

# Dedekind Zeta Functions and the Complexity of Hilbert's Nullstellensatz

J. Maurice Rojas\*

November 10, 2018

## Abstract

Let **HN** denote the problem of determining whether a system of multivariate polynomials with integer coefficients has a complex root. It has long been known that  $\mathbf{HN} \in \mathbf{P} \implies \mathbf{P} = \mathbf{NP}$  and, thanks to recent work of Koiran, it is now known that the truth of the **Generalized Riemann Hypothesis (GRH)** yields the implication  $\mathbf{HN} \notin \mathbf{P} \implies \mathbf{P} \neq \mathbf{NP}$ . We show that the assumption of GRH in the latter implication can be replaced by either of two more plausible hypotheses from analytic number theory. The first is an effective short interval Prime Ideal Theorem with explicit dependence on the underlying field, while the second can be interpreted as a quantitative statement on the higher moments of the zeroes of Dedekind zeta functions. In particular, both assumptions can still hold even if GRH is false. We thus obtain a new application of Dedekind zero estimates to computational algebraic geometry. Along the way, we also apply recent explicit algebraic and analytic estimates, some due to Silberman and Sombra, which may be of independent interest.

## 1 Introduction and Main Results


Deciding whether a system of multivariate polynomial equations has a solution is arguably the most fundamental problem of algebraic complexity. Over the ring  $\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}$  this problem defines the famous complexity class **NP** and is the subject of much interest in proof systems theory (see, e.g., [BIKPP96]). Over the complex numbers this problem is a cornerstone of computational algebraic geometry and is the defining problem of the complexity class  $\mathbf{NP}_{\mathbb{C}}$  of the recent BSS model over  $\mathbb{C}$  [BCSS98]. Let **HN** denote the problem of determining whether a multivariate system of polynomials with **integer** coefficients has a **complex** root. It has been known at least since the 1980's that  $\mathbf{HN} \in \mathbf{PSPACE}$  (see, e.g., [Can88]), and that the special case of two univariate polynomials is already **NP**-hard [Pla84].

**Remark 1** *Recall the following containments of complexity classes:*

---

\*Department of Mathematics, Texas A&M University, TAMU 3368, College Station, Texas 77843-3368, USA. e-mail: rojas@math.tamu.edu, web page: <http://www.math.tamu.edu/~rojas>.

This research was partially supported by NSF grant DMS-0211458 a grant from the Texas A&M College of Science.



and that all these complexity classes consist of **decision** problems, i.e., problems where the answer to any instance is either **Yes** or **No**. In particular, the properness of **every** inclusion above is a major open problem, and even the inclusion  $\mathbf{P} \subseteq \mathbf{PSPACE}$  is not known to be proper [Zac86, BM88, BF91, Pap95]. The definitions of the aforementioned complexity classes are reviewed briefly in Section 2.  $\diamond$

Here we use analytic number theory to get a simple, surprisingly fast algorithm for **HN**. Our algorithm is completely different from the usual Gröbner basis, resultant, or homotopy methods from computational algebraic geometry. Indeed, the latter methods result in a complexity bound of at best **PSPACE** for deciding the existence of a complex root (see, e.g., [Can88, Roj00]), while our algorithm yields a bound of **AM** — the so-called **Arthur-Merlin** class [BM88] — under either of two plausible number-theoretic assumptions: **GIPIT** and **DZH**. In particular, an Arthur-Merlin bound for **HN** was known earlier only under the assumption of the **Generalized Riemann Hypothesis (GRH)** [Koi96] (see the next section for its statement), while our new hypotheses can both continue to hold even if GRH is false.

In essence, our approach begins by naturally associating a finite algebraic extension  $K$  of  $\mathbb{Q}$  to any polynomial system  $F$ . Then, if the prime ideals in the ring of integers  $\mathcal{O}_K$  of  $K$  are sufficiently well behaved, we can use a randomized sampling trick to relate the existence of complex roots of  $F$  to the existence of roots of a mod  $p$  reduction of  $F$ . Our hypotheses GIPIT and DZH (short for **Good Short Interval Prime Ideal Theorem** and **Dedekind Zero Hypothesis**) are then simply the two most convenient statements encoding what sort of quantitative behavior we require from the prime ideals of  $\mathcal{O}_K$ . To arrive quickly at our main results, we postpone the exact statements of these hypotheses for the next section.

**Definition 1** Let  $f_1, \dots, f_k \in \mathbb{Z}[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ ,  $F := (f_1, \dots, f_n)$ , and let  $\sigma(F)$ , the **sparse size** (or **bit size**) of  $F$ , denote the number of bits<sup>1</sup> needed to write down the monomial term expansions of all the  $f_i$ . (So only monomials which appear are counted, and we (internally) assume all coefficients **and** exponents are written in binary.)  $\diamond$

**Theorem 1** Following the notation above, suppose either GIPIT or DZH is true. Then  $\mathbf{HN} \in \mathbf{AM}$ . Furthermore,

$$\text{GRH} \implies \text{DZH} \implies \text{GIPIT} \implies \mathbf{HN} \in \mathbf{AM} \implies [\mathbf{HN} \notin \mathbf{P} \implies \mathbf{P} \neq \mathbf{NP}],$$

and both GIPIT and DZH can hold even if GRH is false.

---

<sup>1</sup>The sparse size thus obviously extends to integers:  $a \in \mathbb{Z} \implies \sigma(a) = 1 + \lceil \log_2(1 + |a|) \rceil$ .

The very last implication follows easily from the basic facts that  $\mathbf{AM} \subseteq \mathbf{P}^{\mathbf{NP}^{\mathbf{NP}}}$  and  $\mathbf{P} = \mathbf{NP} \implies \mathbf{P} = \mathbf{P}^{\mathbf{NP}} = \mathbf{P}^{\mathbf{NP}^{\mathbf{NP}}}$  [Pap95]. Note also that the implication  $\mathbf{HN} \in \mathbf{P} \implies \mathbf{P} = \mathbf{NP}$  holds unconditionally, thanks to the aforementioned  $\mathbf{NP}$ -hardness of  $\mathbf{HN}$  [Pla84].

The algorithm underlying Theorem 1 is based on the following quantitative result relating prime distributions and solvability over the complex numbers and finite fields.

**Theorem 2** *Following the notation above, there are positive integers  $t_F$ ,  $a_F$ , and  $C_F$  (depending on  $F$ ) such that the following assertions hold:*

1.  *$F$  has no complex root  $\implies$  the mod  $p$  reduction of  $F$  has a root in  $(\mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z})^n$  for at most  $a_F$  primes  $p$ . In particular,  $\sigma(a_F) = O(\sigma(F)^2)$ .*
2.  *$F$  has at least one complex root  $\implies$  for all integers  $t \geq t_F$ , there is a prime  $p \in \{t^{C_F} + 1, \dots, (t+1)^{C_F}\}$  such that the mod  $p$  reduction of  $F$  has a root in  $(\mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z})^n$ .*
3. *We have  $C_F = 2^{O(\sigma(F))}$  and  $t_F = O(1)$  unconditionally.*
4. *If either of DZH or GIPIT are true, then we can assert further that  $C_F = O(\sigma(F)^\kappa)$  and  $t_F = O(\sigma(F)^\kappa)$  for some effectively computable absolute constant  $\kappa > 0$ .*
5. *If GRH is true then we can assert even further that  $C_F = O(\sigma(F)^{2.01})$  and  $t_F = O(1)$ .*

**Note:** *Throughout this paper, all  $O$ -constants and  $\Omega$ -constants are absolute and effectively computable.  $\diamond$*

Explicit formulae for  $t_F$ ,  $a_F$ , and  $C_F$ , under the assumption of GRH, were derived earlier in [Roj00, Sec. 6.1.6, Rems. 12 and 13]. Although Assertion (1) was observed earlier by Koiran [Koi96, Thm. 5] (following easily from earlier work of János Kollár [Kol88]), we point out that Assertion (2) appears to be new. In particular, the existence of a sequence of polynomial growth, interleaving the set of primes  $p$  for which the mod  $p$  reduction of  $F$  has a root in  $(\mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z})^n$ , was known earlier only under strong restrictions: One either needed to assume GRH [Koi96, Thm. 1] or use unconditional results (e.g., those of [H-B77]) that would leave  $t_F$  completely unknown and  $C_F$  far too large to be algorithmically useful.

Via a clever use of randomization, it is not hard to derive an  $\mathbf{AM}$  algorithm for  $\mathbf{HN}$  directly from Theorem 2, assuming GIPIT or DZH. One may then wonder if one could dispense with randomness and instead simply check the solvability of  $F$  over  $\mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z}$  for a number of primes polynomial in  $\sigma(F)$ , thus obtaining an algorithm in  $\mathbf{P}^{\mathbf{NP}}$  for  $\mathbf{HN}$ . Unfortunately, the following family of examples shows that such a simplification is simply not possible.

**Example 1** [Koi96, Thm. 10] *For  $n \geq 1$ , consider  $F$  defined by the following two univariate equations:*

$$x^{\pi_n} - 1 = 0$$

$$x - \pi_n = 0$$

where  $\pi_n$  is the product of the first  $n$  prime numbers. Then  $F$  clearly has no roots in  $\mathbb{C}$  and  $\sigma(F) = O(n \log n)$ . (The latter fact follows easily from the Prime Number Theorem, stated in Section 1.1 below.) However, the number of primes  $p$  for which the mod  $p$  reduction of  $F$  has a root is at least  $2^n$ , which is clearly exponential in  $\sigma(F)$ . This abundance of primes follows from the fact (observed by Noam Elkies around 1996) that the number of prime factors of  $\pi_n^{\pi_n} - 1$  is at least  $2^n$  [Koi96, Lem. 4].  $\diamond$

## 1.1 Riemann Hypotheses and Related Zeta Functions

Primordial versions of the connection between analysis and number theory are not hard to derive from scratch and have been known since the 19<sup>th</sup> century. For example, letting  $\zeta(s) := \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n^s}$  denote the usual **Riemann zeta function** (for any real number  $s > 1$ ), one can easily derive with a bit of calculus [TF00, pp. 30–32] that

$$\zeta(s) = \prod_{p \text{ prime}} \frac{1}{1 - \frac{1}{p}} \text{ and thus } -\frac{\zeta'(s)}{\zeta(s)} = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{\Lambda(n)}{n^s},$$

where  $\Lambda$  is the classical Mangoldt function which sends  $n$  to  $\log p$  or 0, according as  $n = p^k$  for some prime  $p$  (and some positive integer  $k$ ) or not. For a deeper connection, recall that  $\pi(x)$  denotes the number of primes (in  $\mathbb{N}$ )  $\leq x$  and that the **Prime Number Theorem (PNT)** is the asymptotic formula  $\pi(x) \sim \frac{x}{\log x}$  for  $x \rightarrow \infty$ . Writing  $\rho = \beta + i\gamma$  for real  $\beta$  and  $\gamma$ , recall also that  $\zeta$  admits an analytic continuation to the complex plane, sans the point 1, via

$$\zeta(\rho) = 2^\rho \pi^{\rho-1} \sin\left(\frac{\pi\rho}{2}\right) \Gamma(1-\rho) \zeta(1-\rho),$$

where  $\Gamma$  is Euler’s famous continuous analogue of the factorial function [TF00, Sec. 2]. (We’ll abuse notation henceforth by letting  $\zeta$  denote the analytic continuation of  $\zeta$  to  $\mathbb{C} \setminus \{1\}$ .) One should then note that the first proofs of PNT, by Hadamard and de la Vallée-Poussin (independently, in 1896), were based essentially on the fact that  $\zeta(\beta + i\gamma)$  has **no** zeroes on the vertical line  $\gamma = 1$ .<sup>2</sup>

Going to an even deeper connection, the **Riemann Hypothesis (RH)** (from 1859) is the following assertion:

**(RH)** The **only** zeroes  $\rho = \beta + i\gamma$  of  $\zeta$  other than the “trivial” zeroes  $\{-2, -4, -6, \dots\}$  are those on the **critical line**  $\gamma = \frac{1}{2}$ .

In particular, letting  $\pi(x)$  denote the number of primes  $p \leq x$ , it is known that RH is true  $\iff \left| \pi(x) - \int_2^x \frac{dt}{\log t} \right| = O(\sqrt{x} \log x)$  [TF00]. Aside from a myriad of other hitherto unprovably sharp statements on the distribution of primes, the truth of RH is also known to imply a **deterministic** polynomial-time algorithm for primality detection

<sup>2</sup>Shikau Ikehara later showed in 1931 that PNT is in fact **equivalent** to the fact that  $\zeta$  has no zeroes on the line  $\gamma = 1$  (the proof is reproduced in [DMcK72]).

[Mil76] even faster than the recent unconditional algorithm of Agrawal, Kayal, and Saxena [AKS02].

Through the last estimate on  $\pi(x)$ , RH also easily implies that for any fixed  $\varepsilon > 0$ , there is a  $C_\varepsilon > 0$  such that  $\pi(x + x^{\frac{1}{2}+\varepsilon}) - \pi(x) \geq C_\varepsilon \frac{x^{\frac{1}{2}+\varepsilon}}{\log x}$ , for all  $x$  sufficiently large. However, one can prove lower bounds nearly as good without RH. For example, it is known that  $\pi(x + x^{0.535}) - \pi(x) \geq \frac{x^{0.535}}{20 \log x}$  for all  $x$  sufficiently large [BH96]. Preceding [IJ79], results of this flavor were derived via estimates on the sum

$$S(x, T) := \sum_{\substack{\zeta(\rho)=0 \\ 0 < \beta < 1, |\gamma| < T}} \frac{x^\rho}{\rho}.$$

In particular, since the work of Hoheisel [Hoh30], it has been known that sufficiently good bounds of the form  $|S(x, T)| = o(x \log^2 T)$  yield results such as our last bound; **independent of RH**. Note also that we at least know  $|S(x, T)| = O(x \log^2 T)$  unconditionally [LO77, Lem. 5.4 and Sec. 9] and that under RH we have  $|S(x, T)| = O(\sqrt{x} \log^2 T)$ .

Let us now consider general number fields. GRH can be defined as follows: For any finite algebraic extension  $K$  of  $\mathbb{Q}$ , define the **Dedekind zeta function** via the formula  $\zeta_K(s) := \sum_{\mathfrak{a}} \frac{1}{(N\mathfrak{a})^s}$ , where  $\mathfrak{a}$  ranges over all nonzero ideals of  $\mathcal{O}_K$ ,  $N$  denotes the norm function, and  $s > 1$  [BS96]. (So  $\zeta_{\mathbb{Q}} = \zeta$ .) Then, like  $\zeta$ , the function  $\zeta_K$  also admits an analytic continuation to  $\mathbb{C} \setminus \{1\}$  [LO77], and GRH is the following statement:

**(GRH)** The **only** zeroes  $\rho = \beta + i\gamma$  of  $\zeta_K$  other than the “trivial” zeroes  $\{-2, -4, -6, \dots\}$  are those on the critical line  $\gamma = \frac{1}{2}$ .

In particular, letting  $\pi_K(x)$  denote the number of **prime** ideals  $\mathfrak{p}$  of  $\mathcal{O}_K$  satisfying  $N\mathfrak{p} \leq x$ , it is known that GRH is true  $\iff \left| \pi_K(x) - \int_2^x \frac{dt}{\log t} \right| = O(\sqrt{x}(n_K \log x + \log d_K))$ , where  $n_K$  and  $d_K$  respectively denote the field extension degree  $[K : \mathbb{Q}]$  and absolute value of the discriminant of  $K$  over  $\mathbb{Q}$  (see, e.g., [LO77, Thm. 1.1] and [BS96]). Also, in addition to numerous other important consequences in number theory and complexity theory, the truth of GRH implies sub-exponential speed-ups for detecting rational points on certain algebraic sets [Roj01].

Paralleling the special case  $K = \mathbb{Q}$ , GRH also easily implies that for any fixed  $\varepsilon > 0$ , there is a  $C_\varepsilon > 0$  such that  $\pi_K(x + x^{\frac{1}{2}+\varepsilon}) - \pi_K(x) \geq C_\varepsilon \frac{x^{\frac{1}{2}+\varepsilon}}{\log x}$ , for all  $x > 2$ . (This follows routinely from, say, [LO77, Thm. 1.1].) However, trying to do without GRH introduces some difficulties: While it is known that one can always find positive constants  $c_K, C_K$ , and  $t_K$  depending on  $K$  such that  $c_K < 1/2$  and  $\pi_K(x + x^{1-c_K}) - \pi_K(x) \geq C_K \frac{x^{1-c_K}}{\log x}$  for all  $x \geq t_K$  [Sok68, Mit68, H-B77, BO01], there are no known estimates for  $C_K$  or  $t_K$ . In any event, in close analogy to the case of the ordinary prime counting function, bounds of this type can be derived by estimating the sum

$$S_K(x, T) := \sum_{\substack{\zeta_K(\rho)=0 \\ 0 < \beta < 1, |\gamma| < T}} \frac{x^\rho}{\rho}.$$

Let us also note that  $|S_K(x, T)| \leq O(x(\log d_K + n_K + \log T) \log T)$  unconditionally [LO77, Lem. 5.4 and Sec. 9], and that under GRH we have  $|S_K(x, T)| \leq O(\sqrt{x}(\log d_K + n_K + \log T) \log T)$ .

We are thus naturally led to DZH and GIPIT. These alternatives to GRH respectively deal with upper bounds on  $|S_K(x, T)|$  and lower bounds on  $\pi_K(x + y) - \pi_K(x)$ .

**Dedekind Zero Hypothesis (DZH)** *Following the notation above, there exists an absolute constant  $\bar{\kappa} > 0$  such that  $|S_K(x, T)| \leq x^{-\frac{1}{1.01+(1+\log(n_K \log d_K))^{\bar{\kappa}}}} T^{\frac{1.99}{1.01+(1+\log(n_K \log d_K))^{\bar{\kappa}}}}$  for all  $x, T \geq (1 + \log(n_K \log d_K))^{\bar{\kappa}}$ .  $\diamond$*

**Good Short Interval Prime Ideal Theorem (GIPIT)** *Following the notation above, there is an absolute constant  $\kappa > 0$  such that  $\pi_K((x + 1)^{1.01+(1+\log(n_K \log d_K))^\kappa}) - \pi_K(x^{1.01+(1+\log(n_K \log d_K))^\kappa}) \geq 1 + \frac{n_K}{2}(x + 1)^{(1.01+(1+\log(n_K \log d_K))^\kappa)/2}$ , for all  $x \geq (1 + \log(n_K \log d_K))^\kappa$ .  $\diamond$*

Note that DZH and GIPIT become harder to prove as we decrease  $\bar{\kappa}$  and  $\kappa$ , and that DZH is the stronger assumption (cf. Theorem 1 of the last section). In particular, by our preceding discussion, the truth of GRH easily implies that both DZH and GIPIT are true for **any** arbitrarily small positive  $\bar{\kappa}$  and  $\kappa$ .

**Remark 2** *Some experts have recently expressed the opinion that GRH maybe true modulo a small exception: the existence of so-called Landau-Siegel zeroes on the real line [SZ02]. Note, however, that the existence of such zeroes does not affect the truth of DZH or GIPIT.  $\diamond$*

## 2 Background and Related Work

Let us first consider the following recent refined effective arithmetic version of Hilbert's Nullstellensatz.

**Note:** *In what follows, we always normalize  $n$ -dimensional volume  $\text{Vol}(\cdot)$  so that the  $n$ -dimensional unit cube has volume  $n!$ .  $\diamond$*

**Theorem 3** [Som02, Thm. 4.1] *Let  $f_1, \dots, f_k \in \mathbb{Z}[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ ,  $F := (f_1, \dots, f_k)$ ,  $D := \max_i \deg f_i$ , and let  $V_F$  denote the volume of the convex hull of<sup>3</sup> the union of  $\{\mathbf{0}, e_1, \dots, e_n\}$  (the origin and the standard basis vectors of  $\mathbb{R}^n$ ) and the set of all exponent vectors of the monomial term expansion of  $F$ . Then  $F$  has **no** roots in  $\mathbb{C}^n \iff$  there exist polynomials  $g_1, \dots, g_k \in \mathbb{Z}[x_1, \dots, x_n]$  and a positive integer  $a$  with  $f_1 g_1 + \dots + f_k g_k = a_F$  identically and*

1.  $\deg g_i \leq 2n^2 DV_F$
2.  $\sigma(a_F) \leq 2(n + 1)^3 DV_F (\sigma(F) + \log k + 14(n + 1)D \log(D + 1))$  ■

This result immediately implies that **HN** can be solved by solving a linear system with  $O((2n^2 DV_F)^n)$  variables and equations over the rationals (with total bit-size  $O(\sigma(F)(2n^2 DV_F)^n)$ ), thus easily yielding **HN**  $\in$  **EXPTIME**. That **HN**  $\in$  **PSPACE**

<sup>3</sup>i.e., smallest convex set containing...

then follows immediately from the fact that linear algebra can be efficiently parallelized [Csa76].

Another result we'll need is an effective version of rational univariate reduction (a.k.a. effective primitive element theorem).

**Theorem 4** [(See [Roj00, Thms. 5 and 7])] *Following the notation of Theorem 3, let  $Z_F$  denote the zero set of  $F$  in  $\mathbb{C}^n$ . Then there are univariate polynomials  $h_1, \dots, h_n, \hat{h}_F \in \mathbb{Z}[t]$  and positive integers  $a_1, \dots, a_n$  with the following properties:*

1. *The number of irreducible components of  $Z_F$  is bounded above by  $\deg \hat{h}_F$ ; and  $\deg h_1, \dots, \deg h_n \leq \deg \hat{h}_F \leq V_F$ .*
2. *For any root  $\theta$  of  $\hat{h}_F$  we have  $F\left(\frac{h_1(\theta)}{a_1}, \dots, \frac{h_n(\theta)}{a_n}\right) = \mathbf{0}$  and every irreducible component of  $Z_F$  contains at least one point that can be expressed in this way.*
3.  *$\sigma(a_1), \sigma(h_1), \dots, \sigma(a_n), \sigma(h_n) = O(V_F^5 \sigma(\hat{h}_F))$  and  $\sigma(\hat{h}_F) = \mathcal{O}(V_F[\sigma(F) + n \log D])$ . ■*

**Sketch of Proof:** The proof follows almost exactly the same development as [Roj01, Secs. 6.1.3 and 6.1.5], except that Theorem 23 there (an estimate on the maximum coefficient size of a variant of the toric resultant) is combined with [Som02, Cor. 2.5]. This allows us to omit a factor exponential in  $n$  that would have otherwise appeared in Assertion (3) above. ■

For technical reasons, it will be more convenient to work with a weighted variant of  $\pi_K$  instead of  $\pi_K$  itself. So let us define  $\psi_K(x) := \sum \log N\mathfrak{p}$  — the natural generalization of the Mangoldt  $\Lambda$  function to prime ideals in algebraic number rings — where the sum ranges over all integral ideals of the form  $\mathfrak{p} = \mathfrak{q}^m$  with  $\mathfrak{q}$  an unramified prime ideal of  $\mathcal{O}_K$  and  $N\mathfrak{q}^m \leq x$ . The results from analytic number theory we'll need can then be summarized as follows.

**Theorem 5 (Unconditional (Weighted) Effective Prime Ideal Theorem)**

*For all  $x, T \geq 2$ , we have*

$$\left| \psi_K(x) - \left( x - \sum_{\substack{\zeta_K(\rho)=0 \\ 0 < \beta < 1, |\gamma| < T}} \frac{x^\rho}{\rho} + \sum_{|\rho| < \frac{1}{2}} \frac{1}{\rho} \right) \right| = O\left(\frac{x}{T} (n_K \log^2 x + \log d_K + n_K \log T) + (n_K + \log d_K) \log x\right).$$

*In particular, for all  $x \geq e^{10} \approx 22027$  and  $T \geq e^5 \approx 148.4$ , we have that the left-hand side of the above asymptotic equality is no larger than*

$$\frac{x}{T} \{5n_K \log^2 x + 36.55n_K \log x + 375.2n_K \log T + 196.6 \log d_K + 351n_K\} + (2 \log d_K + 3.51n_K) \log x + 25 \log d_K + 283.1n_K.$$

**Sketch of Proof:** The first portion is nothing more than the special case of [LO77, Thm. 7.1] where, in the notation there,  $K = L$  and the conjugacy class  $C$  of  $\text{Gal}(L/K)$  is just the identity element  $e$ . (The sums over zeroes of  $\zeta_K$  also simplify since there is just one underlying character of  $H = \langle e \rangle$  and it is the trivial character.) The second portion is a variation of [Sil02, Thm. 9.1]. (The latter theorem gives a bound on  $\psi_K(x) - x$  instead, and assumes the truth of GRH.) In particular, by modifying the proof to **avoid** the use of GRH (and employing [Sil02, Lem. 5.8]), the result follows easily. ■

We then immediately obtain the following corollary.

**Corollary 1 (Unconditional (Weighted) Effective Short Interval Prime Ideal Theorem)**

For all  $x, y, T \geq 2$ , we have

$$\psi_K(x+y) - \psi_K(x) = y - \sum_{\substack{\zeta_K(\rho)=0, \rho=\beta+i\gamma \\ 0 < \beta < 1, |\gamma| < T}} \frac{(x+y)^\rho - x^\rho}{\rho} - O\left(\frac{x+y}{T} (n_K \log^2(x+y) + \log d_K + n_K \log T) + (n_K + \log d_K) \log(x+y)\right).$$

In particular, for all  $x, y \geq e^{10} \approx 22027$  and  $T \geq e^5 \approx 148.4$ , we have that the equality sign above can be replaced by a  $\leq$  sign and the  $O(\cdot)$  estimate replaced by the following:

$$\frac{x+y}{T} \{10n_K \log^2(x+y) + 73.1n_K \log(x+y) + 750.4n_K \log T + 393.2 \log d_K + 702n_K\} + (4 \log d_K + 7.02n_K) \log(x+y) + 50 \log d_K + 566.2n_K. \blacksquare$$

While we won't need the following estimate to prove our main results, we include it so the reader can see how the conditional estimates on  $\pi(x+y) - \pi(x)$  and  $\pi_K(x+y) - \pi_K(x)$  from Section 1.1 follow immediately from our unconditional corollary above, should GRH turn out to be true.

**Lemma 1** (See [LO77, Lem. 5.4] and [Sil02, Lem. 5.7 and the Proof of Thm. 9.1])

We have  $\sum_{\substack{\zeta_K(\rho)=0, \rho=\beta+i\gamma \\ 0 < \beta < 1, |\gamma| < T}} \frac{1}{|\rho|} = O(\log^2 T + (n_K + \log d_K) \log T)$ . In particular, for all

$$T \geq e^5 \approx 148.4, \text{ we have } \sum_{\substack{\zeta_K(\rho)=0, \rho=\beta+i\gamma \\ 0 < \beta < 1, |\gamma| < T}} \frac{1}{|\rho|} \leq 3.1 \log^2 T + (77.1n_K + 8 \log d_K) \log T. \blacksquare$$

The following basic result will help us relate  $\log d_K$  and  $n_K$  to the bit-size of the defining polynomial of  $K$ . Recall that the square-free part of a univariate polynomial  $f$  is  $f / \gcd(f, f')$ .

**Proposition 1** (See [Roj01, Lemmata 2.1 and 4.1]) Suppose  $K = \mathbb{Q}[x_1] / \langle f \rangle$  where  $f$  is the square-free part of some polynomial  $g \in \mathbb{Z}[x_1] \setminus \mathbb{Z}$ . Then

$$n_K \leq \deg g \quad \text{and} \quad \log d_K = O((\deg g) \sigma(g) + (\deg f)^2).$$

More precisely,

$$\log d_K \leq (2 \deg g - 1)(\sigma(g) + (\deg g + \alpha) \log 2) + \frac{2 \deg g - 1}{2} \log(\deg g + 1) + \frac{\deg g}{2} \log((\deg g)(2 \deg g + 1)/6). \blacksquare$$

Finally, let us briefly and informally review the complexity classes mentioned earlier in the introduction. First, our underlying computational model will be the classical Turing machine, which for our purposes can be assumed to be a lap-top with infinite memory and a flawless operating system. In particular, bit operations (and time) can be identified with the number of clock-cycles used by the underlying microprocessor. Input size, for an input such as  $F$ , is then simply  $\sigma(F)$ , and can also be interpreted as the amount of memory used by our idealized lap-top to store  $F$ .

Our complexity classes can then be summarized as follows. Note that an **oracle in  $\mathbf{A}$**  is a special machine which is allowed to run an algorithm with complexity  $A$  in one unit of time, and all problems below are **decision** problems.

- P** The family of problems which can be done within time polynomial in the input size.<sup>4</sup>
- RP** The family of problems admitting a polynomial-time algorithm for which a ‘‘Yes’’ answer is always correct but a ‘‘No’’ answer is wrong with probability  $\frac{1}{2}$ .
- coRP** The family of problems admitting a polynomial-time algorithm for which a ‘‘No’’ answer is always correct but a ‘‘Yes’’ answer is wrong with probability  $\frac{1}{2}$ .
- NP** The family of problems where a ‘‘Yes’’ answer can be **certified** within time polynomial in the input size.
- coNP** The family of problems where a ‘‘No’’ answer can be **certified** within time polynomial in the input size.
- AM** The family of problems solvable by a **BPP** algorithm which has been augmented with exactly **one** use of an oracle in **NP**.
- NP<sup>NP</sup>** The family of problems where a ‘‘Yes’’ answer can be certified by using an **NP**-oracle a number of times polynomial in the input size.
- coNP<sup>NP</sup>** The family of problems where a ‘‘No’’ answer can be certified by using an **NP**-oracle a number of times polynomial in the input size.
- P<sup>NP<sup>NP</sup></sup>** The family of problems solvable within time polynomial in the input size, with as many calls to an **NP<sup>NP</sup>** oracle as allowed by the time bound.
- PSPACE** The family of problems solvable within time polynomial in the input size, provided a number of processors exponential in the input size is allowed.
- EXPTIME** The family of problems solvable within time exponential in the input size.

We note that **RP** algorithms and **BPP** algorithms are sometimes respectively referred to as **Monte-Carlo** and **Atlantic City** algorithms.

### 3 Reducing Theorem 1 to Theorem 2

Let us begin with a description of the algorithm which proves Theorem 1:

ALGORITHM KAMHN<sup>5</sup>

**Input** *A system  $F$  of  $k$  polynomials in  $n$  variables with integer coefficients*

<sup>4</sup>Note that the underlying polynomial depends only on the **problem**, not the particular instance of the problem.

<sup>5</sup>Short for Koiran-Arthur-Merlin-Hilbert-Nullstellensatz. A similar algorithm was outlined on Page 6 of [Koi96] (but **not** in the journal version of the paper), hence our naming.

**Output** A declaration, correct with probability  $\geq \frac{2}{3}$ , of whether  $F$  has a complex root or not.

**Step 0** Let  $t_F$ ,  $a_F$ , and  $C_F$  be the integer constants from Theorem 2.

**Step 1** Pick a (uniformly distributed) random integer  $t \in \{t_F, \dots, t_F + 3a_F\}$ .

**Step 2** Using an NP oracle just once, decide if there is a prime  $p \in \{t^{C_F} + 1, \dots, (t+1)^{C_F}\}$  such that the mod  $p$  reduction of  $F$  has a root in  $(\mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z})^n$ . If so, declare that  $F$  has a complex root. Otherwise, declare that  $F$  has no complex root.  $\diamond$

The last technical lemma we will need relates short interval bounds between  $\pi_K$  and  $\psi_K$ .

**Lemma 2** Suppose  $f \in \mathbb{Z}[x_1] \setminus \mathbb{Z}$  is square-free and  $K := \mathbb{Q}[x_1]/\langle f \rangle$ . Then, assuming  $x \geq 1 + \log d_K$  and  $y \geq 0$ ,

$$\psi_K(x+y) - \psi_K(x) \geq \left(1 + \frac{7n_K}{2}\sqrt{x+y}\right) \log(x+y) \implies \pi_K(x+y) - \pi_K(x) \geq 1 + \frac{n_K}{2}\sqrt{x+y}.$$

**Proof:** Note that the right-hand bound can be enforced via a similar bound on yet another related weighted prime power counting function: First, define  $\Theta_K(x) := \sum \log N\mathfrak{p}$  where the sum ranges over all unramified prime ideals of  $\mathcal{O}_K$  of norm  $\leq x$ . Since

$$\Theta_K(x+y) - \Theta_K(x) \leq (\pi_K(x+y) - \pi_K(x)) \log(x+y),$$

the right-hand bound of our lemma is clearly implied by

$$(\heartsuit) \quad \Theta_K(x+y) - \Theta_K(x) \geq \left(1 + \frac{n_K\sqrt{x+y}}{2}\right) \log(x+y).$$

Now,

$$\sum_{\substack{(\mathfrak{p}, m) \\ m \geq 2 \\ N\mathfrak{p}^m \leq x}} \log N\mathfrak{p} = O(\sqrt{x}) \leq \sum_{k=2}^{\lfloor \log_2 x \rfloor} n_K x^{1/k} \log x \leq n_K (\log x) \sum_{k=2}^{\lfloor \log_2 x \rfloor} x^{1/k}$$

$$\leq n_K (\log x) (\sqrt{x} + x^{1/3} \log_2 x) \leq n_K (\log x) (3\sqrt{x}) = 3n_K \sqrt{x} \log x.$$

So we then clearly have  $0 \leq \psi_K(x) - \Theta_K(x) = 3n_K \sqrt{x} \log x$ , and it thus suffices to enforce

$$\psi_K(x+y) - \psi_K(x) \geq \left(1 + \frac{7n_K\sqrt{x+y}}{2}\right) \log(x+y).$$

So we are done.  $\blacksquare$

**Proof of Theorem 1:** Clearly, to prove the first assertion of Theorem 1, it suffices to prove that the truth of either DZH or GIPIT implies that the algorithm above is correct and runs within **AM**. We will handle the remaining implications later.

To see correctness, simply note that Theorem 2 implies that  $F$  has no complex roots (resp. has at least one complex root)  $\implies$  at most one third (resp. **all**) of

the half-open intervals  $\{[t^{C_F} + 1, (t + 1)^{C_F}]\}_{t \in \{t_F, \dots, t_F + 3a_F\}}$  has (resp. have) a prime  $p$  such that the mod  $p$  reduction of  $F$  has a root in  $(\mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z})^n$ . So a declaration of ‘‘No Complex Roots’’ is always correct, while a declaration of ‘‘There is at Least One Complex Root’’ is wrong with probability  $\frac{1}{3}$ . So correctness is actually independent of DZH or GIPIT or any unproven assumption.

To see that KAMHN runs in **AM**, let us now assume either DZH or GIPIT. Note then that by Assertion (2) of Theorem 2, no integer computed has bit size larger than  $O(\sigma(F)^{\kappa+2})$ , so a single use of an **NP** oracle really does suffice to run our algorithm. Note also that since  $\kappa$  is effectively computable, the constants  $t_F$ ,  $a_F$ , and  $C_F$  are all computable in polynomial time by recursive squaring. So KAMHN indeed runs in **AM**.

We must now prove the remaining assertions. The implications  $[\text{GRH} \implies \text{DZH}]$  and  $[\text{HN} \in \text{AM} \implies [\text{HN} \notin \text{P} \implies \text{P} \neq \text{NP}]]$  were already proved during our discussion in Sections 1 and 1.1. The same goes for the fact that GIPIT and DZH can still hold even if GRH is false. So, thanks to our earlier application of Theorem 2, we need only prove  $\text{DZH} \implies \text{GIPIT}$ .

To prove the last implication, note that DZH implies that

$$|S(x^C, x^{C/2})| \leq x^{C \left(1 - \frac{0.005}{1.01 + (1 + \log(n_K \log d_K))^{\bar{\kappa}}}\right)}, \text{ for all } x \geq (1 + \log(n_K \log d_K))^{\bar{\kappa}}.$$

So, provided  $C > 200(1.01 + (1 + \log(n_K \log d_K))^{\bar{\kappa}})$ , we obtain that  $|S(x^C, x^{C/2})| \leq x^{C-1}$  for all  $x \geq (1 + \log(n_K \log d_K))^{\bar{\kappa}}$ . Let us define  $C$  a bit larger asymptotically by setting  $C := (1.01 + (1 + \log(n_K \log d_K))^{\bar{\kappa}})^{\kappa}$  for any  $\kappa > \bar{\kappa}$ .

Now recall that  $Cx^{C-1} \leq (x+1)^C - x^C \leq C(x+1)^{C-1}$ . Corollary 1, with  $T := x^{C/2}$ , then yields

$$\begin{aligned} \psi_K((x+1)^C) - \psi_K(x^C) &= C(x+1)^{C-1} - o(x^{C-1}) - O(x^{1-\frac{C}{2}}(Cn_K \log^2(x+1) + n_K \log x + C(\log d_K) \log x)), \\ &= \Omega(x^{C-1}) \end{aligned}$$

where the underlying constants are effectively computable and the implied inequality takes effect for all  $x \geq (1 + \log(n_K \log d_K))^{\kappa'}$  for some absolute effectively computable  $\kappa' > 0$ . In particular, by construction  $C - 1 > C/2$  and we thus obtain

$$\psi_K((x+1)^C) - \psi_K(x^C) \geq \left(1 + \frac{7n_K}{2}(x+1)^{C/2}\right) \log(x+1)$$

for all  $x \geq (1 + \log(n_K \log d_K))^{\kappa''}$ , for some absolute effectively computable  $\kappa'' > 0$ . Replacing  $\kappa$  by  $\max\{\kappa, \kappa''\}$ , and substituting  $x + y \leftarrow (x + 1)^C$  and  $x \leftarrow x^C$  into Lemma 2, we are done. ■

## 4 Prime Distribution and Proving Theorem 2

**Proof of Theorem 2:** Assertion (1) follows easily from the following argument which has appeared earlier in various incarnations, e.g., [Koi96, HMPS00, Roj00]: By assumption, Theorem 3 tells us that the mod  $p$  reduction of  $F$  has a root in  $(\mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z})^n \implies p$  divides  $a_F$ . Since the number of prime divisors of an integer  $a$  is

no more than  $1 + \log a$  (since any prime power other than 2 is bounded below by  $e < 2.718281829$ ), an elementary calculation yields Assertion (1).

The proof of Assertions (2) relies on effective univariate reduction and some density estimates for prime ideals. In particular, we will derive Assertion (2) by examining the following cleaner abstraction: Let  $\pi_F(x)$  denote the number of primes  $p \leq x$  such that the mod  $p$  reduction of  $F$  has a root in  $(\mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z})^n$ . Clearly then, it is enough to find sufficiently good upper bounds on  $y$  (as a function of  $x$ ) and  $t_F$  such that for all  $x \geq t_F$ ,

$$(\star) \quad \pi_F(x + y) - \pi_F(x) \geq 1.$$

To do this, we will pass through various reductions, eventually culminating in enforcing a particular lower bound on  $\pi_K(x + y) - \pi_K(x)$ , for some number field  $K$  depending naturally on  $F$ . In particular, GIPIT will immediately imply a lower bound good enough to imply Assertion (3), and without GIPIT we can still derive the weaker Assertion (4) by employing older theorems on the distribution of prime ideals in  $\mathcal{O}_K$ . (Since Theorem 1 contains the implication  $\text{DZH} \implies \text{GIPIT}$ , we need not worry about assuming DZH any more.) Our framework will then imply Assertion (5) almost trivially.

To start, let  $h_1, \dots, h_n, \hat{h}_F \in \mathbb{Z}[t]$  and  $a_1, \dots, a_n$  be the polynomials and integers arising from applying Theorem 4 to our input  $F$ . Letting  $f$  be the square-free part of  $\hat{h}_F$ , note that  $p \nmid \text{lcm}(a_1, \dots, a_n)$  **and** the mod  $p$  reduction of  $f$  has a root in  $(\mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z})^n \implies$  the mod  $p$  reduction of  $F$  has a root in  $(\mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z})^n$ . So to prove  $(\star)$  it clearly suffices to instead enforce

$$(\star\star) \quad N_f(x + y) - N_f(x) \geq 1, \text{ for all } x \leq 1 + \log d_K$$

where  $N_f(x)$  denotes the number of linear factors of the mod  $p$  reduction of  $f$  **summed over all primes**  $p \leq x$ . In particular, since  $\sigma(f) = \sigma(\hat{h}_F) + (V_F + c_0) \log 2$ , where  $c_0 = 2 - \frac{3}{4 \log 2} \leq 0.91798$  [Roj00, Lemma 5], Theorem 4 and Proposition 1 tell us that Assertion (2) is true if we can show that we can take  $y = x^{1-1/C_F}$  in  $(\star)$ . However, the latter condition was already noted as true in our discussion of unconditional lower bounds on  $\pi(x + y) - \pi(x)$  from Section 1.1. Similarly, our discussion of GRH-dependent lower bounds immediately implies Assertion (5). Assertion (3) then routinely from [LO77, Thm. 1.3], which contains an unconditional version of the Prime Ideal Theorem.

To prove Assertion (4) we must now show GIPIT implies that we can find  $t_F$  and  $C_F$  with  $\sigma(t_F), \sigma(C_F) = O(\sigma(f)^\kappa)$  for some effectively computable absolute constant  $\kappa > 0$ . Letting  $K := \mathbb{Q}[x_1]/\langle f \rangle$ , note now that  $p \nmid d_K$  implies that the mod  $p$  reduction of  $f$  has a linear factor iff  $p$  lies below a prime in  $\mathcal{O}_K$  of residue class degree 1 [Lan94, Ch. I, Sec. 8, Prop. 25, pp. 27–28]. Note also that  $\mathfrak{p}$  (of residue class degree 1) lies over  $p \implies N\mathfrak{p} = p$ . Now let  $\pi_K^1(x)$  denote the number of unramified primes  $\mathfrak{p}$  of  $\mathcal{O}_K$  with  $N\mathfrak{p} \leq x$  and residue class degree 1. It is then clear that  $|\pi_K^1(x) - N_f(x)| \leq (n_K - 1)(1 + \log d_K)$  (since the correspondence between factors and primes breaks down only for  $p \mid \Delta_K$ ) and the left-hand side is **constant** for all  $x$  larger than any prime dividing  $d_K$ . So we can clearly replace  $(\star\star)$  by the combined assertions

$$(\clubsuit) \quad \pi_K^1(x + y) - \pi_K^1(x) \geq 1$$

and

(♣♣) no prime  $\geq t_F$  divides any  $a_1, \dots, a_n$  or  $\Delta_f$ .

We are now ready for our final reduction: Let  $\pi_K(x)$  denote the number of unramified primes  $\mathfrak{p}$  of  $\mathcal{O}_K$  with  $N\mathfrak{p} \leq x$ . Note then that for any prime  $\mathfrak{p}$  of  $\mathcal{O}_K$  of residue class field degree  $\geq 2$  lying over  $p$ , we must have  $N\mathfrak{p} \geq p^2$ , which in turn implies  $p \leq \sqrt{x}$ . Since the number of such primes  $\mathfrak{p}$  over  $p$  is  $\leq n_K/2$ , we must then have  $0 \leq \pi_K(x) - \pi_K^1(x) \leq \frac{n_K \sqrt{x}}{2}$ . So it suffices to replace (♣) by

$$(\spadesuit) \quad \pi_K(x+y) - \pi_K(x) \geq 1 + \frac{n_K \sqrt{x+y}}{2}.$$

Via GIPIT, we can then substitute  $x+y \leftarrow (x+1)^{C_F}$  and  $x \leftarrow x^{C_F}$  to immediately obtain (♠). Taking  $t_F$  to be the smallest power of 2 larger than  $d_K$  (which, by Proposition 1 and Theorem 4, must have size  $O(1 + \log(n_K \log d_K))^2$ ), we can then immediately obtain (♣♣). Note in particular that  $t_F$  can be computed in polynomial time by recursive squaring. So we are done. ■

## Acknowledgements

Around March of 2002, Enrico Bombieri kindly took the time to look at one of my earlier papers ([Roj00]) and spotted an error in one of the proofs. (The result in question was Part (b) of Theorem 4 and the error changes the numerical estimates of Remark 13 in Section 6.1.6 but does not invalidate the result.) The present paper arose when I checked the details and noted that the earlier assumptions of GRH could be considerably weakened. I am therefore deeply indebted to Professor Bombieri for helping inspire the present paper. Later, around May 2002, I had the wonderful good fortune of meeting Lior Silberman at the Workshop on Zeta-Functions and Associated Riemann Hypotheses at the Courant Institute of Mathematical Sciences, New York University. Lior provided a copy of [Sil02] just when I needed some extremely explicit Čebotarev-like estimates. I am thus also indebted to Professor Silberman for writing and sharing his notes with such generosity and good timing.

## References

- [AKS02] Agrawal, Manindra; Kayal, Neeraj; and Saxena, Nitin, “*PRIMES is in P,*” submitted for publication, downloadable from <http://www.cse.iitk.ac.in/news/primality.html>
- [BF91] Babai, László and Fortnow, Lance, “*Arithmetization: a New Method in Structural Complexity Theory,*” *Comput. Complexity* **1** (1991), no. 1, 41–66.
- [BM88] Babai, László and Moran, Shlomo, “*Arthur-Merlin Games: A Randomized Proof System and a Hierarchy of Complexity Classes,*” *Journal of Computer and System Sciences*, 36:254–276, 1988.

- [BS96] Bach, Eric and Shallit, Jeff, *Algorithmic Number Theory, Vol. I: Efficient Algorithms*, MIT Press, Cambridge, MA, 1996.
- [BH96] Baker, R. C. and Harman, G., “*The difference between consecutive primes*,” Proc. London Math. Soc. (3) **72** (1996), no. 2, pp. 261–280.
- [BO01] Balog, Antal and Ono, Ken, “*The Chebotarev Density Theorem in Short Intervals and Some Questions of Serre*,” J. Number Theory **91** (2001), no. 2, pp. 356–371.
- [BIKPP96] Beam, Paul; Impagliazzo, Russel; Krajicek, Janos; Pitassi, Toniann; and Pudlak, Pavel, “*Lower Bounds on Hilbert’s Nullstellensatz and Propositional Proofs*,” Proceedings of the London Mathematical Society **73** (1996), pp. 1–26.
- [BCSS98] Blum, Lenore; Cucker, Felipe; Shub, Mike; and Smale, Steve, *Complexity and Real Computation*, Springer-Verlag, 1998.
- [Can88] Canny, John F., “*Some Algebraic and Geometric Computations in PSPACE*,” Proc. 20<sup>th</sup> ACM Symp. Theory of Computing, Chicago (1988), ACM Press.
- [Csa76] Csanky, L., “*Fast Parallel Matrix Inversion Algorithms*,” SIAM J. Comput. **5** (1976), no. 4, pp. 618–623.
- [DMcK72] Dym, H. and McKean, H. P., *Fourier Series and Integrals*, Probability and Mathematical Statistics, vol. 14, Academic Press, 1972.
- [HMPS00] Hägele, Klemens; Morais, Juan Enrique; Pardo, Luis Miguel; Sombra, Martin, “*On the Intrinsic Complexity of the Arithmetic Nullstellensatz*,” Journal of Pure and Applied Algebra **146** (2000), no. 2, pp. 103–183.
- [H-B77] Heath-Brown, D. R., “*On the Density of Zeros of the Dedekind Zeta-function*,” Acta Arithmetica **33** (1977), no. 2, pp. 169–181.
- [Hoh30] Hoheisel, G., “*Primzahlprobleme in der Analysis*,” Sitz. Preuss. Akad. Wiss. Phys.-Math. Kl. (1930), pp. 580–588.
- [IJ79] Iwaniec, Henryk and Jutila, Matti, “*Primes in short intervals*,” Ark. Mat. **17** (1979), no. 1, pp. 167–176.
- [Koi96] Koiran, Pascal, “*Hilbert’s Nullstellensatz is in the Polynomial Hierarchy*,” DIMACS Technical Report 96-27, July 1996. (**Note:** This preprint considerably improves the published version which appeared Journal of Complexity **12** (1996), no. 4, pp. 273–286.)
- [Kol88] Kollár, János, “*Sharp effective Nullstellensatz*,” J. Amer. Math. Soc. **1** (1988), no. 4, pp. 963–975.

- [LO77] Lagarias, Jeff and Odlyzko, Andrew, “*Effective Versions of the Chebotarev Density Theorem*,” Algebraic Number Fields:  $L$ -functions and Galois Properties (Proc. Sympos. Univ. Durham, Durham, 1975), 409–464, Academic Press, London, 1977.
- [Lan94] Lang, Serge, “*Algebraic Number Theory*,” 2<sup>nd</sup> ed., Springer-Verlag, New York, 1994.
- [Mil76] Miller, Gary L., “*Riemann’s Hypothesis and Tests for Primality*,” J. Comput. System Sci. **13** (1976), no. 3, 300–317.
- [Mit68] Mitsui, Takayoshi “*On the Prime Ideal Theorem*,” J. Math. Soc. Japan **20** (1968), pp. 233–247.
- [Pap95] Papadimitriou, Christos H., *Computational Complexity*, Addison-Wesley, 1995.
- [Pla84] Plaisted, David A., “*New NP-Hard and NP-Complete Polynomial and Integer Divisibility Problems*,” Theoret. Comput. Sci. 31 (1984), no. 1–2, 125–138.
- [Roj00] Rojas, J. Maurice, “*Algebraic Geometry Over Four Rings and the Frontier to Tractability*,” Contemporary Mathematics, vol. 270, Proceedings of a Conference on Hilbert’s Tenth Problem and Related Subjects (University of Gent, November 1-5, 1999), edited by Jan Denef, Leonard Lipschitz, Thanases Pheidas, and Jan Van Geel, pp. 275–321, AMS Press (2000).
- [Roj01] \_\_\_\_\_, “*Computational Arithmetic Geometry I: Sentences Nearly in the Polynomial Hierarchy*,” J. Comput. System Sci., STOC ’99 special issue, vol. 62, no. 2, march 2001, pp. 216–235.
- [SZ02] Sarnak, Peter and Zaharescu, Alexandru, “*Some Remarks on Landau-Siegel Zeros*,” Duke Math. J. **111** (2002), no. 3, pp. 495–507.
- [Sil02] Silberman, Lior, “*Effective Versions of the Čebotarev Density Theorem*,” preprint, downloadable from <http://www.math.princeton.edu/~lior/work> .
- [Sma00] Smale, Steve, “*Mathematical Problems for the Next Century*,” Mathematics: Frontiers and Perspectives, pp. 271–294, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2000.
- [Sok68] Sokolovskii, A. V., “*A Theorem on the Zeros of Dedekind’s Zeta-Function and the Distance Between ‘Neighboring’ Prime Ideals*,” Acta Arith. **13** (1967/1968), pp. 321–334.
- [Som02] Sombra, Martin, “*Minima Successifs des Variétés Toriques Projectives*,” Math ArXiv preprint math.NT/0209195, submitted for publication.
- [TF00] Tenenbaum, Gérald and Mendès France, Michel, *The Prime Numbers and Their Distribution*, Student Mathematical Library, vol. 6, AMS Press, Rhode Island, 2000.

[Zac86] Zachos, S., “*Probabilistic Quantifiers, Adversaries, and Complexity Classes: An Overview*,” Proc. 1<sup>st</sup> Structure in Complexity Theory Conference, vol. 223, Lecture Notes in Computer Science, Springer-Verlag, 1986.