

# Random Ideals

Katharina Boudgoust

May 30, 2020

## 1 Introduction

Number theory, as the name indicates, is the mathematical study of numbers. Given two integers  $x$  and  $y$  in  $\mathbb{Z}$ , one can do a lot of funny things with them, as we learned in school. One can compute their sum  $x + y$ , their product  $x \cdot y$  or even their *greatest common divisor*  $\gcd(x, y)$ , which is the smallest integer that divides both  $x$  and  $y$ . If the  $\gcd(x, y)$  is 1, we call them *relatively prime*. An interesting result in number theory says that the probability that two random positive integers are relatively prime is  $6/\pi^2$ . This happens to be exactly the value of  $1/\zeta(2)$ , where  $\zeta$  is the [Riemann zeta function](#). More generally, one can prove that the probability that  $n$  positive integers are pairwise relatively prime is  $1/\zeta(n)$ . We can even further generalize this statement for any algebraic number field  $K$  with associated ring of integers  $O_K$ . We call two nonzero ideals  $\mathfrak{a}$  and  $\mathfrak{b}$  of  $O_K$  *relatively prime* if there does not exist a prime ideal  $\mathfrak{p} \subseteq O_K$  such that  $\mathfrak{p}|\mathfrak{a}$  and  $\mathfrak{p}|\mathfrak{b}$ . Sittinger and DeMoss show in [\(DS18\)](#) the following result:

**Theorem 1.1.** *Fix a positive integer  $n$ . Then, the probability that  $n$  nonzero ideals of  $O_K$  are relatively prime equals*

$$\begin{aligned} P_n &= \prod_{\mathfrak{p}} \left(1 - \frac{1}{\mathfrak{N}(\mathfrak{p})}\right)^n + \frac{n}{\mathfrak{N}(\mathfrak{p})} \cdot \left(1 - \frac{1}{\mathfrak{N}(\mathfrak{p})}\right)^{n-1} \\ &= \prod_{\mathfrak{p}} \left(1 - \frac{1}{\mathfrak{N}(\mathfrak{p})}\right)^{n-1} \cdot \left(1 + \frac{n-1}{\mathfrak{N}(\mathfrak{p})}\right), \end{aligned}$$

where the product runs over all prime ideals  $\mathfrak{p}$  in  $O_K$  and where  $\mathfrak{N}$  denotes the norm of an ideal.

In general it is quite tricky to compute an *infinite* product. However, in many cases, it is sufficient to only know an approximative value of this probability. Sittinger and DeMoss [\(DS18\)](#) give a lower bound on the number  $N$  of prime ideals that we need to use in the product in order to have a satisfying approximation of the probability  $P_n$ . More precisely, let  $d$  denote the degree of  $O_K$  and  $t$  denote the decimal point accuracy for  $P_n$  that we want to have. In this case

$$N \geq \frac{d(n-1)^2 \cdot 10^t + (n-3)}{2}$$

is sufficient. In [\(DS18, Fig. 1\)](#), the authors give approximations of this probability for different examples of number fields. For example, for the case of the 5-th cyclotomic number field, the probability is approximatively 0.9155.

In this repository, we include a sage code to compute this probability for any cyclotomic number field.

## 2 Cyclotomic fields

In order to understand the sage code, it is crucial to understand how some specific ideals behave in the ring of integers  $O_K$ , when  $K$  is a cyclotomic number field. We only recall some important results that we use without proving or motivating them. We refer an interested reader to (LPR13) and (Con) for more details.

A *number field*  $K = \mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$  of degree  $d$  is a finite extension of the rational number field  $\mathbb{Q}$  obtained by adjoining an algebraic number  $\zeta$ . The set of all algebraic integers of  $K$  defines a ring, called the *ring of integers* which we denote by  $O_K$ .

A first fact that we need to know is that the norm of a prime ideal  $\mathfrak{p}$  in  $O_K$  is a power of a prime. Further, for every prime  $p$  the norm of the ideal generated by  $p$  has norm  $p^d$ , where  $d$  is the degree of the number field. Thus, in order to find all prime ideals in  $O_K$ , it is sufficient to compute the prime ideal factorization of the ideals  $\langle p \rangle$ , where  $p$  is a prime. Fortunately, this factorization in  $O_K$  exists and is unique (we call those rings *Dedekind domains*). In the special case of cyclotomic number fields, we exactly know the factoring behavior of those ideals.

A number field  $K$  is called the  $m$ -th *cyclotomic field*, when  $\zeta$  is a primitive  $m$ -th root of unity. In this case the equality  $O_K = \mathbb{Z}[\zeta]$  holds. We denote by  $\varphi(m) = d$  the degree of  $O_K$ , where  $\varphi$  denotes the *Euler's totient function*. To give a concrete example, let  $m = 2^k$  be a power of two. Then we can think of  $\zeta$  as  $\exp(2\pi i/m)$  and  $O_K$  will be isomorphic to  $\mathbb{Z}[x]/\langle x^{m/2} + 1 \rangle$ .

In the case of cyclotomic number fields, we know how the prime ideal factorization of principal ideals generated by prime numbers behaves. In more details, for an integer prime  $p \in \mathbb{Z}$ , the factorization of the principal ideal  $\langle p \rangle \subseteq O_K$  is as follows. Let  $\ell \geq 0$  be the largest integer such that  $p^\ell$  divides  $m$ , let  $h = \varphi(p^\ell)$ , and let  $f \geq 1$  be the multiplicative order of  $p$  modulo  $m/p^\ell$ . Further let  $g = d/(hf)$ . Then the ideal  $\langle p \rangle$  splits in exactly  $g$  distinct prime ideals each of norm  $p^f$ , i.e.,  $\langle p \rangle = \mathfrak{p}_1^h \cdots \mathfrak{p}_g^h$ .

To illustrate this, we may look at the specific case where  $p = 1 \bmod m$ . Then we know that the ideal generated by  $p$  totally splits in  $d$  distinct primes, each of norm  $p$  (use  $\ell = 0, h = 1, f = 1$ ). Another example is the case where  $m$  is prime and thus for every  $p \neq m$  we know that  $\ell = 0$  and  $h = 1$ . Thus, the multiplicative order of  $p$  modulo  $m$  fully determines how the ideal  $\langle p \rangle$  splits in  $O_K$ .

## References

- [Con] K. Conrad. The different ideal. <http://www.math.uconn.edu/~kconrad/blurbs/gradnumthy/different.pdf>.
- [DS18] Ryan D. DeMoss and Brian D. Sittinger. The probability that ideals in a number ring are  $k$ -wise relatively  $r$ -prime, 2018.
- [LPR13] V. Lyubashevsky, C. Peikert, and O. Regev. On ideal lattices and learning with errors over rings. *J. ACM*, 60(6):43:1–43:35, 2013.