

Discrepancy bounds over function fields

Daniel Miller

August 19, 2016

Let C/\mathbf{F}_p be smooth proper curve, \mathcal{F} a smooth l -adic sheaf, pure of weight zero on C . Let G^{geom} be the geometric monodromy group of \mathcal{F} , and assume what is necessary (see §9.0 of Katz–Sarnak) for the Sato–Tate conjecture for \mathcal{F} to make sense. Let K be a maximal compact subgroup of $G^{\text{geom}}(\mathbf{C})$ and K^{\natural} the set of conjugacy classes in K . For each $c \in C$, we have the Frobenius conjugacy class $\vartheta(c) \in K^{\natural}$. Katz–Sarnak prove that, for each irreducible $\rho: K \rightarrow \text{GL}(n, \mathbf{C})$, we have the bound

$$\left| \frac{1}{\#\{c \in |C| : \deg c \leq N\}} \sum_{c \in |C| : \deg c \leq N} \text{tr } \rho(\vartheta(c)) \right| \ll \#\{c \in |C| : \deg c \leq N\}^{-\frac{1}{2}}.$$

In simpler terms, if we enumerate the $c \in |C|$ as c_1, c_2, \dots with ascending degree, then

$$\left| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n \leq N} \text{tr } \rho(\vartheta(c_n)) \right| \ll N^{-\frac{1}{2}}. \quad (1)$$

I am wondering whether a similar bound is known on the discrepancy of the $\vartheta(c_n)$. For example, assume $K = \text{SU}(2)$, so that $K^{\natural} = [0, \pi]$. Put

$$D_N(\{\vartheta(c_n)\}) = \sup_{0 \leq \alpha \leq \pi} \left| \frac{\#\{n \leq N : \vartheta(c_n) \in [0, \alpha]\}}{N} - \int_0^\alpha \frac{2}{\pi} \sin^2(\theta) d\theta \right|.$$

It is natural to conjecture (Akiyama and Tanigawa have for elliptic curves over \mathbf{Q}) that

$$D_N(\{\vartheta(c_n)\}) \ll N^{-\frac{1}{2} + \epsilon}. \quad (2)$$

Is this known in the above case? Via the Koksma–Hlawka inequality, a discrepancy bound like (2) certainly implies the estimate (1), but I am wondering if (2) is known even in the case where \mathcal{F} comes from a family of elliptic curves E/C .

I have constructed a sequence of angles $\vartheta_n \in [0, \pi]$ such that $|\sum_{n \leq N} \text{tr } \rho(\vartheta_n)| \ll_\rho 1$, but for which the discrepancy decays like $N^{-1/k}$ for arbitrary k . So analytically, there is no a priori reason that the truth of (1) should imply that of (2).