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## 1. Introduction and results

Let $K$ be a number field, $[K: \mathbb{Q}]<\infty, \mathcal{O}_{K}$ maximal order in $K$. Let Disc $K=\operatorname{Disc} \mathcal{O}_{K} \in \mathbb{Z}$. Everything we say today will be over $\mathbb{Q}$ for simplicity, but we could also do this for relative extensions and ask the same questions and get the same sort of results.

Let $\operatorname{Gal}(K)=\operatorname{Gal}(\tilde{K} / \mathbb{Q})$ be the Galois group of $K\left(\operatorname{Gal}(K) \subset S_{[K: \mathbb{Q}]}\right)$ acting on $K \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$. Suppose we have a permutation group $G \subset S_{n}$, and define

$$
N(G, X):=\#\{\text { isomorphism classes of } K \text { with } \operatorname{Gal}(K)=G \text { and } \operatorname{Disc}(K) \mid \leq X
$$

The question of counting number fields, then, amounts to studying this asymptotically in $X$.
We can formulate more refined counting questions. Let $p$ be a prime of $\mathbb{Z}, p \mathcal{O}_{K}=\prod \mathfrak{p}_{\mathfrak{i}}{ }^{e_{i}}, f_{i}=\left[\mathcal{O}_{K} / \mathfrak{p}_{\mathfrak{i}}: \mathbb{Z} / p\right]$.
Definition 1.1. A splitting type is the multiset of ramification and inertia degrees: $\left\{\left\{\left(e_{i}, f_{i}\right)\right\}\right\}$ (or more precisely, isomorphism class of $K \otimes \mathbb{Q}_{p}$ as a $\mathbb{Q}_{p}$-algebra).

Let $S$ be a splitting type at $p$. We define

$$
\operatorname{Prob}_{G}(S):=\lim _{X \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\#\{\text { isomorphism classes of } K \text { with } \operatorname{Gal}(K)=G,|\operatorname{Disc}(K)| \leq X, \text { splitting type } S\}}{N(G, X)}
$$

Understanding these probabilities is a "vertical question," which we compare to the "horizontal question": fix $K$, vary $p$, ask about the densities of splitting types. These are given by Chebotarev density theorem as a function of $\operatorname{Gal}(K)$.

Remark 1.2. For fixed $K$, finitely many $p$ ramify. For fixed $p$, there can be infinitely many $K$ in which $p$ ramify.

Guesses:
(1) Chebotarev probability: restrict to unramified splitting, might guess that horizontal probabilities equal vertical probabilities
(2) Fix $S_{1}, \ldots, S_{k}$ splitting types at distinct primes, "independence guess": $\operatorname{Prob}\left(S_{1}+\ldots+S_{k}\right)=$ $\prod_{i} \operatorname{Prob}\left(S_{i}\right)$
There are many ways and reasons in which these guesses are wrong.
Example 1.3. $G=\mathbb{Z} / 8 \subset S_{8}$ (Wang) There is no $K$ with $\operatorname{Gal}(K)=\mathbb{Z} / 8$, unramified and unsplit at $2 . S$ at 2, $e=1, f=8 \operatorname{Prob}_{\mathbb{Z} / 8}(S)=0$. For fixed $K, \operatorname{Gal}(K)=\mathbb{Z} / 8$, half of the primes have this splitting type.

Theorem 1.4 (Wright). Given $G$ abelian, prime $p$, all splitting types that occur over $p$ for some $K$ with $\operatorname{Gal}(K)=G$, occur with positive probability.

Theorem 1.5 (Wood). These probabilities do not always agree with the Chebotarev probabilities, even over odd primes.

Example 1.6. Prob $_{\mathbb{Z} / 9}($ split completely at $q \mid$ unramified at $q)<\frac{1}{9}, q$ prime, $q=2, \ldots, 13$.

Theorem 1.7 (Wood). Given $G$ abelian, $p$ prime, if we count by conductor instead of discriminant, over $p \neq 2$, splitting types occur with the Chebotarev probability, and for $p=2$, the splitting types that occur have the same relative probabilities as in the Chebotarev question.
Theorem 1.8 (Wood). Independence can fail when counting by discriminant.
Theorem 1.9 (Wood). For G abelian, counting by conductor, independence holds.
So this raises the question: if we're counting number fields, which invariant should we use? (See Wood's talk next week.)

How do we count number fields with abelian Galois groups and certain splitting types?

## 2. Proofs

The strategy does not differ, whether counting by discriminant or counting by conductor. For $G$ abelian, $G \subset S_{G}$. By class field theory, we know

$$
\{K \text { with } \operatorname{Gal}(K)=G\} \longleftrightarrow\left\{J_{\mathbb{Q}} \rightarrow G\right\}
$$

where the idèle class group $J_{\mathbb{Q}}=\left(\mathbb{R}^{*} \times \prod_{p} \mathbb{Q}_{p}^{*}\right) / \mathbb{Q}^{*} \rightarrow G$.
Make the Dirichlet series $\sum a_{n} n^{-s}$, where $a_{n}$ is the number of homomorphisms with invariant $n$. So if we can study $\sum a_{n} n^{-s}$ as a complex function of $s$, then the rightmost pole determines the order of growth of $\sum_{n \leq X} a_{n}$, and the residue determines the constant. This needs analytic continuation of the function of $s$ to the line of the rightmost pole.

In the case of $S_{3}$, Datskovsky and Wright used this. Can use CFT to count abelian number fields.
If we use $J_{Q}^{0} \rightarrow G$, with $J_{Q}^{0} \simeq \prod_{p} \mathbb{Z}_{p}^{*}$ then we have

with $\phi(1, \ldots, 1, p, 1, \ldots, 1)=\phi\left(\frac{1}{p}, \ldots, \frac{1}{p}, 1, \frac{1}{p}, \ldots, \frac{1}{p}\right)$.
Then writing

$$
\prod_{p}\left(\sum_{\phi: \mathbb{Z}_{p}^{*} \rightarrow G} \frac{1}{\operatorname{invt}(\phi)^{s}}\right)
$$

we compute local factors and relate this to $L$-functions to get analytic continuation (expressing in terms of roots of Hecke $L$-functions, zeta functions of number fields, and other parts that are easy to continue). If we do this, we obtain total asymptotics of counting $J_{\mathbb{Q}} \rightarrow G$, and inclusion-exclusion allows us count the surjective homomorphisms.

Harder: say we wanted to know the probability $\operatorname{Prob}(2$ splits completely). This is a question about if $(1,2,1, \ldots, 1) \mapsto 0$. So we'll count continuous homomorphisms $\mathbb{Q}_{2}^{*} \times \prod_{p>2} \mathbb{Z}_{p}^{*} \rightarrow G$. Then we pick out the ones in which $(2,2, \ldots 2) \mapsto 0$. Here we're using

$$
\mathbb{Q}_{2}^{*} \times \prod_{p>2} \mathbb{Z}_{p}^{*} /\langle 2\rangle \simeq J_{\mathbb{Q}}^{0}
$$

We do this by summing over group characters. Then

$$
\sum a_{n} n^{-s}=\sum_{\text {inc-excl group char }} \sum_{\text {Euler products. }}
$$

Multiple summands have the same rightmost pole, but when counting by conductor, they have the same residue. Counting by discriminant, they have different residues.

