ON THE DIVISIBILITY OF THE RANK OF APPEARANCE OF A LUCAS SEQUENCE
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ABSTRACT. Let $U = (U_n)_{n \geq 0}$ be a Lucas sequence and, for every prime number $p$, let $\rho_U(p)$ be the rank of appearance of $p$ in $U$, that is, the smallest positive integer $k$ such that $p$ divides $U_k$, whenever it exists. Furthermore, let $d$ be an odd positive integer. Under some mild hypotheses, we prove an asymptotic formula for the number of primes $p \leq x$ such that $d$ divides $\rho_U(p)$, as $x \to +\infty$.

1. INTRODUCTION

Let $(U_n)_{n \geq 0}$ be a Lucas sequence, that is, a sequence of integers satisfying $U_0 = 0$, $U_1 = 1$, and $U_n = a_1 U_{n-1} + a_2 U_{n-2}$ for every integer $n \geq 2$, where $a_1, a_2$ are fixed nonzero integers. The rank of appearance of a prime number $p$, denoted by $\rho_U(p)$, is the smallest positive integer $k$ such that $p \mid U_k$. It can be easily seen that $\rho_U(p)$ exists whenever $p \nmid a_2$. Define

$$\mathcal{R}_U(d; x) := \# \{p \leq x : p \not\mid a_2, d \mid \rho_U(p) \},$$

for every positive integer $d$ and for every $x > 1$.

Let $(F_n)_{n \geq 0}$ be the Lucas sequence of Fibonacci numbers, corresponding to $a_1 = a_2 = 1$. In 1985, Lagarias [5] (see [6] for a correction and [8, 10] for generalizations) showed that $\mathcal{R}_F(2; x) \sim \frac{3}{2} x$, as $x \to +\infty$. More recently, Cubre and Rouse [2], settling a conjecture of Bruckman and Anderson [1], proved that $\mathcal{R}_F(d; x) \sim c(d) d^{-1} \prod_{p \mid d} (1 - p^{-2})^{-1}$, as $x \to +\infty$, for every positive integer $d$, where $c(d)$ is equal to $1, \frac{5}{4}$, or $\frac{1}{2}$, whenever $10 \nmid d, d \equiv 10 \pmod{20}$, or $20 \nmid d$, respectively.

Let $\alpha, \beta$ be the roots of the characteristic polynomial $f_U(X) := X^2 - a_1 X - a_2$, and assume that $\gamma := \alpha/\beta$ is not a root of unity. Let $\Delta := a_1^2 + 4a_2$ be the discriminant of $f_U(X)$, and let $\Delta_0$ be the squarefree part of $\Delta$. Assume that $\Delta$ is not a square, so that $K := \mathbb{Q}(\sqrt{\Delta})$ is a quadratic number field. Let $h$ be the greatest positive integer such that $\gamma$ is a $h$th power in $K$.

Our result is the following:

**Theorem 1.1.** Let $d$ be an odd positive integer with $3 \nmid d$ whenever $\Delta_0 = -3$. Then, for every $x > \exp(B e^{8\omega(d)} d^8)$, we have

$$\mathcal{R}_U(d; x) = \delta_U(d) \operatorname{Li}(x) + O_U \left( \frac{(\omega(d) + 1)d}{\varphi(d)} \cdot \frac{x (\log \log x)^{\omega(d)}}{\log x} \right),$$

where $B > 0$ is an absolute constant and

$$\delta_U(d) := \frac{1}{d} \left( \frac{1}{(d^\infty, h)} + \eta_U(d) \prod_{p \mid d} \left( 1 - \frac{1}{p^2} \right)^{-1} \right),$$

with $\eta_U(d) := 0$ if $\Delta > 0$ or $\Delta_0 \not\equiv 1 \pmod{4}$ or $\Delta_0 \nmid d^\infty$; and

$$\eta_U(d) := \frac{(d^\infty, h)}{[(d^\infty, h), \Delta_0/(d, \Delta_0)]^2}.$$
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Cubre and Rouse’s proof of the asymptotic formula for $R_F(d; x)$ relies on the study of the algebraic group $G : x^2 - 5y^2 = 1$ and relates $\rho_F(p)$ with the order of $(3/2, 1/2) \in G(F_p)$. Instead, our proof of Theorem 1.1 is an adaptation of the methods that Moree [9] used to prove an asymptotic formula for the number of primes $p \leq x$ such that the multiplicative order of $g$ modulo $p$ is divisible by $d$, where $g \notin \{-1, 0, +1\}$ is a fixed rational number.
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3. Notation

We employ the Landau–Bachmann “Big Oh” notation $O$, as well as the associated Vinogradov symbol $\ll$. Any dependence of the implied constants is explicitly stated or indicated with subscripts. In particular, notations like $O_U$ and $\ll_U$ are shortcuts for $O_{a_1,a_2}$ and $\ll_{a_1,a_2}$, respectively. For $x \geq 2$ we let $\text{Li}(x) := \int_2^x \frac{dt}{\log t}$ denote the logarithmic integral. We reserve the letter $p$ for prime numbers. Given an integer $d$, we let $d^\infty$ denote the supernatural number $\prod_{p|d} p^\infty$. Given a field $F$ and a positive integer $n$, we write $F^n$ for the set of $n$th powers of elements of $F$. Given a Galois extension $E/F$ of number fields and a prime ideal $P$ of $\mathcal{O}_E$ lying above an unramified prime ideal $p$ of $\mathcal{O}_F$, we write $\left(\frac{E/F}{p}\right)$ for the Frobenius automorphism corresponding to $P/p$, that is, the unique element $\sigma$ of the Galois group $\text{Gal}(E/F)$ that satisfies $\sigma(a) \equiv a^{N(p)} \pmod{P}$ for every $a \in \mathcal{O}_E$, where $N(p)$ denotes the norm of $p$. Moreover, we let $\left[\frac{E/F}{P}\right]$ be the set of all $\left[\frac{E/F}{p}\right]$ with $P$ prime ideal of $\mathcal{O}_E$ lying over $p$. We write $\Delta_{E/F}$ for the relative discriminant of $E/F$, and $\Delta_E := \Delta_{E/Q}$ for the absolute discriminant of $E$. For every integer $d$ and for every prime number $p$ we let $(\frac{i}{p})$ be the Legendre symbol. For every positive integer $n$, we let $\zeta_n := e^{2\pi i/n}$ be a primitive $n$th root of unity. We write $\omega(n)$, $\varphi(n)$, $\mu(n)$, and $\tau(n)$, for the number of prime factors, the totient function, the Möbius function, and the number of divisors of a positive integer $n$, respectively.

4. General preliminaries

Lemma 4.1. Let $n$ be a positive integer, let $p$ be a prime number not dividing $n$, and let $P$ be a prime ideal of $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{Q}(\zeta_n)}$ lying over $p$. Then $\zeta_n$ has multiplicative order modulo $P$ equal to $n$.

Proof. Let $k$ be the multiplicative order of $\zeta_n$ modulo $P$, that is, $k$ is the least positive integer such that $\zeta_n^k \equiv 1 \pmod{P}$. On the one hand, we have that $p \mid N(P) \mid N(\zeta_n^k - 1)$. On the other hand, since $\zeta_n^m \equiv 1 \pmod{P}$, we have that $k \mid n$, and consequently $\zeta_n^k$ is a $m$th primitive root of unity, where $m := n/k$. If $k < n$ then $m > 1$ and $N(\zeta_n^k - 1)$ is either $1$ or a prime factor of $m$, but both cases are impossible since $p \nmid n$. Hence, $k = n$. □

Lemma 4.2. Let $F$ be a field, let $a \in F$, and let $n$ be a positive integer. Then $X^n - a$ is irreducible over $F$ if and only if $a \notin F^p$ for each prime $p$ dividing $n$ and $a \notin -4F^4$ whenever $4 \mid n$.

Proof. See [4, Chapter 8, Theorem 1.6]. □

Lemma 4.3. Let $F$ be a field, let $n$ be a positive integer not divisible by the characteristic of $F$, and let $m$ be the number of $n$th roots of unity contained in $F$. Then, for every $a \in F$, the extension $F(\zeta_n, a^{1/n})/F$ is abelian if and only if $a^n \in F^m$.

Proof. See [4, Chapter 8, Theorem 3.2]. □

Lemma 4.4. Let $n$ be an odd positive integer and let $d$ be a squarefree integer. Then $\sqrt{d} \in \mathbb{Q}(\zeta_n)$ if and only if $d \mid n$ and $d \equiv 1 \pmod{4}$.

Proof. See [12, Lemma 3]. □
We need the following form of the Chebotarev Density Theorem.

**Theorem 4.5.** Let \( E/F \) be a Galois extension of numbers fields with Galois group \( G \), and let \( C \) be the union of \( k \) conjugacy classes of \( G \). Then

\[
\#\left\{ p \text{ prime ideal of } \mathcal{O}_F \text{ non-ramifying in } E : N_{F/Q}(p) \leq x, \left\lfloor \frac{E/F}{p} \right\rfloor \subseteq C \right\} \\
= \frac{#C}{#G} \cdot \text{Li}(x) + O\left(k x \exp\left(-c_1 \left( \log x/n_E \right)^{1/2} \right)\right)
\]

for every

\[
x \geq \exp\left(c_2 \max\left(n_E (\log |\Delta_E|)^2, |\Delta_E|^{2/n_E}/n_E \right)\right),
\]

where \( n_E := [E : \mathbb{Q}] \) and \( c_1, c_2 > 0 \) are absolute constants.

**Proof.** The result follows from the effective form of the Chebotarev Density Theorem given by Lagarias and Odlyzko [7, Theorem 1.3] and from the bounds for the exceptional zero of the Dedekind zeta function \( \zeta_E \) given by Stark [13, Lemma 8 and 11]. \( \square \)

5. Preliminaries to the proof of Theorem 1.1

Recalling that \( h \) is the greatest positive integer such that \( \gamma \) is an \( h \)th power in \( K \), write \( \gamma = \gamma_0^h \) for some \( \gamma_0 \in K \). Also, let \( \sigma_K \in \text{Gal}(K/Q) \) be the nontrivial automorphism, which satisfies \( \sigma_K(\sqrt{\Delta}) = -\sqrt{\Delta} \). Note that, since \( \gamma = \alpha/\beta \) and \( \sigma_K \) swaps \( \alpha \) and \( \beta \), we have that \( \sigma_k(\gamma) = \gamma^{-1} \). For all positive integers \( d, n \) such that \( d \mid n \), let \( K_{n,d} := K(\zeta_n, \gamma^{1/d}) \).

**Lemma 5.1.** Let \( p \) be a prime number not dividing \( a_2 \Delta \) and let \( \pi \) be a prime ideal of \( \mathcal{O}_K \) lying over \( p \). Then \( \rho_U(p) \) is equal to the multiplicative order of \( \gamma \) modulo \( \pi \). Moreover, \( \rho_U(p) \) divides \( p - (\Delta^\pi) \).

**Proof.** First, note that \( p \nmid a_2 \) ensures that \( \beta \) is invertible modulo \( \pi \), and consequently it makes sense to consider the multiplicative order of \( \gamma = \alpha/\beta \) modulo \( \pi \). Also, \( p \nmid \Delta \) implies that \( p \) does not ramifies in \( K \) and that \( \alpha \not\equiv \beta \pmod{\pi} \).

We shall prove that \( p \mid U_n \) if and only if \( \gamma^n \equiv 1 \pmod{\pi} \), for every positive integer \( n \). Then the claim on \( \rho_U(p) \) follows easily. It is well known that the Binet’s formula

\[
U_n = \frac{\alpha^n - \beta^n}{\alpha - \beta}
\]

holds for every positive integer \( n \). On the one hand, if \( p \mid U_n \) then, since \( p \mathcal{O}_K \subseteq \pi \) and (1), we have \( \alpha^n \equiv \beta^n \pmod{\pi} \), and consequently \( \gamma^n \equiv 1 \pmod{\pi} \). On the other hand, if \( \gamma^n \equiv 1 \pmod{\pi} \) then by (1) we get \( U_n \equiv 0 \pmod{\pi} \). If \( p \) is inert in \( K \), then \( p \mathcal{O}_K = \pi \) and so \( p \mid U_n \).

If \( p \) splits in \( K \), then \( p \mathcal{O}_K = \pi \cap \sigma_K(\pi) \). Thus \( U_n \equiv 0 \pmod{\pi} \) and \( U_n \equiv \sigma_K(U_k) \equiv 0 \pmod{\sigma_K(\pi)} \) imply that \( p \mid U_n \).

Let \( \sigma := \left[ \frac{K/Q}{\pi} \right] \). On the one hand, if \( \left( \frac{\Delta}{p} \right) = -1 \) then \( \sigma = \sigma_K \) and \( \gamma^{p+1} \equiv \sigma_K(\gamma)\gamma \equiv \gamma^{-1} \gamma \equiv 1 \pmod{\pi} \), so that \( \rho_U(p) \mid p + 1 \). On the other hand, if \( \left( \frac{\Delta}{p} \right) = +1 \) then \( \sigma = \text{id} \) and \( \gamma^{p-1} \equiv \gamma^{-1} \equiv 1 \pmod{\pi} \), so that \( \rho_U(p) \mid p - 1 \). \( \square \)

For each prime number \( p \) not dividing \( a_2 \Delta \), let us define the index of appearance of \( p \) as

\[
u_U(p) := (p - (\Delta^\pi))/\rho_U(p).
\]

Note that, in light of Lemma 5.1, \( \nu_U(p) \) is an integer.

**Lemma 5.2.** Let \( d, n \) be positive integers such that \( d \mid n \), and let \( p \) be a prime number not dividing \( a_2 \Delta \). Moreover, let \( P \) be a prime ideal of \( \mathcal{O}_{K_{n,d}} \) lying over \( p \) and let \( \sigma := \left[ \frac{K_{n,d}/Q}{P} \right] \). Then

\[
p \equiv (\Delta^\pi) \pmod{n} \quad \text{and} \quad d \mid \nu_U(p)
\]
if and only if $\sigma = \text{id}$ or

$$\sigma(\zeta_n) = \zeta_n^{-1} \quad \text{and} \quad \sigma(\gamma^{1/d}) = \gamma^{-1/d}.$$  

Proof. First, suppose that $\left(\frac{a}{p}\right) = -1$. Let us assume (2). On the one hand, since $p \equiv -1 \pmod{n}$, we have

$$\sigma(\zeta_n) \equiv \zeta_n^p \equiv \zeta_n^{-1} \pmod{P}.$$  

Since $\sigma(\zeta_n) = \zeta_n^k$ for some integer $k$, and since $p$ does not divide $n$, Lemma 4.1 and (4) yield that $\sigma(\zeta_n) = \zeta_n^{-1}$.

On the other hand, $d \mid \mu_U(p)$ implies that $\rho_U(p) \mid (p + 1)/d$. Hence, letting $\pi := P \cap \mathcal{O}_K$, Lemma 5.1 yields $\gamma^{(p+1)/d} \equiv 1 \pmod{\pi}$. Consequently,

$$\sigma(\gamma^{1/d}) \equiv (\gamma^{1/d})^p \equiv \gamma^{(p+1)/d} \cdot \gamma^{-1/d} \equiv \gamma^{-1/d} \pmod{P}.$$  

Note that, since $\left(\frac{a}{p}\right) = -1$, we have

$$\sigma(\gamma) = \sigma|_K(\gamma) = \frac{K/Q}{\pi}(\gamma) = \sigma_K(\gamma) = \gamma^{-1},$$  

so that $\sigma(\gamma^{1/d}) = \zeta_d^{k-1/d}$ for some integer $k$. Thus Lemma 4.1 and (5) yield that $\sigma(\gamma^{1/d}) = \gamma^{-1/d}$. We have proved (3).

Now let us assume (3). On the one hand, we have

$$\zeta_n^{-1} = \sigma(\zeta_n) = \sigma|_Q(\zeta_n) = \frac{Q(\zeta_n)/Q}{P \cap \mathcal{O}_{Q(\zeta_n)}}(\zeta_n) = \zeta_n^p,$$  

so that $p \equiv -1 \pmod{n}$. On the other hand,

$$\gamma^{(p+1)/d} \equiv (\gamma^{1/d})^p \cdot \gamma^{-1/d} \equiv \sigma(\gamma^{1/d}) \cdot \gamma^{-1/d} \equiv \gamma^{-1/d} \cdot \gamma^{-1/d} \equiv 1 \pmod{P},$$  

so that $\gamma^{(p+1)/d} \equiv 1 \pmod{\pi}$, which, by Lemma 5.1, implies $d \mid \mu_U(p)$. We have proved (2).

If $\left(\frac{a}{p}\right) = 1$ then the proof proceeds similarly to the case $\left(\frac{a}{p}\right) = -1$, and yields that (2) is equivalent to $\sigma(\zeta_n) = \zeta_n$ and $\sigma(\gamma^{1/d}) = \gamma^{1/d}$, that is, $\sigma = \text{id}$. \hfill $\square$

Lemma 5.3. The roots of unity contained in $K$ are: the sixth roots of unity, if $\Delta_0 = -3$; the forth roots of unity, if $\Delta_0 = -1$; or the second roots of unity, if $\Delta_0 \neq -1, -3$.

Proof. If $\zeta_n \in K$ for some positive integer $n$, then $Q(\zeta_n) \subseteq K$, so that $\varphi(n) \leq 2$, and $n \in \{1, 2, 3, 4, 6\}$. Then the claim follows easily since $\zeta_3 = (-1 + \sqrt{-3})/2$, $\zeta_4 = \sqrt{-1}$, and $\zeta_6 = (1 + \sqrt{-3})/2$. \hfill $\square$

Lemma 5.4. Let $n$ be an odd positive integer with $3 \nmid n$ whenever $\Delta_0 = -3$, and let $d$ be a positive integer dividing $n$. Then $a \in K \cap K(\zeta_n)^d$ if and only if $a \in K^d$.

Proof. The “if” part is obvious. Let us prove the “only if” part. Note that, by the hypothesis on $n$ and by Lemma 5.3, the only $n$th root of unity in $K$ is 1. Suppose that $a \in K \cap K(\zeta_n)^d$. Hence, there exists $b \in K(\zeta_n)$ such that $a = b^d$. Putting $a_1 := a^{n/d}$, we get that $a_1 = b^n$. Therefore, $K(\zeta_n, a_1^{1/n}) = K(\zeta_n, b) = K(\zeta_n)$ is an abelian extension of $K$. Consequently, by Lemma 4.3, we have $a_1 \in K^n$, that is, $a_1 = b_1^n$ for some $b_1 \in K$. Thus $a^n = a_1^n = b_1^{dn}$, so that $a = \zeta b_1^d$, where $\zeta$ is a $n$th root of unity in $K$. We already noticed that $\zeta = 1$, hence $a \in K^d$. \hfill $\square$

Lemma 5.5. Let $n$ be an odd positive integer with $3 \nmid n$ whenever $\Delta_0 = -3$, and let $d$ be a positive integer dividing $n$. Then

$$[K_{n,d} : \mathbb{Q}] = \frac{\varphi(n)d}{(d, h)} \cdot \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \sqrt{\Delta} \in \mathbb{Q}(\zeta_n), \\ 2 & \text{if } \sqrt{\Delta} \notin \mathbb{Q}(\zeta_n), \end{cases}$$  

while

$$|\Delta_{K_{n,d}}|^{1/[K_{n,d} : \mathbb{Q}]} \ll_U n^3 \quad \text{and} \quad \log |\Delta_{K_{n,d}}| \ll_U n^2 \log(n + 1).$$
Moreover, there exists \( \sigma \in \text{Gal}(K_{n,d}/\mathbb{Q}) \) satisfying (3) if and only if \( \sqrt{\Delta} \notin \mathbb{Q}(\zeta_n) \) or \( \Delta < 0 \). In particular, if \( \sigma \) exists then it belongs to the center of \( \text{Gal}(K_{n,d}/\mathbb{Q}) \).

Proof. Let \( d_0 := d/(d,h) \), \( h_0 := h/(d,h) \), and \( f(X) = X^{d_0} - \gamma_0^{h_0} \). Suppose that \( \gamma_0^{h_0} \in K(\zeta_n)^p \) for some prime number \( p \) dividing \( d_0 \). Then, by Lemma 5.4, we have \( \gamma_0^{h_0} \in K^p \). In turn, by the maximality of \( h \), it follows that \( p \mid h_0 \), which is impossible, since \( (d_0,h_0) = 1 \). Hence, \( \gamma_0^{h_0} \notin K(\zeta_n)^p \) for every prime number \( p \) dividing \( d_0 \). Consequently, by Lemma 4.2, \( f \) is irreducible over \( K(\zeta_n) \). Thus \( K_{n,d} \cong K(\zeta_n)[X]/(f(X)) \), so that \( [K_{n,d} : K(\zeta_n)] = d_0 \) and \( (\gamma^{1/d})^{d_0} = \gamma_0^{h_0} \).

It is easy to check that \( [K(\zeta_n) : \mathbb{Q}] = \varphi(n) \) if \( \sqrt{\Delta} \in \mathbb{Q}(\zeta_n) \), and \( [K(\zeta_n) : \mathbb{Q}] = 2\varphi(n) \) otherwise. Hence, (6) follows.

Let \( s \) be a positive integer such that \( s\gamma_0 \in \mathcal{O}_K \), and put \( g(X) := s^{d_0}f(X/s) = X^{d_0} - s^{d_0}\gamma_0^{h_0} \). Since \( f \) is the minimal polynomial of \( \gamma^{1/d} \) over \( K(\zeta_n) \), we get that \( g \) is the minimal polynomial of \( s\gamma^{1/d} \) over \( K(\zeta_n) \). In particular, since \( g \in \mathcal{O}_K[X] \), we have that \( s\gamma^{1/d} \in \mathcal{O}_{K_{n,d}} \). Hence, from \( K_{n,d} = K(\zeta_n)(s\gamma^{1/d}) \) it follows that

\[
\Delta_{K_{n,d}/K(\zeta_n)} \supseteq \text{disc}(g)O_{K(\zeta_n)} = \prod_{1 \leq i < j \leq d_0} (s\gamma^{1/d}_0\zeta_{d_0}^i - s\gamma^{1/d}_0\zeta_{d_0}^j)^2O_{K(\zeta_n)} = (s\gamma^{1/d}_0)^{d_0(d_0-1)}d_0O_{K(\zeta_n)} = \gamma_0^{h_0(d_0-1)}(s^{d_0-1}d_0)^{d_0}O_{K(\zeta_n)},
\]

and

\[
N_{K(\zeta_n)/\mathbb{Q}}(\Delta_{K_{n,d}/K(\zeta_n)}) = N_{K/\mathbb{Q}}(\gamma_0^{h_0})^{d_0(d_0-1)}[K(\zeta_n):K](s^{d_0-1}d_0)^{d_0}[K(\zeta_n):\mathbb{Q}] \cdot (N_{K/\mathbb{Q}}(\gamma)s)^{\infty}.
\]

Also, a quick computation shows that \( \Delta_{K(\zeta_n)} \mid (4\Delta n)^\infty \). Therefore, since

\[
\Delta_{K_{n,d}} = \Delta_{K(\zeta_n)}^{|K_{n,d}:K(\zeta_n)|}N_{K(\zeta_n)/\mathbb{Q}}(\Delta_{K_{n,d}/K(\zeta_n)}),
\]

we get that every prime factor of \( \Delta_{K_{n,d}} \) divides \( An \), where \( A := 4\Delta N_{K/\mathbb{Q}}(\gamma)s \). By Hensel’s estimate (see, e.g., [11, comments after Theorem 7.3]), we have that

\[
|\Delta|^{1/n_L} \leq n_L \prod_{p \mid \Delta_L} p,
\]

for every Galois extension \( L/\mathbb{Q} \) of degree \( n_L \). Consequently,

\[
|\Delta_{K_{n,d}}|^{1/|K_{n,d}:\mathbb{Q}|} \leq [K_{n,d} : \mathbb{Q}]An \ll_U \varphi(n)d \ll n^3,
\]

and

\[
\log |\Delta_{K_{n,d}}| \leq [K_{n,d} : \mathbb{Q}](\log n + O_U(1)) \ll_U \varphi(n)d \log(n + 1) \ll n^2 \log(n + 1),
\]

so that (7) is proved.

Suppose that there exists \( \sigma \in \text{Gal}(K_{n,d}/\mathbb{Q}) \) satisfying (3). We shall prove that \( \sqrt{\Delta} \notin \mathbb{Q}(\zeta_n) \) or \( \Delta < 0 \). Assume that \( \sqrt{\Delta} \in \mathbb{Q}(\zeta_n) \). On the one hand, \( \sigma(\gamma) = \sigma(\gamma^{1/d}) = \gamma^{-1} \), and consequently \( \sigma(\sqrt{\Delta}) = -\sqrt{\Delta} \). On the other hand, since \( \sqrt{\Delta} \in \mathbb{Q}(\zeta_n) \) and \( \sigma(\zeta_n) = \zeta_n^{-1} \), we have that \( \sigma(\sqrt{\Delta}) = \sqrt{\Delta} \). Therefore, \( \sqrt{\Delta} = -\sqrt{\Delta} \) and so \( \Delta < 0 \). Now let us check that \( \sigma \) belongs to the center of \( \text{Gal}(K_{n,d}/\mathbb{Q}) \). Note that \( N_{K/\mathbb{Q}}(\gamma) = \gamma \sigma K(\zeta_n) = \gamma^{-1} \). Also, \( N_{K/\mathbb{Q}}(\gamma_0^{h_0}) = N_{K/\mathbb{Q}}(\gamma_0^h) = N_{K/\mathbb{Q}}(\gamma) = 1 \), since \( d \) is odd and so \( h_0 \equiv h \pmod{2} \). Therefore, for every \( \tau \in \text{Gal}(K_{n,\mathbb{Q}}/\mathbb{Q}) \), we have \( \tau(\gamma_0^{h_0}) = \gamma_0^{h_0} \), if \( \tau|_{K} = \text{id} \), or \( \tau(\gamma_0^{h_0}) = N_{K/\mathbb{Q}}(\gamma_0^{h_0})\gamma_0^{h_0} = \gamma_0^{h_0} \).

If \( \tau|_{K} = \sigma K \). Consequently, recalling that \( (\gamma^{1/d})^{d_0} = \gamma_0^{h_0} \), we have that \( \tau(\zeta_n) = \zeta_n^{-1} \) and \( \tau(\gamma^{1/d}) = \zeta_n^{-1} \gamma^{1/d} + 1 \). For some integers \( s, t \). At this point, it can be easily checked that \( (\sigma \tau)(\zeta_n) = (\sigma \tau)(\zeta_n) \) and \( (\sigma \tau)(\gamma^{1/d}) = (\sigma \tau)(\gamma^{1/d}) \). Hence, \( \sigma \) belongs to the center of \( \text{Gal}(K_{n,d}/\mathbb{Q}) \).

Suppose that \( \sqrt{\Delta} \notin \mathbb{Q}(\zeta_n) \) or \( \Delta < 0 \). We shall prove the existence of \( \sigma \in \text{Gal}(K_{n,d}/\mathbb{Q}) \) satisfying (3). It suffices to show that there exists \( \sigma_1 \in \text{Gal}(K(\zeta_n)/K) \) such that \( \sigma_1(\zeta_n) = \zeta_n^{-1} \).
and \( \sigma_1|_K = \sigma_K \). Indeed, recalling that \( K_{n,d} \cong K(\zeta_n)[x]/(f(x)) \), we can extend \( \sigma_1 \) to an automorphism \( \sigma \in \text{Gal}(K_{n,d}/\mathbb{Q}) \) that sends the root \( \gamma_1^{1/d} \) of \( f \) to the root \( \gamma_1^{1/d} \) of
\[
(\sigma_1 f)(X) = X^{d_0} - \sigma_1(\gamma_0^{h_0}) = X^{d_0} - N_{K/Q}(\gamma_0^{h_0})\gamma_0^{h_0} = X^{d_0} - \gamma_0^{-h_0},
\]
and so \( \sigma \) satisfies (3). Pick \( \sigma_0 \in \text{Gal}(\mathbb{Q}(\zeta_n)/\mathbb{Q}) \) such that \( \sigma_0(\zeta_n) = \zeta_n^{-1} \). If \( \sqrt{\Delta} \in \mathbb{Q}(\zeta_n) \) then \( K(\zeta_n) = \mathbb{Q}(\zeta_n), \Delta < 0 \), and \( \sigma_0(\sqrt{\Delta}) = \sqrt{\Delta} = -\sqrt{\Delta} \), so we let \( \sigma_1 := \sigma_0 \). If \( \sqrt{\Delta} \notin \mathbb{Q}(\zeta_n) \) then \( X^2 - \Delta \) is the minimal polynomial of \( \sqrt{\Delta} \) over \( \mathbb{Q}(\zeta_n) \) and we can extend \( \sigma_0 \) to \( \sigma_1 \in \text{Gal}(K(\zeta_n)/\mathbb{Q}) \) such that \( \sigma_1(\sqrt{\Delta}) = -\sqrt{\Delta} \).

6. Proof of Theorem 1.1

The proof proceeds similarly to [9, Section 2]. For all positive integers \( d, n \) with \( d \mid n \), and for all \( x > 1 \), let us define
\[
\pi_{U,n,d}(x) := \#\{p \leq x : p \nmid a_2\Delta, p \equiv \left(\frac{\Delta}{p}\right) \pmod{n}, d \mid \nu_U(p)\}.
\]
In what follows, we will tacitly ignore the finitely many prime numbers dividing \( a_2\Delta \).

Lemma 6.1. For every positive integer \( d \) and for every \( x > 1 \), we have
\[
\mathcal{R}_U(d; x) = \sum_{v \mid d^\infty} \sum_{a \mid d} \mu(a)\pi_{U,dv,av}(x).
\]

Proof. Every prime number \( p \) counted by the inner sum of (8) satisfies \( p \leq x, p \equiv \left(\frac{\Delta}{p}\right) \pmod{dv} \), and \( \nu_U(p) = vw \) for some integer \( w \). Writing \( w = w_1w_2 \), with \( w_1 := (w, d) \), we get that the contribution of \( p \) to the inner sum or (8) is equal to \( \sum_{a\mid w_1} \mu(a) \) (mod dv). Hence,
\[
\pi_{U,dv,av}(x) = \#\{p \leq x : p \equiv \left(\frac{\Delta}{p}\right) \pmod{dv}, v \mid \nu_U(p), \nu_U(p)/v, d) = 1\}.
\]
Now it suffices to show that
\[
\mathcal{R}_U(d; x) = \sum_{v \mid d^\infty} \#\{p \leq x : p \equiv \left(\frac{\Delta}{p}\right) \pmod{dv}, v \mid \nu_U(p), (\nu_U(p)/v, d) = 1\}
\]
On the other hand, let \( p \) be a prime number counted on the right-hand side of (10). Note that this is counted only once, namely for \( v = (\nu_U(p), d^\infty) \). Then, from \( \rho_U(p)\nu_U(p) = p - \left(\frac{\Delta}{p}\right) \), it follows that \( d \mid \rho_U(p) \). Hence, \( p \) is counted on the left-hand side of (10).

On the other hand, let \( p \) be a prime number counted by \( \mathcal{R}_U(d; x) \). Then \( d \mid \rho_U(p) \) and, by Lemma 5.1, \( p \equiv \left(\frac{\Delta}{p}\right) \pmod{d} \). Consequently, there is an integer \( v \) such that \( v \mid d^{\infty}, p \equiv \left(\frac{\Delta}{p}\right) \pmod{dv} \), and \( (\nu_U(p)/v, d) = 1 \). Hence, \( p \) is counted on the right-hand side of (10). \( \square \)

Lemma 6.2. Let \( n \) be an odd positive integer with \( 3 \nmid n \) whenever \( \Delta_0 = -3 \), and let \( d \) be a positive integer dividing \( n \). There exist absolute constants \( A, B > 0 \) such that
\[
\pi_{U,n,d}(x) = \delta_{U,n,d}(x) \text{Li}(x) + O_{U} \left( x \exp \left( -A(\log x)^{1/2}/n \right) \right)
\]
for \( x \geq \exp(Bn^8) \), where
\[
\delta_{U,n,d} := \frac{(d, h)}{\varphi(n)d} \cdot \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \Delta > 0 \text{ or } \Delta_0 \equiv 1 \pmod{4} \text{ or } \Delta_0 \nmid n, \\ 2 & \text{otherwise}. \end{cases}
\]

Proof. Put \( E := K_{n,d}, F := \mathbb{Q}, G := \text{Gal}(E/F) \), and \( C = \{\text{id}, \sigma\} \) if there exists \( \sigma \in \text{Gal}(K_{n,d}/\mathbb{Q}) \) satisfying (3), or \( C = \{\text{id}\} \) otherwise. By Lemma 5.5, \( \sigma \) belongs to the center of \( G \), so that \( C \) is the union of conjugacy classes of \( G \). By Lemma 5.2, we have that \( \pi_{U,n,d}(x) \) is the number of primes \( p \) not exceeding \( x \) and such that \( \frac{E/F}{p} \subseteq C \). Thus, taking into account the bounds for the degree and the discriminant of \( E/F \) given in Lemma 5.5, and considering Lemma 4.4, the asymptotic formula follows by applying Theorem 4.5. \( \square \)
Lemma 6.3. Let $d$ be an odd positive integer with $3 \nmid d$ whenever $\Delta_0 = -3$. If $x > 1$ and $e^{\omega(d)} < y \leq \log x/\varphi(d)$, then

$$\sum_{\substack{v \mid d \infty \ a \mid d \\ v > y}} \mu(a)\pi_{U,dv,av}(x) \ll \frac{x}{\log x} \cdot \frac{\omega(d) + 1}{\varphi(d)} \cdot \frac{(\log y)^{\omega(d)}}{y}$$

and

$$\sum_{\substack{v \mid d \infty \ a \mid d \\ v > y}} \mu(a)\delta_{U,dv,av} \ll_U \frac{\omega(d) + 1}{\varphi(d)} \cdot \frac{(\log y)^{\omega(d)}}{y}.$$ 

Proof. Let $\pi(m,r;x) := \# \{ p \leq x : p \equiv r \pmod{m} \}$. From (9) it follows that

$$\sum_{a \mid d} \mu(a)\pi_{U,dv,av}(x) \leq \pi_{U,dv,av}(x) \leq \pi(x; dv, \pm 1).$$

Moreover, letting $x \to +\infty$, Lemma 6.2 and the first inequality of (13) yield

$$\sum_{a \mid d} \mu(a)\delta_{U,dv,av} \leq \delta_{U,dv}. $$

Now we have $M_d(x) := \# \{ v \leq x : v \mid d \infty \} \ll (\log x)^{\omega(d)}$, for every $x \geq 2$. Hence, by partial summation and since $y \geq e^{\omega(d)}$, we obtain that

$$\sum_{\substack{v \mid d \infty \\ v > y}} \frac{1}{v} = \frac{M_d(t)}{t} \bigg|_{t=y}^{+\infty} + \int_{y}^{+\infty} \frac{M_d(t)}{t^2} \, dt \ll \int_{y}^{+\infty} \frac{(\log t)^{\omega(d)}}{t^2} \, dt \leq \frac{(\omega(d) + 1)(\log y)^{\omega(d)}}{y}.$$ 

On the one hand, using the Brun–Titchmarsh inequality [3, Theorem 12.7]

$$\pi(m,r;x) \ll \frac{x}{\varphi(m) \log (x/m)},$$

holding for $x > m$, and (15) we get that

$$\sum_{\substack{v \mid d \infty \\ v > y, dv \leq x^{2/3}}} \pi(dv, \pm 1; x) \ll \frac{x}{\varphi(d) \log x} \sum_{\substack{v \mid d \infty \\ v > y}} \frac{1}{v} \ll \frac{x}{\varphi(d) \log x} \cdot \frac{\omega(d) + 1}{\varphi(d)} \cdot \frac{(\log y)^{\omega(d)}}{y}.$$ 

On the other hand, using the trivial bound $\pi(m, \pm 1; x) \ll x/m$, holding for $x \geq 1$, and (15) again, we find that

$$\sum_{\substack{v \mid d \infty \\ dv > x^{2/3}}} \pi(dv, \pm 1; x) \ll \sum_{\substack{w \mid d \infty \\ w > x^{2/3}}} \frac{x}{w} \ll x^{1/3}(\omega(d) + 1)(\log x)^{\omega(d)}.$$ 

Putting together (16), (17), and (13), taking into account that $\omega(d) \leq \log y$ and $\varphi(d)y \leq \log x$, we obtain (12). Finally, from (14), (11), and (15), we get

$$\sum_{\substack{v \mid d \infty \ a \mid d \\ v > y}} \mu(a)\delta_{U,dv,av} \leq \sum_{\substack{v \mid d \infty \ a \mid d \\ v > y}} \delta_{U,dv} \ll_U \frac{1}{\varphi(d)} \sum_{\substack{v \mid d \infty \ a \mid d \\ v > y}} \frac{1}{v^2} \ll \frac{\omega(d) + 1}{\varphi(d)} \cdot \frac{(\log y)^{\omega(d)}}{y},$$

as desired. \qed

Lemma 6.4. Let $d$ be an odd positive integer with $3 \nmid d$ whenever $\Delta_0 = -3$. Then

$$\sum_{\substack{v \mid d \infty \ a \mid d}} \mu(a)\delta_{U,dv,av} = \delta_{U}(d).$$
Proof. For every integer \(e\) dividing \(d^\infty\), define
\[
S_{d,e,h} := \sum_{v \mid d^\infty} \sum_{a \mid d} \mu(a)(av, h) \varphi(av)^e
\]
The value of \(S_{d,1,h}\) was computed in [9, Lemma 4] and a slight modification of the proof (precisely, replacing \((h, d^\infty)\) with \([e, (h, d^\infty)]\) in the last equation) yields
\[
S_{d,e,h} = (d^\infty, h) \sum_{p \mid d} \left( 1 - \frac{1}{p^e} \right)^{-1}
\]
At this point, by (11) and considering that \(\Delta_0 \mid dv\) if and only if \(e \mid v\), where \(e := \Delta_0/(d, \Delta_0)\), we have
\[
\sum_{v \mid d^\infty} \sum_{a \mid d} \mu(a)\delta_{U,dv,av} = \begin{cases} 
S_{d,1,h} & \text{if } \Delta > 0 \text{ or } \Delta_0 \equiv 1 \text{ (mod } 4) \text{ or } \Delta_0 \nmid d^\infty = \delta_U(d), \\
S_{d,1,h} + S_{d,e,h} & \text{otherwise}
\end{cases}
\]
as claimed. \(\square\)

Proof of Theorem 1.1. Let \(A, B > 0\) be the constants of Lemma 6.2. Assume that \(x \geq \exp(Be^{8\omega(d)}d^8)\) and put \(y := (\log x/B)^{1/8}/d\). Note that \(\omega(d) \leq y \leq \log x/\varphi(d)\) and \(\log y \leq \log \log x\), for every \(x \gg B^1\). By Lemma 6.1, Lemma 6.2, and Lemma 6.4, we obtain that
\[
R_U(d; x) = \sum_{v \mid d^\infty} \sum_{a \mid d} \mu(a)\pi_{U,dv,av}(x) + O(E_1)
\]
\[
= \sum_{v \mid d^\infty} \sum_{a \mid d} \mu(a)\delta_{U,dv,av} Li(x) + O(E_1) + O_U(E_2)
\]
\[
= \delta_U(d) Li(x) + O(E_1) + O_U(E_2) + O(E_3),
\]
where, by Lemma 6.3, we have
\[
E_1 := \sum_{v \mid d^\infty} \sum_{a \mid d} \mu(a)\pi_{U,dv,av}(x) \ll \frac{x}{\log x} \cdot \frac{\omega(d) + 1}{\varphi(d)} \cdot \frac{1}{y} \cdot \frac{\varphi(d)}{\varphi(d)} \cdot \frac{x}{(\log x)^{1/8}}
\]
and
\[
E_3 := \sum_{v \mid d^\infty} \sum_{a \mid d} \mu(a)\delta_{U,dv,av} Li(x) \ll_U \frac{\omega(d) + 1}{\varphi(d)} \cdot \frac{1}{y} \cdot Li(x) \ll \frac{\omega(d) + 1}{\varphi(d)} \cdot \frac{x}{(\log x)^{9/8}}.
\]
while, also using the inequality \(\tau(d)/d \leq d/\varphi(d)\), we have
\[
E_2 := \sum_{v \mid d^\infty} \sum_{a \mid d} x \exp\left(-A(\log x)^{1/2}/(dv)\right) \ll x \exp\left(-AB^{1/8}(\log x)^{3/8}\right)\tau(d)y
\]
\[
\ll x \exp\left(-AB^{1/8}(\log x)^{3/8}\right)(\log x)^{1/8} \cdot \frac{\tau(d)}{d} \ll \frac{d}{\varphi(d)} \cdot \frac{x}{(\log x)^{9/8}}.
\]
The result follows. \(\square\)
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