Ratios of regulators of number fields

Antone Costa
and
Eduardo Friedman

Department of Mathmatics
American University
Washington, D.C. 20016

USA

Max-Planck-Institut für Mathematik
Gottfried-Claren-Straße 26
D-5300 Bonn 3

Germany

MPI/91-69

Ratios of regulators in extensions of number fields

Antone Costa* and Eduardo Friedman**

Abstract. Let L/K be an extension of number fields. Then

$$\mathrm{Reg}(L)/\mathrm{Reg}(K) > c_{[L:\mathbf{Q}]}(\log|D_L|)^m,$$

where Reg denotes the regulator, D_L is the absolute discriminant of L and $c_{[L:\mathbf{Q}]} > 0$ depends only on the degree of L. The non–negative integer $m = m(L/K)$ is positive if L/K does not belong to certain precisely defined infinite families of extensions, analogous to CM fields, along which $\mathrm{Reg}(L)/\mathrm{Reg}(K)$ is constant. This generalizes some inequalities due to Remak and Silverman, who assumed that K is the rational field $\mathbf{Q}$, and modifies those of Bergé–Martinet who dealt with a general extension L/K but used its relative discriminant where we use the absolute one.

1. Introduction

Remak [R 1] laid down the principle that a number field ought to have a large regulator if and only if it has a large discriminant. In one direction this follows from work of Landau [L] [Sie], who proved that $\sqrt{|D_L|}(\log|D_L|)^{[L:\mathbf{Q}]-1}$ is an upper bound for $\mathrm{Reg}(L)$. To obtain an inequality in the opposite sense, Remak considered the field $\mathbf{Q}(E_L)$ generated by the units E_L of L. The geometry of numbers tells us that $\mathbf{Q}(E_L)$ can be generated by integral elements (units) whose size at every embedding is bounded in terms of $\mathrm{Reg}(L)$. It follows that $|D_{\mathbf{Q}(E_L)}|$ can be bounded above by a function of $\mathrm{Reg}(L)$. Remak then observed that $\mathbf{Q}(E_L) = L$ unless L is a CM field (a totally imaginary quadratic extension of a totally real field). Thus he proved [R 1]

$$\mathrm{Reg}(L) > C_N \log(|D_L|/N^N)\,, \tag{1.1}$$

where L is assumed non CM, $N = [L:\mathbf{Q}]$ and $C_N > 0$ depends explicitly on N. In 1984 Silverman [Sil] improved the dependence on $\log|D_L|$ in (1.1) to

$$\mathrm{Reg}(L) > 2^{-4N^2}\left(\log(|D_L|/N^{N^{\log_2(8N)}})\right)^{r_L-\rho},$$

where $|D_L| > N^{N^{\log_2(8N)}}$ is assumed, r_L is the unit rank of L and $\rho = \max\limits_{F\subsetneq L}\{r_F\}$.

1991 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 11R27, 11R29.

Key words and phrases. Regulator, discriminant, unit–weak extensions.

* Partially supported by NSA grant MDA90-H-1019.

** Research supported by the Max Planck Institut für Mathematik and the NSF.

It follows from (1.1) that given an integer N and a real number y there are only finitely many non–CM number fields L such that $[L : \mathbf{Q}] \le N$ and $\mathrm{Reg}(L) < y$. CM fields must be excluded since in this case the regulator is essentially that of a proper subfield and is shared by infinitely many CM fields. We can, however, drop all restrictions on the degree $[L : \mathbf{Q}]$ by using Zimmert's [Z] bound

$$\mathrm{Reg}(L) > (0.04)1.05^{[L:\mathbf{Q}]}.$$

In the late 1980's Bergé and Martinet [B–M 1] [B–M 2] generalized Remak and Silverman's method to the relative case. Given an extension L/K of number fields their idea was to equate the ratio of regulators $\mathrm{Reg}(L)/\mathrm{Reg}(K)$ with the co–volume of a lattice produced from the units of L. In their approach the absolute norm $\mathrm{N}(\mathcal{D}_{L/K})$ of the relative discriminant of L/K appeared naturally and they were able to bound $\mathrm{Reg}(L)/\mathrm{Reg}(K)$ from below by a power of $\log(\mathrm{N}(\mathcal{D}_{L/K}))$.

While Bergé and Martinet's results can be used quite effectively [B–M 3] if $\mathrm{N}(\mathcal{D}_{L/K})$ is large, they are otherwise not so strong. This makes it difficult to obtain inequalities in which K is allowed to vary, say only fixing $[L : \mathbf{Q}]$, as there will be in general infinitely many L/K with $\mathrm{N}(\mathcal{D}_{L/K}) = 1$. Our results for totally real fields [C–F] suggested that this problem could be overcome by modifying Bergé and Martinet's lattice. We use the lattice associated to the relative units $E_{L/K}$. By definition, $E_{L/K}$ consists of those units of L whose norm to K is a root of unity. Since the co–volume of $E_{L/K}$ under the logarithmic embedding is readily related to $\mathrm{Reg}(L)/\mathrm{Reg}(K)$, we can apply Remak's geometric method to bound the absolute discriminant of $\mathbf{Q}(E_{L/K})$ from above in terms of $\mathrm{Reg}(L)/\mathrm{Reg}(K)$. It turns out that $\mathbf{Q}(E_{L/K}) = L$, except when one of the following three conditions holds:

(i) $L = K$.

(ii) The field L is CM (and K is any subfield of L).

(iii) The field L is a Galois extension of a totally real field k with group $\mathrm{Gal}(L/k) \cong \mathbf{Z}/2\mathbf{Z} \times \mathbf{Z}/2\mathbf{Z}$, $k \subsetneq K \subsetneq L$, and there is a CM field $M \neq K$ lying strictly between k and L.

We call the extension L/K ***unit–weak*** if it satisfies (i), (ii) or (iii) above.

Theorem. *Let L/K be an extension of number fields and assume that $D_L > 3N^N$, where D_L is the absolute discriminant of L and $N = [L : \mathbf{Q}]$. Then*

$$\frac{\mathrm{Reg}(L)}{\mathrm{Reg}(K)} > \frac{C}{N^{2r}} \left(\log(|D_L|/N^N)\right)^m. \tag{1.2}$$

Here Reg *is the regulator, $C > 0$ is a computable absolute constant, $r = r_L - r_K = \mathrm{rank}(E_{L/K})$ is the difference of the unit ranks of L and K, and $m = m(L/K) = r - \max_{F \subsetneq L}\{\mathrm{rank}(E_{L/K} \cap F)\}$, where F runs over all proper subfields of L and where $E_{L/K}$ is* *the group consisting of those units of L whose norm to K is a root of unity. If L/K is not unit–weak (see above definition), then $m \geq 1$.*

In general we do not obtain a good value of C, so we do not calculate it here. Our proof does yield that one can take $C = 1$ and $m = r$ if K contains all proper subfields of L. In general, $m = \max_{F \subsetneq L}\{\dim_{\mathbf{R}}((\mathcal{L}(E_{L/K}) \otimes_{\mathbf{Z}} \mathbf{R}) \cap (\mathcal{L}(F^*) \otimes_{\mathbf{Z}} \mathbf{R}))\}$, where $\mathcal{L}$ denotes the logarithmic embedding (2.1). Thus m can be computed by linear algebra without any knowledge of $E_{L/K}$.

When L/K is unit–weak, m vanishes and (1.2) becomes almost useless. However, in this case the ratio of regulators $\mathrm{Reg}(L)/\mathrm{Reg}(K)$ is essentially that of a proper sub–extension. Unit–weak extensions can thus be treated inductively and represent no essential complication to the problem of bounding $\mathrm{Reg}(L)/\mathrm{Reg}(K)$ from below. We treat unit–weak extensions briefly at the end of §2 and 3.

A consequence of (1.2) is

Corollary. *Given an integer N and a real number y, there are at most finitely many extensions L/K such that $[L : \mathbf{Q}] \leq N$, $\mathrm{Reg}(L)/\mathrm{Reg}(K) < y$ and L/K is not unit-weak.*

If L is totally real we can drop the restriction on $[L : \mathbf{Q}]$. In other words, given any real number y there are finitely many pairs of *totally real* fields L and K, with $K \subsetneq L$, such that $\mathrm{Reg}(L)/\mathrm{Reg}(K) < y$ [C–F]. We do not know if this extends to all non unit–weak L/K, totally real or not.

2. The field generated by the relative units

Recall that the group of relative units $E_{L/K}$ of an extension L/K of number fields is defined by

$$E_{L/K} = \{\alpha \in E_L \mid \mathrm{Norm}_{L/K}(\alpha) \in W_K\},$$

where E_L denotes the units of L and W_K the torsion subgroup of E_K. The (free) rank of $E_{L/K}$ is $r = r_{L/K} = r_L - r_K$, where r_L is the rank of E_L. Let $\mathcal{S}_L$ denote the set of embeddings of L into $\mathbf{C}$. We embed E_L/W_L into $\mathbf{R}^{\mathcal{S}_L}$ by the map $\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L}_L : E_L \longrightarrow \mathbf{R}^{\mathcal{S}_L}$ defined by

$$\big(\mathcal{L}_L(\alpha)\big)_\sigma = \big(\mathcal{L}(\alpha)\big)_\sigma = \log|\sigma(\alpha)|\,, \qquad \sigma \in \mathcal{S}_L\,. \tag{2.1}$$

We endow $\mathbf{R}^{\mathcal{S}_L}$ with the Euclidean inner product

$$<(x_\sigma),(y_\sigma)> \;=\; \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{S}_L} x_\sigma y_\sigma\,. \tag{2.2}$$

Then $\mathcal{L}_L(E_{L/K})$ is perpendicular to $\mathcal{L}_L(E_K)$. A dimension count shows that the $\mathbf{Q}$–spans $\mathbf{Q}\mathcal{L}_L(E_{L/K})$ and $\mathbf{Q}\mathcal{L}_L(E_K)$ of these two lattices are orthogonal complements of each other inside $\mathbf{Q}\mathcal{L}(E_L)$.

Our first goal is to characterize the extensions L/K for which $\mathbf{Q}(E_{L/K})$ is a proper subfield of L. Slightly more generally, we prove

Proposition 1. *Let L/K be an extension of number fields and let $E_{L/K}$ be its group of relative units. Let E be a subgroup of finite index in $E_{L/K}$ and suppose that E is contained in a proper subfield of L. Then at least one of (i), (ii) or (iii) below holds:*

(i) $L = K$.

(ii) L *is CM (and* $K \subset L$ *is arbitrary).*

(iii) The field L *is a Galois extension of a totally real field* k *with group* $\mathrm{Gal}(L/k) \cong \mathbf{Z}/2\mathbf{Z} \times \mathbf{Z}/2\mathbf{Z}$, $k \subsetneq K \subsetneq L$, *and some CM field* $M \neq K$ *lies strictly between* k *and* L.

Conversely, if (iii), (ii) or (i) holds (with $L \neq \mathbf{Q}$*), then* $E_{L/K}$ *contains a subgroup* E *as above.*

Proof. The last statement is obvious in cases (i) and (ii). If (iii) holds let $H \neq K$, $H \neq M$ be the third field lying strictly between k and L. A short computation shows that $E := E_{H/k} \subset H$ has the same rank as $E_{L/K}$ and $E \subset E_{L/K}$, proving the converse claim.

We now prove the first part of the proposition. Given a subfield $F \subset L$ and an archimedean place ω of L, let $e_F(\omega) = e_{L/F}(\omega) = 2$ if ω ramifies in L/F. Otherwise let $e_F(\omega) = 1$. Let ∞_F denote the set of archimedean places of F. Then

$$r_F + 1 = \frac{1}{[L:F]} \sum_{\omega \in \infty_L} e_F(\omega)\,, \tag{2.3}$$

because

$$r_F + 1 = \sum_{\nu \in \infty_F} 1 = \sum_{\nu \in \infty_F} \frac{1}{[L:F]} \sum_{\substack{\omega \in \infty_L \\ \omega | \nu}} e_F(\omega) = \frac{1}{[L:F]} \sum_{\omega \in \infty_L} e_F(\omega)\,.$$

Let $H = \mathbf{Q}(E)$. Then $H \subsetneq L$, by assumption. Since $E \subset E_H$, we have $r_H \geq r_{L/K} = r_L - r_K$. From this and (2.3) we obtain

$$\frac{1}{[L:H]} \sum_{\omega \in \infty_L} e_H(\omega) \;+\; \frac{1}{[L:K]} \sum_{\omega \in \infty_L} e_K(\omega) \;>\; \sum_{\omega \in \infty_L} 1\,.$$

The compositum $HK \subset L$ contains E and E_K. These are independent (perpendicular!) subgroups of E_L of rank $r_L - r_K$ and r_K. Hence the units of HK have rank r_L. If $HK \neq L$, then L must be a CM field, in which case the proof is done. We may therefore assume $HK = L$. Then we cannot simultaneously have $e_H(\omega) = 2$ and $e_K(\omega) = 2$ for $\omega \in \infty_L$. Hence,

$$\Big(\frac{1}{[L:H]} + \frac{1}{[L:K]}\Big) \sum_{\omega \in \infty_L} 1 \;+\; \max\Big(\frac{1}{[L:H]}, \frac{1}{[L:K]}\Big) \sum_{\omega \in \infty_L} 1 \;>\; \sum_{\omega \in \infty_L} 1\,. \tag{2.4}$$

By assumption, $[L:H] \geq 2$. Thus, either $[L:H] = 2$ or $[L:K] = 2$ (we dismiss the trivial case $L = K$).

We first assume $[L:K]=2$. Let τ be the non–trivial element of $\mathrm{Gal}(L/K)\cong \mathbf{Z}/2\mathbf{Z}$. For $\alpha\in E\subset E_{L/K}$, we have $\mathrm{Norm}_{L/K}(\alpha)\in W_K$. Therefore, $\tau(\alpha)=\eta\alpha^{-1}$, $\eta\in W_K$. By passing, as we may, to a subgroup of finite index in E, we can assume $\tau(\alpha)=\alpha^{-1}$. Hence τ induces a non–trivial field automorphism of $H=\mathbf{Q}(E)$. Let H_τ be its fixed field, so that $[H:H_\tau]=2$. Since $H_\tau\subset L_\tau=K$, we must have either $H\cap K=H_\tau$ or $H\cap K=H$. In the latter case we would have $E\subset K$. But then $E\subset K\cap E_{L/K}=W_K$. Since E has finite index in $E_{L/K}$, this could only happen if L is CM. We may thus assume $H\cap K=H_\tau$. Then $E\subset H\cap E_{L/K}=E_{H/H\cap K}\subset E_{L/K}$. Since E has finite index in $E_{L/K}$, $r_{H/H\cap K}=r_{L/K}$. From this and (2.3) we find

$$\frac{1}{[L:H]}\sum_{\omega\in\infty_L} e_H(\omega)\;-\;\frac{1}{[L:H\cap K]}\sum_{\omega\in\infty_L} e_{H\cap K}(\omega)\;=\;\sum_{\omega\in\infty_L}1\;-\;\tfrac{1}{2}\sum_{\omega\in\infty_L} e_K(\omega).$$

Since $[L:H\cap K]=2\,[L:H]$, we have

$$\frac{1}{[L:H]}\sum_{\omega\in\infty_L}\left(2e_H(\omega)-e_{H\cap K}(\omega)\right)\;=\;\sum_{\omega\in\infty_L}\left(2-e_K(\omega)\right). \tag{2.5}$$

Observe that if ω ramifies in L/K, then ω ramifies in $L/H\cap K$ but does not ramify in L/H (since $L=HK$). Thus, if $e_K(\omega)=2$ then $2e_H(\omega)-e_{H\cap K}(\omega)=0$. If $e_K(\omega)=1$, then $2e_H(\omega)-e_{H\cap K}(\omega)\le 2$. It now follows from (2.5) that $[L:H]=2$ and that $e_H(\omega)=2$ if and only if $e_K(\omega)=1$. Hence $[L:H]=2=[H:H\cap K]=[K:H\cap K]$ and all archimedean places of L ramify in either L/K or L/H, but none ramifies in both extensions. It follows that L/K satisfies condition (iii) in the proposition (let $k=K\cap H$ and let $M\neq K$, $M\neq H$, be the third field lying strictly between k and L). This proves Proposition 1 when $[L:K]=2$.

If $[L:K]>2$, then (2.4) implies $[L:H]=2$. The strategy now is to reverse the roles of H and K and thereby reduce the proof to the quadratic case which we have just handled. Recall that if F is any subfield of L, then the $\mathbf{Q}$–spans of $\mathcal{L}(E_{L/F})$ and $\mathcal{L}(E_F)$ are orthogonal with respect to the ($\mathbf{R}$–valued) inner product (2.2). By construction, $\mathcal{L}(E)\subset\mathcal{L}(E_H)$. Since E has finite index in $E_{L/K}$, $\mathbf{Q}\mathcal{L}(E)=\mathbf{Q}\mathcal{L}(E_{L/K})$. Hence

$$\mathbf{Q}\mathcal{L}(E_{L/H})=\mathbf{Q}\mathcal{L}(E_H)^{\perp}\subset\mathbf{Q}\mathcal{L}(E_{L/K})^{\perp}=\mathbf{Q}\mathcal{L}(E_K), \tag{2.6}$$

where $^{\perp}$ denotes the orthogonal complement inside $\mathbf{Q}\mathcal{L}(E_L)$. Since the kernel W_L of $\mathcal{L}$ is finite, (2.6) shows that $E_{L/H}^n\subset E_K$ for some positive integer n. Thus $E':=E_{L/H}^n$ has finite index in $E_{L/H}$, $[L:H]=2$ and $\mathbf{Q}(E')\subset K$, a proper subfield of L. But this is the quadratic case of the proposition, so the proof is done.

We conclude this section with a brief discussion of the unit–index $u_{L/K}$ of a unit–weak extension L/K. We assume first that $K\neq L$ and that L is not CM. Let k and M be as in (iii) above. Denote by K and H the two remaining fields lying strictly between k and L. Let τ_H, τ_K and $\tau_M=\tau_H\tau_K$ be the non-trivial automorphisms of L/H, L/K and L/M. Since we assume that L is not CM, at least one archimedean place of k ramifies in H. Hence at least one archimedean place of K ramifies in L. Thus $W_K = \{\pm 1\}$ and -1 is not a norm in L/K, whence $\mathrm{Norm}_{L/K}(E_{L/K}) = \{+1\}$. Equivalently, $\tau_K(\alpha) = \alpha^{-1}$ for $\alpha \in E_{L/K}$. Hence, $\mathrm{Norm}_{L/M}(\alpha) = \alpha\tau_H(\tau_K(\alpha)) = \alpha/\tau_H(\alpha)$. Therefore, $\mathrm{Norm}_{L/M}(\alpha) = 1$ if and only if $\alpha \in E_{L/K} \cap H = E_{H/k}$. In short, $\mathrm{Norm}_{L/M}$ induces an injection of $E_{L/K}/E_{H/k}$ into $W_M = E_{M/k}$. As $W_M^2 = \mathrm{Norm}_{L/M}(W_M) \subset \mathrm{Norm}_{L/M}(W_L)$ and W_M is cyclic, we have $u_{L/K} := [E_{L/K} : W_L E_{H/k}] = 1$ or 2.

So far we have assumed that L is not CM. If L is CM, let H be its maximal totally real subfield. It is well-known that $[E_L : W_L E_H] = 1$ or 2 [R 2]. It follows that $u_{L/K} := [E_{L/K} : W_L E_{H/k}] = 1$ or 2, where $k = H \cap K$. Finally, if $L = K$ we let $H = k = \mathbf{Q}$ and $u_{L/K} = 1$.

We have thus defined, whenever L/K is unit–weak, a sub–extension H/k and a unit–index $u_{L/K} := [E_{L/K} : W_L E_{H/k}] = 1$ or 2. When L is CM and $K = \mathbf{Q}$, $u_{L/\mathbf{Q}}$ is just the usual unit–index of L. In the next section we relate the regulators of $E_{L/K}$ and $E_{H/k}$ using $u_{L/K}$. Notice that H/k is not unit–weak unless $r_{L/K} = 0$.

3. Proof of Theorem

We begin with the definition of the regulator of relative units $\mathrm{Reg}(E_{L/K})$. Pick $\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \cdots, \alpha_r$ to be independent generators of the relative units modulo torsion. Let M be the matrix $M = (\log \|\alpha_i\|_\omega)$, where $1 \le i \le r$, ω runs over the set ∞_L of archimedean places of L and $\| \ \|_\omega$ denotes the normalized absolute value at ω (so that $\| \ \|_\omega = | \ |_\omega^2$ if ω is complex and $\| \ \|_\omega = | \ |_\omega$ otherwise). For each place $\nu \in \infty_K$, fix a place $\omega_\nu \in \infty_L$ lying above ν. Then $\mathrm{Reg}(E_{L/K})$ is the absolute value of the determinant of the submatrix of M which results when we delete from M the rows corresponding to the ω_ν's. In [C–F, Th. 1] we showed, for L/K of any signature,

$$\mathrm{Reg}(E_{L/K}) \ = \ \frac{1}{[E_K : W_K\, \mathrm{N}_{L/K}(E_L)]}\, \frac{\mathrm{Reg}(L)}{\mathrm{Reg}(K)}\,. \tag{3.1}$$

We also related [C–F, Lemma 2.1] $\mathrm{Reg}(E_{L/K})$ to the r–dimensional volume $V_L(E_{L/K})$ of a fundamental domain for $\mathcal{L}(E_{L/K})$ (see (2.1)),

$$V_L(E_{L/K}) = [L:K]^{(r_1(K)+r_2(K))/2}\, 2^{(r_2(K)-r_2(L))/2}\, \mathrm{Reg}(E_{L/K})\,, \tag{3.2}$$

where (r_1, r_2) denotes the number of (real, complex) places. The Euclidean structure (which normalizes volume) is given by $\|(x_\sigma)\|^2 = <(x_\sigma),(x_\sigma)>$, as in (2.2). For $\alpha \in E_L$ we write $\|\alpha\|$ instead of $\|\mathcal{L}(\alpha)\|$. Thus,

$$\|\alpha\|^2 \ := \ \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{S}_L} (\log|\sigma(\alpha)|)^2\,, \tag{3.3}$$

where $\mathcal{S}_L$ denotes the set of all embeddings of L into $\mathbf{C}$. We will need the lower bound [F, (3.21)]

$$\|\alpha\| > \frac{C'}{\sqrt{N}(\log N)^3} \tag{3.4}$$

where $\alpha \in E_L$, $\alpha \notin W_L$, $N = [L : \mathbf{Q}]$ and $C' > 0$ is a computable absolute constant (inequality (3.4) follows easily from Dobrowolsky's lower bound for heights [D]).

Let the successive minima of $\| \ \|$ on the lattice $\mathcal{L}(E_{L/K})$ be attained at $\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2, \cdots, \varepsilon_r$. Thus [G–K, pp. 195, 197] the subgroup $E := <\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2, \cdots, \varepsilon_r>$ of $E_{L/K}$ generated by the ε_i has finite index in $E_{L/K}$ and

$$0 < \|\varepsilon_1\| \leq \|\varepsilon_2\| \leq \cdots \leq \|\varepsilon_r\|, \tag{3.5}$$

$$\prod_{i=1}^{r} \|\varepsilon_i\| \leq \gamma_r^{r/2} V_L(E_{L/K}), \tag{3.6}$$

where γ_r denotes Hermite's constant in dimension $r = r_{L/K}$.

Lemma. *Let $\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2, \cdots, \varepsilon_r$ be as above and assume that L/K is not unit–weak (see §1). Let $H_0 = \mathbf{Q}$, $H_i = H_{i-1}(\varepsilon_i)$. Then there is integer T such that $H_T \neq L$, $H_{T+1} = L$, $0 \leq T < r$ and*

$$\frac{1}{[L:\mathbf{Q}]} \log|D_L| \leq \log([L:\mathbf{Q}]) + \frac{1}{\sqrt{3[L:\mathbf{Q}]}} \sum_{i=1}^{T+1} \|\varepsilon_i\| \sqrt{[H_i : H_{i-1}]^2 - 1},$$

where D_L denotes the absolute discriminant of L and $\| \ \|$ is given by (3.3).

Proof. Proposition 1 implies that there is a least $T < r$ so that $L = \mathbf{Q}(\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2, \cdots, \varepsilon_{T+1})$. The inequality then follows from [F, (3.3), (3.14) and Lemma 3.5].

Theorem. *Let L/K be an extension of number fields and assume that $D_L > 3N^N$, where D_L is the absolute discriminant of L and $N = [L : \mathbf{Q}]$. Then*

$$\operatorname{Reg}(E_{L/K}) \geq \frac{C}{N^{2r}} \left(\log(|D_L|/N^N)\right)^m. \tag{3.7}$$

Here $\operatorname{Reg}(E_{L/K})$ is the regulator of relative units given by (3.1) above, $C > 0$ is a computable absolute constant, $r = r_L - r_K = \operatorname{rank}(E_{L/K})$ is the difference of the unit ranks of L and K, and $m = m(L/K) = r - \max_{F \subsetneq L}\{\operatorname{rank}(E_{L/K} \cap F)\}$, where F runs over all proper subfields of L and where $E_{L/K}$ is the group consisting of those units of L whose norm to K is a root of unity. If L/K is not unit–weak (see §1), then $m \geq 1$.

The slightly simplified version of the theorem given in §1 follows from (3.1) and (3.7).

Proof. We first assume that L/K is not unit–weak. From the lemma and (3.5) we have

$$\frac{1}{N}\log(|D_L|/N^N) \leq \frac{\|\varepsilon_{T+1}\|}{\sqrt{3N}} \sum_{i=1}^{T+1} \sqrt{[H_i : H_{i-1}]^2 - 1} \leq \|\varepsilon_{T+1}\|\sqrt{N/3}, \tag{3.8}$$

since $\prod_{i=1}^{T+1}[H_i : H_{i-1}] = N$. From (3.5), (3.6) and (3.4)

$$\|\varepsilon_{T+1}\|^{r-T} \le \prod_{i=T+1}^{r} \|\varepsilon_i\| \le \frac{\gamma_r^{r/2} V_L(E_{L/K})}{\left(\frac{C'}{\sqrt{N}(\log N)^3}\right)^T}. \tag{3.9}$$

If we put this together with (3.2) and (3.8), and use $\log(|D_L|/N^N) > 0$, we find

$$\frac{1}{N^{2r}}\left(\log(|D_L|/N^N)\right)^{r-T} \le \frac{\left(([L:K]/2)^{(r_1(K)+r_2(K))/r} 2^{([K:\mathbf{Q}]-r_2(L))/r} \frac{\gamma_r}{3N}\right)^{r/2}}{\left(\frac{NC'}{\sqrt{3}(\log N)^3}\right)^T} \operatorname{Reg}(E_{L/K}). \tag{3.10}$$

If $[L : K] \ge 3$, (2.3) yields

$$r = r_L - r_K = \sum_{\omega\in\infty_L}\left(1 - \frac{e_K(\omega)}{[L:K]}\right) \ge \sum_{\omega\in\infty_L}\frac{1}{3} \ge \frac{[L:\mathbf{Q}]}{6}.$$

Hence, for any $[L : K] \ge 2$,

$$([L:K]/2)^{(r_1(K)+r_2(K))/r} \le ([L:K]/2)^{\frac{6}{[L:K]}} < 3.003. \tag{3.11}$$

Note that

$$[K:\mathbf{Q}] - r_2(L) \le r_1(L) + r_2(L) - r_1(K) - r_2(K) = r \tag{3.12}$$

and that, for $r > 2$, $\gamma_r \le r/2.1$ (Proof: Use the inequalities quoted in [C–F, (2.9)]). We have then in (3.10)

$$\left(([L:K]/2)^{(r_1(K)+r_2(K))/r} 2^{([K:\mathbf{Q}]-r_2(L))/r} \frac{\gamma_r}{3N}\right)^{r/2} \le 1, \tag{3.13}$$

for all $r > 0$ (do $r = 1$ or 2 separately). Since $T < r < N$, (3.10) and (3.13) yield

$$\operatorname{Reg}(E_{L/K}) > \frac{C}{N^{2r}}\left(\log(|D_L|/N^N)\right)^{r-T}, \tag{3.14}$$

with $C > 0$ a computable absolute constant. To prove (3.7) we must still show that in (3.14) we can replace T by $\rho := \max_{F \subsetneq L}\{\operatorname{rank}(E_{L/K} \cap F)\}$. Since we assume $D_L > 3N^N$, it suffices to show $T \le \rho$. By the lemma, H_T is a proper subfield of L containing the T independent relative units $\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2, \cdots, \varepsilon_T \in E_{L/K}$. Hence $T \le \rho$. Proposition 1 implies that $m = r - \rho > 0$, which concludes the proof when L/K is not unit–weak.

If L/K is unit–weak then $m = r - \rho = 0$ in (3.7). In this case (3.7) follows from

Proposition 2. *Let L/K be an extension of number fields. Then*

$$\operatorname{Reg}(E_{L/K}) \geq \frac{c^r}{(Nr\,(\log N)^6)^{r/2}}. \tag{3.15}$$

Here $\operatorname{Reg}(E_{L/K})$ *is the regulator of relative units given by (3.1) above,* $c > 0$ *is a computable absolute constant,* $N = [L : \mathbf{Q}]$ *and* $r = r_L - r_K$ *is the difference of the unit ranks of L and K (If $r = 0$, (3.15) means the trivial $1 \geq 1$).*

Proof. From (3.4), (3.6) and (3.2) we obtain

$$\operatorname{Reg}(E_{L/K}) \geq \left(\frac{C'^2}{N\gamma_r\,(\log N)^6\,([L:K]/2)^{(r_1(K)+r_2(K))/r}\,2^{([K:\mathbf{Q}]-r_2(L))/r}} \right)^{r/2}.$$

Now use (3.11), (3.12) and $\gamma_r \leq r$ to obtain (3.15), with $c = C'/\sqrt{6.006}$.

Corollary. *Let L/K (and all notation) be as in the theorem. Suppose further that all proper subfields of L are contained in K. Then*

$$\operatorname{Reg}(E_{L/K}) \geq \frac{1}{N^{2r}} \left(\log(|D_L|/N^N)\right)^r. \tag{3.16}$$

Proof. We first dispose of the trivial cases. If $L = K$ is unit–weak, the hypothesis on K implies that case (iii) in Proposition 1 cannot hold. If (ii) holds, so L is CM, then K must be its maximal totally real subfield. Then $r = 0$ and (3.16) is trivial. Since case (i) ($L = K$) is equally trivial, we may assume that L/K is not unit weak. But then $T = 0$ in (3.10) because of the assumption on K (use $E_{L/K} \cap K = W_K$). The corollary now follows from (3.13) and (3.10).

We conclude with a comment on $\operatorname{Reg}(E_{L/K})$ and $\operatorname{Reg}(L)/\operatorname{Reg}(K)$ for L/K unit–weak. We defined in §2 a sub–extension H/k and a unit index $u_{L/K} := [E_{L/K} : W_L E_{H/k}] = 1$ or 2. On examining the ramification of the archimedean places in L/K and H/k one finds, directly from the definition of $\operatorname{Reg}(E_{L/K})$ as a determinant,

$$\operatorname{Reg}(E_{L/K}) = 2^{r_{H/k}} \operatorname{Reg}(E_{H/k})/u_{L/K}\,. \tag{3.17}$$

If we let L/K range over the infinitely many unit–weak extensions associated to the same H/k, it is clear from (3.17) that $\operatorname{Reg}(E_{L/K})$ assumes at most two values. It follows, mainly from (3.1), that $\operatorname{Reg}(L)/\operatorname{Reg}(K)$ assumes at most $2^{[H:\mathbf{Q}]}$ values.

References

[B–M 1] Bergé, A.–M. and Martinet, J.: *Sur les minorations géométriques des régulateurs*, Séminaire de Théorie des Nombres de Paris 1987–1988 (C. Goldstein, ed.), Birkhäuser Verlag, Boston 1990, pp. 23–50.

[B–M 2] Bergé, A.–M. and Martinet, J.: *Notions relatives de régulateur et de hauteur*, Acta Arith. **54** (1989), 155–170.

[B–M 3] Bergé, A.–M. and Martinet, J.: *Minorations de hauteurs et petits régulateurs relatifs*, Séminaire de Théorie des Nombres de Bordeaux 1987-1988, Univ. de Bordeaux, 1989.

[C–F] Costa, A. and Friedman, E.: *Ratios of regulators in totally real extensions of number fields*, J. Number Theory **37** (1991), 288-297.

[D] Dobrowolsky, E.: *On a question of Lehmer and the number of irreducible factors of a polynomial*, Acta Arith. **34** (1979), 391–401.

[F] Friedman, E.: *Analytic formulas for the regulator of a number field*, Invent. Math. **98** (1989), 599–622.

[G–K] Gruber, P. M. and Lekkerkerker, C. G.: *Geometry of Numbers*, North Holland, Amsterdam, 1987.

[L] Landau, E.: *Abschätzungen von Charaktersummen, Einheiten und Klassenzahlen*, Nachr. Kgl. Ges. Wiss. Göttingen, Math.–Phys. Kl. (1918), 79–97. Also in Landau's *Collected Works* **7**, Thales Verlag, Essen, pp. 114–132.

[R 1] Remak, R.: *Über Größenbeziehungen zwischen Diskriminanten und Regulator eines algebraischen Zahlkörpers*, Compos. Math. **10** (1952), 245–285.

[R 2] Remak, R.: *Über algebraische Zahlkörper mit schwachem Einheitsdefekt*. Compos. Math. **12** (1954), 35–80.

[Sie] Siegel, C.–L.: *Abschätzungen von Einheiten*, Nachr. Akadem. Wiss. Göttingen Math.–Phys. Kl., Nr. 9 (1969), 71–86. Also in Siegel's *Gesammelte Abhandlungen* **4**, Springer Verlag, Berlin, 1979, pp. 66–81.

[Sil] Silverman, J.: *An inequality connecting the regulator and discriminant of a number field*, J. Number Theory **19** (1984), 437-442.

[Z] Zimmert, R.: *Ideale kleiner Norm in Idealklassen und eine Regulatorabschätzung*, Invent. Math. **62** (1981), 367–380.

A. Costa, Department of Mathematics, American University, Washington, D.C. 20016, U.S.A.

E. Friedman, Max Planck Institut für Mathematik, Gottfried Claren Straße 26, 5300 Bonn 3, Germany