerian numbers  $A(n, k)$  ( $1 \leq k \leq n$ ) defined recursively by

$$A(1, 1) = 1, \quad A(n, k) = (n-k+1)A(n-1, k-1) + kA(n-1, k).$$

And  $\zeta_L$  is a primitive  $L$ th root of unity, and  $\mathbb{Q}(f)$  is a Galois extension of the rational number field  $\mathbb{Q}$  generated by all roots  $\alpha_i$  of  $f$ . Lastly for an abelian field  $F$  in  $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta_c)$  and an integer  $m$  relatively prime to  $c$ ,  $[[m]]$  denotes an automorphism of  $F$  induced by  $\zeta_c \rightarrow \zeta_c^m$ .

In the first section of this note, we review Expectation 2 and generalize it to a polynomial with a non-trivial linear relation among roots: Restricting a prime  $p \in \text{Spl}(f)$  by the condition (7), we introduce a more natural density  $\Pr(f, \sigma, \{k_j\}, L, \{R_i\})$  than  $\Pr(f, L, \{R_i\})$  in (14), which seems to take the same value independent of integers  $\{R_i\}$  fixing a permutation  $\sigma$  and integers  $k_j$  in (7), if it does not vanish. In case of  $\deg f = 1$ , it is essentially equivalent to Dirichlet's prime number theorem on arithmetic progressions.

## DISTRIBUTION OF ROOTS OF A POLYNOMIAL

In the second section, we give several miscellaneous remarks on  $\text{Spl}(f, \sigma)$ ,  $\mathfrak{D}(f, \sigma)$  and the constant  $c$  in Expectation 1''.

### 1.

To state the conjecture, we introduce following notations according to conditions (6), (7), (12):

$$\text{Spl}_X(f, \sigma) = \left\{ p \in \text{Spl}_X(f) \left| \sum_{i=1}^n m_{j,i} r_{\sigma(i)} \equiv m_j \pmod{p^{(\forall j)}} \right. \right\}, \quad (\text{cf. (8)})$$

$$\text{Spl}_X(f, \sigma, \{k_j\}) := \left\{ p \in \text{Spl}_X(f, \sigma) \left| \sum_{i=1}^n m_{j,i} r_{\sigma(i)} = m_j + k_j p^{(\forall j)} \right. \right\},$$

$$\text{Spl}_X(f, \sigma, \{k_j\}, L, \{R_i\}) := \left\{ p \in \text{Spl}_X(f, \sigma, \{k_j\}) \mid r_i \equiv R_i \pmod{L^{(\forall i)}} \right\},$$

$$\text{Pr}(f, \sigma) = \lim_{X \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\#\text{Spl}_X(f, \sigma)}{\#\text{Spl}_X(f)}, \quad (\text{cf. (11)})$$

$$\text{Pr}(f, \sigma, \{k_j\}) := \lim_{X \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\#\text{Spl}_X(f, \sigma, \{k_j\})}{\#\text{Spl}_X(f, \sigma)},$$

$$\text{Pr}(f, \sigma, \{k_j\}, L, \{R_i\}) := \lim_{X \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\#\text{Spl}_X(f, \sigma, \{k_j\}, L, \{R_i\})}{\#\text{Spl}_X(f, \sigma, \{k_j\})},$$

where for the last two, the denominators  $\#\text{Spl}_X(f, \sigma)$ ,  $\#\text{Spl}_X(f, \sigma, \{k_j\})$  of the right-hand sides are supposed to tend to the infinity.

The density  $\text{Pr}(f, \sigma)$  is given by (11), where the constant  $c$  will be given by Proposition 4 in the subsection 2.3. (11) implies that the density of  $\text{Spl}_\infty(f, \sigma)$  is positive if and only if the geometric condition  $\dim \mathfrak{D}(f, \sigma) = n - t$  holds. It seems that two conditions  $\#\text{Spl}_\infty(f, \sigma) = \infty$  and  $\text{Pr}(f, \sigma) > 0$  are equivalent. What is the number of permutations  $\sigma$  with  $\text{Pr}(f, \sigma) > 0$  or  $\dim \mathfrak{D}(f, \sigma) = n - t$ ?

Putting

$$D(\sigma, \{k_j\}) := \left\{ (x_1, \dots, x_n) \left| \left| \sum_{i=1}^n m_{j,i} x_{\sigma(i)} - k_j \right| \leq 1/3 \ (j = 1, \dots, t) \right. \right\},$$

we see that for a sufficiently large  $p \in \text{Spl}_\infty(f, \sigma)$ , the condition  $(r_1/p, \dots, r_n/p) \in D(\sigma, \{k_j\})$  is equivalent to (7). Hence the density  $\text{Pr}(f, \sigma, \{k_j\})$  is equal to the density  $\text{Pr}_D(f, \sigma)$  in Expectation 1' with  $D = D(\sigma, \{k_j\})$ , thus we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\Pr(f, \sigma, \{k_j\}) &= \Pr_{D(\sigma, \{k_j\})}(f, \sigma) = \frac{\text{vol}(D(\sigma, \{k_j\}) \cap \mathfrak{D}(f, \sigma))}{\text{vol}(\mathfrak{D}(f, \sigma))} \\
&= \frac{\text{vol}(\{(x_1, \dots, x_n) \mid 0 \leq x_1 \leq \dots \leq x_n < 1, \sum_i m_{j,i} x_{\sigma(i)} = k_j \text{ (}\forall j)\})}{\text{vol}(\mathfrak{D}(f, \sigma))} \quad (16)
\end{aligned}$$

by Expectation 1'.

Lastly, assume  $\#\text{Spl}_\infty(f, \sigma, \{k_j\}) = \infty$ ; then we expect that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\Pr(f, \sigma, \{k_j\}, L, \{R_i\}) \\
&= \begin{cases} \frac{1}{\#\mathfrak{R}(f, \sigma, \{k_j\}, L)} & \text{if } \#\text{Spl}_\infty(f, \sigma, \{k_j\}, L, \{R_i\}) = \infty, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad (17)
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\mathfrak{R}(f, \sigma, \{k_j\}, L) := \{\{R_i\} \in [0, L-1]^n \mid \#\text{Spl}_\infty(f, \sigma, \{k_j\}, L, \{R_i\}) = \infty\}.$$

It is not easy to see whether  $\#\text{Spl}_\infty(f, \sigma, \{k_j\}, L, \{R_i\}) = \infty$  or not. Suppose  $\#\text{Spl}_\infty(f, \sigma, \{k_j\}, L, \{R_i\}) = \infty$ ; then there is a large prime  $p \in \text{Spl}(f)$  such that  $\sum_i m_{j,i} r_{\sigma(i)} = m_j + k_j p$  and  $r_i \equiv R_i \pmod{L}$ , hence  $\sum_i m_{j,i} R_{\sigma(i)} \equiv m_j + k_j p \pmod{L}$  ( $j = 1, \dots, t$ ). Thus the following condition  $(C_1)$  is satisfied:

$(C_1) : (k_j, L) = (\sum_i m_{j,i} R_{\sigma(i)} - m_j, L) (= d_j \text{ say})$  and there is an integer  $q$  which is independent of  $j$ , relatively prime to  $L$  and satisfies that  $\sum_i m_{j,i} R_{\sigma(i)} - m_j \equiv k_j \cdot q \pmod{L}$  and  $[[q]] = [[1]]$  on  $\mathbb{Q}(f) \cap \mathbb{Q}(\zeta_{L/d_j})$ .

Data suggest that the condition  $(C_1)$  is also a sufficient condition, that is putting

$$\mathfrak{R}'(f, \sigma, \{k_j\}, L) := \{\{R_i\} \in [0, L-1]^n \mid (C_1)\} (\supset \mathfrak{R}(f, \sigma, \{k_j\}, L)),$$

we expect that

$$\mathfrak{R}(f, \sigma, \{k_j\}, L) = \mathfrak{R}'(f, \sigma, \{k_j\}, L) \text{ if } \#\text{Spl}_\infty(f, \sigma, \{k_j\}) = \infty. \quad (18)$$

**EXAMPLE 1.** Let us see the case of degree 1, i.e.  $f(x) = x - a$ : Then we see that the permutation  $\sigma$  is the identity,  $t = 1$ ,  $\hat{m}_1 = (1, a)$ , and the local root  $r_1$  is equal to  $a + k_1 p$  for  $k_1 = 0, 1$  according to  $a \geq 0$ ,  $a < 0$  if  $p > |a|$ . Hence we have  $\#\text{Spl}_\infty(f, id, k_1) < \infty$  unless  $k_1 = 0, 1$  according to  $a \geq 0$ ,  $a < 0$ . We consider only such an integer  $k_1$  ( $= 0$  or  $1$ ) and neglect a finite number of primes  $p$  less than or equal to  $|a|$ ; then we see that

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{Spl}_X(f, id) &= \{p \leq X\}, \\
\text{Spl}_X(f, id, k_1) &= \{p \leq X\}, \\
\text{Spl}_X(f, id, k_1, L, R_1) &= \{p \leq X \mid a + k_1 p \equiv R_1 \pmod{L}\},
\end{aligned}$$

hence

$$\Pr(f, id) = \Pr(f, id, k_1) = 1$$

and

$$\Pr(f, id, k_1, L, R_1) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } a \geq 0, a \equiv R_1 \pmod{L}, \\ 0 & \text{if } a \geq 0, a \not\equiv R_1 \pmod{L}, \\ \frac{1}{\varphi(L)} & \text{if } a < 0, (R_1 - a, L) = 1, \\ 0 & \text{if } a < 0, (R_1 - a, L) \neq 1 \end{cases}$$

by Dirichlet's theorem, and

$$\#\mathfrak{R}(f, id, k_1, L) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } a \geq 0, \\ \varphi(L) & \text{if } a < 0. \end{cases}$$

Thus the conjecture (17) is nothing but Dirichlet's theorem. Since the condition  $(C_1)$  is :  $d_1 := (R_1 - a, L) = (k_1, L) = L$  or 1 according to  $a \geq 0$  or  $a < 0$ , and there is an integer  $q$  such that  $(q, L) = 1$ ,  $R_1 - a \equiv k_1 q \pmod{L}$ , it is easy to see that (18) is true.

**EXAMPLE 2.** Let us see that Expectation 2 follows from the conjectures (17), (18). Suppose that a polynomial  $f$  has no non-trivial linear relation among roots. So, we have  $t = 1$ ,  $\hat{\mathbf{m}}_1 = (1, \dots, 1, -a_{n-1})$ . The equation (15) in Expectation 2 is equivalent to

$$\Pr(f, L, \{R_i\}) = \frac{1}{L^{n-1}} \sum_{k_1} \frac{E_n(k_1)}{[\mathbb{Q}(\zeta_{L/d}) : \mathbb{Q}(f) \cap \mathbb{Q}(\zeta_{L/d})]}, \quad (19)$$

where  $k_1$  satisfies that

$$1 \leq k_1 \leq n-1, d := (a_{n-1} + \sum R_i, L) = (k_1, L),$$

and that there is an integer  $q$  such that  $(q, L) = 1$ ,  $(a_{n-1} + \sum R_i)/d \equiv k_1/d \cdot q \pmod{L/d}$  and  $[[q]] = [[1]]$  on  $\mathbb{Q}(f) \cap \mathbb{Q}(\zeta_{L/d})$ , since the number of such integers  $q$  is  $[\mathbb{Q}(\zeta_L) : \mathbb{Q}(\zeta_{L/d})]$  if there exists. We see that for any permutation  $\sigma$

$$\text{Spl}_X(f, \sigma) = \text{Spl}_X(f),$$

$$\text{Spl}_X(f, \sigma, k_1) = \left\{ p \in \text{Spl}_X(f, \sigma) \mid \sum r_i = -a_{n-1} + k_1 p \right\},$$

$$\text{Spl}_X(f, \sigma, k_1, L, \{R_i\}) = \left\{ p \in \text{Spl}_X(f, \sigma, k_1) \mid r_i \equiv R_i \pmod{L} (\forall i) \right\}.$$

The identity  $\Pr(f, \sigma) = 1$  is obvious. Since we know

$$\text{vol}\left(\{\mathbf{x} \in \hat{\mathfrak{D}}_n \mid \sum x_i = k_1\}\right) / \text{vol}(\hat{\mathfrak{D}}_n) = E_n(k_1),$$

we have

$$\Pr(f, \sigma, k_1) = E_n(k_1) \quad \text{by (16).}$$

We see that the density in (14) is

$$\begin{aligned}
& \lim_{X \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\#\{p \in \text{Spl}_X(f) \mid r_i \equiv R_i \pmod{L}\}}{\#\text{Spl}_X(f)} \\
&= \sum_{k_1=1}^{n-1} \lim_{X \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\#\{p \in \text{Spl}_X(f) \mid r_i \equiv R_i \pmod{L}, \sum r_i = -a_{n-1} + k_1 p\}}{\#\text{Spl}_X(f)} \\
&= \sum_{k_1=1}^{n-1} \lim_{X \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\#\text{Spl}_X(f, \sigma, k_1, L, \{R_i\})}{\#\text{Spl}_X(f)} \\
&= \sum_{k_1=1}^{n-1} ', \lim_{X \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\#\text{Spl}_X(f, \sigma, k_1, L, \{R_i\})}{\#\text{Spl}_X(f, \sigma, k_1)} \cdot \frac{\#\text{Spl}_X(f, \sigma, k_1)}{\#\text{Spl}_X(f, \sigma)}
\end{aligned}$$

where  $\sum'$  means that  $k_1$  satisfies the condition  $\#\text{Spl}_\infty(f, \sigma, k_1, L, \{R_i\}) = \infty$ , i.e.  $\{R_i\} \in \mathfrak{R}(f, \sigma, k_1, L)$ , then  $\#\text{Spl}_\infty(f, \sigma, k_1) = \infty$  is satisfied

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \sum_{k_1=1}^{n-1} ' \Pr(f, \sigma, k_1, L, \{R_i\}) \Pr(f, \sigma, k_1) \\
&= \sum_{k_1=1}^{n-1} ', \frac{E_n(k_1)}{\#\mathfrak{R}(f, \sigma, k_1, L)} \quad \text{using (17).}
\end{aligned}$$

Put  $d_1 := (k_1, L)$  and suppose  $(\sum R_i + a_{n-1}, L) = d_1$ . Making use of  $(\sum R_i + a_{n-1})/d_1 \equiv k_1/d_1 \cdot p \pmod{L/d_1}$ , the mapping  $\{R_i\} \mapsto [[p]] \in \text{Gal}(\mathbb{Q}(\zeta_{L/d_1})/\mathbb{Q})$  tells us  $\#\mathfrak{R}'(f, \sigma, k_1, L) = L^{n-1}[\mathbb{Q}(\zeta_{L/d_1}) : \mathbb{Q}(f) \cap \mathbb{Q}(\zeta_{L/d_1})]$ . Hence under the assumption (18), we obtain (15) in Expectation 2.

Putting

$$C(f, L, k) := \frac{E_n(k)}{L^{n-1}[\mathbb{Q}(\zeta_{L/d}) : \mathbb{Q}(f) \cap \mathbb{Q}(\zeta_{L/d})]} \quad (d := (k, L)),$$

we have checked for polynomials

$$x^2 + 1, x^3 + 2, x^4 + x^3 + x^2 + x + 1, x^5 + 2, x^6 + x^5 + x^4 + x^3 + x^2 + x + 1,$$

which have no non-trivial linear relation among roots that there is a large number  $X (\leq 10^{12})$  and  $L \leq 7$  such that

$$\left| \frac{\#\text{Spl}_X(f, \sigma, k, L, \{R_i\})}{\#\text{Spl}_X(f)} - C(f, L, k) \right| < C(f, L, k)/10$$

if  $\#\text{Spl}_X(f, \sigma, k, L, \{R_i\}) > 10$ .



# DISTRIBUTION OF ROOTS OF A POLYNOMIAL

**EXAMPLE 3.** Suppose that a polynomial  $f(x) = (x^2 + ax)^2 + b(x^2 + ax) + c$  is irreducible. It is an irreducible polynomial of the least degree with a non-trivial linear relation. For roots  $\beta_1, \beta_2$  of  $x^2 + bx + c$ , denote roots of  $x^2 + ax = \beta_i$  by  $\alpha_{i,j}$  ( $j = 1, 2$ ). Then we can take linear equations  $\alpha_{i,1} + \alpha_{i,2} = -a$  ( $i = 1, 2$ ) as a basis of linear relations among roots of  $f(x)$  ([K1]). By putting  $\alpha_1 = \alpha_{1,1}, \alpha_2 = \alpha_{2,1}, \alpha_3 = \alpha_{2,2}, \alpha_4 = \alpha_{1,2}$ , the relations  $\alpha_1 + \alpha_4 = \alpha_2 + \alpha_3 = -a$  are a basis, hence we see that  $t = 2$  and  $\hat{\mathbf{m}}_1 = (1, 0, 0, 1, -a), \hat{\mathbf{m}}_2 = (0, 1, 1, 0, -a)$ . Let  $p$  be a large prime in  $\text{Spl}(f)$  and  $r_i$  local roots, which are supposed to satisfy  $0 < r_1 < \dots < r_4 < p$  by the assumption. Then, the induced local linear relations (7) among them are  $r_1 + r_4 = -a + p, r_2 + r_3 = -a + p$  for a large prime  $p$ , hence a permutation  $\sigma$  with  $\#\text{Spl}(f, \sigma) = \infty$  satisfies  $\{\sigma(1), \sigma(4)\} = \{1, 4\}$  or  $\{2, 3\}$  with  $k_1 = k_2 = 1$ . For such permutations  $\sigma$  and  $k_1 = k_2 = 1$ , we see that  $\text{Spl}_X(f, \sigma, \{k_j\}) = \text{Spl}_X(f)$  and  $\text{Spl}_X(f, \sigma, \{k_j\}, L, \{R_i\}) = \{p \in \text{Spl}_X(f) \mid r_i \equiv R_i \pmod{L}\}$ , neglecting a finite number of small primes. Our expectation with (18) is, for  $\mathfrak{R}' = \mathfrak{R}'(f, \sigma, \{k_j\}, L)$

$$\Pr(f, \sigma, \{k_i\}, L, \{R_i\}) = \begin{cases} 1/\#\mathfrak{R}' & \text{if } (R_1, \dots, R_4) \in \mathfrak{R}', \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

We have checked for  $2 \leq L \leq 40$  and for polynomials in the following table below

[a,b,c]	G	Max. abelian subfield	Cond
[10, 5, 7]	D	$x^4 - x^2 + 1$	12
[10, 2, 3]	D	$x^4 + 1$	8
[4, 4, 5]	D	$x^4 + 3x^2 + 1$	20
[9, -3, 3]	D	$x^4 - x^3 - x^2 - 2x + 4$	21
[-3, 0, 9]	B	$x^4 - x^2 + 1$	12
[-2, 1, 4]	B	$x^4 - x^3 + 2x^2 + x + 1$	15
[-4, 0, 9]	B	$x^4 + 1$	8
[-3, 4, 9]	B	$x^4 + 3x^2 + 1$	20
[0, 0, 1]	B	$x^4 + 1$	8
[-1, 3, 1]	C	$x^4 - x^3 + x^2 - x + 1$	5
[-9, 3, -9]	C	$x^4 - x^3 - 4x^2 + 4x + 1$	15
[-6, 8, -4]	C	$x^4 - 5x^2 + 5$	20
[-1, 7, 9]	C	$x^4 - x^3 + 2x^2 + 4x + 3$	13
[-8, -8, 8]	C	$x^4 - 4x^2 + 2$	16
[-6, 1, -4]	C	$x^4 - x^3 - 6x^2 + x + 1$	17
[-4, -2, -4]	C	$x^4 - 10x^2 + 20$	40

that there is a number  $X (\leq 10^{12})$  such that  $|\text{Pr}_X(f, \sigma, \{k_i\}, L, \{R_i\}) - 1/\#\mathfrak{R}'| < 1/(10\#\mathfrak{R}')$  if  $(R_1, \dots, R_4) \in \mathfrak{R}'$ . In the table,  $[a, b, c]$  means a polynomial  $f := (x^2 + ax)^2 + b(x^2 + ax) + c$ , and  $G$  is the Galois group  $\text{Gal}(\mathbb{Q}(f)/\mathbb{Q})$ :  $D$  is the dihedral group of order 8,  $B$  is  $\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}$ , and  $C$  means  $\mathbb{Z}/4\mathbb{Z}$ . “Max. abelian subfield” is a defining polynomial of the maximal abelian subfield of  $\mathbb{Q}(f)$ , which is of degree 4. “Cond” is its conductor.

**EXAMPLE 4.** Let us give another example of a polynomial with a non-trivial linear relation among roots. Let

$$f(x) = x^6 + 2x^5 + 4x^4 + x^3 + 2x^2 - 3x + 1,$$

whose roots are

$$v = (\zeta_7^3 + \zeta_7, \quad \zeta_7^5 + \zeta_7^4, \quad -\zeta_7^5 - \zeta_7^4 - \zeta_7^3 - \zeta_7 - 1, \\ \zeta_7^3 + \zeta_7^2, \quad \zeta_7^5 + \zeta_7, \quad -\zeta_7^5 - \zeta_7^3 - \zeta_7^2 - \zeta_7 - 1)$$

and the basis of linear relations among roots are  $v_1 + v_2 + v_3 = -1$ ,  $v_4 + v_5 + v_6 = -1$ . Hence we have  $t = 2$  and (7) is

$$r_{\sigma(1)} + r_{\sigma(2)} + r_{\sigma(3)} = -1 + k_1 p, \quad r_{\sigma(4)} + r_{\sigma(5)} + r_{\sigma(6)} = -1 + k_2 p.$$

We have only to consider the case  $1 \in \{\sigma(1), \sigma(2), \sigma(3)\}$ , and then possible permutations  $\sigma$  and a pair  $[k_1, k_2]$  of integers are following (1),  $\dots$ , (9.3):

permutation, $[k_1, k_2]$
(1) : $[1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6], [1, 2]$ ,
(2) : $[1, 2, 4, 3, 5, 6], [1, 2]$ ,
(3) : $[1, 2, 5, 3, 4, 6], [1, 2]$ ,
(4.1) : $[1, 2, 6, 3, 4, 5], [1, 1]$ ,
(4.2) : $[1, 2, 6, 3, 4, 5], [1, 2]$ ,
(4.3) : $[1, 2, 6, 3, 4, 5], [2, 2]$ ,
(5) : $[1, 3, 4, 2, 5, 6], [1, 2]$ ,
(6.1) : $[1, 3, 6, 2, 4, 5], [1, 1]$ ,
(6.2) : $[1, 3, 6, 2, 4, 5], [2, 2]$ ,
(7.1) : $[1, 4, 5, 2, 3, 6], [1, 1]$ ,
(7.2) : $[1, 4, 5, 2, 3, 6], [2, 2]$ ,
(8.1) : $[1, 4, 6, 2, 3, 5], [1, 1]$ ,
(8.2) : $[1, 4, 6, 2, 3, 5], [2, 2]$ ,
(9.1) : $[1, 5, 6, 2, 3, 4], [1, 1]$ ,
(9.2) : $[1, 5, 6, 2, 3, 4], [2, 1]$ ,
(9.3) : $[1, 5, 6, 2, 3, 4], [2, 2]$ ,

where a permutation  $\sigma$  is identified with the 6-tuple  $[\sigma(1), \dots, \sigma(6)]$  of images. Then  $\Pr(f, \sigma)$  is numerically  $10/144, 24/144, 15/144, 13/144, 15/144, 18/144, 18/144, 18/144, 13/144$  in order of permutations  $(1), (2), (3), (4), \dots, (9)$ , and  $\Pr(f, \sigma, \{k_j\})$  is  $1, 1, 1, 8/13, 4/13, 1/13, 1, 2/3, 1/3, 1/2, 1/2, 1/3, 2/3, 1/13, 4/13, 8/13$  in order of pairs of a permutation and  $[k_1, k_2]$   $(1), (2), (3), (4.1), (4.2), \dots, (9.3)$ . We checked that there is a large integer  $X(< 10^{12})$  such that

$$\left| \frac{\#\text{Spl}_X(f, \sigma, \{k_j\}, L, \{R_i\})}{\#\text{Spl}_X(f, \sigma)} - \frac{\Pr(f, \sigma, \{k_j\})}{\#\mathfrak{R}(f, \sigma, \{k_j\}, L)} \right| < \frac{\Pr(f, \sigma, \{k_j\})}{10\#\mathfrak{R}(f, \sigma, \{k_j\}, L)}$$

for  $\{R_i\}$  satisfying  $\#\text{Spl}_X(f, \sigma, \{k_j\}, L, \{R_i\}) > 10$  in the case of  $L \leq 8$ . Data say that  $\#\mathfrak{R}(f, \sigma, \{k_j\}, 8) = \#\mathfrak{R}'(f, \sigma, \{k_j\}, 8) = 8192$  if  $[k_1, k_2] = [2, 2]$ , otherwise 16384.

## 2.

Let us give several miscellaneous remarks on  $\mathfrak{D}(f, \sigma)$ ,  $\text{Spl}(f, \sigma)$ , the constant  $c$  in Expectation 1'' and  $\Pr_D(f)$  of (5) in the case that  $f$  has a non-trivial linear relation. We put for  $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_n), x \in \mathbb{R}$  and a permutation  $\sigma \in S_n$

$$\sigma^{-1}(\mathbf{x}) := (x_{\sigma(1)}, \dots, x_{\sigma(n)}), \quad \sigma^{-1}((\mathbf{x}, x)) := (\sigma^{-1}(\mathbf{x}), x), \quad (20)$$

### 2.1.

By definition (9), we see

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathfrak{D}(f, \sigma) \\ &= \left\{ \mathbf{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_n) \in [0, 1]^n \left| \begin{array}{l} 0 \leq x_1 \leq \dots \leq x_n < 1, \\ (\mathbf{m}_j, \sigma^{-1}(\mathbf{x})) \in \mathbb{Z} \text{ for } 1 \leq \forall j \leq t \end{array} \right. \right\} \\ &= \left\{ \mathbf{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_n) \in [0, 1]^n \left| \begin{array}{l} 0 \leq x_1 \leq \dots \leq x_n < 1, \\ (\sigma(\mathbf{m}_j), \mathbf{x}) \in \mathbb{Z} \text{ for } 1 \leq \forall j \leq t \end{array} \right. \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

The aim in this subsection is

**PROPOSITION 1.** *Suppose that  $\text{vol}(\mathfrak{D}(f, \sigma)) > 0$ , i.e.  $\dim \mathfrak{D}(f, \sigma) = n - t$ ; then for a permutation  $\mu$ , we have the equivalence*

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{vol}(\mathfrak{D}(f, \sigma) \cap \mathfrak{D}(f, \mu)) > 0 \iff \mathfrak{D}(f, \sigma) = \mathfrak{D}(f, \mu) \\ & \iff \langle \sigma(\mathbf{m}_1), \dots, \sigma(\mathbf{m}_t) \rangle_{\mathbb{Z}} = \langle \mu(\mathbf{m}_1), \dots, \mu(\mathbf{m}_t) \rangle_{\mathbb{Z}} \\ & \iff \mu^{-1}\sigma \in G := \{ \nu \in S_n \mid \langle \nu(\mathbf{m}_1), \dots, \nu(\mathbf{m}_t) \rangle_{\mathbb{Z}} = \langle \mathbf{m}_1, \dots, \mathbf{m}_t \rangle_{\mathbb{Z}} \}. \end{aligned}$$

In particular,  $\mathfrak{D}(f, \sigma) = \mathfrak{D}(f, \sigma\nu)$  holds if and only if  $\nu \in G$ .

**Proof.** Define a mapping  $\psi$  from  $\mathfrak{D}(f, \sigma)$  to  $\mathbb{Z}^t$  by  $\psi(\mathbf{x})_j = (\sigma(\mathbf{m}_j), \mathbf{x})$ , and take an inverse image  $\mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{k}}$  of  $\mathbf{k}$ , i.e.  $\psi(\mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{k}}) = \mathbf{k}$ . If  $\psi(\mathbf{x}) = \psi(\mathbf{y})$  holds for  $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in \mathfrak{D}(f, \sigma)$ , then we have  $(\sigma(\mathbf{m}_j), \mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}) = 0$ . Therefore we have

$$\mathfrak{D}(f, \sigma) = \cup_{\mathbf{k} \in \psi(\mathfrak{D}(f, \sigma))} \{\hat{\mathfrak{D}}_n \cap \{\mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{k}} + \langle \sigma(\mathbf{m}_1), \dots, \sigma(\mathbf{m}_t) \rangle_{\mathbb{R}}^{\perp}\}\}. \quad (22)$$

Suppose that  $\text{vol}(\mathfrak{D}(f, \sigma)) > 0$ ; if the property  $\text{vol}(\mathfrak{D}(f, \sigma) \cap \mathfrak{D}(f, \mu)) > 0$  holds, then (22) implies  $\langle \sigma(\mathbf{m}_1), \dots, \sigma(\mathbf{m}_t) \rangle_{\mathbb{R}}^{\perp} = \langle \mu(\mathbf{m}_1), \dots, \mu(\mathbf{m}_t) \rangle_{\mathbb{R}}^{\perp}$ , i.e.

$$\langle \sigma(\mathbf{m}_1), \dots, \sigma(\mathbf{m}_t) \rangle_{\mathbb{R}} = \langle \mu(\mathbf{m}_1), \dots, \mu(\mathbf{m}_t) \rangle_{\mathbb{R}}.$$

Since the matrix whose  $j$ th row is  $\mathbf{m}_j$  is integral with every elementary divisor being 1, the above is equivalent to

$$\langle \sigma(\mathbf{m}_1), \dots, \sigma(\mathbf{m}_t) \rangle_{\mathbb{Z}} = \langle \mu(\mathbf{m}_1), \dots, \mu(\mathbf{m}_t) \rangle_{\mathbb{Z}}.$$

Conversely, suppose that the above is true. Then it is easy to see that

$$\mathbf{x} \in \mathfrak{D}(f, \sigma) \iff \mathbf{x} \in \mathfrak{D}(f, \mu) \quad \text{by (21),}$$

hence  $\mathfrak{D}(f, \sigma) = \mathfrak{D}(f, \mu)$ . □

**Remark** The condition  $\nu \in G$  is equivalent to

$$\begin{pmatrix} \nu^{-1}(\mathbf{m}_1) \\ \vdots \\ \nu^{-1}(\mathbf{m}_t) \end{pmatrix} = A \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{m}_1 \\ \vdots \\ \mathbf{m}_t \end{pmatrix},$$

and if a polynomial  $f$  has no non-trivial linear relation among roots, then we have  $G = S_n$  obviously.

**COROLLARY 1.** *We have*

$$\sum_{\mu \in S_n} \text{vol}(\mathfrak{D}(f, \mu)) = \#G \cdot \text{vol}(\cup_{\mu \in S_n} \mathfrak{D}(f, \mu)). \quad (23)$$

**Proof.** Put

$$S' := \{\sigma \in S_n \mid \text{vol}(\mathfrak{D}(f, \sigma)) > 0\}.$$

Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\sigma \in S_n} \text{vol}(\mathfrak{D}(f, \sigma)) &= \sum_{\sigma \in S'} \text{vol}(\mathfrak{D}(f, \sigma)) = \sum_{\mu \in S'/G} \sum_{\sigma \in \mu G} \text{vol}(\mathfrak{D}(f, \sigma)) \\ &= \#G \sum_{\mu \in S'/G} \text{vol}(\mathfrak{D}(f, \mu)) = \#G \cdot \text{vol}(\cup_{\mu \in S'/G} \mathfrak{D}(f, \mu)) \\ &= \#G \cdot \text{vol}(\cup_{\mu \in S_n} \mathfrak{D}(f, \mu)). \end{aligned} \quad \square$$

**2.2.**

Put 
$$\hat{G} := \left\{ \nu \in S_n \mid \sum_i m_{j,\nu(i)} \alpha_i = m_j \ (j = 1, \dots, t) \right\}.$$

Since vectors  $\hat{\mathbf{m}}_1, \dots, \hat{\mathbf{m}}_n$  are a basis of linear relations LR (cf. (4)), there is an integral matrix  $A$  for  $\nu \in \hat{G}$  such that, by the definition (20)

$$\begin{pmatrix} \nu^{-1}(\hat{\mathbf{m}}_1) \\ \vdots \\ \nu^{-1}(\hat{\mathbf{m}}_t) \end{pmatrix} = A \begin{pmatrix} \hat{\mathbf{m}}_1 \\ \vdots \\ \hat{\mathbf{m}}_t \end{pmatrix},$$

i.e.

$$\begin{pmatrix} m_{1,\nu(1)} & \dots & m_{1,\nu(n)} & m_1 \\ \vdots & \dots & \vdots & \vdots \\ m_{t,\nu(1)} & \dots & m_{t,\nu(n)} & m_t \end{pmatrix} = A \begin{pmatrix} m_{1,1} & \dots & m_{1,n} & m_1 \\ \vdots & \dots & \vdots & \vdots \\ m_{t,1} & \dots & m_{t,n} & m_t \end{pmatrix}. \quad (24)$$

Since the matrix whose  $j$ th row is  $\hat{\mathbf{m}}_j$  is primitive, the left-hand side is also primitive, hence  $A \in GL_t(\mathbb{Z})$ . Conversely, (24) implies easily  $\nu \in \hat{G}$ . Therefore, the condition (24) is equivalent to  $\nu \in \hat{G}$  and we see that

$$\hat{G} = \{ \nu \in S_n \mid \langle \nu(\hat{\mathbf{m}}_1), \dots, \nu(\hat{\mathbf{m}}_t) \rangle_{\mathbb{Z}} = \langle \hat{\mathbf{m}}_1, \dots, \hat{\mathbf{m}}_t \rangle_{\mathbb{Z}} \}$$

is a subgroup of  $G$ .

**REMARK.** If  $m_1 = \dots = m_t = 0$ , then  $\hat{G} = G$  is obvious. If a polynomial  $f$  is irreducible, then  $\sum_i m_{j,\nu(i)} \alpha_i = m_j$  implies  $(\sum_i m_{j,\nu(i)}) \text{tr}(\alpha_1) = nm_j$ , and so the identity

$$\begin{pmatrix} m_{1,\nu(1)} & \dots & m_{1,\nu(n)} \\ \vdots & \dots & \vdots \\ m_{t,\nu(1)} & \dots & m_{t,\nu(n)} \end{pmatrix} = A \begin{pmatrix} m_{1,1} & \dots & m_{1,n} \\ \vdots & \dots & \vdots \\ m_{t,1} & \dots & m_{t,n} \end{pmatrix}$$

implies

$$\begin{pmatrix} m_1 \\ \vdots \\ m_t \end{pmatrix} = A \begin{pmatrix} m_1 \\ \vdots \\ m_t \end{pmatrix},$$

multiplying  ${}^t(\text{tr}(\alpha_1)/n, \dots, \text{tr}(\alpha_t)/n)$  from the right. Therefore, *if  $f$  is irreducible, then we have  $\hat{G} = G$* . However, it is not necessarily true for a reducible polynomial. For example, let a polynomial  $f$  be  $(x^2 + x + 1)(x^2 + 2x + 2)$  with roots  $\alpha_1 = (-1 + \sqrt{-3})/2, \alpha_2 = (-1 - \sqrt{-3})/2, \alpha_3 = -1 + \sqrt{-1}, \alpha_4 = -1 - \sqrt{-1}$ . Then we may choose obviously  $\hat{\mathbf{m}}_1 = (1, 1, 0, 0, -1), \hat{\mathbf{m}}_2 = (0, 0, 1, 1, -2)$ , thus a permutation  $\nu = (1, 3)(2, 4)$  is in  $G$ , but not in  $\hat{G}$ .

To prove the next proposition, we introduce one more notation. For a prime  $p \in \text{Spl}(f)$ , we take and fix a prime ideal  $\mathfrak{p}$  of the field  $\mathbb{Q}(f) = \mathbb{Q}(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n)$  lying above  $p$ , and put

$$M_\mu := \{p \in \text{Spl}(f) \mid \alpha_i \equiv r_{\mu(i)} \pmod{\mathfrak{p}} \ (i = 1, \dots, n)\}.$$

It is clear that  $\#(M_\sigma \cap M_\mu) = \infty$  implies  $\alpha_{\sigma^{-1}\mu(i)} = \alpha_i$  ( $i = 1, \dots, n$ ), hence  $\sigma^{-1}\mu \in \hat{G}$ , i.e.  $\sigma\hat{G} = \mu\hat{G}$ . The aim of this subsection is to show

**PROPOSITION 2.** *We have*

$$\text{Spl}(f, \sigma) = (\cup_\mu M_\mu) \cup T_\sigma \quad (25)$$

where  $\mu$  runs over the set of permutations satisfying  $\mu \in \sigma\hat{G}$  and  $\#M_\mu = \infty$ , and  $T_\sigma$  is a finite set.

**Proof.** Since  $\text{Spl}(f, \sigma) = \cup_{\mu \in S_n} (\text{Spl}(f, \sigma) \cap M_\mu)$  by  $\text{Spl}(f) = \cup_{\mu \in S_n} M_\mu$ , we have only to show that  $\#(\text{Spl}(f, \sigma) \cap M_\mu) = \infty$  if and only if  $\mu\hat{G} = \sigma\hat{G}$  and  $\#M_\mu = \infty$ , and then  $M_\mu \subset \text{Spl}(f, \sigma)$ . Suppose that  $\#(\text{Spl}(f, \sigma) \cap M_\mu) = \infty$ . The property  $\#M_\mu = \infty$  is clear. For  $p \in \text{Spl}(f, \sigma) \cap M_\mu$ , we have

$$\sum_i m_{j,i} r_{\sigma(i)} \equiv m_j \pmod{p}, \quad r_i \equiv \alpha_{\mu^{-1}(i)} \pmod{\mathfrak{p}},$$

which implies  $\sum_i m_{j,i} \alpha_{\mu^{-1}\sigma(i)} \equiv m_j \pmod{\mathfrak{p}}$  for infinitely many primes in  $p \in \text{Spl}(f, \sigma) \cap M_\mu$ , thus  $\sum_i m_{j,i} \alpha_{\mu^{-1}\sigma(i)} = m_j$ . It means  $\mu^{-1}\sigma \in \hat{G}$ , i.e.  $\mu\hat{G} = \sigma\hat{G}$ .

Conversely, suppose that  $\mu\hat{G} = \sigma\hat{G}$  and  $\#M_\mu = \infty$  hold; then we have  $\sum_i m_{j,i} \alpha_{\mu^{-1}\sigma(i)} = m_j$ . Hence, for  $p \in M_\mu$ , we see  $\sum_i m_{j,i} r_{\sigma(i)} \equiv m_j \pmod{\mathfrak{p}}$ , that is,  $p \in \text{Spl}(f, \sigma)$  and so  $M_\mu \subset \text{Spl}(f, \sigma)$ , thus  $\#(\text{Spl}(f, \sigma) \cap M_\mu) = \infty$ .

Therefore, the condition  $\#(\text{Spl}(f, \sigma) \cap M_\mu) = \infty$  is equivalent to  $\#M_\mu = \infty$  and  $\mu\hat{G} = \sigma\hat{G}$ . And then, we have  $M_\mu \subset \text{Spl}(f, \sigma)$  as above. This completes the proof.  $\square$

**REMARK.** The proposition says that the condition  $\#\text{Spl}(f, id) = \infty$  holds if and only if  $\#M_\mu = \infty$  for some  $\mu \in \hat{G}$ . Suppose that  $\mathbb{Q}(\alpha_1)$  is a Galois extension of  $\mathbb{Q}$ , and we take the prime ideal  $\mathfrak{p} := (\alpha_1 - r_1, p)$  as a prime ideal to define the set  $M_\mu$ . Using a polynomial  $g_i \in \mathbb{Q}[x]$  defined by  $\alpha_i = g_i(\alpha_1)$ , we have  $p \in M_\mu \iff g_i(r_1) \equiv r_{\mu(i)} \pmod{p}$ .

**COROLLARY 2.** *We have*

$$\lim_{X \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{\sigma \in S_n} \frac{\#\text{Spl}_X(f, \sigma)}{\#\text{Spl}_X(f)} = \#\hat{G}. \quad (26)$$

**P r o o f.** Suppose  $\#\text{Spl}(f, \sigma) = \infty$ . Let us see that the following three conditions are equivalent: (i)  $\sigma\hat{G} = \nu\hat{G}$ , (ii) there is a finite set  $T$  such that

$$\text{Spl}(f, \sigma) \setminus T = \text{Spl}(f, \nu) \setminus T,$$

(iii)  $\#(\text{Spl}(f, \sigma) \cap \text{Spl}(f, \nu)) = \infty$ . The condition (iii) implies that there are permutations  $\mu_1, \mu'_1$  such that  $\mu_1 \in \sigma\hat{G}$ ,  $\mu'_1 \in \nu\hat{G}$  and  $\#(M_{\mu_1} \cap M_{\mu'_1}) = \infty$ , which implies  $\mu_1\hat{G} = \mu'_1\hat{G}$ , hence  $\sigma\hat{G} = \nu\hat{G}$ , i.e. (i). Suppose (i); then (ii) holds for  $T = T_\sigma \cup T_\nu$ . (ii) implies obviously (iii). Thus we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \lim_{X \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{\sigma \in S_n} \frac{\#\text{Spl}_X(f, \sigma)}{\#\text{Spl}_X(f)} \\ &= \#\hat{G} \lim_{X \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{\sigma \in S_n/\hat{G}} \frac{\#\text{Spl}_X(f, \sigma)}{\#\text{Spl}_X(f)} \\ &= \#\hat{G} \lim_{X \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\#(\cup_{\sigma \in S_n/\hat{G}} \text{Spl}_X(f, \sigma))}{\#\text{Spl}_X(f)} \\ &= \#\hat{G}. \end{aligned} \quad \square$$

**PROPOSITION 3.** *Let  $\sigma, \nu$  be permutations, and suppose that  $\nu \in \hat{G}$ . Then we have, neglecting a finite set of primes*

$$\text{Spl}(f, \sigma) = \text{Spl}(f, \sigma\nu^{-1}),$$

$$\text{Spl}(f, \sigma, \{k_j\}) = \text{Spl}(f, \sigma\nu^{-1}, \{k'_j\}), \quad (27)$$

$$\text{Spl}(f, \sigma, \{k_j\}, L, \{R_j\}) = \text{Spl}(f, \sigma\nu^{-1}, \{k'_j\}, L, \{R_j\}), \quad (28)$$

where  ${}^t(k'_1, \dots, k'_t) := A \cdot {}^t(k_1, \dots, k_t)$  for the integral matrix  $A = (a_{ij}) \in GL_t(\mathbb{Z})$  given at (24). In particular, we have

$$\text{Pr}(f, \sigma) = \text{Pr}(f, \sigma\nu^{-1}),$$

$$\text{Pr}(f, \sigma, \{k_j\}) = \text{Pr}(f, \sigma\nu^{-1}, \{k'_j\}),$$

$$\text{Pr}(f, \sigma, \{k_j\}, L, \{R_i\}) = \text{Pr}(f, \sigma\nu^{-1}, \{k'_j\}, L, \{R_i\}).$$

**P r o o f.** The first equation follows from the equivalence in the proof of the corollary above. Let  $p$  be a prime in  $\text{Spl}(f, \sigma, \{k_j\})$ ; then we see

$$\sum_i m_{j,i} r_{\sigma(i)} = m_j + k_j p \quad \text{and so} \quad \sum_j a_{l,j} \sum_i m_{j,i} r_{\sigma(i)} = \sum_j a_{l,j} m_j + \sum_j a_{l,j} k_j p,$$

that is,

$$\sum_i m_{l,\nu(i)} r_{\sigma(i)} = m_l + k'_l p,$$

which implies

$$p \in \text{Spl}(f, \sigma \nu^{-1}, \{k'_j\}),$$

that is,  $\text{Spl}(f, \sigma, \{k_j\})$  is included in  $\text{Spl}(f, \sigma \nu^{-1}, \{k'_j\})$ . Since  $A^{-1}$  is also integral, we have the converse inclusion

$$\text{Spl}(f, \sigma \nu^{-1}, \{k'_j\}) \subset \text{Spl}(f, \sigma, \{k_j\})$$

similarly, hence (27), (28).  $\square$

### 2.3.

We give the constant  $c$  in (11) explicitly.

#### PROPOSITION 4.

$$c = [G : \hat{G}] \cdot \text{vol}(\cup_{\sigma \in S_n} \mathfrak{D}(f, \sigma)).$$

**P r o o f.** Suppose that (11) is true; then we have

$$\lim_{X \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{\sigma \in S_n} \frac{\#\text{Spl}_X(f, \sigma)}{\#\text{Spl}_X(f)} = c^{-1} \sum_{\sigma \in S_n} \text{vol}(\mathfrak{D}(f, \sigma)), \quad (29)$$

Applying Corollary 1, 2, we see

$$c = [G : \hat{G}] \cdot \text{vol}(\cup_{\sigma \in S_n} \mathfrak{D}(f, \sigma)). \quad \square$$

### 2.4.

If a polynomial  $f$  may have a non-trivial linear relation, then Expectation 1 is generalized as follows :

For a subset  $D = \overline{D^\circ} \subset [0, 1]^n$ , we have

$$\text{Pr}_D(f) = \frac{1}{\#G} \sum_{\sigma \in S_n} \frac{\text{vol}(D \cap \mathfrak{D}(f, \sigma))}{\text{vol}(\cup_{\sigma \in S_n} \mathfrak{D}(f, \sigma))}. \quad (30)$$



Because, we see that  $\Pr_D(f)$  is, by definition (5) equal to

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \lim_{X \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\#\{p \in \text{Spl}_X(f) \mid (r_1/p, \dots, r_n/p) \in D\}}{\#\text{Spl}_X(f)} \\
 &= \frac{1}{\#\hat{G}} \lim \sum_{\sigma \in S_n} \frac{\#\{p \in \text{Spl}_X(f, \sigma) \mid (r_1/p, \dots, r_n/p) \in D\}}{\#\text{Spl}_X(f)} \\
 &= \frac{1}{\#\hat{G}} \lim \sum_{\sigma \in S_n} \frac{\#\text{Spl}_X(f, \sigma)}{\#\text{Spl}_X(f)} \cdot \frac{\#\{p \in \text{Spl}_X(f, \sigma) \mid (r_1/p, \dots, r_n/p) \in D\}}{\#\text{Spl}_X(f, \sigma)} \\
 &= \frac{1}{\#\hat{G}} \lim \sum_{\sigma \in S_n} \frac{\text{vol}(\mathfrak{D}(f, \sigma))}{c} \cdot \frac{\text{vol}(D \cap \mathfrak{D}(f, \sigma))}{\text{vol}(\mathfrak{D}(f, \sigma))} \quad \text{by (11), (10)} \\
 &= \frac{1}{\#\hat{G}} \frac{\sum_{\sigma \in S_n} \text{vol}(D \cap \mathfrak{D}(f, \sigma))}{\text{vol}(\cup_{\sigma \in S_n} \mathfrak{D}(f, \sigma))},
 \end{aligned}$$

where  $\sum'$  means that permutations  $\sigma \in S_n$  with  $\#\text{Spl}_\infty(f, \sigma) < \infty$  are omitted.

**APPLICATION 1.** Let us consider the case of a decomposable polynomial of degree 4. Let a polynomial  $f(x) = (x^2 + ax)^2 + b(x^2 + ax) + c$  be irreducible. Referring to Example 3 in the previous section, we see that

$$\{\sigma \mid \#\text{Spl}(f, \sigma) = \infty\} = \{\sigma \mid \{\sigma(1), \sigma(4)\} = \{1, 4\} \text{ or } \{2, 3\}\} = \hat{G} = G.$$

Only for such permutations,  $\mathfrak{D}(f, \sigma) > 0$  and  $\mathfrak{D}(f, \sigma) = \mathfrak{D}(f, id)$  are easy, hence we have, by (30)

$$\Pr_D(f) = \frac{\text{vol}(D \cap \mathfrak{D}(f, id))}{\text{vol}(\mathfrak{D}(f, id))}. \quad (31)$$

Let us see that this implies the traditional equi-distribution of the sequence of  $r_1/p, \dots, r_4/p$  in  $[0, 1)$ . (cf. [K2] in the case that there is no non-trivial linear relation.)

Because, we have only to show

$$\frac{\sum_{p \in \text{Spl}_X(f)} \#\{1 \leq i \leq 4 \mid r_i/p \leq A\}}{4\#\text{Spl}_X(f)} \rightarrow A \quad (0 \leq A < 1).$$

By putting  $D_i := \{(x_1, \dots, x_4) \mid x_i \leq A\} \cap \mathfrak{D}(f, id)$ , (31) tells us that the left-hand side tends to

$$\sum_{i=1}^4 \frac{1}{4} \frac{\text{vol}(D_i)}{\text{vol}(\mathfrak{D}(f, id))}, \quad (32)$$

using  $\text{Spl}_X(f) = \text{Spl}_X(f, id)$ . By  $\mathfrak{D}(f, id) = \{(x_1, \dots, x_4) \mid 0 \leq x_1 \leq \dots \leq x_4 < 1 \mid x_1 + x_4 = 1, x_2 + x_3 = 1\}$  we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathfrak{D}(f, id) &= \{(x_1, x_2, 1 - x_2, 1 - x_1) \mid 0 \leq x_1 \leq x_2 < 1/2\}, \\ D_1 &= \{(x_1, x_2, 1 - x_2, 1 - x_1) \mid 0 \leq x_1 \leq x_2 < 1/2, x_1 \leq A\}, \\ D_2 &= \{(x_1, x_2, 1 - x_2, 1 - x_1) \mid 0 \leq x_1 \leq x_2 < \min(1/2, A)\}, \\ D_3 &= \{(x_1, x_2, 1 - x_2, 1 - x_1) \mid 0 \leq x_1 \leq x_2 < 1/2, 1 - x_2 \leq A\}, \\ D_4 &= \{(x_1, x_2, 1 - x_2, 1 - x_1) \mid 0 \leq x_1 \leq x_2 < 1/2, 1 - x_1 \leq A\},\end{aligned}$$

and projecting them on the  $(x_1, x_2)$ -plane, we see

$$\begin{aligned}\text{vol}(\text{pr}(\mathfrak{D}(f, id))) &= 1/8, \\ \text{vol}(\text{pr}(D_1)) &= \begin{cases} A/2 - A^2/2 & \text{if } A \leq 1/2, \\ 1/8 & \text{if } A \geq 1/2, \end{cases} \\ \text{vol}(\text{pr}(D_2)) &= \begin{cases} A^2/2 & \text{if } A \leq 1/2, \\ 1/8 & \text{if } A \geq 1/2, \end{cases} \\ \text{vol}(\text{pr}(D_3)) &= \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } A \leq 1/2, \\ (A - 1/2)/2 - (A - 1/2)^2/2 & \text{if } A \geq 1/2, \end{cases} \\ \text{vol}(\text{pr}(D_4)) &= \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } A \leq 1/2, \\ (A - 1/2)^2/2 & \text{if } A \geq 1/2. \end{cases}\end{aligned}$$

Thus we see that (32) is equal to  $A$ .

## REFERENCES

- [K1] KITAOKA, Y.: Notes on the distribution of roots modulo a prime of a polynomial, Unif. Distrib. Theory **12** (2017), no. 2, 91–116.
- [K2] ———: *Statistical distribution of roots of a polynomial modulo primes III*, Int. J. Statist. Probab. **7** (2018), 115–124.

Received March 16, 2018  
Accepted August 28, 2018

**Yoshiyuki Kitaoka**  
*Author is retired,*  
*Asahi*  
*JAPAN*  
*E-mail: kitaoka@meijo-u.ac.jp*