
ON THE GLOBAL DETERMINANT METHOD

Chunhui Liu

Abstract. — In this paper, we build the global determinant method of Salberger by Arakelov geometry, where we admit the Generalized Riemann Hypothesis in order to obtain an explicit estimate over an arbitrary number field. As an application, we study the dependence on the degree of the number of rational points of bounded height in plane curves.

Résumé (Autour de la méthode globale de déterminant). — Dans cet article, on construit la méthode globale de déterminant de Salberger par la géométrie d'Arakelov, où l'on admet l'hypothèse généralisée de Riemann à fin d'obtenir une estimation explicite sur un corps de nombres arbitraire. Comme une application, on étudie la dépendance du degré du nombre de points rationnels de hauteur majorée dans courbes planes.

Contents

1. Introduction.....	1
2. Fundamental settings.....	5
3. Global determinant method for hypersurfaces.....	11
4. Some quantitative estimates.....	16
5. An explicit estimate of determinant.....	22
6. Counting rational points in plane curves.....	30
Appendix A. An explicit lower bound of $Q_\xi(r)$	31
References.....	34

1. Introduction

Let $X \hookrightarrow \mathbb{P}_K^n$ be a projective variety over a number field K . For every rational point $\xi \in X(K)$, we denote by $H_K(\xi)$ a height of ξ with respect to the above closed immersion, for example, the classic Weil height (cf. [27, §B.2, Definition]). Let $S(X; B) = \{\xi \in X(K) \mid H_K(\xi) \leq B\}$, where $B \geq 1$ and the embedding morphism is

omitted. By the Northcott's property, the cardinality $\#S(X; B)$ is finite for a fixed $B \in \mathbb{R}$.

In order to understand the density of the rational points of X , it is an important approach to study the function $\#S(X; B)$ with the variable $B \in \mathbb{R}^+$. For different required properties of $\#S(X; B)$, numerous methods have been applied. In this article, we are interested the uniform upper bound of $\#S(X; B)$ for all $X \hookrightarrow \mathbb{P}_K^n$ with fixed degree and dimension, or for those satisfying certain common conditions.

1.1. Determinant method. — For this purpose, we will introduce the so-called *determinant method* to study the number of rational points with bounded height in arithmetic varieties, which is proposed in [26].

1.1.1. Basic ideas and history. — Traditionally, the determinant method is proposed over the rational number field \mathbb{Q} to avoid some extra technical troubles. In [3] (see also [35]), Bombieri and Pila proposed a method of determinant argument to study plane affine curves. The monomials of a certain degree evaluated on a family of rational points in $S(X; B)$ having the same reduction modulo some prime numbers form a matrix whose determinant is zero by a local estimate. By Siegel's Lemma, we can assure the existence of the hypersurfaces in $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{Q}}^n$ with bounded degree which contain all rational points in the family, but do not contain the generic point of X . If we can control the number of these auxiliary hypersurfaces and their maximal degree well, it will play a significant role in controlling the upper bound of $\#S(X; B)$. By this method, they proved $\#S(X; B) \ll_{\delta, \epsilon} B^{\frac{2}{\delta} + \epsilon}$ for all $\epsilon > 0$, where $\delta = \deg(X)$.

In [26], Heath-Brown generalized the method of [3] to the higher dimensional case. His idea is to focus on a subset of $S(X; B)$ whose reductions modulo a prime number are a same regular point, and he proved that this subset can be covered by a bounded degree hypersurface which do not contain the generic point of X . Then he counted the number of regular points over finite fields, and controled the regular reductions. In [6], Broberg generalized it to the case over arbitrary number fields.

In [41, 42], Serre asked whether $\#S(X; B) \ll_X B^{\dim(X)} (\log B)^c$ is verified for all arithmetic varieties X with a particular constant c . In [26], Heath-Brown proposed a uniform version $\#S(X; B) \ll_{d, \delta, \epsilon} B^{\dim(X) + \epsilon}$ for all $\epsilon > 0$ with $\delta = \deg(X)$, which is called *the dimension growth conjecture*. He proved this conjecture for some special cases. Later, Browning, Heath-Brown and Salberger had some contributions on this subject, see [7, 8, 9] for the improvements of the determinant method and the proofs under certain conditions. In [39], Salberger considered the general reductions, and the multiplicities of rational points are taken into consideration, and he proved the dimension growth conjecture with certain conditions on the subvarieties of X .

1.1.2. A global version. — The so-called *global determinant method* is first introduced by Salberger in [40] in order to study the dimension growth conjecture. In general, it allows only one auxiliary hypersurface to cover the rational points of bounded height, and we optimize the degree of this hypersurface. By the global version, he proved the dimension growth conjecture for $\deg(X) = \delta \geq 4$ and $\#S(X; B) \ll_{\delta} B^{\frac{2}{\delta}} \log B$ when X is a curve.

In [46], Walsh refined the global determinant method in [40], and he removed the $\log B$ term in [40] when X is a curve. In [11], Castryck, Cluckers, Dittmann and Nguyen refined [46] on giving an explicit dependence on δ . As applications, they obtained a better estimate of $\#S(X; B)$ when X is a plane curve, and a better partial result of the dimension growth conjecture than that in [40]. Besides this, they studied the bound of 2-torsion points of the class group of number fields, which improved the work [2, Theorem 1.1] of Bhargava, Shankar, Taniguchi, Thorne, Tsimerman and Y. Zhao.

1.1.3. Formulation by Arakelov geometry. — In [13, 14], H. Chen reformulated the works of Salberger [39] by the slope method in Arakelov geometry of Bost in [4]. By this formulation, we replace the matrix of monomials by the evaluation map which sends a global section of a particular line bundle to a family of rational points. By the slope inequalities, we can control the height of the evaluation map in the slope method, which replaces the role of Siegel's lemma in controlling heights.

There are two advantages by the approach of Arakelov geometry. First, Arakelov geometry gives a natural conceptual framework for the determinant method over arbitrary number fields. Next, it is easier to obtain explicit estimates, since the constants obtained from the slope inequalities are given explicitly in general.

1.2. A global version with the formulation of Arakelov geometry. — In this article, we will construct the global determinant method by Arakelov geometry following the strategy of [13, 14], where we work over an arbitrary number field. As an application, we will study the problem of counting rational points in plane curves, and we consider how these upper bounds depend on the degree. Some ideas are inspired by [40, 46, 11].

1.2.1. Main results. — First, we have the control of auxiliary hypersurface below in Corollary 5.5 and Corollary 5.6, which are deduced from Theorem 5.4.

Theorem 1.1. — *Let X be a geometrically integral hypersurface in \mathbb{P}_K^n of degree δ . We suppose that there exists a hypersurface of degree \square which covers $S(X; B)$ but does not contain the generic point of X . Then we have*

$$\square \ll_{K,n} \delta^3 B^{\frac{n}{(n-1)n-\sqrt{\delta}}}$$

in Corollary 5.5, and

$$\square \ll_{K,n} \delta^{3-\frac{1}{n-1}} B^{\frac{n}{(n-1)n-\sqrt{\delta}}} \max \left\{ \frac{\log B}{[K:\mathbb{Q}]}, 1 \right\}$$

in Corollary 5.6. The above constants depending on K and n will be given explicitly in Corollary 5.5 and Corollary 5.6 under the assumption of the Generalized Riemann Hypothesis.

As an application, we have the following results on counting rational points of bounded height in plane curves in Theorem 6.1 and Theorem 6.2.

Theorem 1.2. — *Let X be a geometrically integral plane curve in \mathbb{P}_K^2 of degree δ . Then we have*

$$\#S(X; B) \ll_K \delta^4 B^{\frac{2}{\delta}}$$

in Theorem 6.1, and

$$\#S(X; B) \ll_K \delta^3 B^{\frac{2}{\delta}} \log B$$

in Theorem 6.2. The above constants depending on K will be given explicitly in Theorem 6.1 and Theorem 6.2 under the assumption of the Generalized Riemann Hypothesis.

Theorem 6.1 generalizes [11, Theorem 2] over an arbitrary number field, and gives an explicit estimate under the assumption of the Generalized Riemann Hypothesis. Theorem 6.2 can be viewed as a projective analogue of [11, Theorem 3] over an arbitrary number field.

1.2.2. The role of the Generalized Riemann Hypothesis. — In this work, some explicit estimates of the distribution of prime ideals are applied. In order to provide these estimates, we admit **GRH (the Generalized Riemann Hypothesis)** of the Dedekind zeta function of the base number field, see [22], for example. Without the assumptions of GRH, it seems to be very difficult to obtain explicit estimates over an arbitrary number field, since we do not know the zero-free region of the Dedekind zeta function. If we know the zero-free region clearly enough, for example, if we work on the rational number field \mathbb{Q} or totally imaginary fields (see [44] and [10] respectively), or we just want an implicit estimate (see [37]), we do not need to suppose GRH.

1.3. Organization of article. — This article is organized as following. In §2, we provide some preliminaries to construct the determinant method by Arakelov geometry. In §3, we formulate the global determinant method by the slope method. In §4, we give some useful estimates on the non-geometrically integral reductions, a count of multiplicities over finite fields, the distributions of some particular prime ideals under the assumption of GRH, and the geometric Hilbert-Samuel function. In §5, we provide an explicit upper bound of the determinant under the assumption of GRH and lower bounds of auxiliary hypersurfaces. In §6, we give two uniform upper bounds of rational points of bounded height in plane curves. In Appendix A, we will give an explicit lower bound of a useful function induced by the local Hilbert-Samuel function.

Acknowledgement. — I would like to thank Prof. Per Salberger for introducing his brilliant work [40] to me, and for explaining me some ingredients of his work. These discussions and suggestions play a significant role in this paper. I would also like to thank Dr. Stanley Yao Xiao for his suggestions on the study of the distribution of prime ideals.

2. Fundamental settings

In this section, we will introduce some preliminaries to understand the problem of counting rational points of bounded height. In particular, we will provide some basic notions on Arakelov geometry.

2.1. Counting rational points of bounded height. — Let K be a number field, and \mathcal{O}_K be its ring of integers. We denote by $M_{K,f}$ the set of finite places of K , and by $M_{K,\infty}$ the set of infinite places of K . In addition, we denote by $M_K = M_{K,f} \sqcup M_{K,\infty}$ the set of places of K . For every $v \in M_K$ and $x \in K$, we define the absolute value $|x|_v = |N_{K_v/\mathbb{Q}_v}(x)|_v^{\frac{1}{[K_v:\mathbb{Q}_v]}}$ for each $v \in M_K$, extending the usual absolute values on \mathbb{Q}_p or \mathbb{R} .

Let $\xi = [\xi_0 : \cdots : \xi_n] \in \mathbb{P}_K^n(K)$. We define the *height* of ξ in \mathbb{P}_K^n as

$$(1) \quad H_K(\xi) = \prod_{v \in M_K} \max_{0 \leq i \leq n} \left\{ |\xi_i|_v^{[K_v:\mathbb{Q}_v]} \right\}.$$

We also define the logarithmic height of ξ as

$$(2) \quad h(\xi) = \frac{1}{[K:\mathbb{Q}]} \log H_K(\xi),$$

which is independent of the choice of K (cf. [27, Lemma B.2.1]).

Suppose that X is a closed integral subscheme of \mathbb{P}_K^n , and $\phi : X \hookrightarrow \mathbb{P}_K^n$ is the closed immersion. For $\xi \in X(K)$, we define $H_K(\xi) = H_K(\phi(\xi))$, and usually we omit the closed immersion ϕ if there is no confusion. Next, we denote

$$S(X; B) = \{\xi \in X(K) | H_K(\xi) \leq B\}, \text{ and } N(X; B) = \#S(X; B).$$

By the Northcott's property (cf. [27, Theorem B.2.3]), the cardinality $N(X; B)$ is finite for a fixed $B \geq 1$.

The aim of counting rational points of bounded height is to understand the function $N(X; B)$ for some particular X and $B \geq 1$.

2.2. A function induced by local Hilbert-Samuel functions. — In this part, we will define a function induced by the local Hilbert-Samuel function of schemes at a closed point, and we will use this function in Proposition 3.4. For the motivation and background, see [39, §2] and [14, §3.2].

Let k be a field, and X be a closed subscheme of \mathbb{P}_k^n of pure dimension d , which means all its irreducible have the same dimension. Let ξ be a closed point of X . We denote by

$$(3) \quad H_\xi(s) = \dim_{\kappa(\xi)} \left(\mathfrak{m}_{X,\xi}^s / \mathfrak{m}_{X,\xi}^{s+1} \right)$$

the local Hilbert-Samuel function of X at the point ξ with the variable $s \in \mathbb{N}$, where $\mathfrak{m}_{X,\xi}$ is the maximal ideal of the local ring $\mathcal{O}_{X,\xi}$, and $\kappa(\xi)$ is the residue field of the local ring $\mathcal{O}_{X,\xi}$. For this function, we have the polynomial asymptotic

$$(4) \quad H_\xi(s) = \frac{\mu_\xi(X)}{(d-1)!} s^{d-1} + o(s^{d-1}),$$

where we define the positive integer $\mu_\xi(X)$ as the *multiplicity* of point ξ in X .

We define the series $\{q_\xi(m)\}_{m \geq 1}$ as the increasing series of non-negative integers such that every integer $s \in \mathbb{N}$ appears exactly $H_\xi(s)$ times in this series. For example, if $H_\xi(0) = 1, H_\xi(1) = 2, H_\xi(2) = 4, H_\xi(3) = 5, \dots$, then the series $\{q_\xi(m)\}_{m \geq 1}$ is

$$\{0, 1, 1, 2, 2, 2, 2, 3, 3, 3, 3, 3, 4, \dots\}.$$

Let $\{Q_\xi(m)\}_{m \geq 1}$ be the partial sum of the series $\{q_\xi(m)\}_{m \geq 1}$, which is

$$(6) \quad Q_\xi(m) = q_\xi(0) + q_\xi(1) + \dots + q_\xi(m)$$

for all $m \in \mathbb{N}$.

If X is a hypersurface of \mathbb{P}_k^n , then by [28, Example 2.70 (2)], the local Hilbert-Samuel function of X at the point ξ defined at (3) is

$$H_\xi(s) = \binom{n+s-1}{s} - \binom{n+s-\mu_\xi(X)-1}{s-\mu_\xi(X)}.$$

For this case, we have the following explicit lower bound of $Q_\xi(m)$, which is

$$(6) \quad Q_\xi(m) > \left(\frac{(n-1)!}{\mu_\xi(X)} \right)^{\frac{1}{n-1}} \left(\frac{n-1}{n} \right) m^{\frac{n}{n-1}} - \frac{n^3 + 2n^2 + n - 4}{2n(n+1)} m.$$

This lower bound has the optimal dominant term by the argument in [39, Main Lemma 2.5] and some other subsequent references. In Appendix A, we will provide a detailed proof of this lower bound.

2.3. Normed vector bundles. — A *normed vector bundle* over $\text{Spec } \mathcal{O}_K$ is all the pairings $\overline{E} = (E, (\|\cdot\|_v)_{v \in M_{K,\infty}})$, where:

- E is a projective \mathcal{O}_K -module of finite rank;
- $(\|\cdot\|_v)_{v \in M_{K,\infty}}$ is a family of norms, where $\|\cdot\|_v$ is a norm over $E \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_K, v} \mathbb{C}$ which is invariant under the action of $\text{Gal}(\mathbb{C}/K_v)$.

If the norms $(\|\cdot\|_v)_{v \in M_{K,\infty}}$ are Hermitian for all $v \in M_{K,\infty}$, we call \overline{E} a *Hermitian vector bundle* over $\text{Spec } \mathcal{O}_K$. If $\text{rk}_{\mathcal{O}_K}(E) = 1$, we say that \overline{E} is a *Hermitian line bundle*.

Suppose that F is a sub- \mathcal{O}_K -module of E . We say that F is a *saturated* sub- \mathcal{O}_K -module if E/F is a torsion-free \mathcal{O}_K -module.

Let $\overline{E} = (E, (\|\cdot\|_{E,v})_{v \in M_{K,\infty}})$ and $\overline{F} = (F, (\|\cdot\|_{F,v})_{v \in M_{K,\infty}})$ be two Hermitian vector bundles. If F is a saturated sub- \mathcal{O}_K -module of E and $\|\cdot\|_{F,v}$ is the restriction of $\|\cdot\|_{E,v}$ over $F \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_K, v} \mathbb{C}$ for every $v \in M_{K,\infty}$, we say that \overline{F} is a *sub-Hermitian vector bundle* of \overline{E} over $\text{Spec } \mathcal{O}_K$.

We say that $\overline{G} = (G, (\|\cdot\|_{G,v})_{v \in M_{K,\infty}})$ is a *quotient Hermitian vector bundle* of \overline{E} over $\text{Spec } \mathcal{O}_K$, if for every $v \in M_{K,\infty}$, the module G is a projective quotient \mathcal{O}_K -module of E and $\|\cdot\|_{G,v}$ is the induced quotient space norm of $\|\cdot\|_{E,v}$.

For simplicity, we will denote by $E_K = E \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_K} K$ below.

2.4. Arakelov invariants. — Let \overline{E} be a Hermitian vector bundle over $\text{Spec } \mathcal{O}_K$, and $\{s_1, \dots, s_r\}$ be a K -basis of E_K . We will introduce some invariants in Arakelov geometry below.

2.4.1. Arakelov degree. — The *Arakelov degree* of \overline{E} is defined as

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{\deg}(\overline{E}) &= - \sum_{v \in M_K} [K_v : \mathbb{Q}_v] \log \|s_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge s_r\|_v \\ &= \log(\#(E/\mathcal{O}_K s_1 + \cdots + \mathcal{O}_K s_r)) - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{v \in M_{K,\infty}} \log \det(\langle s_i, s_j \rangle_{v, 1 \leq i, j \leq r}), \end{aligned}$$

where $\|s_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge s_r\|_v$ follows the definition in [12, 2.1.9] for all $v \in M_{K,\infty}$, and $\langle s_i, s_j \rangle_{v, 1 \leq i, j \leq r}$ is the Gram matrix of the basis $\{s_1, \dots, s_r\}$ with respect to $v \in M_{K,\infty}$. We refer the readers to [19, 2.4.1] for a proof of the equivalence of the above two definitions. The Arakelov degree is independent of the choice of the basis $\{s_1, \dots, s_r\}$ by the product formula (cf. [34, Chap. III, Proposition 1.3]). In addition, we define

$$\widehat{\deg}_n(\overline{E}) = \frac{1}{[K : \mathbb{Q}]} \widehat{\deg}(\overline{E})$$

as the *normalized Arakelov degree* of \overline{E} , which is independent of the choice of K .

2.4.2. Slope. — Let \overline{E} be a non-zero Hermitian vector bundle over $\text{Spec } \mathcal{O}_K$, and $\text{rk}(E)$ be the rank of E . The *slope* of \overline{E} is defined as

$$\widehat{\mu}(\overline{E}) := \frac{1}{\text{rk}(E)} \widehat{\deg}_n(\overline{E}).$$

In addition, we denote by $\widehat{\mu}_{\max}(\overline{E})$ the maximal value of slopes of all non-zero Hermitian subbundles, and by $\widehat{\mu}_{\min}(\overline{E})$ the minimal value of slopes of all non-zero Hermitian quotient bundles of \overline{E} .

2.4.3. Height of linear maps. — Let \overline{E} and \overline{F} be two non-zero Hermitian vector bundles over $\text{Spec } \mathcal{O}_K$, and $\phi : E_K \rightarrow F_K$ be a non-zero homomorphism. The *height* of ϕ is defined as

$$h(\phi) = \frac{1}{[K : \mathbb{Q}]} \sum_{v \in M_K} \log \|\phi\|_v,$$

where $\|\phi\|_v$ is the operator norm of $\phi_v : E \otimes_K K_v \rightarrow F \otimes_K K_v$ induced by the above linear homomorphism with respect to $v \in M_K$.

We refer the readers to [4, Appendix A] for some equalities and inequalities on Arakelov degrees and corresponding heights of homomorphisms.

2.5. Arithmetic Hilbert-Samuel function. — Let $\overline{\mathcal{E}}$ be a Hermitian vector bundle of rank $n + 1$ over $\text{Spec } \mathcal{O}_K$, and $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E})$ be the projective space which represents the functor from the category of commutative \mathcal{O}_K -algebras to the category of sets mapping all \mathcal{O}_K -algebra A to the set of projective quotient A -module of $\mathcal{E} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_K} A$ of rank 1. Let $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E})}(1)$ (or $\mathcal{O}(1)$ if there is no confusion) be the universal bundle, and $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E})}(D)$ (or $\mathcal{O}(D)$) be the line bundle $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E})}(1)^{\otimes D}$ for simplicity. The Hermitian metrics on \mathcal{E} induce by quotient of Hermitian metrics (i.e. Fubini-Study metrics) on $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E})}(1)$ which define a Hermitian line bundle $\overline{\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E})}(1)}$ on $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E})$.

For every $D \in \mathbb{N}^+$, let

$$(7) \quad E_D = H^0(\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}), \overline{\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E})}(D)}),$$

and let $r(n, D)$ be the its rank over \mathcal{O}_K . In fact, we have

$$(8) \quad r(n, D) = \binom{n+D}{D}.$$

For each $v \in M_{K, \infty}$, we denote by $\|\cdot\|_{v, \text{sup}}$ the norm over $E_{D, v} = E_D \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_K, v} \mathbb{C}$ such that

$$(9) \quad \forall s \in E_{D, v}, \|s\|_{v, \text{sup}} = \sup_{x \in \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}_K)_v(\mathbb{C})} \|s(x)\|_{v, \text{FS}},$$

where $\|\cdot\|_{v, \text{FS}}$ is the corresponding Fubini-Study norm.

Next, we introduce the *metric of John*, see [45] for a systematic introduction of this notion. In general, for a given symmetric convex body C , there exists the unique ellipsoid $J(C)$, called *ellipsoid of John*, contained in C with the maximal volume.

For the \mathcal{O}_K -module E_D and any place $v \in M_{K, \infty}$, we take the ellipsoid of John of its unit closed ball defined via the norm $\|\cdot\|_{v, \text{sup}}$, and this ellipsoid induces a Hermitian norm, noted by $\|\cdot\|_{v, J}$. For every section $s \in E_D$, the inequality

$$(10) \quad \|s\|_{v, \text{sup}} \leq \|s\|_{v, J} \leq \sqrt{r(n, D)} \|s\|_{v, \text{sup}}$$

is verified by [45, Theorem 3.3.6]. In fact, these constants do not depend on the choice of the symmetric convex body.

Let A be a ring, and E be an A -module. We denote by $\text{Sym}_A^D(E)$ the symmetric product of degree D of the A -module E , or by $\text{Sym}^D(E)$ if there is no confusion on the base ring.

If we consider the above E_D defined in (7) as a \mathcal{O}_K -module, we have the isomorphism of \mathcal{O}_K -modules $E_D \cong \text{Sym}^D(\mathcal{E})$. Then for every place $v \in M_{K, \infty}$, the Hermitian norm $\|\cdot\|_v$ over $\mathcal{E}_{v, \mathbb{C}}$ induces a Hermitian norm $\|\cdot\|_{v, \text{sym}}$ by the symmetric product. More precisely, this norm is the quotient norm induced by the quotient morphism

$$\mathcal{E}^{\otimes D} \rightarrow \text{Sym}^D(\mathcal{E}),$$

where the vector bundle $\overline{\mathcal{E}}^{\otimes D}$ is equipped with the norms of the tensor product of $\overline{\mathcal{E}}$ over $\text{Spec } \mathcal{O}_K$ (cf. [18, Définition 2.10] for the definition). We say that this norm is the *symmetric norm* over $\text{Sym}^D(\mathcal{E})$. For any place $v \in M_{K, \infty}$, the norms $\|\cdot\|_{v, J}$ and $\|\cdot\|_{v, \text{sym}}$ are invariant under the action of the unitary group $U(\mathcal{E}_{v, \mathbb{C}}, \|\cdot\|_v)$ of order $n+1$. Then they are proportional and the ratio is independent of the choice of $v \in M_{K, \infty}$ (see [5, Lemma 4.3.6] for a proof). We denote by $R_0(n, D)$ the constant such that, for every section $0 \neq s \in E_{D, v}$, the equality

$$(11) \quad \log \|s\|_{v, J} = \log \|s\|_{v, \text{sym}} + R_0(n, D).$$

is verified.

Definition 2.1. — Let E_D be the \mathcal{O}_K -module defined in (7). For every place $v \in M_{K, \infty}$, we denote by \overline{E}_D the Hermitian vector bundle over $\text{Spec } \mathcal{O}_K$ which E_D is equipped with the norm of John $\|\cdot\|_{v, J}$ induced by the norms $\|\cdot\|_{v, \text{sup}}$ defined in (9). Similarly, we denote by $\overline{E}_{D, \text{sym}}$ the Hermitian vector bundle over $\text{Spec } \mathcal{O}_K$ which E_D is equipped with the norms $\|\cdot\|_{v, \text{sym}}$ introduced above.

With all the notations in Definition 2.1, we have the following result.

Proposition 2.2 ([13], **Proposition 2.7**). — *With all the notations in Definition 2.1, we have*

$$\widehat{\mu}_{\min}(\overline{E}_D) = \widehat{\mu}_{\min}(\overline{E}_{D,\text{sym}}) - R_0(n, D).$$

In the above equality, the constant $R_0(n, D)$ defined in the equality (11) satisfies the inequality

$$0 \leq R_0(n, D) \leq \log \sqrt{r(n, D)},$$

where the constant $r(n, D) = \text{rk}(E_D)$ follows the definition in the equality (8).

Let X be an integral closed subscheme of $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}_K)$, and \mathcal{X} be the Zariski closure of X in $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E})$. We denote by

$$(12) \quad \eta_{X,D} : E_{D,K} = H^0(\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}_K), \mathcal{O}(D)) \rightarrow H^0(X, \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}_K)}(1)|_X^{\otimes D})$$

the *evaluation map* over X induced by the closed immersion of X in $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}_K)$. We denote by F_D the saturated image of the morphism $\eta_{X,D}$ in $H^0(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E})}(1)|_{\mathcal{X}}^{\otimes D})$. In other words, the \mathcal{O}_K -module F_D is the largest saturated sub- \mathcal{O}_K -module of $H^0(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E})}(1)|_{\mathcal{X}}^{\otimes D})$ such that $F_{D,K} = \text{Im}(\eta_{X,D})$. When the integer D is large enough, the homomorphism $\eta_{X,D}$ is surjective, which means $F_D = H^0(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E})}(1)|_{\mathcal{X}}^{\otimes D})$.

The \mathcal{O}_K -module F_D is equipped with the quotient metrics (from \overline{E}_D) such that F_D is a Hermitian vector bundle over $\text{Spec } \mathcal{O}_K$, noted by \overline{F}_D this Hermitian vector bundle.

Definition 2.3 (Arithmetic Hilbert-Samuel function)

Let \overline{F}_D be the Hermitian vector bundle on $\text{Spec } \mathcal{O}_K$ defined above from the map (12). We say that the function which maps the positive integer D to $\widehat{\mu}(\overline{F}_D)$ is the *arithmetic Hilbert-Samuel function* of X with respect to the Hermitian line bundle $\overline{\mathcal{O}(1)}$.

2.6. Height of rational points. — In this part, we will define a height function of rational points by Arakelov geometry. Let $\overline{\mathcal{E}}$ be a Hermitian vector bundle of rank $n+1$ over $\text{Spec } \mathcal{O}_K$, $P \in \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}_K)(K)$, and $\mathcal{P} \in \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E})(\mathcal{O}_K)$ be the Zariski closure of P in $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E})$. Let $\overline{\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E})}(1)}$ be the universal bundle equipped with the corresponding Fubini-Study metric at each $v \in M_{K,\infty}$, then $\mathcal{P}^*\overline{\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E})}(1)}$ is a Hermitian vector bundle over $\text{Spec } \mathcal{O}_K$. We define the *height* of the rational point P with respect to $\overline{\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E})}(1)}$ as

$$(13) \quad h_{\overline{\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E})}(1)}}(P) = \widehat{\text{deg}}_n \left(\mathcal{P}^*\overline{\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E})}(1)} \right).$$

We keep all the above notations. We choose

$$(14) \quad \overline{\mathcal{E}} = \left(\mathcal{O}_K^{\oplus(n+1)}, (\|\cdot\|_v)_{v \in M_{K,\infty}} \right),$$

where for every $v \in M_{K,\infty}$, $\|\cdot\|_v$ is the ℓ^2 -norm mapping (t_0, \dots, t_n) to $\sqrt{|v(t_0)|^2 + \dots + |v(t_n)|^2}$. In this case, we use the notations $\mathbb{P}_K^n = \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}_K)$ and

$\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{O}_K}^n = \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E})$ for simplicity. We suppose that P has a K -rational projective coordinate $[x_0 : \cdots : x_n]$, then we have (cf. [33, Proposition 9.10])

$$\begin{aligned} h_{\overline{\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E})}(1)}}(P) &= \sum_{v \in M_{K,f}} \frac{[K_v : \mathbb{Q}_v]}{[K : \mathbb{Q}]} \log \left(\max_{1 \leq i \leq n} |x_i|_v \right) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{v \in M_{K,\infty}} \frac{[K_v : \mathbb{Q}_v]}{[K : \mathbb{Q}]} \log \left(\sum_{j=0}^n |v(x_j)|^2 \right). \end{aligned}$$

Remark 2.4. — We compare the logarithmic height $h(\cdot)$ defined in (2) and the height $h_{\overline{\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E})}(1)}}(\cdot)$ defined in (13) by Arakelov geometry, where $\overline{\mathcal{E}}$ is defined in (14). In fact, by an elementary calculation, the inequality

$$\left| h(P) - h_{\overline{\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E})}(1)}}(P) \right| \leq \frac{1}{2} \log(n+1)$$

is uniformly verified for all $P \in \mathbb{P}_K^n(K)$.

Let $\psi : X \hookrightarrow \mathbb{P}_K^n$ be a projective scheme, and $P \in X(K)$. We define the height of P as $h_{\overline{\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E})}(1)}}(\psi(P))$. We will just use the notation $h_{\overline{\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E})}(1)}}(P)$ or $h(P)$ if there is no confusion of the morphism ψ and the Hermitian line bundle $\overline{\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E})}(1)}$.

2.7. Height functions of arithmetic varieties. — In this part, we will introduce several height functions of arithmetic varieties, which evaluate their arithmetic complexities.

2.7.1. Arakelov height. — First, we will introduce a kind of height functions of arithmetic varieties defined by the arithmetic intersection theory developed by Gillet and Soulé in [20], which is first introduced by Faltings in [16, Definition 2.5], see also [43, III.6].

Definition 2.5 (Arakelov height). — Let K be a number field, \mathcal{O}_K be its ring of integers, $\overline{\mathcal{E}}$ be a Hermitian vector bundle of rank $n+1$ over $\text{Spec } \mathcal{O}_K$, and $\overline{\mathcal{L}}$ be a Hermitian line bundle over $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E})$. Let X be a pure dimensional closed subscheme of $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}_K)$ of dimension d , and \mathcal{X} be the Zariski closure of X in $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E})$. The *Arakelov height* of X is defined as the arithmetic intersection number

$$\frac{1}{[K : \mathbb{Q}]} \widehat{\deg} (\widehat{c}_1(\overline{\mathcal{L}})^{d+1} \cdot [\mathcal{X}]),$$

where $\widehat{c}_1(\overline{\mathcal{L}})$ is the arithmetic first Chern class of $\overline{\mathcal{L}}$ (cf. [43, Chap. III.4, Proposition 1] for its definition). This height is noted by $h_{\overline{\mathcal{L}}}(X)$ or $h_{\overline{\mathcal{L}}}(\mathcal{X})$.

Remark 2.6. — With all the notations in Definition 2.3 and Definition 2.5. By [36, Théorème A], we have

$$h_{\overline{\mathcal{O}(1)}}(X) = \lim_{D \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{\widehat{\deg}_n(\overline{F}_D)}{D^{d+1}/(d+1)!}.$$

2.7.2. Heights of hypersurfaces. — Let X be a hypersurface in \mathbb{P}_K^n . By [25, Proposition 7.6, Chap. I], X is defined by a homogeneous polynomial of degree δ . We define a height function of hypersurfaces by considering its polynomial of definition.

Definition 2.7 (Naive height). — Let

$$f(T_0, \dots, T_n) = \sum_{(i_0, \dots, i_n) \in \mathbb{N}^{n+1}} a_{i_0, \dots, i_n} T_0^{i_0} \cdots T_n^{i_n} \in K[T_0, \dots, T_n].$$

We define the *naive height* of $f(T_0, \dots, T_n)$ as

$$H_K(f) = \prod_{v \in M_K} \max_{(i_0, \dots, i_n) \in \mathbb{N}^{n+1}} \{ |a_{i_0, \dots, i_n}|_v \}^{[K_v: \mathbb{Q}_v]},$$

and $h(f) = \frac{1}{[K:\mathbb{Q}]} \log H_K(f)$. In addition, if $f(T_0, \dots, T_n)$ is homogeneous and defines the hypersurface $X \hookrightarrow \mathbb{P}_K^n$, we define the *naive height* of X as

$$H_K(X) = H_K(f) \text{ and } h(X) = h(f).$$

2.7.3. Comparison of height functions. — In order to compare $h_{\overline{\mathcal{O}(1)}}(\mathcal{X})$ and $h(X)$ for a hypersurface X , we refer the following result in [30].

Proposition 2.8. — *Let X be a hypersurface in \mathbb{P}_K^n of degree δ . With all the notations above, we have*

$$\begin{aligned} -\delta \left(\frac{1}{2\delta} \log((n+1)(\delta+1)) + \frac{1}{2} \mathcal{H}_n \right) &\leq h(X) - h_{\overline{\mathcal{O}(1)}}(\mathcal{X}) \\ &\leq \delta \left(\log 2 + 5 \log(n+1) - \frac{1}{2} \mathcal{H}_n \right), \end{aligned}$$

where $\mathcal{H}_n = 1 + \dots + \frac{1}{n}$.

Proof. — Since X is a hypersurface, the Chow variety of X is just X itself. Then we have the result from [30, Proposition 3.7] directly after some elementary calculations. \square

3. Global determinant method for hypersurfaces

In the rest part of this article, unless specially mentioned, we suppose that X is an integral hypersurface in \mathbb{P}_K^n , and \mathcal{X} is its Zariski closure in $\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{O}_K}^n$. In fact, $X \rightarrow \text{Spec } K$ is the generic fiber of $\mathcal{X} \rightarrow \text{Spec } \mathcal{O}_K$. When we consider the height $h(P)$ of a rational point $P \in X(K)$ embedded into \mathbb{P}_K^n , we use the definition at (13) by Arakelov geometry. Let \mathfrak{p} be a maximal ideal of \mathcal{O}_K , and we denote by $\mathcal{X}_{\mathfrak{p}} = \mathcal{X} \times_{\text{Spec } \mathcal{O}_K} \text{Spec } \mathbb{F}_{\mathfrak{p}} \rightarrow \text{Spec } \mathbb{F}_{\mathfrak{p}}$ the fiber at \mathfrak{p} .

Let $r_1(n, D)$ be the rank of F_D over \mathcal{O}_K , where F_D is defined in §2.5. For the case where X is a hypersurface of degree δ in \mathbb{P}_K^n , we have

$$r_1(n, D) = \binom{n+D}{n} - \binom{n+D-\delta}{n}.$$

Our main target of this section is to prove the following result.

Theorem 3.1. — We keep all the notations in §2.5 and in this section above. Let $\{\mathfrak{p}_j\}_{j \in J}$ be a finite family of maximal ideals of \mathcal{O}_K , and $\{P_i\}_{i \in I}$ be a family rational points of X . For a fixed prime ideal \mathfrak{p} of \mathcal{O}_K , let $\mu_\xi(\mathcal{X}_{\mathfrak{p}})$ be the multiplicity of the point ξ in $\mathcal{X}_{\mathfrak{p}}$, and we denote $n(\mathcal{X}_{\mathfrak{p}}) = \sum_{\xi \in \mathcal{X}(\mathbb{F}_{\mathfrak{p}})} \mu_\xi(\mathcal{X}_{\mathfrak{p}})$. If the inequality

$$(15) \quad \sup_{i \in I} h(P_i) < \frac{\widehat{\mu}(\overline{F}_D)}{D} - \frac{\log r_1(n, D)}{2D} \\ + \frac{1}{[K : \mathbb{Q}]} \sum_{j \in J} \left(\frac{(n-1)!^{\frac{1}{n-1}} (n-1)r_1(n, D)^{\frac{1}{n-1}}}{nDn(\mathcal{X}_{\mathfrak{p}_j})^{\frac{1}{n-1}}} - \frac{n^3 + 2n^2 + n - 4}{2Dn(n+1)} \right) \log N(\mathfrak{p}_j)$$

is verified, then there exists a section $s \in E_{D,K}$, which contains $\{P_i\}_{i \in I}$ but does not contain the generic point of X . In another words, $\{P_i\}_{i \in I}$ can be covered by a hypersurfaces of degree D which does not contain the generic point of X .

3.1. Auxiliary results. — We refer some results in [13, 14], which are useful in the reformulation of the determinant method by Arakelov geometry. We will also prove a new auxiliary lemma.

Proposition 3.2 ([13], **Proposition 2.2**). — Let \overline{E} be a Hermitian vector bundle of rank $r > 0$ on $\text{Spec } \mathcal{O}_K$, and $\{\overline{L}_i\}_{i \in I}$ be a family of Hermitian line bundles on $\text{Spec } \mathcal{O}_K$. If $\phi : E_K \rightarrow \bigoplus_{i \in I} L_{i,K}$ is an injective homomorphism, then there exists a subset I_0 of I whose cardinal is r such that the following equality

$$\widehat{\mu}(\overline{E}) = \frac{1}{r} \left(\sum_{i \in I_0} \widehat{\mu}(\overline{L}_i) + h(\wedge^r(\text{pr}_{I_0} \circ \phi)) \right)$$

is verified, where $\text{pr}_{I_0} : \bigoplus_{i \in I} L_{i,K} \rightarrow \bigoplus_{i \in I_0} L_{i,K}$ is the canonical projection.

In order to benefit the readers, we will provide the details on the construction of certain local homomorphisms, which are introduced at [39, Lemma 2.4], see also [14, §3.2].

Let X be an integral closed subscheme of \mathbb{P}_K^n and \mathcal{X} be the Zariski closure of X in $\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{O}_K}^n$. Let \mathfrak{p} be a maximal ideal of \mathcal{O}_K and $\xi \in \mathcal{X}(\mathbb{F}_{\mathfrak{p}})$. In this case, $\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X},\xi}$ is a local algebra over $\mathcal{O}_{K,\mathfrak{p}}$. Let $(f_i)_{1 \leq i \leq m}$ be a family of local homomorphisms of $\mathcal{O}_{K,\mathfrak{p}}$ -algebras from $\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X},\xi}$ to $\mathcal{O}_{K,\mathfrak{p}}$.

Let E be a free sub- $\mathcal{O}_{K,\mathfrak{p}}$ -module of finite type of $\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X},\xi}$ and let f be the $\mathcal{O}_{K,\mathfrak{p}}$ -linear homomorphism

$$(f_i|_E)_{1 \leq i \leq m} : E \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_{K,\mathfrak{p}}^m.$$

As f_1 is a local homomorphism of $\mathcal{O}_{K,\mathfrak{p}}$ -algebras, it must be surjective. Let \mathfrak{a} be the kernel of f_1 , then we have $\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X},\xi}/\mathfrak{a} \cong \mathcal{O}_{K,\mathfrak{p}}$. Furthermore, since $\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X},\xi}$ is a local ring and we suppose that \mathfrak{m}_ξ is its maximal ideal, then we have $\mathfrak{m}_\xi \supseteq \mathfrak{a}$. Moreover, since f_1 is a local homomorphism, we have $\mathfrak{a} + \mathfrak{p}\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X},\xi} = \mathfrak{m}_\xi$. For each $j \in \mathbb{N}$, $\mathfrak{a}^j/\mathfrak{a}^{j+1}$ is an $\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X},\xi}/\mathfrak{a} \cong \mathcal{O}_{K,\mathfrak{p}}$ -module of finite type.

In order to estimate its rank, we need the following result.

Lemma 3.3. — *With all the above notations and constructions, we have*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{F}_p \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_{K,p}} (\mathfrak{a}^j / \mathfrak{a}^{j+1}) &\cong (\mathfrak{a} / \mathfrak{a} \cap \mathfrak{p} \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X},\xi})^j / (\mathfrak{a} / \mathfrak{a} \cap \mathfrak{p} \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X},\xi})^{j+1} \\ &\cong (\mathfrak{m}_\xi / \mathfrak{m}_\xi \cap \mathfrak{p} \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X},\xi})^j / (\mathfrak{m}_\xi / \mathfrak{m}_\xi \cap \mathfrak{p} \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X},\xi})^{j+1}. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. — By definition, we have

$$\mathbb{F}_p \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_{K,p}} (\mathfrak{a}^j / \mathfrak{a}^{j+1}) \cong (\mathfrak{a} / \mathfrak{a} \cap \mathfrak{p} \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X},\xi})^j / (\mathfrak{a} / \mathfrak{a} \cap \mathfrak{p} \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X},\xi})^{j+1}.$$

Next, since $\mathfrak{a} + \mathfrak{p} \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X},\xi} = \mathfrak{m}_\xi$ and $\mathfrak{a} \subseteq \mathfrak{m}_\xi$, then we have $\mathfrak{a} \cap \mathfrak{p} \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X},\xi} = \mathfrak{m}_\xi \cap \mathfrak{p} \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X},\xi}$. We also have $\mathfrak{a} / \mathfrak{a} \cap \mathfrak{p} \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X},\xi} \cong \mathfrak{a} / \mathfrak{a} \cap (\mathfrak{m}_\xi \cap \mathfrak{p} \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X},\xi}) \cong (\mathfrak{a} + \mathfrak{m}_\xi \cap \mathfrak{p} \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X},\xi}) / \mathfrak{m}_\xi \cap \mathfrak{p} \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X},\xi} \cong \mathfrak{m}_\xi / \mathfrak{m}_\xi \cap \mathfrak{p} \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X},\xi}$, which terminates the proof. \square

By Nakayama's lemma (cf. [32, Theorem 2.2]), we deduce that the rank of $\mathfrak{a}^j / \mathfrak{a}^{j+1}$ over $\mathcal{O}_{K,p}$ is equal to the rank of $(\mathfrak{m}_\xi / \mathfrak{m}_\xi \cap \mathfrak{p} \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X},\xi})^j / (\mathfrak{m}_\xi / \mathfrak{m}_\xi \cap \mathfrak{p} \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X},\xi})^{j+1}$ over \mathbb{F}_p from the isomorphism in Lemma 3.3, which is the value of the local Hilbert-Samuel function $H_\xi(j)$ defined at (3).

By this fact, we consider the filtration

$$\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X},\xi} = \mathfrak{a}^0 \supseteq \mathfrak{a} \supseteq \mathfrak{a}^2 \supseteq \dots \supseteq \mathfrak{a}^j \supseteq \mathfrak{a}^{j+1} \supseteq \dots$$

of $\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X},\xi}$, which induces the filtration

$$(16) \quad \mathcal{F}: E = E \cap \mathfrak{a}^0 \supseteq E \cap \mathfrak{a} \supseteq E \cap \mathfrak{a}^2 \supseteq \dots \supseteq E \cap \mathfrak{a}^j \supseteq E \cap \mathfrak{a}^{j+1} \supseteq \dots$$

of E whose j -th sub-quotient $E \cap \mathfrak{a}^j / E \cap \mathfrak{a}^{j+1}$ is a free $\mathcal{O}_{K,p}$ -module of rank smaller than or equal to $H_\xi(j)$.

We suppose that the reductions of all the above local homomorphisms f_1, \dots, f_m modulo \mathfrak{p} are same, which means all the composed homomorphisms

$$\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X},\xi} \xrightarrow{f_i} \mathcal{O}_{K,p} \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_p$$

are same for every $i = 1, \dots, m$, where the last arrow is the canonical reduction morphism modulo \mathfrak{p} . We note $N(\mathfrak{p}) = \#\mathbb{F}_p$. In this case, the restriction of f on $E \cap \mathfrak{a}^j$ has its norm smaller than $N(\mathfrak{p})^{-j}$. In fact, for any $1 \leq i \leq m$, we have $f_i(\mathfrak{a}) \subseteq \mathfrak{p} \mathcal{O}_{K,p}$ and hence we have $f_i(\mathfrak{a}^j) \subseteq \mathfrak{p}^j \mathcal{O}_{K,p}$.

By the above argument, we have the following result from [14, Lemma 3.2, Lemma 3.3].

Proposition 3.4 ([14, Proposition 3.4]). — *Let \mathfrak{p} be a maximal ideal of \mathcal{O}_K and $\xi \in \mathcal{X}(\mathbb{F}_p)$. Suppose that $\{f_i\}_{1 \leq i \leq m}$ is a family of local $\mathcal{O}_{K,p}$ -linear homomorphism from $\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X},\xi}$ to $\mathcal{O}_{K,p}$ whose reduction modulo \mathfrak{p} are the same. Let E be a free sub- $\mathcal{O}_{K,p}$ -module of finite type of $\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X},\xi}$ and $f = (f_i|_E)_{1 \leq i \leq m}$. Then for any integer $r \geq 1$, we have*

$$(17) \quad \|\wedge^r f_K\| \leq N(\mathfrak{p})^{-Q_\xi(r)},$$

where $N(\mathfrak{p}) = \#(\mathcal{O}_K/\mathfrak{p})$, and $Q_\xi(r)$ is defined at (5).

The following lemma will be useful in the global determinant estimate.

Lemma 3.5. — Let $(K, |\cdot|)$ be a normed field, E_1, E_2, F_1, F_2 be four normed vector spaces over K , and $f_1 : E_1 \rightarrow F_1$ and $f_2 : E_2 \rightarrow F_2$ be two K -linear isomorphisms. Suppose $\dim_K(E_1) = \dim_K(F_1) = r_1$ and $\dim_K(E_2) = \dim_K(F_2) = r_2$. We equipped $f_1 \oplus f_2 : E_1 \oplus E_2 \rightarrow F_1 \oplus F_2$ equipped with the corresponding maximal value norms. Then we have

$$\|\wedge^{r_1+r_2}(f_1 \oplus f_2)\| = \|\wedge^{r_1} f_1\| \cdot \|\wedge^{r_2} f_2\|,$$

where the above $\|\cdot\|$ is the norm of operators.

Proof. — By definition, the linear maps $\wedge^{r_1} f_1$ and $\wedge^{r_2} f_2$ are both scalar products by the corresponding determinants, and $\wedge^{r_1+r_2}(f_1 \oplus f_2)$ is the scalar product of the above two determinants. Then we have the result by definition directly. \square

3.2. Proof of Theorem 3.1. — We are going to prove Theorem 3.1, and some ideas of the proof below are inspired from [14, §3].

Proof of Theorem 3.1. — Let D be an integer larger than 1. We suppose that the global section predicted by Theorem 3.1 does not exist. Then the evaluation map

$$f : F_{D,K} \rightarrow \bigoplus_{i \in I} P_i^* \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}_K^n}(D)$$

is injective. We can replace I by one of its subsets such that f is an isomorphism. From now on, we suppose f is isomorphic. Then by Proposition 3.2, we have

$$\widehat{\mu}(\overline{F}_D) = \frac{1}{r_1(n, D)} \left(D \sum_{i \in I} h(P_i) + h(\wedge^{r_1(n, D)} f) \right),$$

which implies

$$\frac{\widehat{\mu}(\overline{F}_D)}{D} \leq \sup_{i \in I} h(P_i) + \frac{1}{Dr_1(n, D)} h(\wedge^{r_1(n, D)} f).$$

Now we estimate the height of $\wedge^{r_1(n, D)} f$. For every $v \in M_{K, \infty}$, we have

$$\frac{1}{r_1(n, D)} \log \|\wedge^{r_1(n, D)} f\|_v \leq \log \|f\|_v \leq \log \sqrt{r_1(n, D)},$$

where the second inequality comes from the definition of metrics of John.

Now we consider the case of $v \in M_{K, f}$. The homomorphism f is induced by a homomorphism of \mathcal{O}_K -module $F_D \rightarrow \bigoplus_{i \in I} P_i^* \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{O}_K}^n}(D)$, where \mathcal{P}_i is the Zariski closure of P_i in \mathcal{X} for each $i \in I$. Then for every $v \in M_{K, f}$, we have $\log \|\wedge^{r_1(n, D)} f\|_v \leq 0$.

We fix a maximal ideal \mathfrak{p} of \mathcal{O}_K corresponding to $v \in M_{K, f}$, and decompose the set $\{\mathcal{P}_i\}_{i \in I}$ as

$$\{\mathcal{P}_i\}_{i \in I} = \bigcup_{\xi \in \mathcal{X}(\mathbb{F}_{\mathfrak{p}})} \{\mathcal{P}_{l, \xi}\}_{l=1}^{m_{\xi}},$$

where all elements in $\{\mathcal{P}_{l, \xi}\}_{l=1}^{m_{\xi}}$ modulo \mathfrak{p} are the same point $\xi \in \mathcal{X}(\mathbb{F}_{\mathfrak{p}})$. If $\{\mathcal{P}_{l, \xi}\}_{l=1}^{m_{\xi}}$ is empty for some $\xi \in \mathcal{X}(\mathbb{F}_{\mathfrak{p}})$, we define $m_{\xi} = 0$ for simplicity. With the above

notations, let

$$\bigcup_{\xi \in \mathcal{X}(\mathbb{F}_{\mathfrak{p}})} \{s_{l,\xi}\}_{l=1}^{m_{\xi}}$$

be an $\mathcal{O}_{K,\mathfrak{p}}$ -basis of $F_{D,\mathfrak{p}}$ such that $f(s_{l,\xi})$ generates $\mathcal{P}_{l,\xi}^* \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^n_{\mathcal{O}_K}}(D)$ for all $l = 1, \dots, m_{\xi}$ and $\xi \in \mathcal{X}(\mathbb{F}_{\mathfrak{p}})$. Since $\mathcal{O}_{K,\mathfrak{p}}$ is a local ring, the $\mathcal{O}_{K,\mathfrak{p}}$ -module $F_{D,\mathfrak{p}}$ is free, then there exists such a basis for a fixed maximal ideal \mathfrak{p} . We denote by $F_{D,\xi}$ the sub- $\mathcal{O}_{K,\mathfrak{p}}$ -module of $F_{D,\mathfrak{p}}$ generated by $\{s_{l,\xi}\}_{l=1}^{m_{\xi}}$.

By Proposition 3.4, we have

$$\log \left\| \wedge^{\text{rk}(F_{D,\xi})} f|_{F_{D,\xi}} \right\|_{\mathfrak{p}} \leq -Q_{\xi}(\text{rk}(F_{D,\xi})) \log N(\mathfrak{p}).$$

By definition, we have

$$F_{D,\mathfrak{p}} = \bigoplus_{\xi \in \mathcal{X}(\mathbb{F}_{\mathfrak{p}})} F_{D,\xi},$$

and

$$(18) \quad r_1(n, D) = \sum_{\xi \in \mathcal{X}(\mathbb{F}_{\mathfrak{p}})} \text{rk}(F_{D,\xi}).$$

Then from the above construction, by applying Lemma 3.5 and Proposition 3.4 respectively, we obtain

$$\log \left\| \wedge^{r_1(n,D)} f \right\|_{\mathfrak{p}} = \sum_{\xi \in \mathcal{X}(\mathbb{F}_{\mathfrak{p}})} \log \left\| \wedge^{\text{rk}(F_{D,\xi})} f|_{F_{D,\xi}} \right\|_{\mathfrak{p}} \leq - \sum_{\xi \in \mathcal{X}(\mathbb{F}_{\mathfrak{p}})} Q_{\xi}(\text{rk}(F_{D,\xi})) \log N(\mathfrak{p}).$$

In order to estimate the term $\frac{1}{r_1(n,D)} \sum_{\xi \in \mathcal{X}(\mathbb{F}_{\mathfrak{p}})} Q_{\xi}(\text{rk}(F_{D,\xi}))$, by (6), we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{\xi \in \mathcal{X}(\mathbb{F}_{\mathfrak{p}})} Q_{\xi}(\text{rk}(F_{D,\xi})) \\ & > \sum_{\xi \in \mathcal{X}(\mathbb{F}_{\mathfrak{p}})} \left(\left(\frac{(n-1)!}{\mu_{\xi}(\mathcal{X}_{\mathfrak{p}})} \right)^{\frac{1}{n-1}} \left(\frac{n-1}{n} \right) \text{rk}(F_{D,\xi})^{\frac{n}{n-1}} - \frac{n^3 + 2n^2 + n - 4}{2n(n+1)} \text{rk}(F_{D,\xi}) \right) \\ & = \frac{(n-1)!^{\frac{1}{n-1}} (n-1)}{n} \sum_{\xi \in \mathcal{X}(\mathbb{F}_{\mathfrak{p}})} \frac{\text{rk}(F_{D,\xi})^{\frac{n}{n-1}}}{\mu_{\xi}(\mathcal{X}_{\mathfrak{p}})^{\frac{1}{n-1}}} - \frac{n^3 + 2n^2 + n - 4}{2n(n+1)} r_1(n, D). \end{aligned}$$

By (18) and Hölder's inequality, we have

$$\sum_{\xi \in \mathcal{X}(\mathbb{F}_{\mathfrak{p}})} \frac{\text{rk}(F_{D,\xi})^{\frac{n}{n-1}}}{\mu_{\xi}(\mathcal{X}_{\mathfrak{p}})^{\frac{1}{n-1}}} \geq \frac{\left(\sum_{\xi \in \mathcal{X}(\mathbb{F}_{\mathfrak{p}})} \text{rk}(F_{D,\xi}) \right)^{\frac{n}{n-1}}}{\left(\sum_{\xi \in \mathcal{X}(\mathbb{F}_{\mathfrak{p}})} \mu_{\xi}(\mathcal{X}_{\mathfrak{p}}) \right)^{\frac{1}{n-1}}} = \frac{r_1(n, D)^{\frac{n}{n-1}}}{n(\mathcal{X}_{\mathfrak{p}})^{\frac{1}{n-1}}},$$

where $n(\mathcal{X}_{\mathfrak{p}})$ is defined in the statement of Theorem 3.1. Then we obtain the inequality

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\widehat{\mu}(\overline{F}_D)}{D} &\leq \sup_{i \in I} h(P_i) + \frac{\log r_1(n, D)}{2D} \\ &- \frac{1}{[K : \mathbb{Q}]} \sum_{j \in J} \left(\frac{(n-1)!^{\frac{1}{n-1}} (n-1) r_1(n, D)^{\frac{1}{n-1}}}{n D n(\mathcal{X}_{\mathfrak{p}})^{\frac{1}{n-1}}} - \frac{n^3 + 2n^2 + n - 4}{2Dn(n+1)} \right) \log N(\mathfrak{p}), \end{aligned}$$

which leads to a contradiction. \square

4. Some quantitative estimates

In order to apply the global determinant method introduced in Theorem 3.1, we need to gather enough information on the term $n(\mathcal{X}_{\mathfrak{p}})$ in it. For this target, we need to have a control of the reduction type of $\mathcal{X} \hookrightarrow \mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{O}_K}^n \rightarrow \text{Spec } \mathcal{O}_K$, an upper bound of $n(\mathcal{X}_{\mathfrak{p}})$ when $\mathcal{X}_{\mathfrak{p}} \rightarrow \text{Spec } \mathbb{F}_{\mathfrak{p}}$ is geometrically integral, and a distribution of certain prime ideals of \mathcal{O}_K . We will also provide an explicit estimate of the geometric Hilbert-Samuel function of hypersurfaces.

4.1. Control the non-geometrically integral reductions. — Let $X \hookrightarrow \mathbb{P}_K^n$ be a geometrically integral hypersurface of degree δ , $\mathcal{X} \hookrightarrow \mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{O}_K}^n \rightarrow \text{Spec } \mathcal{O}_K$ be its Zariski closure, and $\mathcal{X}_{\mathbb{F}_{\mathfrak{p}}} = \mathcal{X} \times_{\text{Spec } \mathcal{O}_K} \text{Spec } \mathbb{F}_{\mathfrak{p}} \rightarrow \text{Spec } \mathbb{F}_{\mathfrak{p}}$ for every $\mathfrak{p} \in \text{Spm } \mathcal{O}_K$. By [23, Théorème 9.7.7], the set

$$(19) \quad \mathcal{Q}(\mathcal{X}) = \{\mathfrak{p} \in \text{Spm } \mathcal{O}_K \mid \mathcal{X}_{\mathbb{F}_{\mathfrak{p}}} \rightarrow \text{Spec } \mathbb{F}_{\mathfrak{p}} \text{ is not geometrically integral}\}$$

is finite. Next, we will give a numerical description of the set $\mathcal{Q}(\mathcal{X})$.

For a numerical description of the non-geometrically integral reductions, there are fruitful results on this subjects, but most of them are over rational number field \mathbb{Q} . In [31], the estimate [38, Satz 4] is generalized over arbitrary number fields by using a height function in an adelic sense by the approach in [30, §3.4]. By [31, Proposition 4.1], we have

$$(20) \quad \frac{1}{[K : \mathbb{Q}]} \sum_{\mathfrak{p} \in \mathcal{Q}(\mathcal{X})} \log N(\mathfrak{p}) \leq (\delta^2 - 1)h(X) + C(n, \delta),$$

where $h(X)$ is the naive height of X defined at Definition 2.7, $N(\mathfrak{p}) = \#(\mathcal{O}_K/\mathfrak{p})$, $\mathcal{H}_n = 1 + \cdots + \frac{1}{n}$, and the constant

$$C(n, \delta) = (\delta^2 - 1) \left(3 \log \delta + \delta \log 3 + \log \binom{n + \delta}{\delta} \right).$$

In fact, we have $C(n, \delta) \ll_n \delta^3$.

4.2. Quantitative estimates over finite fields. — In this subsection, we give an upper bound of the term $n(\mathcal{X}_{\mathfrak{p}})$ for a fixed maximal ideal \mathfrak{p} of \mathcal{O}_K , where $n(\mathcal{X}_{\mathfrak{p}})$ is defined in the statement of Theorem 3.1. In this part, we consider this problem over arbitrary finite fields.

Let \mathbb{F}_q be the finite field with q elements, X be a geometrically integral hypersurface in $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{F}_q}^n$ of degree δ , and $n(X_{\mathbb{F}_q}) = \sum_{\xi \in X(\mathbb{F}_q)} \mu_{\xi}(X)$, where $\mu_{\xi}(X)$ is the multiplicity of ξ in X defined via the local Hilbert-Samuel fuction in (4). Then we have

$$n(X_{\mathbb{F}_q}) = \#X(\mathbb{F}_q) + \sum_{\xi \in X(\mathbb{F}_q)} (\mu_{\xi}(X) - 1).$$

In order to estimate $n(X_{\mathbb{F}_q})$, we will consider the terms $\#X(\mathbb{F}_q)$ and $\sum_{\xi \in X(\mathbb{F}_q)} (\mu_{\xi}(X) - 1)$ separately.

4.2.1. — For the estimate of $\#X(\mathbb{F}_q)$, there are fruitful results on it. For our application, we have the following result deduced from [10, Corollary 5.6].

Proposition 4.1. — *Let $X \hookrightarrow \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{F}_q}^n$ be a geometrically integral hypersurface of degree δ over the finite field \mathbb{F}_q . When $q \leq \delta^2$ or $q \geq 27\delta^4$, we have*

$$\#X(\mathbb{F}_q) - q^{n-1} \leq n\delta^2 q^{n-\frac{3}{2}}.$$

Proof. — We consider this estimate case by case as following.

1. If $q \leq \delta$, we have $\#X(\mathbb{F}_q) \leq \#\mathbb{P}^n(\mathbb{F}_q) = q^n + \dots + 1$. Then $\#X(\mathbb{F}_q) - q^{n-1} \leq nq^n \leq n\delta^2 q^{n-\frac{3}{2}}$.
2. If $\delta + 1 \leq q \leq \delta^2$, we have $\#X(\mathbb{F}_q) \leq \delta \#\mathbb{P}^{n-1}(\mathbb{F}_q) = \delta(q^{n-1} + \dots + 1)$. Then $\#X(\mathbb{F}_q) - q^{n-1} \leq (\delta - 1)q^{n-1} + \delta(q^{n-2} + \dots + 1) \leq n\delta^2 q^{n-\frac{3}{2}}$.
3. If $q \geq 27\delta^4$, by [10, Corollary 5.6], we have $\#X(\mathbb{F}_q) - q^{n-1} \leq (\delta - 1)(\delta - 2)q^{n-\frac{3}{2}} + (5\delta^2 + \delta + 1)q^{n-2} \leq n\delta^2 q^{n-\frac{3}{2}}$.

□

Remark 4.2. — With all the notations in Proposition 4.1. When $\delta^2 \ll_n q \ll_n \delta^4$, by [10, Corollary 5.6], we have

$$\#X(\mathbb{F}_q) - q^{n-1} \leq (\delta - 1)(\delta - 2)q^{n-\frac{3}{2}} + B(n, \delta)q^{n-2},$$

where the constant satisfies $B(n, \delta) \ll_n \delta^4$. It seems that the constant $B(n, \delta)$ could have a better dependence on δ , but up to the author's knowledge, we do not know the answer.

4.2.2. — For the term $\sum_{\xi \in X(\mathbb{F}_q)} (\mu_{\xi}(X) - 1)$, by [29, Theorem 5.1], we have

$$(21) \quad \begin{aligned} \sum_{\xi \in X(\mathbb{F}_q)} (\mu_{\xi}(X) - 1) &\leq \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\xi \in X(\mathbb{F}_q)} \mu_{\xi}(X) (\mu_{\xi}(X) - 1) \\ &\leq \frac{(n-1)^2}{2} \delta(\delta-1) \max\{\delta-1, q\}^{n-2} \end{aligned}$$

uniformly, which has the optimal dependances on δ and $\max\{\delta - 1, q\}$.

4.2.3. — We combine Propostion 4.1 and the estimate (21). When $q \leq \delta^2$ or $q \geq 27\delta^4$, we have

$$n(X_{\mathbb{F}_q}) \leq q^{n-1} + n^2\delta^2 \max\{q, \delta - 1\}^{n-\frac{3}{2}}$$

by an elementary calculation. In addition, we have

$$(22) \quad \frac{1}{n(X_{\mathbb{F}_q})^{\frac{1}{n-1}}} \geq \frac{1}{q} - \frac{n^2\delta^2}{\max\{q, \delta - 1\}^{\frac{3}{2}}}$$

under the same assumption of q and δ as above.

4.3. Distribution of certain prime ideals. — In this part, we will consider the some distributions of prime ideals of the ring of integers of number fields.

4.3.1. Distribution of prime ideals contained in an ideal. — In this part, we will consider the distribution of certain maximal ideals of \mathcal{O}_K . First, we generalize [40, Lemma 1.10] to an arbitrary number field, where the former result works over \mathbb{Z} only.

Lemma 4.3. — *Let \mathfrak{a} be a proper ideal of \mathcal{O}_K , \mathfrak{p} be an prime ideal of \mathcal{O}_K , and $N(\mathfrak{a}) = \#(\mathcal{O}_K/\mathfrak{a})$. Then we have*

$$\frac{1}{[K : \mathbb{Q}]} \sum_{\mathfrak{p} \subset \mathfrak{a}} \frac{\log N(\mathfrak{p})}{N(\mathfrak{p})} \leq \log \log (N(\mathfrak{a})) + 2,$$

where the above sum takes all over the prime ideals contained in \mathfrak{a} of \mathcal{O}_K .

Proof. — We will prove it for the case of $K = \mathbb{Q}$ at first, and then we prove the general case.

Case of $K = \mathbb{Q}$. - In this case, we will repeat the proof of [40, Lemma 1.10] by Salberger, since this preprint is not easily available. Suppose that \mathfrak{a} is generated by the positive square-free integer π , and let m be a positive integer such that $m \leq \pi$. For the prime p , let $v_p(m)$ be the largest integer such that $p^{v_p(m)} \mid m$. By [44, Tome I, Corollaire 1.7] and [44, Tome I, Théorème 1.8], we have

$$m \sum_{p|\pi} \frac{\log p}{p} - \sum_{p|\pi} \log p \leq \sum_{p|\pi} v_p(m!) \log p \leq \sum_{p \leq \pi} v_p(m!) \log p = \log m! \leq m \log m,$$

and then we obtain

$$\sum_{p|\pi} \frac{\log p}{p} \leq \log m + \frac{1}{m} \sum_{p|\pi} \log p \leq \log m + \frac{1}{m} \log \pi.$$

Let $m = \lfloor \log \pi \rfloor$ for $\pi \geq 2$, and then we accomplish the proof for $K = \mathbb{Q}$.

Case of arbitrary number fields. - Let $\mathfrak{a} = \mathfrak{p}_1^{v_{\mathfrak{p}_1}(\mathfrak{a})} \cdots \mathfrak{p}_k^{v_{\mathfrak{p}_k}(\mathfrak{a})}$, where $\mathfrak{p}_1, \dots, \mathfrak{p}_k$ are distinct prime ideals of \mathcal{O}_K , and $v_{\mathfrak{p}_i}(\mathfrak{a}) \in \mathbb{N}^+$ for all $i = 1, \dots, k$. Let the prime p_i be the characteristic of the prime ideal \mathfrak{p}_i , where $i = 1, \dots, k$ as above. For a fixed prime p , there are at most $[K : \mathbb{Q}]$ prime ideals of characteristic p . For all prime p and $f \in \mathbb{N}^+$, we have $\frac{\log p^f}{p^f} \leq \frac{\log p}{p}$. Let $P(\mathfrak{a})$ be the product of all the different

characteristics of $\mathfrak{p}_1, \dots, \mathfrak{p}_k$, and we have $P(\mathfrak{a}) \leq N(\mathfrak{a})$ by definition directly. Then by the above facts, we obtain

$$\sum_{\mathfrak{p} \subset \mathfrak{a}} \frac{\log N(\mathfrak{p})}{N(\mathfrak{p})} \leq [K : \mathbb{Q}] \sum_{p|P(\mathfrak{a})} \frac{\log p}{p}.$$

By the result of the case of $K = \mathbb{Q}$, we have

$$\sum_{p|P(\mathfrak{a})} \frac{\log p}{p} \leq \log \log P(\mathfrak{a}) + 2 \leq \log \log N(\mathfrak{a}) + 2,$$

which proves the assertion. \square

4.3.2. Distribution of prime ideals with bounded norm. — Let $x \in \mathbb{R}^+$, $\mathfrak{p} \in \text{Spm } \mathcal{O}_K$, and $N(\mathfrak{p}) = \#(\mathcal{O}_K/\mathfrak{p})$. In this part, we consider the explicit estimates of

$$\theta_K(x) = \sum_{N(\mathfrak{p}) \leq x} \log N(\mathfrak{p}), \quad \psi_K(x) = \sum_{N(\mathfrak{p}) \leq x} \frac{\log N(\mathfrak{p})}{N(\mathfrak{p})}, \quad \text{and} \quad \phi_K(x) = \sum_{N(\mathfrak{p}) \leq x} \frac{\log N(\mathfrak{p})}{N(\mathfrak{p})^{\frac{3}{2}}}$$

under the assumption that the Dedekind zeta function of the number field K satisfies **GRH (the Generalized Riemann Hypothesis)**.

When $K = \mathbb{Q}$, these are classic estimates of Chebyshev function (cf. [44, Tome I, Théorème 2.11]) and Mertens' first theorem (cf. [44, Tome I, Théorème 1.8]), which are both explicit. In this case, we do not need to assume the Riemann Hypothesis of the Riemann zeta function. For the case of an arbitrary number field, an implicit generalization of [44, Tome I, Théorème 2.11] is Landau's prime ideals theorem (cf. [37, Theorem 2.2]), and an implicit generalization of Mertens' first theorem is deduced from it in [37, Lemma 2.3].

In order to obtain explicit estimates, first we refer a result in [22] under the assumption of GRH. Then by the same technique in [37], we get an explicit generalization of Mertens' first theorem. If we do not need the explicit version, it is not necessary to assume GRH.

Let Δ_K be the discriminant of the number field K . By [22, Corollary 1.3], if $x \geq 3$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |\theta_K(x) - x| &\leq \sqrt{x} \left(\left(\frac{1}{2\pi} \log \left(\frac{18.8x}{\log^2 x} \right) + 2.3 \right) \log \Delta_K \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \left(\frac{1}{8\pi} \log^2 \left(\frac{18.8x}{\log^2 x} \right) + 1.3 \right) [K : \mathbb{Q}] + 0.3 \log x + 14.6 \right) \end{aligned}$$

under the assumption of GRH. By an elementary calculation, we have

$$(23) \quad |\theta_K(x) - x| \leq 528\sqrt{x} \log^2 x (\log \Delta_K + [K : \mathbb{Q}])$$

for $x \geq 3$ under the same assumption.

Same as the application of [37, Lemma 2.1] to the proof of [37, Lemma 2.3], by Abel's summation formula, we have

$$\psi_K(x) = \frac{\theta_K(x)}{x} + \int_2^x \frac{\theta_K(t)}{t^2} dt.$$

Then by an elementary calculation, we obtain

$$(24) \quad |\psi_K(x) - \log x| \leq 9550 (\log \Delta_K + [K : \mathbb{Q}])$$

for $x \geq 3$ from (23) under the assumption of GRH.

By the same idea as that deducing from [37, Lemma 2.1] to [37, Lemma 2.3], we have

$$\phi_K(x) = \frac{\theta_K(x)}{x^{\frac{3}{2}}} + \int_2^x \frac{\theta_K(t)}{t^{\frac{5}{2}}} dt.$$

Then after an elementary calculation, we obtain

$$(25) \quad \left| \phi_K(x) - \sqrt{2} + \frac{1}{x^{\frac{1}{2}}} \right| \leq 1677 \frac{\log^2 x}{x} (\log \Delta_K + [K : \mathbb{Q}])$$

uniformly for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^+$ from (23) under the assumption of GRH.

Remark 4.4. — Besides the case of $K = \mathbb{Q}$, if we work over some other particular number fields, the assumption of the Generalized Riemann Hypothesis may not be obligatory. For example, in [24, Theorem 2], we are able to do it over totally imaginary fields. It depends on the understand of the zero-free region of the Dedekind zeta function of the number field K . In addition, if we do not require the explicit estimate, we are able to use the estimates in [37] directly.

4.3.3. Distribution of non-geometrically integral reductions. — In this part, we consider a distribution of the prime ideals modulo which the reductions are not geometrically integral. In order to have an explicit estimate, we assume GRH here.

Proposition 4.5 (GRH). — *Let X be a geometrically integral hypersurface of degree δ in \mathbb{P}_K^n , and \mathcal{X} be its Zariski closure in $\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{O}_K}^n$. Let $\mathfrak{p} \in \text{Spm } \mathcal{O}_K$, $N(\mathfrak{p}) = \#(\mathcal{O}_K/\mathfrak{p})$,*

$\mathcal{Q}'(\mathcal{X}) = \{\mathfrak{p} \in \text{Spm } \mathcal{O}_K \mid N(\mathfrak{p}) > 27\delta^4 \text{ and } \mathcal{X}_{\mathfrak{p}} \rightarrow \text{Spec } \mathbb{F}_{\mathfrak{p}} \text{ not geometrically integral}\}$,

and

$$b'(\mathcal{X}) = \prod_{\mathfrak{p} \in \mathcal{Q}'(\mathcal{X})} \exp\left(\frac{\log N(\mathfrak{p})}{N(\mathfrak{p})}\right).$$

If we assume GRH, then we have

$$b'(\mathcal{X}) \leq \exp(19101 (\log \Delta_K + [K : \mathbb{Q}])) \cdot (\delta^{-2} - \delta^{-4}) \left(h(X) + \left(3 \log \delta + \delta \log 3 + \log \binom{n + \delta}{\delta} \right) \right),$$

where $h(X)$ is defined at Definition 2.7.

Proof. — We denote by $\mathcal{P}'(\mathcal{X})$ the product of all maximal ideals in $\mathcal{Q}'(\mathcal{X})$, and $c'(\mathcal{X}) = (\delta^2 - 1) \left(h(X) + \left(3 \log \delta + \delta \log 3 + \log \binom{n+\delta}{\delta} \right) \right)$. Then by Lemma 4.3 and (20), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{[K:\mathbb{Q}]} \log b'(\mathcal{X}) &= \frac{1}{[K:\mathbb{Q}]} \sum_{\mathfrak{p} \in \mathcal{Q}'(\mathcal{X})} \frac{\log N(\mathfrak{p})}{N(\mathfrak{p})} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{[K:\mathbb{Q}]} \sum_{27\delta^4 < N(\mathfrak{p}) \leq c'(\mathcal{X})} \frac{\log N(\mathfrak{p})}{N(\mathfrak{p})} + \frac{1}{[K:\mathbb{Q}]} \sum_{\substack{\mathfrak{p} \in \mathcal{Q}'(\mathcal{X}) \\ N(\mathfrak{p}) > c'(\mathcal{X})}} \frac{\log N(\mathfrak{p})}{c'(\mathcal{X})}. \end{aligned}$$

By (24), we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{1}{[K:\mathbb{Q}]} \sum_{27\delta^4 < N(\mathfrak{p}) \leq c'(\mathcal{X})} \frac{\log N(\mathfrak{p})}{N(\mathfrak{p})} \\ &= \frac{1}{[K:\mathbb{Q}]} \sum_{N(\mathfrak{p}) \leq c'(\mathcal{X})} \frac{\log N(\mathfrak{p})}{N(\mathfrak{p})} - \frac{1}{[K:\mathbb{Q}]} \sum_{N(\mathfrak{p}) \leq 27\delta^4} \frac{\log N(\mathfrak{p})}{N(\mathfrak{p})} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{[K:\mathbb{Q}]} (\log c'(\mathcal{X}) - 4 \log \delta + 19100 (\log \Delta_K + [K:\mathbb{Q}])). \end{aligned}$$

Let

$$\mathcal{Q}(\mathcal{X}) = \{ \mathfrak{p} \in \text{Spm } \mathcal{O}_K \mid \mathcal{X}_{\mathbb{F}_p} \rightarrow \text{Spec } \mathbb{F}_p \text{ is not geometrically integral} \},$$

then by (23) and (20), we have

$$\frac{1}{[K:\mathbb{Q}]} \sum_{\substack{\mathfrak{p} \in \mathcal{Q}'(\mathcal{X}) \\ N(\mathfrak{p}) > c'(\mathcal{X})}} \frac{\log N(\mathfrak{p})}{c'(\mathcal{X})} \leq \frac{1}{[K:\mathbb{Q}]c'(\mathcal{X})} \sum_{\mathfrak{p} \in \mathcal{Q}(\mathcal{X})} \log N(\mathfrak{p}) \leq 1,$$

By combining the above two estimates, we terminate the proof. \square

Remark 4.6. — With all the notations and assumptions in Proposition 4.5. We have

$$b'(\mathcal{X}) \ll_{n,K} \max \{ \delta^{-2} h(X), \delta^{-1} \}.$$

4.4. An explicit estimate of the geometric Hilbert-Samuel function. — In this part, we will provide an explicit lower bound of the geometric Hilbert-Samuel function of a projective hypersurface, which will be useful in the application of the determinant method. The inequality

$$\frac{(N-m+1)^m}{m!} \leq \binom{N}{m} \leq \frac{(N-(m-1)/2)^m}{m!}$$

will be useful in the calculation below.

Lemma 4.7. — Let X be a hypersurface of degree δ in \mathbb{P}_K^n . We denote by $r_1(n, D)$ its geometric Hilbert-Samuel function with the variable D . When $D \geq \delta + 1$, we have

$$r_1(n, D)^{\frac{1}{n-1}} \geq {}^{n-1}\sqrt{\frac{\delta}{(n-1)!}} D - (\delta - 2) {}^{n-1}\sqrt{\frac{\delta}{(n-1)!}},$$

and

$$r_1(n, D)^{\frac{1}{n-1}} \leq n^{-1} \sqrt{\frac{\delta}{(n-1)!}} D + \frac{n}{2} n^{-1} \sqrt{\frac{\delta}{(n-1)!}}.$$

Proof. — In fact, we have

$$r_1(n, D) = \binom{n+D}{n} - \binom{n+D-\delta}{n}$$

when $D \geq \delta + 1$.

In order to obtain the lower bound, we have

$$(26) \quad \begin{aligned} r_1(n, D) &= \sum_{j=1}^{\delta} \binom{D-\delta+n-1+j}{n-1} \geq \frac{\delta(D-\delta+2)^{n-1}}{(n-1)!} \\ &\geq \frac{\delta}{(n-1)!} D^{n-1} - \frac{\delta(\delta-2)}{(n-1)!} D^{n-2}. \end{aligned}$$

Then we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} r_1(n, D)^{\frac{1}{n-1}} &\geq n^{-1} \sqrt{\frac{\delta}{(n-1)!}} D \left(1 - \frac{\delta-2}{D}\right)^{\frac{1}{n-1}} \\ &\geq n^{-1} \sqrt{\frac{\delta}{(n-1)!}} D - (\delta-2) n^{-1} \sqrt{\frac{\delta}{(n-1)!}} \end{aligned}$$

when $D \geq \delta + 1$.

On the other hand, we have

$$(27) \quad r_1(n, D) = \sum_{j=1}^{\delta} \binom{D-\delta+n-1+j}{n-1} \leq \frac{\delta(D+\frac{n}{2})^{n-1}}{(n-1)!} = \frac{\delta D^{n-1}}{(n-1)!} \left(1 + \frac{n}{2D}\right)^{n-1},$$

which terminates the proof by an elementary calculation. \square

5. An explicit estimate of determinant

In this section, we will give an upper bound of the degree of the auxiliary hyper-surface determined by Theorem 3.1. In order to obtain an explicit estimate, we will assume GRH.

5.1. A uniform lower bound of arithmetic Hilbert-Samuel functions. —

Firstly, we refer a result in [13], which is an application of the uniform lower bound of the arithmetic Hilbert-Samuel functions in the determinant method.

Proposition 5.1 ([13], Proposition 2.12). — *We keep all the notations in §2.5. Let X is a closed integral subscheme of \mathbb{P}_K^n , $Z = (P_i)_{i \in I}$ be a family of rational points and*

$$\phi_{Z,D} : F_{D,K} \rightarrow \bigoplus_{i \in I} P_i^* \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}_K^n}(D)$$

be the evaluation map. If we have the inequality

$$\sup_{i \in I} h_{\overline{\mathcal{O}(1)}}(P_i) < \frac{\widehat{\mu}_{\max}(\overline{F}_D)}{D} - \frac{1}{2D} \log r_1(n, D),$$

where $r_1(n, D) = \text{rk}(F_D)$ and the height function $h_{\overline{\mathcal{O}(1)}}(\cdot)$ is defined in (13), then the homomorphism $\phi_{Z, D}$ cannot be injective.

The uniform lower bound of $\widehat{\mu}(\overline{F}_D)$ for all $D \geq 1$ will play a significant role in the construction of auxiliary hypersurfaces if we want to apply Proposition 5.1. In [15], David and Philippon give an explicit uniform lower bound of $\widehat{\mu}(\overline{F}_D)$. This result is reformulated by H. Chen in [13, Theorem 4.8] by the language of the slope method. In fact, let X be a closed integral subscheme of \mathbb{P}_K^n of dimension d and degree δ , and \mathcal{X} be its Zariski closure in $\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{O}_K}^n$. The inequality

$$(28) \quad \frac{\widehat{\mu}(\overline{F}_D)}{D} \geq \frac{d!}{\delta(2d+2)^{d+1}} h_{\overline{\mathcal{O}(1)}}(\mathcal{X}) - \log(n+1) - 2^d$$

is uniformly verified for all $D \geq 2(n-d)(\delta-1) + d + 2$ (see also [13, Remark 4.9] for some minor modifications), where $h_{\overline{\mathcal{O}(1)}}(\mathcal{X})$ follows the definition in Definition 2.5.

By Proposition 5.1, all the rational points with small heights in a projective variety can be covered by one hypersurface which does not contain the generic point of the original variety, and we will give the following numerical control of this observation.

Proposition 5.2. — *Let X be an integral hypersurface of degree δ in \mathbb{P}_K^n , the constant $\mathcal{H}_n = 1 + \dots + \frac{1}{n}$ and the constant*

$$(29) \quad C_1(n) = -\frac{(2n)^n}{(n-1)!} \left(\log 2 + 5 \log(n+1) - \frac{1}{2} \mathcal{H}_n \right) - \frac{3}{2} \log(n+1) - 2^{n-1}.$$

If

$$\frac{\log B}{[K : \mathbb{Q}]} < \frac{(n-1)!}{\delta(2n)^n} h(X) + C_1(n),$$

then there exists a hypersurface of degree smaller than $2\delta + n - 1$, which contains all rational points in $S(X; B)$ but does not contain the generic point of X , where we use the height function defined in (13).

Proof. — If there does not exist such a hypersurface, the evaluation map $\phi_{Z, D}$ in Proposition 5.1 is injective. On the other hand, by (28), Proposition 2.8 and the fact that

$$r_1(n, D) \leq \binom{n+D}{n} \leq (n+1)^D$$

is uniformly verified for all $n, D \geq 1$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\log B}{[K : \mathbb{Q}]} &< \frac{(n-1)!}{\delta(2n)^n} h(X) + C_1(n) \\ &\leq \frac{(n-1)!}{\delta(2n)^n} h_{\overline{\mathcal{O}(1)}}(\mathcal{X}) - \frac{3}{2} \log(n+1) - 2^{n-1} \\ &\leq \frac{\widehat{\mu}_{\max}(\overline{F}_D)}{D} - \frac{1}{2D} \log r_1(n, D), \end{aligned}$$

which contradicts to Proposition 5.1. \square

Remark 5.3. — With all the notations in Proposition 5.2. By the arithmetic Hilbert-Samuel Theorem of arithmetic ample line bundles (cf. [21, Theorem 8], [47, Theorem 1.4] and [1, Théorème principal]), we have

$$\widehat{\mu}(\overline{F}_D) = \frac{h_{\mathcal{O}(1)}(\mathcal{X})}{n\delta}D + o(D)$$

for D tends into infinity. So it is expected that we can obtain a better uniform lower bound of $\widehat{\mu}(\overline{F}_D)$ than (28). If we have a better explicit lower bound, we can improve the bound given in Proposition 5.2.

5.2. Estimate of the determinant. — In the global determinant method, for each geometrically integral hypersurface, we allow only one auxiliary hypersurface to cover its rational points with bounded height not containing the generic point of the original hypersurface, and we optimize the degree of this auxiliary hypersurface.

In this part, we will give an upper bound of the degree of the auxiliary hypersurface determined in Theorem 3.1, where the size of non-geometrically integral reductions and the height of the original hypersurface will be involved. In order to obtain an explicit estimate, we will assume GRH.

Theorem 5.4 (GRH). — *Let K be a number field. Let X be a geometrically integral hypersurface in \mathbb{P}_K^n of degree $\delta \geq 2$, and $S(X; B)$ be the set of rational points in X whose height is smaller than B with respect to the above closed immersion, see (13) for the definition of the height function used above. Under the assumption of GRH, there exists a hypersurface in \mathbb{P}_K^n of degree smaller than*

$$e^{C_2(n, K)} B^{\frac{n}{(n-1)^{n-\sqrt{\delta}}}} \delta^{4-\frac{1}{n-1}} \frac{b'(\mathcal{X})}{H_K(X)^{\frac{n!}{(n-1)(2n)^n} \delta^{-1-\frac{1}{n-1}}}}$$

which covers $S(X; B)$ but does not contain the generic point of X , where the constant

$$C_2(n, K) = \frac{nC_1(n)[K : \mathbb{Q}]}{(n-1)^{n-\sqrt{2}}} + (19100 + 379n^2)(\log \Delta_K + [K : \mathbb{Q}]) + \frac{\log(n-1)!}{n-1} \\ + 3 + \frac{n^3 + 2n^2 + n - 4}{2(n^2 - 1)^{n-1} \sqrt{(n-1)!}} \left(1 + \frac{n}{4}\right) \left(1 + \frac{8448(\log \Delta_K + [K : \mathbb{Q}])}{e^2}\right),$$

the constant $C_1(n)$ is defined in (29), $b'(\mathcal{X})$ is defined in Proposition 4.5, and the height $H_K(X)$ of X is defined in Definition 2.7.

Proof. — By Proposition 5.2, we divide the proof into two parts.

I. Case of large height variety. - If

$$\frac{\log B}{[K : \mathbb{Q}]} < \frac{(n-1)!}{\delta(2n)^n} h(X) + C_1(n),$$

where the constant $C_1(n)$ is defined at (29) and $h(X)$ is defined in Definition 2.7, then by Proposition 5.2, $S(X; B)$ can be covered by a hypersurface of degree no more than $2\delta + n - 1$ which does not contain the generic point of X , which is smaller than the bound provided in the statement.

II. Case of small height variety. - For the case of

$$\frac{\log B}{[K : \mathbb{Q}]} \geq \frac{(n-1)!}{\delta(2n)^n} h(X) + C_1(n),$$

which is equivalent to

$$h(X) \leq \frac{\delta(2n)^n}{(n-1)!} \cdot \left(\frac{\log B}{[K : \mathbb{Q}]} - C_1(n) \right),$$

we will treat it as following. We keep all the notations in Theorem 3.1, and we suppose $D \geq 3\delta \log \delta + n - 1 \geq 2\delta + n - 1$ from now on. We denote the set

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{R}(\mathcal{X}) &= \{ \mathfrak{p} \in \text{Spm } \mathcal{O}_K \mid 27\delta^4 \leq N(\mathfrak{p}) \leq r_1(n, D)^{\frac{1}{n-1}}, \\ &\quad \mathcal{X}_{\mathfrak{p}} \rightarrow \text{Spec } \mathbb{F}_{\mathfrak{p}} \text{ is geometrically integral} \}, \end{aligned}$$

and we apply Theorem 3.1 to the reductions at $\mathcal{R}(\mathcal{X})$. If there does not exist such a hypersurface, by Theorem 3.1 applied in the above sense, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\log B}{[K : \mathbb{Q}]} &\geq \frac{\widehat{\mu}(\overline{F}_D)}{D} - \frac{\log r_1(n, D)}{2D} \\ &+ \frac{1}{[K : \mathbb{Q}]} \sum_{\mathfrak{p} \in \mathcal{R}(\mathcal{X})} \left(\frac{(n-1)!^{\frac{1}{n-1}} (n-1) r_1(n, D)^{\frac{1}{n-1}}}{nDn(\mathcal{X}_{\mathfrak{p}})^{\frac{1}{n-1}}} - \frac{n^3 + 2n^2 + n - 4}{2Dn(n+1)} \right) \log N(\mathfrak{p}). \end{aligned}$$

From the explicit lower bound of $\widehat{\mu}(F_D)$ provided at (28) and Proposition 5.2, we deduce

$$\begin{aligned} (30) \quad &\frac{\log B}{[K : \mathbb{Q}]} - \frac{(n-1)!}{\delta(2n)^n} h(X) + C_1(n) \\ &\geq \frac{(n-1)!^{\frac{1}{n-1}} (n-1) r_1(n, D)^{\frac{1}{n-1}}}{nD[K : \mathbb{Q}]} \sum_{\mathfrak{p} \in \mathcal{R}(\mathcal{X})} \frac{\log N(\mathfrak{p})}{n(\mathcal{X}_{\mathfrak{p}})^{\frac{1}{n-1}}} \\ &\quad - \frac{n^3 + 2n^2 + n - 4}{2nD(n+1)[K : \mathbb{Q}]} \sum_{\mathfrak{p} \in \mathcal{R}(\mathcal{X})} \log N(\mathfrak{p}). \end{aligned}$$

II-1. Estimate of $\sum_{\mathfrak{p} \in \mathcal{R}(\mathcal{X})} \frac{\log N(\mathfrak{p})}{n(\mathcal{X}_{\mathfrak{p}})^{\frac{1}{n-1}}}$. - In order to estimate $\sum_{\mathfrak{p} \in \mathcal{R}(\mathcal{X})} \frac{\log N(\mathfrak{p})}{n(\mathcal{X}_{\mathfrak{p}})^{\frac{1}{n-1}}}$, by (22), we have

$$\sum_{\mathfrak{p} \in \mathcal{R}(\mathcal{X})} \frac{\log N(\mathfrak{p})}{n(\mathcal{X}_{\mathfrak{p}})^{\frac{1}{n-1}}} \geq \sum_{\mathfrak{p} \in \mathcal{R}(\mathcal{X})} \frac{\log N(\mathfrak{p})}{N(\mathfrak{p})} - n^2 \delta^2 \sum_{\mathfrak{p} \in \mathcal{R}(\mathcal{X})} \frac{\log N(\mathfrak{p})}{N(\mathfrak{p})^{\frac{3}{2}}}.$$

For the estimate of $\sum_{\mathfrak{p} \in \mathcal{R}(\mathcal{X})} \frac{\log N(\mathfrak{p})}{N(\mathfrak{p})}$, we denote

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{Q}'(\mathcal{X}) &= \{ \mathfrak{p} \in \text{Spm } \mathcal{O}_K \mid 27\delta^4 \leq N(\mathfrak{p}) \leq r_1(n, D)^{\frac{1}{n-1}}, \\ &\quad \mathcal{X}_{\mathfrak{p}} \rightarrow \text{Spec } \mathbb{F}_{\mathfrak{p}} \text{ is not geometrically integral} \}. \end{aligned}$$

Then by (24), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\mathfrak{p} \in \mathcal{R}(\mathcal{X})} \frac{\log N(\mathfrak{p})}{N(\mathfrak{p})} &= \sum_{27\delta^4 \leq N(\mathfrak{p}) \leq r_1(n, D)^{\frac{1}{n-1}}} \frac{\log N(\mathfrak{p})}{N(\mathfrak{p})} - \sum_{\mathfrak{p} \in \mathcal{Q}'(\mathcal{X})} \frac{\log N(\mathfrak{p})}{N(\mathfrak{p})} \\ &\geq \frac{1}{n-1} \log r_1(n, D) - 3 \log 3 - 4 \log \delta - 19100(\log \Delta_K + [K : \mathbb{Q}]) - \log(b'(\mathcal{X})) \end{aligned}$$

under the assumption of GRH, where the notation $b'(\mathcal{X})$ is introduced in Proposition 4.5.

For the term $\sum_{\mathfrak{p} \in \mathcal{R}(\mathcal{X})} \frac{\log N(\mathfrak{p})}{N(\mathfrak{p})^{\frac{3}{2}}}$, it is equal to zero when $r_1(n, D)^{\frac{1}{n-1}} \leq 27\delta^4$. By (25), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\mathfrak{p} \in \mathcal{R}(\mathcal{X})} \frac{\log N(\mathfrak{p})}{N(\mathfrak{p})^{\frac{3}{2}}} &\leq \sum_{27\delta^4 \leq N(\mathfrak{p}) \leq r_1(n, D)^{\frac{1}{n-1}}} \frac{\log N(\mathfrak{p})}{N(\mathfrak{p})^{\frac{3}{2}}} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{3\sqrt{3}\delta^2} - r_1(n, D)^{-\frac{1}{2(n-1)}} + 908 \frac{\log^2(27\delta^4)}{27\delta^4} (\log \Delta_K + [K : \mathbb{Q}]) \end{aligned}$$

when $r_1(n, D)^{\frac{1}{n-1}} > 27\delta^4$.

By the above two estimates, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} (31) \quad \sum_{\mathfrak{p} \in \mathcal{R}(\mathcal{X})} \frac{\log N(\mathfrak{p})}{n(\mathcal{X}_{\mathfrak{p}})^{\frac{1}{n-1}}} &\geq \frac{1}{n-1} \log r_1(n, D) - 19100(\log \Delta_K + [K : \mathbb{Q}]) - 3 \log 3 - 4 \log \delta - \log(b'(\mathcal{X})) \\ &\quad - n^2 \delta^2 \left(\frac{1}{3\sqrt{3}\delta^2} - r_1(n, D)^{-\frac{1}{2(n-1)}} + 908 \frac{\log^2(27\delta^4)}{27\delta^4} (\log \Delta_K + [K : \mathbb{Q}]) \right) \end{aligned}$$

by combining the above two inequalities.

II-2. Estimate of $\sum_{\mathfrak{p} \in \mathcal{R}(\mathcal{X})} \log N(\mathfrak{p})$. - For the estimate of $\sum_{\mathfrak{p} \in \mathcal{R}(\mathcal{X})} \log N(\mathfrak{p})$, by (23), we have

$$\begin{aligned} (32) \quad \frac{1}{D} \sum_{\mathfrak{p} \in \mathcal{R}(\mathcal{X})} \log N(\mathfrak{p}) &\leq \frac{1}{D} \sum_{N(\mathfrak{p}) \leq r_1(n, D)^{\frac{1}{n-1}}} \log N(\mathfrak{p}) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{D} \left(r_1(n, D)^{\frac{1}{n-1}} + 528 (\log \Delta_K + [K : \mathbb{Q}]) \frac{r_1(n, D)^{\frac{1}{2(n-1)}}}{(n-1)^2} \log^2 r_1(n, D) \right) \end{aligned}$$

under the assumption of GRH.

II-3. Deducing the contradiction. - We take (31) and (32) into (30), and we do some elementary calculations. Then the inequality

$$\begin{aligned}
(33) \quad & \frac{\log B}{[K : \mathbb{Q}]} - \frac{(n-1)!}{\delta(2n)^n} h(X) + C_1(n) \\
\geq & \frac{(n-1)!^{\frac{1}{n-1}}(n-1)}{n[K : \mathbb{Q}]} \cdot \frac{r_1(n, D)^{\frac{1}{n-1}}}{D} \left(\frac{1}{n-1} \log r_1(n, D) - \log(b'(\mathcal{X})) - 4 \log \delta \right. \\
& \left. - (19100 + 379n^2)(\log \Delta_K + [K : \mathbb{Q}]) \right) \\
& - \frac{n^3 + 2n^2 + n - 4}{2n(n+1)[K : \mathbb{Q}]} \cdot \frac{r_1(n, D)^{\frac{1}{n-1}}}{D} \left(1 + \frac{528(\log \Delta_K + [K : \mathbb{Q}])}{(n-1)^2} \cdot \frac{\log^2 r_1(n, D)}{r_1(n, D)^{\frac{1}{2(n-1)}}} \right)
\end{aligned}$$

is uniformly verified for all $D \geq 2\delta + n - 1$.

From (26) in Lemma 4.7, we have

$$(34) \quad \frac{1}{n-1} \log r_1(n, D) \geq \log D + \frac{1}{n-1} \log \delta - \frac{1}{n-1} \log(n-1)!$$

when $D \geq 2\delta + n - 1$.

We take Lemma 4.7 and (34) into (33), and by the fact that

$$\frac{\log^2 r_1(n, D)}{r_1(n, D)^{\frac{1}{2(n-1)}}} \leq \frac{16(n-1)^2}{e^2},$$

we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
(35) \quad & \frac{n}{(n-1)^{\frac{n-1}{\sqrt{\delta}}}} \left(\log B - \frac{[K : \mathbb{Q}](n-1)!}{\delta(2n)^n} h(X) + C_1(n)[K : \mathbb{Q}] \right) \\
\geq & \left(1 - \frac{\delta-2}{D} \right) \left(\log D - \left(4 - \frac{1}{n-1} \right) \log \delta - \log(b'(\mathcal{X})) \right. \\
& \left. - (19100 + 379n^2)(\log \Delta_K + [K : \mathbb{Q}]) - \frac{\log(n-1)!}{n-1} \right) \\
& - \frac{n^3 + 2n^2 + n - 4}{2(n^2 - 1)^{\frac{n-1}{\sqrt{\delta}}}} \cdot \left(1 + \frac{n}{4} \right) \left(1 + \frac{8448(\log \Delta_K + [K : \mathbb{Q}])}{e^2} \right).
\end{aligned}$$

When $D \geq 3\delta \log \delta + n - 1 \geq 2\delta + n - 1$ and $\delta \geq 2$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{\delta-2}{D} \left(\log D - \left(4 - \frac{1}{n-1} \right) \log \delta - \frac{\log(n-1)!}{n-1} - \log(b'(\mathcal{X})) \right. \\
& \left. - (19100 + 379n^2)(\log \Delta_K + [K : \mathbb{Q}]) \right) \leq \frac{\delta-2}{D} \log D \leq 3
\end{aligned}$$

by an elementary calculation. We take the above inequality into (35), and then we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{n}{(n-1)^{n-\sqrt[n]{\delta}}} \left(\log B - \frac{[K:\mathbb{Q}](n-1)!}{\delta(2n)^n} h(X) + C_1(n)[K:\mathbb{Q}] \right) \\
\geq & \log D - \left(4 - \frac{1}{n-1} \right) \log \delta - \log(b'(\mathcal{X})) \\
& - (19100 + 379n^2)(\log \Delta_K + [K:\mathbb{Q}]) - 3 - \frac{\log(n-1)!}{n-1} \\
& - \frac{n^3 + 2n^2 + n - 4}{2(n^2 - 1)^{n-1} \sqrt[n]{(n-1)!}} \cdot \left(1 + \frac{n}{4} \right) \left(1 + \frac{8448(\log \Delta_K + [K:\mathbb{Q}])}{e^2} \right),
\end{aligned}$$

which deduces

$$\begin{aligned}
\log D \leq & \frac{n \log B}{(n-1)^{n-\sqrt[n]{\delta}}} - \frac{[K:\mathbb{Q}]n!}{\delta^{1+\frac{1}{n-1}}(n-1)(2n)^n} h(X) + \log(b'(\mathcal{X})) \\
& + \left(4 - \frac{1}{n-1} \right) \log \delta + C_2(n, K)
\end{aligned}$$

with $C_2(n, K)$ in the statement of this theorem, and it leads to the contradiction. \square

5.3. Control of auxiliary hypersurfaces. — The following two upper bounds of the degree of the auxiliary hypersurface are deduced from Theorem 5.4 directly.

Corollary 5.5 (GRH). — *We keep all the notations and conditions in Theorem 5.4. Then there exists a hypersurface of degree smaller than $C_3(n, K)\delta^3 B^{\frac{n}{(n-1)^{n-\sqrt[n]{\delta}}}}$, which covers $S(X; B)$ but does not contain the generic point of X , where the constant*

$$C_3(n, K) = e^{C_2(n, K)} \frac{(n+6)(n-1)(2n)^n \exp(19101(\log \Delta_K + [K:\mathbb{Q}]))}{n!},$$

and $C_2(n, K)$ is defined in Theorem 5.4.

Proof. — By the upper bound of $b'(\mathcal{X})$ given in Proposition 4.5, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
b'(\mathcal{X}) & \leq \exp(19101(\log \Delta_K + [K:\mathbb{Q}])) \\
& \cdot (\delta^{-2} - \delta^{-4}) \left(h(X) + \left(3 \log \delta + \delta \log 3 + \log \left(\frac{n+\delta}{\delta} \right) \right) \right) \\
& \leq (n+6) \exp(19101(\log \Delta_K + [K:\mathbb{Q}])) \max\{\delta^{-2}h(X), \delta^{-1}\}.
\end{aligned}$$

We denote by $G_K(X) = H_K(X)^{\frac{n!}{(n-1)(2n)^n} \delta^{-1-\frac{1}{n-1}}} \geq 1$ for simplicity, where the last inequality is obtained by definition directly. Then by an elementary calculation, we

have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{b'(\mathcal{X})}{H_K(X)^{\frac{n!}{(n-1)(2n)^n} \delta^{-1-\frac{1}{n-1}}}} \\
& \leq (n+6) \exp(19101(\log \Delta_K + [K:\mathbb{Q}])) \frac{\max\left\{\frac{\delta^{-1+\frac{1}{n-1}}(n-1)(2n)^n}{n![K:\mathbb{Q}]} \log G_K(X), \delta^{-1}\right\}}{G_K(X)} \\
& \leq \frac{(n+6)(n-1)(2n)^n \exp(19101(\log \Delta_K + [K:\mathbb{Q}]))}{n!} \delta^{-1+\frac{1}{n-1}}.
\end{aligned}$$

We have the assertion by taking the above estimate into Theorem 5.4. \square

Compared with Corollary 5.5, the result below has a better dependence on the degree of the original hypersurface but a little worse dependence on the bound of heights.

Corollary 5.6 (GRH). — *We keep all the notations and conditions in Theorem 5.4. Then there exists a hypersurface of degree smaller than*

$$\frac{C'_3(n, K) \delta^{3-\frac{1}{n-1}}}{H_K(X)^{\frac{n!}{(n-1)(2n)^n} \delta^{-1-\frac{1}{n-1}}}} B^{\frac{n}{(n-1)^{n-\frac{1}{\delta}}}} \max\left\{\frac{\log B}{[K:\mathbb{Q}]}, 1\right\},$$

which covers $S(X; B)$ but does not contain the generic point of X , where the constant

$$C'_3(n, K) = -e^{C_2(n, K)} \frac{C_1(n)(n+6)(2n)^n \exp(19101(\log \Delta_K + [K:\mathbb{Q}]))}{(n-1)!},$$

$C_1(n)$ is defined in (29), $C_2(n, K)$ is defined in Theorem 5.4, and $H_K(X)$ is defined in Definition 2.7.

Proof. — If

$$\frac{\log B}{[K:\mathbb{Q}]} < \frac{(n-1)!}{\delta(2n)^n} h(X) + C_1(n),$$

then by Proposition 5.2, $S(X; B)$ can be covered by a hypersurface of degree no more than $2\delta + n - 1$ which does not contain the generic point of X . The upper bound of the degree satisfies the bound provided in the statement.

If

$$\frac{\log B}{[K:\mathbb{Q}]} \geq \frac{(n-1)!}{\delta(2n)^n} h(X) + C_1(n),$$

which is equivalent to

$$h(X) \leq \frac{\delta(2n)^n}{(n-1)!} \cdot \frac{\log B}{[K:\mathbb{Q}]} - \frac{\delta(2n)^n}{(n-1)!} C_1(n),$$

we deal with it as following. Same as the proof of Corollary 5.5, we have

$$b'(\mathcal{X}) \leq (n+6) \exp(19101(\log \Delta_K + [K:\mathbb{Q}])) \max\{\delta^{-2}h(X), \delta^{-1}\},$$

where $b'(\mathcal{X})$ is the same as that in Proposition 4.5 and Theorem 5.4. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{b'(\mathcal{X})}{H_K(X)^{\frac{n!}{(n-1)(2n)^n} \delta^{-1 - \frac{1}{n-1}}}} \\ & \leq \frac{(n+6) \exp(19101 (\log \Delta_K + [K : \mathbb{Q}])) \delta^{-1}}{H_K(X)^{\frac{n!}{(n-1)(2n)^n} \delta^{-1 - \frac{1}{n-1}}}} \max \left\{ \frac{(2n)^n}{(n-1)!} \left(\frac{\log B}{[K : \mathbb{Q}]} - C_1(n) \right), 1 \right\} \\ & \leq \frac{-C_1(n)(n+6)(2n)^n \exp(19101 (\log \Delta_K + [K : \mathbb{Q}])) \delta^{-1}}{(n-1)! H_K(X)^{\frac{n!}{(n-1)(2n)^n} \delta^{-1 - \frac{1}{n-1}}}} \max \left\{ \frac{\log B}{[K : \mathbb{Q}]}, 1 \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

and we obtain the assertion by taking the above inequality into Theorem 5.4. \square

6. Counting rational points in plane curves

As applications of Corollary 5.5 and Corollary 5.6, we have the following uniform upper bounds of the number of rational points with bounded height in plane curves.

6.1. A generalization over an arbitrary number field. — The following result generalizes [11, Theorem 2] over an arbitrary number field under the assumption of GRH, which has the optimal dependence on the bound of heights.

Theorem 6.1 (GRH). — *Let X be a geometrically integral curves in \mathbb{P}_K^2 of degree δ . Then under the assumption of GRH, we have*

$$N(X; B) \leq C_3(2, K) \delta^4 B^{\frac{2}{3}},$$

where the constant $C_3(2, K)$ is defined in Corollary 5.5. In addition, we have

$$N(X; B) \ll_K \delta^4 B^{\frac{2}{3}}.$$

Proof. — We apply the Bézout Theorem in the intersection theory (cf. [17, Proposition 8.4]) to X and the auxiliary hypersurface determined in Corollary 5.5 for the case of $n = 2$, and then we obtain the result. \square

6.2. A better dependence on the degree. — In this part, we will provide another uniform upper bound of rational points with bounded height in plane curves under the assumption of GRH. This result has a better dependence on the degree than that of Theorem 6.1, but a bit worse dependence on the bound of heights.

Theorem 6.2 (GRH). — *Let X be a geometrically integral curves in \mathbb{P}_K^2 of degree δ . Then under the assumption of GRH, we have*

$$N(X; B) \leq C'_3(2, K) \delta^3 B^{\frac{2}{3}} \max \left\{ \frac{\log B}{[K : \mathbb{Q}]}, 1 \right\},$$

where the constant $C'_3(2, K)$ is defined in Corollary 5.6. In addition, we have

$$N(X; B) \ll_K \delta^3 B^{\frac{2}{3}} \log B$$

when $B \geq \exp([K : \mathbb{Q}])$.

Proof. — This is the same application of Bézout Theorem in the intersection theory (cf. [17, Proposition 8.4]) to Corollary 5.6 as that of Corollary 6.1 when $n = 2$, where we take $H_K(X) \geq 1$ defined in Definition 2.7 into consideration. \square

Remark 6.3. — It seems that the upper bound given in Theorem 6.1 and Theorem 6.2 are not optimal. Actually, for a geometrically plane curve $X \hookrightarrow \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{Q}}^2$ of degree δ , Heath-Brown conjectured the uniform upper bound

$$N(X; B) \ll \delta^2 B^{\frac{2}{\delta}}.$$

By the examples given in [11, §6], the exponent 2 of δ in the above conjecture is possibly optimal.

Appendix A. An explicit lower bound of $Q_{\xi}(r)$

In this appendix, we give an explicit lower bound of the function $Q_{\xi}(r)$ defined in (5) for the case of hypersurfaces.

In the following proof of Proposition A.1, the inequality

$$\frac{(N - m + 1)^m}{m!} \leq \binom{N}{m} \leq \frac{(N - (m - 1)/2)^m}{m!}$$

will be very useful, where N and m are two positive integers, and $N \geq m \geq 1$.

Proposition A.1. — *Let X be a hypersurface of \mathbb{P}_k^n , ξ be a closed point in X , and μ_{ξ} be the multiplicity of ξ in X induced by its local Hilbert-Samuel function. The function $Q_{\xi}(r)$ is defined in the equality (5). Then we have*

$$Q_{\xi}(r) > \left(\frac{(n-1)!}{\mu_{\xi}} \right)^{\frac{1}{n-1}} \left(\frac{n-1}{n} \right) r^{\frac{n}{n-1}} - \frac{n^3 + 2n^2 + n - 4}{2n(n+1)} r.$$

Proof. — For the case of hypersurfaces, by [28, Example 2.70 (2)], we have

$$H_{\xi}(s) = \binom{n+s-1}{s} - \binom{n+s-\mu_{\xi}-1}{s-\mu_{\xi}}.$$

We define the function $U_{\xi}(k) = H_{\xi}(0) + \cdots + H_{\xi}(k)$, then we have

$$\begin{aligned} U_{\xi}(k) &= \sum_{j=0}^k \binom{n+j-1}{j} - \sum_{j=0}^k \binom{n+j-\mu_{\xi}-1}{j-\mu_{\xi}} \\ &= \binom{n+k}{n} - \binom{n+k-\mu_{\xi}}{n}. \end{aligned}$$

Then we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
Q_\xi(U_\xi(k)) &= \sum_{j=0}^n jH_\xi(j) \\
&= \sum_{j=0}^k j \binom{j+n-1}{n-1} - \sum_{j=0}^k j \binom{n+j-\mu_\xi-1}{n-1} \\
&= n \binom{k+n}{n+1} - n \binom{k-\mu_\xi+n}{n+1} - \mu_\xi \binom{n+k-\mu_\xi}{n}.
\end{aligned}$$

Let $r \in]U_\xi(k-1), U_\xi(k)[$. By the definition of $Q_\xi(r)$ in the equality (5), we have the inequality

$$Q_\xi(U_\xi(k-1)) \leq Q_\xi(r) \leq Q_\xi(U_\xi(k)).$$

So we have

$$\begin{aligned}
(36) \quad Q_\xi(r) &= Q_\xi(U_\xi(k-1)) + k(r - U_\xi(k-1)) \\
&= n \binom{n+k-1}{n+1} - n \binom{n+k-\mu_\xi-1}{n+1} - \mu_\xi \binom{n+k-\mu_\xi-1}{n} \\
&\quad + kr - k \binom{n+k-1}{n} + k \binom{n+k-\mu_\xi-1}{n} \\
&= kr + \binom{n+k-\mu_\xi}{n+1} - \binom{n+k}{n+1}.
\end{aligned}$$

In order to get a lower bound of $Q_\xi(r)$, we need to estimate the term

$$\binom{n+k-\mu_\xi}{n+1} - \binom{n+k}{n+1}.$$

In fact, we have the estimate

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left[\binom{n+k}{n+1} - \binom{n+k-\mu_\xi}{n+1} \right] / U_\xi(k-1) \\
= & \left[\binom{n+k}{n+1} - \binom{n+k-\mu_\xi}{n+1} \right] / \left[\binom{n+k-1}{n} - \binom{n+k-\mu_\xi-1}{n} \right] \\
= & \frac{(n+k)(n+k-1) \cdots k - (n+k-\mu_\xi) \cdots (k-\mu_\xi)}{(n+1)[(n+k-1) \cdots k - (n+k-\mu_\xi-1) \cdots (k-\mu_\xi)]} \\
= & \left(\frac{(n+k)(n+k-1)}{k-1} \frac{(n+k-2) \cdots (k-1)}{(n+k-\mu_\xi-1) \cdots (k-\mu_\xi)} - (n+k-\mu_\xi) \right) / \\
& \left(\left[\frac{n+k-1}{k-1} \left[\frac{(n+k-2) \cdots (k-1)}{(n+k-\mu_\xi-1) \cdots (k-\mu_\xi)} \right] - 1 \right] (n+1) \right) \\
= & \frac{1}{n+1} \left[n+k + \frac{\mu_\xi}{\frac{n+k-1}{k-1} \cdot \frac{(n+k-2) \cdots (k-1)}{(n+k-\mu_\xi-1) \cdots (k-\mu_\xi)} - 1} \right] \\
\leq & \frac{1}{n+1} \left[n+k + \frac{\mu_\xi}{\left(\frac{n+k-1}{n+k-\mu_\xi-1} \right)^n - 1} \right] \\
= & \frac{1}{n+1} \left[n+k + \frac{(n+k-\mu_\xi-1)^n}{(n+k-1)^{n-1} + \cdots + (n+k-\mu_\xi-1)^{n-1}} \right] \\
\leq & \frac{1}{n+1} \left(n+k + \frac{n+k-\mu_\xi-1}{n} \right) \\
= & \frac{(n+1)k + n^2 + n - \mu_\xi - 1}{n(n+1)}.
\end{aligned}$$

By the equality (36), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
(37) \quad Q_\xi(r) &= kr + \binom{n+k-\mu_\xi}{n+1} - \binom{n+k}{n+1} \\
&\geq kr - \frac{(n+1)k + n^2 + n - \mu_\xi - 1}{n(n+1)} U_\xi(k-1) \\
&> kr - \frac{(n+1)k + n^2 + n - \mu_\xi - 1}{n(n+1)} r \\
&= \frac{(n^2-1)k - n^2 - n + \mu_\xi + 1}{n(n+1)} r \\
&= \left(\frac{n-1}{n} k - \frac{n^2 + n - \mu_\xi - 1}{n(n+1)} \right) r,
\end{aligned}$$

where we use the estimate $U_\xi(k-1) < r$ in the inequality (37). In addition, we obtain the inequality

$$\begin{aligned} r \leq U_\xi(k) &= \binom{n+k}{n} - \binom{n+k-\mu_\xi}{n} = \sum_{j=1}^{\mu_\xi} \binom{n+k-j}{n-1} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{(n-1)!} \sum_{j=1}^{\mu_\xi} \left(k + \frac{n}{2} - j + 1\right)^{n-1}. \end{aligned}$$

In addition, we have

$$\sum_{j=1}^{\mu_\xi} \left(k + \frac{n}{2} - j + 1\right)^{n-1} \leq \mu_\xi \left(k + \frac{n}{2}\right)^{n-1}.$$

Then

$$k \geq \frac{1}{n^{-1/\mu_\xi}} n^{-1/\mu_\xi} \sqrt[n-1]{(n-1)!r} - \frac{n}{2}.$$

Finally we have

$$\begin{aligned} Q_\xi(r) &> \left(\frac{n-1}{n} \left(\frac{1}{n^{-1/\mu_\xi}} n^{-1/\mu_\xi} \sqrt[n-1]{(n-1)!r} - \frac{n}{2}\right) - \frac{n^2 + n - \mu_\xi - 1}{n(n+1)}\right) r \\ &\geq \left(\frac{(n-1)!}{\mu_\xi}\right)^{\frac{1}{n-1}} \left(\frac{n-1}{n}\right) r^{\frac{n}{n-1}} - \frac{n^3 + 2n^2 + n - 4}{2n(n+1)} r, \end{aligned}$$

for $\mu_\xi \geq 1$. Then we obtain the result. \square

References

- [1] A. ABBES & T. BOUCHE – “Théorème de Hilbert-Samuel “arithmétique””, *Université de Grenoble. Annales de l’Institut Fourier* **45** (1995), no. 2, p. 375–401.
- [2] M. BHARGAVA, A. SHANKAR, T. TANIGUCHI, F. THORNE, J. TSIMERMAN & Y. ZHAO – “Bounds on 2-torsion in class groups of number fields and integral points on elliptic curves”, *Journal of the American Mathematical Society* **33** (2020), no. 4, p. 1087–1099.
- [3] E. BOMBIERI & J. PILA – “The number of integral points on arcs and ovals”, *Duke Mathematical Journal* **59** (1989), no. 2, p. 337–357.
- [4] J.-B. BOST – “Périodes et isogénies des variétés abéliennes sur les corps de nombres (d’après D. Masser et G. Wüstholz)”, *Astérisque* (1996), no. 237, p. Exp. No. 795, 4, 115–161, Séminaire Bourbaki, Vol. 1994/1995.
- [5] J.-B. BOST, H. GILLET & C. SOULÉ – “Heights of projective varieties”, *Journal of the American Mathematical Society* **7** (1994), no. 4, p. 903–1027.
- [6] N. BROBERG – “A note on a paper by R. Heath-Brown: “The density of rational points on curves and surfaces” [Ann. of Math. (2) **155** (2002), no. 2, 553–595]”, *Journal für die Reine und Angewandte Mathematik* **571** (2004), p. 159–178.
- [7] T. D. BROWNING & D. R. HEATH-BROWN – “The density of rational points on non-singular hypersurfaces. I”, *The Bulletin of the London Mathematical Society* **38** (2006), no. 3, p. 401–410.

- [8] ———, “The density of rational points on non-singular hypersurfaces. II”, *Proceedings of the London Mathematical Society. Third Series* **93** (2006), no. 2, p. 273–303, With an appendix by J. M. Starr.
- [9] T. D. BROWNING, D. R. HEATH-BROWN & P. SALBERGER – “Counting rational points on algebraic varieties”, *Duke Mathematical Journal* **132** (2006), no. 3, p. 545–578.
- [10] A. CAFURE & G. MATERA – “Improved explicit estimates on the number of solutions of equations over a finite field”, *Finite Fields and Their Applications* **12** (2006), no. 2, p. 155–185.
- [11] W. CASTRYCK, R. CLUCKERS, P. DITTMANN & K. H. NGUYEN – “The dimension growth conjecture, polynomial in the degree and without logarithmic factors”, *Algebra & Number Theory* **14** (2020), no. 8, p. 2261–2294.
- [12] H. CHEN – “Convergence des polygones de Harder-Narasimhan”, *Mémoires de la Société Mathématique de France* **120** (2010), p. 1–120.
- [13] ———, “Explicit uniform estimation of rational points I. Estimation of heights”, *Journal für die Reine und Angewandte Mathematik* **668** (2012), p. 59–88.
- [14] ———, “Explicit uniform estimation of rational points II. Hypersurface coverings”, *Journal für die Reine und Angewandte Mathematik* **668** (2012), p. 89–108.
- [15] S. DAVID & P. PHILIPPON – “Minorations des hauteurs normalisées des sous-variétés des tores”, *Annali della Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa. Classe di Scienze. Serie IV* **28** (1999), no. 3, p. 489–543.
- [16] G. FALTINGS – “Diophantine approximation on abelian varieties”, *Annals of Mathematics. Second Series* **133** (1991), no. 3, p. 549–576.
- [17] W. FULTON – *Intersection theory*, second ed., Ergebnisse der Mathematik und ihrer Grenzgebiete. 3. Folge. A Series of Modern Surveys in Mathematics [Results in Mathematics and Related Areas. 3rd Series. A Series of Modern Surveys in Mathematics], vol. 2, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1998.
- [18] É. GAUDRON – “Pentes de fibrés vectoriels adéliques sur un corps globale”, *Rendiconti del Seminario Matematico della Università di Padova* **119** (2008), p. 21–95.
- [19] H. GILLET & C. SOULÉ – “On the number of lattice points in convex symmetric bodies and their duals”, *Israel Journal of Mathematics* **74** (1991), no. 2-3, p. 347–357.
- [20] H. GILLET & C. SOULÉ – “Arithmetic intersection theory”, *Institut des Hautes Études Scientifiques. Publications Mathématiques* (1990), no. 72, p. 93–174 (1991).
- [21] ———, “An arithmetic Riemann-Roch theorem”, *Inventiones Mathematicae* **110** (1992), no. 3, p. 473–543.
- [22] L. GRENIÉ & G. MOLTENI – “Explicit smoothed prime ideals theorems under GRH”, *Mathematics of Computation* **85** (2016), no. 300, p. 1875–1899.
- [23] A. GROTHENDIECK & J. DIEUDONNÉ – “Éléments de géométrie algébrique. IV. Étude locale des schémas et des morphismes de schémas. III”, *Institut des Hautes Études Scientifiques. Publications Mathématiques* (1966), no. 28, p. 255.
- [24] M. GRZEŚKOWIAK – “Explicit bound for the prime ideal theorem in residue classes”, in *International Conference on Number-Theoretic Methods in Cryptology*, Springer, 2017, p. 48–68.
- [25] R. HARTSHORNE – *Algebraic geometry*, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1977, Graduate Texts in Mathematics, No. 52.

- [26] D. R. HEATH-BROWN – “The density of rational points on curves and surfaces”, *Annals of Mathematics. Second Series* **155** (2002), no. 2, p. 553–595.
- [27] M. HINDRY & J. H. SILVERMAN – *Diophantine geometry*, Graduate Texts in Mathematics, vol. 201, Springer-Verlag, New York, 2000, An introduction.
- [28] J. KOLLÁR – *Lectures on resolution of singularities*, Annals of Mathematics Studies, vol. 166, Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 2007.
- [29] C. LIU – “Comptage des multiplicités dans une hypersurface sur un corps fini”, *arxiv: 1606. 09337* (2016), to appear in Kyoto Journal of Mathematics.
- [30] ———, “Fibres non réduites d’un schéma arithmétique”, *arxiv: 1609. 08979* (2016), to appear in Mathematische Zeitschrift.
- [31] ———, “Control of non-geometrically integral reductions”, *arxiv: 2005. 06174* (2020).
- [32] H. MATSUMURA – *Commutative ring theory*, second ed., Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics, vol. 8, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1989, Translated from the Japanese by M. Reid.
- [33] A. MORIWAKI – *Arakelov geometry*, Translations of Mathematical Monographs, vol. 244, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2014, Translated from the 2008 Japanese original.
- [34] J. NEUKIRCH – *Algebraic number theory*, Grundlehren der Mathematischen Wissenschaften [Fundamental Principles of Mathematical Sciences], vol. 322, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1999, Translated from the 1992 German original and with a note by Norbert Schappacher, With a foreword by G. Harder.
- [35] J. PILA – “Density of integral and rational points on varieties”, *Astérisque* (1995), no. 228, p. 4, 183–187, Columbia University Number Theory Seminar (New York, 1992).
- [36] H. RANDRIAMBOLOLONA – “Métriques de sous-quotient et théorème de Hilbert-Samuel arithmétique pour les faisceaux cohérents”, *Journal für die Reine und Angewandte Mathematik* **590** (2006), p. 67–88.
- [37] M. ROSEN – “A generalization of Mertens’ theorem”, *Journal of the Ramanujan Mathematical Society* **14** (1999), p. 1–19.
- [38] W. RUPPERT – “Reduzibilität ebener kurven.”, *Journal für die Reine und Angewandte Mathematik* **369** (1986), p. 167–191.
- [39] P. SALBERGER – “On the density of rational and integral points on algebraic varieties”, *Journal für die Reine und Angewandte Mathematik* **606** (2007), p. 123–147.
- [40] ———, “Counting rational points on projective varieties”, (2013), preprint.
- [41] J.-P. SERRE – *Lectures on the Mordell-Weil theorem*, third ed., Aspects of Mathematics, Friedr. Vieweg & Sohn, Braunschweig, 1997, Translated from the French and edited by Martin Brown from notes by Michel Waldschmidt, With a foreword by Brown and Serre.
- [42] ———, *Topics in Galois theory*, second ed., Research Notes in Mathematics, vol. 1, A K Peters, Ltd., Wellesley, MA, 2008, With notes by Henri Darmon.
- [43] C. SOULÉ – *Lectures on Arakelov geometry*, Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics, vol. 33, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1992, With the collaboration of D. Abramovich, J.-F. Burnol and J. Kramer.
- [44] G. TENENBAUM – *Introduction à la théorie analytique et probabiliste des nombres*, 4-ième ed., Échelles, Belin, 2015.
- [45] A. C. THOMPSON – *Minkowski geometry*, Encyclopedia of Mathematics and its Applications, vol. 63, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1996.

- [46] M. N. WALSH – “Bounded rational points on curves”, *International Mathematics Research Notices. IMRN* (2015), no. 14, p. 5644–5658.
- [47] S. ZHANG – “Positive line bundles on arithmetic varieties”, *Journal of the American Mathematical Society* **8** (1995), no. 1, p. 187–221.

January 20, 2021

CHUNHUI LIU, Institute for Advanced Study in Mathematics, Harbin Institute of Technology,
150001 Harbin, P. R. China • *E-mail* : `chunhui.liu@hit.edu.cn`