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Abstract

The relative density of visible points of the integer lattice \( \mathbb{Z}^d \) is known to be \( 1/\zeta(d) \) for \( d \geq 2 \), where \( \zeta \) is Riemann’s zeta function. In this paper we prove that the relative density of visible points in the Ammann-Beenker point set is given by \( 2(\sqrt{2} - 1)/\zeta_K(2) \), where \( \zeta_K \) is Dedekind’s zeta function over \( K = \mathbb{Q}(\sqrt{2}) \).

1 Introduction

A locally finite point set \( P \subset \mathbb{R}^d \) has an asymptotic density (or simply density) \( \theta(P) \) if

\[
\lim_{R \to \infty} \frac{\#(P \cap RD)}{\text{vol}(RD)} = \theta(P)
\]

holds for all Jordan measurable \( D \subset \mathbb{R}^d \). The density of a set can be interpreted as the asymptotic number of elements per unit volume. For instance, for a lattice \( L \subset \mathbb{R}^d \) we have \( \theta(L) = \frac{1}{\text{vol}(\mathbb{R}^d/L)} \). Let \( \hat{P} = \{ x \in P \mid tx \notin P, \forall t \in (0,1) \} \) denote the subset of the visible points of \( P \). If \( P \) is a regular cut-and-project set (see Definition 3.1 below) then it is known that \( \theta(P) \) exists. In [5, Theorem 1], J. Marklof and A. Strömbergsson proved that \( \theta(\hat{P}) \) also exists and that \( 0 < \theta(\hat{P}) \leq \theta(P) \) if \( \theta(P) > 0 \). In particular, for such \( P \) the relative density of visible points \( \kappa_P := \frac{\theta(\hat{P})}{\theta(P)} \) exists, but is not known explicitly in most cases.

For \( d \geq 2 \) we have \( \hat{\mathbb{Z}}^d = \{(n_1, \ldots, n_d) \in \mathbb{Z}^d \mid \gcd(n_1, \ldots, n_d) = 1\} \) and \( \theta(\hat{\mathbb{Z}}^d) = 1/\zeta(d) \) gives the probability that \( d \) random integers share no common factor. This can be derived in several ways, see for instance [6]; we sketch another proof in Section 2 below. More generally, \( \theta(\hat{L}) = \frac{1}{\text{vol}(\mathbb{R}^d/L_K)} \) for a lattice \( L \subset \mathbb{R}^d \), see e.g. [3, Prop. 6].

A well-known point set, which can be realised both as the vertices of a substitution tiling and as a cut-and-project set, is the Ammann-Beenker point set. The goal of this paper is to prove that the relative density of visible points in the Ammann-Beenker point set is \( 2(\sqrt{2} - 1)/\zeta_K(2) \). This density was computed by B. Sing in the presentation [7], but he has not published a proof of this result.

2 The density of the visible points of \( \mathbb{Z}^d \)

In this section we show that \( \theta(\hat{\mathbb{Z}}^d) = 1/\zeta(d) \). We shall see that a lot of inspiration can be drawn from this example when calculating the density of the visible points in the Ammann-Beenker point set.
Fix $R > 0$, a Jordan measurable $D \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ and let $P \subset \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ denote the set of prime numbers. For each invisible point $n \in \mathbb{Z}^d \setminus \mathbb{Z}^d$, there is $p \in P$ such that $\frac{n}{p} \in \mathbb{Z}^d$. Setting $\mathbb{Z}^d_* = \mathbb{Z}^d \setminus \{(0, \ldots, 0)\}$ there are only finitely many $p_1, \ldots, p_n \in P$ such that $p_i \mathbb{Z}^d_* \cap RD \neq \emptyset$. By inclusion-exclusion counting we have

$$
\#(\hat{\mathbb{Z}}^d \cap RD) = \# \left( (\mathbb{Z}^d_* \cap RD) \setminus \bigcup_{p \in P} (p \mathbb{Z}^d_* \cap RD) \right) = \# \left( (\mathbb{Z}^d_* \cap RD) \setminus \bigcup_{i=1}^n (p_i \mathbb{Z}^d_* \cap RD) \right)
$$

The last sum can be rewritten to

$$
\sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}} \mu(n) \cdot \#(n \mathbb{Z}^d_* \cap RD),
$$

where $\mu$ is the Möbius function. Hence

$$
\frac{\#(\hat{\mathbb{Z}}^d \cap RD)}{\text{vol}(RD)} = \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}} \frac{\mu(n) \cdot \#(n \mathbb{Z}^d_* \cap RD)}{\text{vol}(RD)} = \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}} \frac{n^d \mu(n) \#(\mathbb{Z}^d_* \cap n^{-1}RD)}{n^d \text{vol}(n^{-1}RD)}.
$$

Letting $R \to \infty$, switching order of limit and summation (for instance justified by finding a constant $C$ depending on $D$ such that $\#(\mathbb{Z}^d_* \cap RD) \leq C \text{vol}(RD)$ for all $R$), using $\theta(\mathbb{Z}^d_*) = 1$ and $1/\zeta(s) = \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}} \frac{\mu(n)}{n^s}$ for $s > 1$, we find that

$$
\theta(\mathbb{Z}^d) = \lim_{R \to \infty} \frac{\#(\hat{\mathbb{Z}}^d \cap RD)}{\text{vol}(RD)} = 1/\zeta(d).
$$

3 Cut-and-project sets and the Ammann-Beenker point set

The Ammann-Beenker point set can be obtained as the vertices of the Ammann-Beenker tiling, a substitution tiling of the plane using a square and a rhombus as tiles, see e.g. [2, Chapter 6.1]. In this paper however, the Ammann-Beenker set is realised as a cut-and-project set, a certain type of point set which we will now define. Cut-and-project sets are sometimes called (Euclidean) model sets. We will use the same notation and terminology for cut-and-project sets as in [4, Sec. 1.2]. For an introduction to cut-and-project sets, see e.g. [2, Ch. 7.2].

If $\mathbb{R}^n = \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^m$, let

$$
\pi : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}^d \quad \pi \text{int} : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}^m
$$

$$(x_1, \ldots, x_n) \mapsto (x_1, \ldots, x_d) \quad (x_1, \ldots, x_n) \mapsto (x_{d+1}, \ldots, x_n)$$

denote the natural projections.

**Definition 3.1.** Let $\mathcal{L} \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be a lattice and $\mathcal{W} \subset \pi \text{int}(\mathcal{L})$ be a set. Then the cut-and-project set of $\mathcal{L}$ and $\mathcal{W}$ is given by $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{W}, \mathcal{L}) = \{\pi(y) \mid y \in \mathcal{L}, \pi \text{int}(y) \in \mathcal{W}\}$.
If $\partial W$ has measure zero with respect to any Haar measure on $\overline{\pi_{\text{int}}(L)}$ we say that $P(W, L)$ is regular. If the interior of $W$ (the window) is non-empty, $P(W, L)$ is relatively dense and if $W$ is bounded, $P(W, L)$ is uniformly discrete (cf. [1] Prop. 3.1). To realise the Ammann-Beenker point set in this way, let $K$ be the number field $\mathbb{Q}(\sqrt{2})$, with algebraic conjugation $x \mapsto \overline{x}$ (we will also write $\overline{x} = (x_1, \ldots, x_n)$ for $x = (x_1, \ldots, x_n) \in \mathbb{K}^n$ and norm $N(x) = xx$. The ring of integers $\mathcal{O}_K = \mathbb{Z}[\sqrt{2}]$ of $K$ is a Euclidean domain with fundamental unit $\lambda := 1 + \sqrt{2}$. With $\zeta := e^{\frac{2\pi i}{3}}$ and $* : K \rightarrow K, x \mapsto x^*$ the automorphism generated by $\zeta \mapsto \zeta^3$, the Ammann-Beenker point set is in [2] Example 7.7] realised as
\[ \{x = x_1 + x_2\zeta \mid x_1, x_2 \in \mathcal{O}_K, x^* \in W_8\}, \]
where $W_8 \subset \mathbb{C}$ is the regular octagon of side length 1 centered at the origin, with sides perpendicular to the coordinate axes.

Let
\[ L = \{(x, \overline{x}) \mid x = (x_1, x_2) \in \mathcal{O}_K^2\} \subset \mathbb{R}^4 \]
be the Minkowski embedding of $\mathcal{O}_K^2$ and let
\[ \tilde{L} = \{(x, \overline{x}) \in L \mid (x_1 - x_2)/\sqrt{2} \in \mathcal{O}_K\}. \]

Then, after a straight-forward translation it is seen that the Ammann-Beenker point set $A$ can be realised in $\mathbb{R}^2$ as $A = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} P(W_A, \tilde{L})$, where $W_A := \sqrt{2}W_8$, i.e. $A$ is the scaling of a cut-and-project set according to [Definition 3.1]

## 4 The density of visible points of $A$

All notation used in this section is defined in and taken from [Section 3]. Since, for any $P \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ whose density exists, and any $c > 0$ it holds that $\theta(cP) = c^{-d}\theta(P)$ and $cP = \overline{cP}$, finding $\theta(A')$ with $A' := \sqrt{2}A = P(W_A, \tilde{L})$ will give the value of $\theta(A)$. As a first step, in [Section 4.1] the asymptotic density of the visible points of the simpler set $B = P(W_A, L) = \{x \in \mathcal{O}_K^2 \mid \overline{x} \in W_A\} \subset \mathcal{O}_K^2$ will be calculated. In [Section 4.2] this result will be used to obtain $\theta(A)$.

### 4.1 The density of visible points of $B$

The following general counting formula for bounded subsets of visible points of a point set $P$ will be needed. Let $P_* = P \setminus \{(0, \ldots, 0)\}$.

**Proposition 4.1.** Let $P \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ be locally finite and fix a set $C \subset \mathbb{R}_{>1}$ such that for each $x \in P \setminus \hat{P}$ there exists $c \in C$ with $x/c \in P$. Let $R > 0$ and a bounded set $D \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ be given. Then
\[
\#(\hat{P} \cap RD) = \sum_{F \subset C} (-1)^{#F} \# \left( P_* \cap \bigcap_{c \in F} cP_* \cap RD \right).
\]

**Proof.** The set $C_R := \{c \in C \mid P_* \cap cP_* \cap RD \neq \emptyset\}$ is finite. Indeed, suppose this is not true and pick distinct $c_1, c_2, \ldots \in C_R$ and corresponding $x_i \in P_* \cap c_iP_* \cap RD$. Since $P$ is locally finite, the sequence $x_1, x_2, \ldots$ contains only finitely many distinct elements. Thus, a subsequence $x_{k_1}, x_{k_2}, \ldots$ which is constant can be extracted, so that $x_{k_i}/c_{k_i} \in \mathbb{R}^d$. \[\square\]
\( \mathcal{P}_s \cap \mathcal{RD} \subset \mathcal{P}_s \cap \mathcal{RD} \) are all distinct, contradiction to \( \mathcal{P} \) being locally finite. Thus, we can write \( C_R = \{c_1, \ldots, c_n\} \) for some \( c_1, \ldots, c_n \in C \). Then

\[
\#(\hat{\mathcal{P}} \cap \mathcal{RD}) = \# \left( (\mathcal{P}_s \cap \mathcal{RD}) \setminus \bigcup_{c \in C} (\mathcal{P}_s \cap c\mathcal{P}_s \cap \mathcal{RD}) \right)
\]

\[
= \#(\mathcal{P}_s \cap \mathcal{RD}) - \# \left( \bigcup_{i=1}^n (\mathcal{P}_s \cap c_i\mathcal{P}_s \cap \mathcal{RD}) \right),
\]

from which the result follows from the inclusion-exclusion counting formula for finite unions of finite sets.

A set \( C \) as in Proposition 4.1 for \( \mathcal{B} \) will be needed, and to this end a visibility condition for the elements of \( \mathcal{B} \) is required. Given \( x_1, x_2 \in \mathcal{O}_K \), let \( \gcd(x_1, x_2) \) be a fixed generator of the ideal generated by \( x_1, x_2 \) and write \( \gcd(x_1, x_2) = 1 \) when \( x_1, x_2 \) are relatively prime. In the following proposition a visibility condition of the complex realisation of the Ammann-Beenker point set given in [11] p. 477 is adapted to our situation.

**Proposition 4.2.** The visible points of \( \mathcal{B} \) are given by

\[
\hat{\mathcal{B}} = \{x = (x_1, x_2) \in \mathcal{B} \mid \gcd(x_1, x_2) = 1, \lambda \mathbf{r} \notin \mathcal{W}_A\}. 
\]

**Proof.** First the necessity of the visibility conditions is established. Take \( x = (x_1, x_2) \) and suppose that \( \gcd(x_1, x_2) \neq 1 \) so that there exists \( c \in \mathcal{O}_K \) with \( |N(c)| > 1 \) and \( c \mid x_1, x_2 \). Scaling \( c \) by units we may assume that \( 1 < c < \lambda \). Suppose first that \( |N(c)| = |\mathbf{r}|c \geq 3 \), which implies \( |\mathbf{r}| > 1 \). By noting that \( \mathcal{W}_A \) is star-shaped with respect to the origin and \( \mathcal{W}_A = -\mathcal{W}_A \) it follows that \( x/c \in \mathcal{B} \), so \( x \) is invisible. If \( |N(c)| = 2 \), then each prime factor of \( c \) must divide \( 2 = \sqrt{2} \cdot \sqrt{2} \), so it can be assumed that \( c = \sqrt{2} \) and hence \( x \) is occluded by \( x/\sqrt{2} \). If \( \lambda \mathbf{r} \in \mathcal{W}_A \) it follows immediately that \( x/\lambda \in \mathcal{B} \).

We now turn to the sufficiency of the visibility conditions. Take \( x = (x_1, x_2) \in \mathcal{B} \setminus \hat{\mathcal{B}} \) and \( c > 1 \) such that \( x/c \in \mathcal{B} \). As \( \mathcal{B} \) is uniformly discrete, we may assume that \( y := x/c \in \hat{\mathcal{B}} \). This implies, by necessity above, that \( \gcd(y_1, y_2) = 1 \). Now, since \( x_i = c y_i \) it follows that \( c \in \mathcal{K} \). Write \( c = a/b \) with \( a, b \in \mathcal{O}_K \) relatively prime. If \( b \) is not a unit, \( \gcd(y_1, y_2) = 1 \) is contradicted, hence \( c \in \mathcal{O}_K \).

If \( |N(c)| \neq 1 \) then \( \gcd(x_1, x_2) \neq 1 \). Otherwise, \( c > 1 \) is a unit, i.e. \( c = \lambda^k \) for some integer \( k > 0 \). Thus \( \frac{x}{c} = \frac{x}{\lambda^k} \in \mathcal{W}_A \). Since \( \lambda = -\lambda \) we get \( (-\lambda)^k \mathbf{r} \in \mathcal{W}_A \) and thus also \( \lambda \mathbf{r} \in \mathcal{W}_A \) as \( \mathcal{W}_A \) is star-shaped with respect to the origin and \( -\mathcal{W}_A = \mathcal{W}_A \). This establishes sufficiency of the visibility conditions.

**Remark.** Note that the proof works just as well for more general windows, that is, \( \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{W}, \mathcal{L}) = \{x \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{W}, \mathcal{L}) \mid \gcd(x_1, x_2) = 1, \lambda \mathbf{r} \notin \mathcal{W}\} \) if \( \mathcal{W} \subset \mathbb{R}^2 \) is bounded with non-empty interior, star-shaped with respect to the origin and \( -\mathcal{W} = \mathcal{W} \).

Let now \( \mathbb{P} = \{\pi \in \mathcal{O}_K \mid \pi \text{ prime}, 1 < \pi < \lambda\} \) and \( C = \mathbb{P} \cup \{\lambda\} \) so that \( \mathbb{P} \) is a set that contains precisely one associate of every prime of \( \mathcal{O}_K \). Then we have the following proposition.

**Proposition 4.3.** For each \( x \in \mathcal{B} \setminus \hat{\mathcal{B}} \) there is \( c \in C \) such that \( x/c \in \mathcal{B} \).
Proof. Fix \( x \in \mathcal{B} \setminus \hat{\mathcal{B}} \). As seen in the proof of Proposition 4.2, there is \( c \in \mathcal{O}_K, c > 1 \), such that \( x/c \in \mathcal{B} \). If \( c \) is not a unit, fix \( \pi \in \mathfrak{P} \) so that \( \pi \mid c \). It can be verified by hand that \( \{(x, \pi) \mid x \in \mathcal{O}_K \} \cap \{1, (1, \lambda) \times (-1, 1)\} = \emptyset \), hence \( |\pi| > 1 \) and \( x/\pi \in \mathcal{B} \). If \( c \) is a unit, \( x/\lambda \in \mathcal{B} \) is immediate. \( \Box \)

Given a finite set \( F \subset \mathcal{O}_K \) let \( I_F \) be the (principal) ideal generated by the elements of \( F \) if \( F \neq \emptyset \) and \( I_F = \mathcal{O}_K \) otherwise. Let \( \ell_F \) denote a fixed least common multiple of \( F \), that is, a generator of the ideal \( \bigcap_{x \in F} \mathfrak{c}\mathcal{O}_K \). Let also \( m_F = \min\{1, \min_{x \in F} |\pi|\} \) and \( \mathcal{L}_F = \{((\ell_F x, \ell_F \overline{x}) \mid x \in \mathcal{O}_K^2\} \). Write \( I \triangleleft \mathcal{O}_K \) when \( I \subset \mathcal{O}_K \) is an ideal and define the absolute norm \( N(I) \) of \( I \) by \( |N(x)| \), where \( x \) is any generator of \( I \). Recall Dedekind’s zeta function \( \zeta_K(s) = \sum_{I \triangleleft \mathcal{O}_K} \frac{1}{N(I)^s} \) for \( s \in \mathbb{C} \) with \( \text{Re}(s) > 1 \).

Given a finite set \( F \subset C \) it is verified that \( \mathfrak{B}_x \cap \bigcap_{x \in F} \mathfrak{c}\mathfrak{B}_x = \mathcal{P}(m_F \mathfrak{W}_A, \mathcal{L}_F) \setminus \{0\} \). For any \( R > 0 \) and bounded \( D \subset \mathbb{R}^2 \), Propositions 4.1, 4.3 imply that

\[
\#(\hat{\mathcal{B}} \cap RD) = \sum_{F \subset C} (-1)^{\#F} \#((\mathcal{P}(m_F \mathfrak{W}_A, \mathcal{L}_F) \setminus \{0\}) \cap RD).
\]

Since \( \ell_F \mathcal{O}_K^2 \subset \pi_{\text{im}}(\mathcal{L}_F) \subset \mathbb{R}^2 \) is dense we have

\[
\theta(\mathcal{P}(m_F \mathfrak{W}_A, \mathcal{L}_F) \setminus \{0\}) = \frac{\text{vol}(m_F \mathfrak{W}_A)}{\text{vol}(\mathbb{R}^2/\mathcal{L}_F)}
\]

from [4 Prop. 3.2]. Dividing (1) by \( \text{vol}(RD) \), letting \( R \to \infty \) and switching order of limit and summation (to be justified in Proposition 4.6 below) we find that

\[
\theta(\hat{\mathcal{B}}) = \sum_{F \subset C} (-1)^{\#F} \frac{\text{vol}(m_F \mathfrak{W}_A)}{\text{vol}(\mathbb{R}^2/\mathcal{L}_F)} = \sum_{F \subset C} (-1)^{\#F} m_F^2 (1 + \sqrt{2}) \frac{2N(\ell_F)^2}{2N(\ell_F)^2},
\]

since \( \text{vol}(\mathfrak{W}_A) = 4(1 + \sqrt{2}) \) and \( \text{vol}(\mathbb{R}^2/\mathcal{L}_F) = 8N(\ell_F)^2 \). The value of the right hand sum will be shown to be \( 1/\zeta_K(2) \) in Theorem 4.7 below. The following lemma gives a bound on the number of points in the intersection of a lattice and a box in terms of the volume of the box, provided that the box is ”not too thin”.

**Lemma 4.4.** Let \( \mathcal{L} \subset \mathbb{R}^d \) be a lattice and let \( c > 0 \) be given. For any \( a_i, b_i \in \mathbb{R} \) with \( b_i - a_i > c \) set \( B = \prod_{i=1}^d [a_i, b_i] \). Then there is a constant \( L \) depending only on \( \mathcal{L} \) and \( c \) such that \( \#(B \cap \mathcal{L}) \leq L\text{vol}(B) \).

**Proof.** Let \( n_i = \lceil \frac{b_i - a_i}{c} \rceil \in \mathbb{Z}_+ \). Then \( \frac{b_i - a_i}{c} \leq n_i < \frac{b_i - a_i}{c} + 1 = \frac{b_i - a_i + c}{c} < \frac{2(b_i - a_i)}{c} \). Hence, with \( n = \prod_{i=1}^d n_i \) it follows that \( n \leq \frac{2^d \text{vol}(B)}{c^d} \). From \( b_i \leq a_i + c n_i \) also \( B \subset \prod_{i=1}^d [a_i, a_i + c n_i] \). Let \( a = (a_1, \ldots, a_d) \) and consider \( -a + \prod_{i=1}^d [a_i, a_i + c n_i] = \prod_{i=1}^d [0, c n_i] \). We have \( \prod_{i=1}^d [0, c n_i] = \sum_{m \in \mathbb{N}_0^d, 0 \leq m_i < n_i} (m c + [0, c]^d) =: B' \). Find now \( D > 0 \) depending on \( \mathcal{L} \) and \( c \) such that \( \text{sup}_{x \in \mathbb{R}^d} \#(\mathcal{L} \cap (t + [0, c]^d)) = D \). Hence \( \#(B \cap \mathcal{L}) \leq \#(B' \cap \mathcal{L}) \leq n D \leq \frac{2^d \text{vol}(B)}{c^d} \), so one can take \( L = \frac{2^d \text{vol}(B)}{c^d} \). \( \Box \)

The following bound will be crucial in the justification of interchanging limit and summation in (1) after division by \( \text{vol}(RD) \).

**Lemma 4.5.** Let \( D \subset \mathbb{R}^2 \) be Jordan measurable. Then there is a constant \( \tilde{L} > 0 \) depending only on \( D \) such that for every \( R > 0 \) and \( F \subset C \) with \( \#F < \infty \),

\[
\#((\mathcal{P}(m_F \mathfrak{W}_A, \mathcal{L}_F) \cap RD) \setminus \{0\}) \leq \frac{\tilde{L} R^2}{N(\ell_F)^2}.
\]
Proof. By definition
\[ \#((\mathcal{P}(m_F \mathcal{W}_A, \mathcal{L}_F) \setminus \{0\}) \cap RD) = \#((\{x \in \ell_F \mathcal{O}_K^2 | x \in m_F \mathcal{W}_A\} \setminus \{0\}) \cap RD). \]

Note that this number is independent of the choice of \(\ell_F\). There is a bijection
\[ \{x \in \ell_F \mathcal{O}_K^2 | x \in m_F \mathcal{W}_A\} \setminus \{0\} \cap RD \rightarrow \{x \in \ell_F \mathcal{O}_K^2 | x \in m_F \mathcal{W}_A\} \setminus \{0\} \cap \frac{RD}{\ell_F} \]
given by \(x \mapsto \frac{x}{\ell_F}\), so it suffices to estimate the number of elements in the latter set. Since \(m_F \leq 1\) it follows that \(\left(\mathcal{L} \cap \left(\frac{RD \times m_F \mathcal{W}_A}{\ell_F}\right)\right) \setminus \{0\} \subset \left(\mathcal{L} \cap \left(\frac{RD \times \mathcal{W}_A}{\ell_F}\right)\right) \setminus \{0\}\). Fix real numbers \(m_1, m_2 > 1\) so that \(D \subset [-m_1, m_1]^2 =: B_1\) and \(\mathcal{W}_A \subset [-m_2, m_2]^2 =: B_2\).

Fix a number \(c\) so that \(c' < c\) implies \((\mathcal{L} \cap (\lambda D \times c' \mathcal{W}_A)) \setminus \{0\} = \emptyset\). This can be done, for otherwise \((\mathcal{L} \cap (\lambda D \times c' \mathcal{W}_A)) \setminus \{0\}\) would be non-empty for each \(c' > 0\), hence \(\mathcal{L} \cap (\lambda D \times \mathcal{W}_A)\) would contain infinitely many points, contradiction, since \(\mathcal{L}\) is a lattice and \(\lambda D \times \mathcal{W}_A\) is bounded.

Suppose first that \(\frac{1}{\ell_F} \leq c\). Scale \(\ell_F\) by units so that \(1 \leq \frac{R}{\ell_F} < \lambda\) which gives \(\frac{1}{\ell_F} \leq \frac{R}{\ell_F} < \lambda\sqrt{c}\). Hence \(\left(\mathcal{L} \cap \left(\frac{RD \times m_F \mathcal{W}_A}{\ell_F}\right)\right) \setminus \{0\} \subset \left(\mathcal{L} \cap \lambda D \times \left(\frac{m_F \mathcal{W}_A}{\ell_F}\right)\right) \setminus \{0\} = \emptyset\) and therefore \# \(\left(\left(\mathcal{L} \cap \left(\frac{RD \times \mathcal{W}_A}{\ell_F}\right)\right) \setminus \{0\}\right) = 0\).

Suppose now that \(\frac{1}{\ell_F} \geq \frac{1}{\lambda} \sqrt{c} > \sqrt{c}\). Thus, \([0, \sqrt{c}]^2 \subset \frac{RD \times \mathcal{W}_A}{\ell_F} =: B\). From Lemma 4.4 we get a constant \(L\) only depending on \(\mathcal{L}\), \(\sqrt{c}\) such that \# \((B \cap \mathcal{L}) \leq L \text{vol}(B) = L \cdot 16m_1^2m_2^2 \frac{R^2}{N(\ell_F)^2}\). Now, since \(\frac{RD}{\ell_F} \times \frac{\mathcal{W}_A}{\ell_F} \subset B\) we get that
\[ \# \left(\left(\mathcal{L} \cap \left(\frac{RD \times \mathcal{W}_A}{\ell_F}\right)\right) \setminus \{0\}\right) \leq \frac{\tilde{L}R^2}{N(\ell_F)^2} \]
with \(\tilde{L} := 16m_1^2m_2^2L\).

\[ \square \]

Proposition 4.6. The equality
\[ \lim_{R \to \infty} \sum_{F \subset C, \#F < \infty} \frac{(-1)^F \#((\mathcal{P}(m_F \mathcal{W}_A, \mathcal{L}_F) \setminus \{0\}) \cap RD)}{\text{vol}(RD)} = \sum_{F \subset C, \#F < \infty} \frac{(-1)^F m_F^2(1 + \sqrt{2})}{2N(\ell_F)^2} \]
holds for all Jordan measurable \(D \subset \mathbb{R}^2\).

Proof. For a finite \(F \subset C\) let \(N(R, F) = \#((\mathcal{P}(m_F \mathcal{W}_A, \mathcal{L}_F) \setminus \{0\}) \cap RD)\). We know that
\[ \lim_{R \to \infty} \frac{N(R, F)}{\text{vol}(RD)} = \frac{m_F^2(1 + \sqrt{2})}{2N(\ell_F)^2} \]
so
\[ \lim_{R \to \infty} \sum_{F \subset C, \#F < \infty} \frac{(-1)^F N(R, F)}{\text{vol}(RD)} = \sum_{F \subset C, \#F < \infty} \lim_{R \to \infty} \frac{(-1)^F N(R, F)}{\text{vol}(RD)} \]
(2)

must be justified. In view of Lemma 4.5
\[ \sum_{F \subset C, \#F < \infty} \left| \frac{(-1)^F N(R, F)}{\text{vol}(RD)} \right| \leq \frac{\tilde{L}}{\text{vol}(D)} \sum_{F \subset C, \#F < \infty} \frac{1}{N(\ell_F)^2} \]

6
and we note that
\[
\sum_{F \in C \atop \# F \leq \infty} \frac{1}{N(\ell_F)^2} = \sum_{F \in C \atop \# F \leq \infty} \frac{1}{N(\ell_F)^2} + \sum_{F \in C \atop \# F \leq \infty} \frac{1}{N(\ell_F)^2} \leq 2 \sum_{I \in \mathcal{O}_K} \frac{1}{N(I)^2},
\]
hence the sums of both sides of (2) are absolutely convergent.

Fix $\Delta > 0$. We claim that there is only a finite number of non-empty $F \subset C$, $\# F < \infty$, such that $|N(\ell_F)| < \Delta$. Given such $F$ let $\ell_F = \prod_{\pi \in F}^c > 1$. Also, since $|\pi| > 1$ for all $\pi \in \mathbb{P}$ we have $|\ell_F| \geq |\lambda|$. Hence, $|N(\ell_F)| = |\ell_F| |\ell_F' | \leq \Delta$ implies $\ell_F' \leq \frac{|\ell_F|}{|\ell_F|} \leq \lambda \Delta$ and hence the sums of both sides of (2) are absolutely convergent.

It follows that
\[
\lim_{R \to \infty} \sum_{F \in C \atop \# F < \infty} \frac{(-1)^{\# F} N(R, F)}{\text{vol}(RD)} - \sum_{F \in C \atop \# F < \infty} \frac{m_F^2 (1 + \sqrt{2})}{2N(\ell_F)^2} \leq \left( \frac{L}{\text{vol}(D)} + \frac{1 + \sqrt{2}}{2} \right) \sum_{F \in C \atop \# F < \infty} \frac{1}{N(\ell_F)^2} \]
where the right hand side tends to 0 as $\Delta \to \infty$ since the tail is the tail of an absolutely convergent sum, hence (2) has been justified.

From Proposition 4.6 it follows that $\theta(\widehat{B}) = \sum_{F \in C \atop \# F < \infty} \frac{(-1)^{\# F} m_F^2 (1 + \sqrt{2})}{2N(\ell_F)^2}$, and it will now be shown that the right hand side is equal to $1/\zeta_K(2)$. Define the function $\omega : \mathcal{O}_K \to \mathbb{C}$, $\omega(x) = \# \{\pi \in \mathbb{P} \mid x/\pi \in \mathcal{O}_K\}$, so that $\omega(x)$ is the number of non-associated prime divisors of $x$. Given $I \in \mathcal{O}_K$, let $\omega(I) = \omega(x)$ for any generator $x$ of $I$ and define a Möbius function on the ideals of $\mathcal{O}_K$ by
\[
\mu(I) = \begin{cases} 
0 & \text{if } \exists \pi \in \mathbb{P} \text{ such that } I \subset \pi^2 \mathcal{O}_K, \\
(-1)^{\omega(I)} & \text{otherwise}.
\end{cases}
\]
One verifies that $\mu(I_1 I_2) = \mu(I_1) \mu(I_2)$ for relatively prime ideals $I_1, I_2$. The function $\zeta_K$ can be expressed as an Euler product for $s$ with $\text{Re}(s) > 1$ as
\[
\zeta_K(s) = \prod_{P \in \mathcal{O}_K, P \text{ prime}} \frac{1}{1 - N(P)^{-s}}
\]
and in analogy with the reciprocal formula for Riemann’s zeta function we have
\[
\frac{1}{\zeta_K(s)} = \sum_{I \in \mathcal{O}_K} \frac{\mu(I)}{N(I)^s}.
\]

**Theorem 4.7.** The density of visible points of $\mathcal{B}$ is given by
\[
\theta(\mathcal{B}) = \frac{1}{\zeta_K(2)} = \frac{48\sqrt{2}}{\pi^4}.
\]
Proof. By Proposition 4.6 we have
\[
\theta(B) = \sum_{F \in C \atop \#F < \infty} \frac{(-1)^F m_F^2 (1 + \sqrt{2})}{2N(\ell_F)^2}.
\]

Splitting the sum into two depending on whether \( \lambda \in F \) or not, and using that \( m_F \) is 1 unless \( \lambda \in F \), in which case \( m_F = |\lambda| = \sqrt{2} - 1 \), we get
\[
\theta(B) = \sum_{F \in C \atop \#F < \infty} \frac{(-1)^F (1 + \sqrt{2})}{2N(\ell_F)^2} + \sum_{\lambda \notin F \atop \#F < \infty} \frac{(-1)^F |\lambda|^2 (1 + \sqrt{2})}{2N(\ell_F)^2}
\]
\[
= \frac{1}{2} \left(1 - |\lambda|^2 \right) (1 + \sqrt{2}) + \sum_{I \in \mathcal{K}} \frac{\mu(I)}{N(I)^2} = \frac{1}{\zeta_K(2)},
\]
last equality by (3). From [8, Theorem 4.2] one can calculate \( \zeta_K(-1) = \frac{1}{12} \) and by the functional equation for Dedekind’s zeta function (cf. e.g. [8, p. 34]) one finds that \( \zeta_K(2) = \frac{\pi^4}{48\sqrt{2}} \) which proves the claim. \( \Box \)

### 4.2 The density of visible points of \( \mathcal{A} \)

Observe that \( \mathcal{A}' = \sqrt{2}\mathcal{A} \subset \mathcal{B} \). It is now shown that \( C \) is also an occluding set for \( \mathcal{A}' \).

**Proposition 4.8.** For each \( x \in \mathcal{A}' \setminus \hat{\mathcal{A}}' \) there is \( c \in C \) such that \( x/c \in \mathcal{A}' \).

**Proof.** Since \( \mathcal{A}' \subset \mathcal{B} \) we have \( \mathcal{A}' \setminus \hat{\mathcal{A}}' \subset \mathcal{B} \setminus \hat{\mathcal{B}} \) and so for each \( x \in \mathcal{A}' \setminus \hat{\mathcal{A}}' \) there exists \( c \in C \) such that \( x/c \in \mathcal{B} \). If \( c \neq \sqrt{2} \), then \( \sqrt{2} \mid \frac{\ell_F - x}{c} \), so \( x/c \notin \mathcal{A}' \).

Take now \( x \in \mathcal{A}' \setminus \hat{\mathcal{A}}' \) such that for all \( c \in C \setminus \{\sqrt{2}\} \) we have \( x/c \notin \mathcal{B} \). Then \( x/\sqrt{2} \in \mathcal{B} \), hence \( \gcd(x_1, x_2) = \sqrt{2} \) for some \( n \geq 1 \). Since \( x \in \mathcal{A}' \setminus \hat{\mathcal{A}}' \), there exists \( c \in \mathbb{Q}(\sqrt{2}) \cap \mathbb{R}_{>1} \) such that \( x/c \in \mathcal{A}' \). Writing \( c = a/b \) with \( \gcd(a, b) = 1 \), the only possible \( \pi \in \mathbb{P} \) with \( \pi \mid a \) is \( \pi = \sqrt{2} \). If \( \sqrt{2} \mid a \), then it follows that \( x/\sqrt{2} \in \mathcal{A}' \).

It remains to check the case where \( a \) is a unit, i.e. \( c = \prod_{\pi \in \mathbb{P}} \pi^{\lambda_\pi} \) for some \( m : \mathbb{P} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} \) with finite support. The facts that \( c > 1 \) and \( \pi > 1 \) for all \( \pi \in \mathbb{P} \) imply \( n > 0 \). We have \( x/\sqrt{2} \notin \mathcal{B} \), hence \( \pi \notin |\lambda| \mathcal{W}_\mathcal{A} \). Since \( x/c \in \sqrt{2}\mathcal{A} \) it follows that \( \pi \in |\pi| \mathcal{W}_\mathcal{A} \) and hence \( |\pi| > |\lambda| \). However
\[
|\pi| = \frac{|\lambda|^n}{\prod_{\pi \in \mathbb{P}} |\pi|^{k(\pi)} \leq |\lambda|^n \leq |\lambda|},
\]
contradiction. \( \Box \)

**Theorem 4.9.** We have \( \theta(\hat{\mathcal{A}}') = \frac{1}{2\zeta_K(2)} \), hence \( \theta(\hat{\mathcal{A}}) = \frac{1}{\zeta_K(2)} \).

**Proof.** Propositions 4.8 imply
\[
\frac{\#(\hat{\mathcal{A}} \cap RD)}{\text{vol}(RD)} = \sum_{F \in C \atop \#F < \infty} \frac{(-1)^F \# ((\mathcal{A}' \cap \mathcal{A}' \cap c\mathcal{A}' \cap RD))/\text{vol}(RD)}{\text{vol}(RD)}.
\]
and it is straightforward to verify that \( A'_s \cap \bigcap_{c \in F} cA'_s = \mathcal{P}(m_F \mathcal{W}_A, \widetilde{L}_F) \setminus \{0\} \) with 
\( \widetilde{L}_F = \{(\ell_F x, \ell_F x) \mid x \in K, (x_1 - x_2)/\sqrt{2} \in \mathcal{O}_K\} \) a sublattice of \( L_F \) of index 2. Hence, by [4, Prop. 3.2], when letting \( R \to \infty \) inside the sum (4) one obtains

\[
\sum_{F \subseteq C \#F < \infty} (-1)^F \frac{\text{vol}(m_F \mathcal{W}_A)}{16N(\ell_F)},
\]

whence \( \theta(\sqrt{2}A) = \frac{1}{2\zeta_K(2)} \) follows by Proposition 4.6 and Theorem 4.7 and the other result is immediate as \( \sqrt{2}A = A'_s \).

\[\square\]

Remark. The data of Table 2 of [1] shows that \( \#(\hat{A} \cap RD)/\#(A \cap RD) \approx 0.577 \) for a particular \( D \) and fairly large \( R \). This agrees with our results, since

\[
\kappa_A = \lim_{R \to \infty} \frac{\#(\hat{A} \cap RD)}{\#(A \cap RD)} = \frac{\theta(\hat{A})}{\theta(A)} = \frac{1}{\zeta_K(2)} = \frac{2(\sqrt{2} - 1)}{\zeta_K(2)} = 0.5773\ldots
\]
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