

# Counterexamples related to the Sato–Tate conjecture for CM abelian varieties\*

Daniel Miller

31 March 2017

## 1 Introduction and motivation

Let  $K/\mathbf{Q}$  be a finite Galois extension,  $A/K$  a  $g$ -dimensional abelian variety. Fix a rational prime  $l$ ; then the  $l$ -adic Tate module of  $A$  gives a representation  $\rho_l: G_{\mathbf{Q}} = \text{Gal}(\overline{\mathbf{Q}}/\mathbf{Q}) \rightarrow \text{GL}_{2g}(\mathbf{Q}_l)$ . The image actually lies in the subgroup  $\text{GSp}_{2g}(\mathbf{Q}_l)$  preserving the Weil pairing, but we won't worry about that. If we write  $F = \text{End}_K(A)_{\mathbf{Q}}$ , then since  $\rho_l$  commutes with  $F$ , the representation actually takes values in  $\text{GL}_{2g/[F:\mathbf{Q}]}(F \otimes \mathbf{Q}_l)$ . We are interested in the extreme case, when  $[F : \mathbf{Q}] = 2g$ . When this occurs, we say that  $A$  has complex multiplication defined over  $K$ . Write  $R_{F/\mathbf{Q}} \mathbf{G}_m$  for the algebraic group whose functor of points is, for any  $\mathbf{Q}$ -algebra  $R$ , given by  $(R \otimes \mathbf{Q}_l)^{\times}$ . The representation  $\rho_l$  is a map  $\rho_l: G_{\mathbf{Q}} \rightarrow (R_{F/\mathbf{Q}} \mathbf{G}_m)(\mathbf{Q}_l)$ . The *motivic Galois group* of  $A$  is a  $\mathbf{Q}$ -subgroup  $G_A \subset R_{F/\mathbf{Q}} \mathbf{G}_m$  such that for all  $l$ ,  $\overline{\text{im}(\rho_l)}^{\text{Zar}} = G_A(\mathbf{Q}_l)$ . It has a canonical subgroup  $G_A^1 = G_A^{N_{F/\mathbf{Q}}=1}$ , which we will not motivate here. There is a direct description of  $G_A$ . Let  $\det_{\mathfrak{a}}: R_{K/\mathbf{Q}} \rightarrow R_{F/\mathbf{Q}}$  be induced by the determinant of the  $K$ -action on  $\mathfrak{a} = \text{Lie}(A)$ , viewed as an  $F$ -vector space. Then  $G_A = \text{im}(\det_{\mathfrak{a}})$ . The *Sato–Tate group* of  $A$  is the maximal compact subgroup of the torus  $G_A^1(\mathbf{C})$ . So  $\text{ST}(A) = (\mathbf{R}/\mathbf{Z})^d$  for some  $1 \leq d \leq g$ . If  $A$  has good reduction at  $\mathfrak{p} \nmid l$ , then  $\rho_l(\text{fr}_{\mathfrak{p}})$  actually lives in  $F^{\times}$  and is independent of  $l$ . Write  $\pi_{\mathfrak{p}} \in F^{\times}$  for this quantity; it is a  $\mathfrak{p}$ -Weil number of weight 1, i.e.  $|\sigma(\pi_{\mathfrak{p}})| = N(\mathfrak{p})^{1/2}$  for all  $\sigma: F \hookrightarrow \mathbf{C}$ . Even better, Shimura–Taniyama–Weil have constructed a continuous homomorphism  $\varepsilon: \mathbf{A}_K^{\times} \rightarrow F^{\times}$  which agrees with  $\det_{\mathfrak{a}}$  on  $K^{\times} \subset \mathbf{A}_K^{\times}$ , and for almost all  $\mathfrak{p}$ , sends a uniformizer  $\varpi_{\mathfrak{p}}$  for  $\mathfrak{p}$  to the element  $\pi_{\mathfrak{p}}$ .

For any  $\sigma: F \hookrightarrow \mathbf{C}$ , let  $\chi_{\sigma}: \mathbf{A}_K^{\times}/K^{\times} \rightarrow \mathbf{C}^{\times}$  be the quasicharacter  $\chi_{\sigma}(x) = \sigma(\varepsilon(x)\psi(x_{\infty})^{-1})$ . Here,  $\varepsilon(x)\psi(x_{\infty})^{-1} \in (F \otimes \mathbf{R})^{\times}$ , and we write  $\sigma$  for the

---

\*Notes for a talk given in Cornell's Number Theory Seminar.

map  $(F \otimes \mathbf{R})^\times \rightarrow \mathbf{C}^\times$  induced by  $\sigma$ . If we write also  $\sigma$  for the corresponding character of  $R_{F/\mathbf{Q}} \mathbf{G}_m$ , then there is equality

$$L(\sigma_* \rho_l, s) = L(s, \chi_\sigma).$$

Given any  $r = \sum m_\sigma \sigma \in X^*(R_{F/\mathbf{Q}} \mathbf{G}_m)$ , put

, and  $\theta_{\mathfrak{p}} = \frac{\rho_l(\text{fr}_{\mathfrak{p}})}{N(\mathfrak{p})^{1/2}}$  lies in  $\text{ST}(A)$ . The *Sato–Tate conjecture* for  $A$  tells us that the  $\theta_{\mathfrak{p}}$  are equidistributed in  $\text{ST}(A)$ , i.e. for all  $f \in C(\text{ST}(A))$ , we have

$$\int f(x) dx = \lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\pi_K(x)} \sum_{N(\mathfrak{p}) \leq x} f(\theta_{\mathfrak{p}})$$

Serre outlined a way to prove the Sato–Tate conjecture. Note first that any character of  $\text{ST}(A)$  is induced by an algebraic character of  $G_A$ . Given  $r \in X^*(G_A)$ , we associate  $L(r_* \rho_l, s)$  with the composite Galois representation  $r \circ \rho_l: G_{\mathbf{Q}} \rightarrow \overline{\mathbf{Q}}_l^\times$ . To prove the Sato–Tate conjecture for  $A$ , it suffices to show that for all  $f$ , the function  $L(r_* \rho_l, s)$  admits non-vanishing meromorphic continuation past  $\Re = 1$ , with at most a simple pole at  $s = 1$ . We will see later how this is done. For our purposes, note that it also suffices to show that for all  $r \in X^*(G_A)$  which induce a nontrivial character of  $\text{ST}(A)$ , a bound of the form

$$\left| \sum_{N(\mathfrak{p}) \leq x} r(\theta_{\mathfrak{p}}) \right| = o(\pi_K(x)).$$

If we can replace  $o(\pi_K(x))$  with  $x^{-\frac{1}{2}+\epsilon}$ , we will have established the Riemann hypothesis for  $L(r_* \rho_l, s)$ .

Unitary representations of  $\text{ST}(A)$  are just characters, and basic representation theory tells us that all such representations are induced by an (algebraic) character of  $G_A$  defined over  $\overline{\mathbf{Q}}$ . For  $r \in X^*(G_A)$ , there is an  $L$ -function  $L(r_* \rho_l, s)$  coming from the composite Galois representation  $r \circ \rho_l: G_{\mathbf{Q}} \rightarrow G_A(\mathbf{Q}_l) \rightarrow \overline{\mathbf{Q}}_l^\times$ . The Sato–Tate conjecture for  $A$  says that all  $L(r_* \rho_l, s)$  have non-vanishing analytic continuation past  $\Re = 1$ , and the Generalized Riemann hypothesis for  $A$  says that all  $L(r_* \rho_l, s)$  satisfy the Riemann hypothesis.

Choose an isomorphism  $(\mathbf{R}/\mathbf{Z})^d \simeq \text{ST}(A)$ , and put

$$D_x(A) = \sup_{t \in [0,1]^d} \left| \frac{1}{\pi_K(x)} \sum_{N(\mathfrak{p}) \leq x} 1_{[0,t]}(\theta_{\mathfrak{p}}) - \int 1_{[0,t]} \right|.$$

Akiyama and Tanigawa conjectured that for non-CM elliptic curves,  $D_x(E) \ll x^{-\frac{1}{2}+\epsilon}$ . We call the “Akiyama–Tanigawa conjecture” for  $A$  the discrepancy decays like  $D_x(A) \ll x^{-\frac{1}{2}+\epsilon}$ . Via the Koksma–Hlawka inequality, the Akiyama–Tanigawa conjecture implies that for all bounded-variation functions  $f$  on

$\text{ST}(A)$ , the estimate

$$\left| \sum_{\mathbf{N}(\mathfrak{p}) \leq x} f(\theta_{\mathfrak{p}}) \right| \ll \text{Var}(f) x^{\frac{1}{2} + \epsilon}.$$

For  $r \in X^*(G_A)$ , this estimate implies the Riemann hypothesis for the  $L$ -function  $L(r_*\rho_l, s)$ .

Analogy with Artin  $L$ -functions (go into detail here!) seems to suggest that if all  $L(r_*\rho_l, s)$  satisfy the Riemann Hypothesis, then the Akiyama–Tanigawa conjecture for  $A$  holds. We'll show: this converse is false, in a limited sense.

## 2 Diophantine approximation

Let  $x \in [0, 1]$  be irrational. It is well known that the sequence  $(x \bmod 1, 2x \bmod 1, 3x \bmod 1, \dots)$  is equidistributed in  $[0, 1]$ . What is less well known is that the rate of convergence of empirical measures from this sequence to the uniform measure is governed by the irrationality measure of  $x$ . The irrationality measure  $\mu(x)$  is the supremum of the set of  $w \geq 1$  such that there are infinitely many  $p/q$  with  $\left| \mu - \frac{p}{q} \right| \leq q^{-w}$ . Let's generalize this to higher-dimensional space. If  $\vec{x} \in \mathbf{R}^d$ , let  $\omega_0(\vec{x})$  (resp.  $\omega_{d-1}(\vec{x})$ ) be the supremum of the set of  $w$  such that there exist infinitely many  $(n, \vec{m}) \in \mathbf{Z} \times \mathbf{Z}^d$  such that

$$\begin{aligned} |n\vec{x} - \vec{m}|_{\infty} &\leq |(n, \vec{m})|_{\infty}^{-w} \quad (\text{resp.} \\ |n + \langle \vec{m}, \vec{x} \rangle| &\leq |(n, \vec{m})|_{\infty}^{-w}. \end{aligned}$$

There are quantities  $\omega_i(\vec{x})$ ,  $i = 0, \dots, d-1$ , defined in terms of approximation of  $\vec{x}$  in terms of rational linear projective varieties of dimension  $i$ , but we do not need them.

A theorem of Jarník says that if  $w \geq 1/d$ , then there exists  $\vec{x} \in \mathbf{R}^d$  such that  $\omega_0(\vec{x}) = w$  and  $\omega_{d-1}(\vec{x}) = dw + d - 1$ . It is clear that if  $d = 1$ , then  $\omega_0(x) + 1$  is the traditional irrationality measure of  $x$ . The key fact we need is that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{d(n\vec{x}, \mathbf{Z}^d)} &\ll |n|^{\omega_0(\vec{x}) + \epsilon} \\ \frac{1}{d(\langle \vec{m}, \vec{x} \rangle, \mathbf{Z})} &\ll |\vec{m}|_{\infty}^{\omega_{d-1}(\vec{x}) + \epsilon}. \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, if we let  $\vec{x} = (\vec{x} \bmod \mathbf{Z}^d, 2\vec{x} \bmod \mathbf{Z}^d, \dots)$  in  $(\mathbf{R}/\mathbf{Z})^d$ , then

$$\begin{aligned} D_N(\mathbf{x}) &\ll N^{-\frac{1}{\omega_{d-1}(\vec{x})} + \epsilon} \\ D_N(\mathbf{x}) &= \Omega\left(N^{-\frac{d}{\omega_0(\vec{x})} - \epsilon}\right). \end{aligned}$$

In particular, this means that if  $\omega_0(\vec{x}) = w$  and  $\omega_{d-1}(\vec{x}) = dw + d - 1$ , then  $D_N(\mathbf{x}) \ll N^{-\frac{1}{dw+d-1}+\epsilon}$  and  $D_N(\mathbf{x}) = \Omega(N^{-\frac{d}{w}-\epsilon})$ . By letting  $w$  get very large, we can ensure that  $D_N(\mathbf{x})$  decays very slowly.

### 3 Fake Satake parameters

Given a sequence  $(z_p)$  of complex numbers, the corresponding Dirichlet series is

$$L(s) = \prod (1 - z_p p^{-s})^{-1},$$

with terms omitted when  $z_p$  is undefined. The Riemann Hypothesis for  $L(s)$  follows from a bound of the form  $|\sum_{p \leq x} z_p| \ll x^{\frac{1}{2}+\epsilon}$ . Now suppose  $z_p = f(x_p)$ , for  $f \in C^\infty((\mathbf{R}/\mathbf{Z})^d)$ , and  $x_{p_n} = n\vec{x} \bmod \mathbf{Z}^d$ . Then we need to bound sums of the form  $\sum_{n \leq N} f(n\vec{x})$  for  $f$  smooth. Suppose  $f(\vec{y}) = e^{2\pi i \langle \vec{m}, \vec{y} \rangle}$ . Then

$$\left| \sum_{n \leq N} f(n\vec{x}) \right| = \left| \frac{(e^{2\pi i \langle \vec{m}, \vec{x} \rangle})^{N+1} - e^{2\pi i \langle \vec{m}, \vec{x} \rangle}}{e^{2\pi i \langle \vec{m}, \vec{x} \rangle} - 1} \right| \leq \frac{2}{|e^{2\pi i \langle \vec{m}, \vec{x} \rangle} - 1|}.$$

It's easy to check that

$$\frac{1}{|e^{2\pi i \langle \vec{m}, \vec{x} \rangle} - 1|} \leq \frac{1}{d(\langle \vec{m}, \vec{x} \rangle, \mathbf{Z})},$$

so we get the bound  $\left| \sum_{n \leq N} f(n\vec{x}) \right| \ll |\vec{m}|_\infty^{\omega_{d-1}(\vec{x})+\epsilon}$ .

This tells us that the  $L$ -function  $\prod (1 - f(x_p)p^{-s})^{-1}$  satisfies the Riemann Hypothesis, but the  $x_p$  have very slowly decaying discrepancy.