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ABSTRACT. A quadratic Z-lattice $L$ of rank $n$ is defined to be $k$-regular for a positive integer $k \leq n$ if $L$ globally represents all quadratic Z-lattices of rank $k$ which are represented everywhere locally by $L$. It is shown that there exist only finitely many isometry classes of primitive positive definite quadratic Z-lattices of rank 4 which are 2-regular.

1. INTRODUCTION

A necessary condition for the representation of a positive integer $a$ by a positive definite integral quadratic form $f(x_1, \ldots, x_n)$ (i.e., the existence of $x \in \mathbb{Z}^n$ such that $f(x) = a$) is that $a$ be locally represented by $f$ at all $p$-adic completions (i.e., for each prime $p$, there exists $x_p \in \mathbb{Z}_p$ such that $f(x_p) = a$). Forms for which these local conditions are also sufficient to guarantee global representation were first systematically studied by Dickson [3], who referred to such forms as “regular”. For example, forms for which the genus and equivalence class coincide (i.e., forms of class number 1) have this regularity property. Primitive positive definite forms of class number 1 are known to occur in only finitely many equivalence classes, regardless of rank [6]. A similar finiteness result for ternary regular forms follows from a fundamental theorem of Watson [10], who considered the number $E(f)$ of positive integers which are represented everywhere locally, but not globally, by a primitive positive definite ternary form $f$, and proved that $E(f)$ is asymptotically bounded from below by a power of the discriminant of $f$. In particular, from this it follows that primitive positive definite ternary regular forms, being those for which $E(f) = 0$, have bounded discriminant and thus occur in only finitely many equivalence classes. In contrast, for any fixed rank $n \geq 4$, it can be shown that there exist infinitely many inequivalent primitive positive definite regular forms. For example, since the form $x_1^2 + x_2^2 + x_3^2 + x_4^2$ is universal, any form which represents this particular form is regular. There is a considerable body of literature devoted to the problem of finding positive definite ternary regular forms (see [4] and the references given there for results of this type).

In this paper, we initiate the study of higher-dimensional analogues of Dickson’s regularity condition. The geometric language of quadratic spaces and lattices...
tices will be adopted throughout the paper, and notation and terminology will follow that of O'Meara's book [8]. The aim of this work is to study the lattices represented by a given $\mathbb{Z}$-lattice $L$ on a positive definite rational quadratic space $V$. The dimension $n$ of $V$ will initially be arbitrary, but will be specialized to $n = 4$ in §4. A $\mathbb{Z}$-lattice $K$ on a rational quadratic space $W$ is said to be represented by $L$, denoted $K \rightarrow L$, if there exists an isometry $\sigma : W \rightarrow V$ such that $\sigma(K) \subseteq L$. In the local setting, representation $K_p \rightarrow L_p$ is defined analogously for the $p$-adic completions of $K$ and $L$.

**Definition 1.1.** Let $L$ be a quadratic $\mathbb{Z}$-lattice of rank $n$, and $k$ a positive integer not exceeding $n$. Then $L$ will be said to be $k$-regular if $L$ represents all quadratic $\mathbb{Z}$-lattices $K$ of rank $k$ for which $K_p \rightarrow L_p$ for all prime spots $p$ on $\mathbb{Q}$.

**Proposition 1.2.** If $L$ is a $k$-regular lattice, then $L$ is $m$-regular for all positive integers $m \leq k$.

**Proof.** Let $M$ be a $\mathbb{Z}$-lattice of rank $m$ for which $M_p \rightarrow L_p$ holds for all prime spots $p$ on $\mathbb{Q}$. Then there exists $L'$ in the genus of $L$ such that $M \rightarrow L'$ [8, 102:5]. Let $\Sigma \in J_V$ be such that $L' = \Sigma L$, and let $K$ be a sublattice of $L'$ of rank $k$ which contains $M$. Then for each $p$, $\Sigma_p^{-1} K_p \subseteq \Sigma_p^{-1} L'_p = L_p$. Thus, $K_p \rightarrow L_p$ holds for all $p$, and then $K \rightarrow L$ follows from the assumption of $k$-regularity. So $M \rightarrow L$. \( \square \)

The main goal of this paper is to prove the finiteness of the number of isometry classes of primitive 2-regular positive definite quaternary $\mathbb{Z}$-lattices (Theorem 4.3). This theorem will be proved by analyzing the successive minima of 2-regular lattices. It will be shown that the 2-regularity condition leads to inequalities of the type $\mu_j \leq C_j D^{\alpha_j}$, where $\mu_j$ is the $j$th successive minimum of the 2-regular lattice $L$, $D$ is the discriminant of $L$, $C_j$ is a constant, and $0 < (\alpha_1 + \alpha_2 + \alpha_3 + \alpha_4) < 1$. Thus $\mu_1 \mu_2 \mu_3 \mu_4 \leq CD^{\beta}$, where $C$ is a constant and $0 < \beta < 1$. But this inequality can be consistent with the elementary inequality $D \leq \mu_1 \mu_2 \mu_3 \mu_4$ for at most finitely many values of $D$. Hence, primitive 2-regular positive definite quaternary lattices must have bounded discriminant, and the desired finiteness follows.

We note that in the proof outlined in the preceding paragraph the estimates for $\mu_1$, $\mu_2$ and $\mu_3$ are established by using only the 1-regularity of the lattice. Hence, similar estimates can be obtained in a completely analogous way for 1-regular ternary lattices, leading to an alternate proof of the finiteness in the ternary case. The stronger assumption of 2-regularity is required only to obtain a suitable bound for $\mu_4$.

### 2. Successive minima

Let $L$ be a $\mathbb{Z}$-lattice on the positive definite rational quadratic space $(V, Q)$ of dimension $n$. We will assume that $L$ is integral, in the sense that $B(x, y) \in \mathbb{Z}$ for all $x, y \in L$, where $B$ is the symmetric bilinear form on $V$ defined by $B(x, y) = \frac{1}{2}(Q(x + y) - Q(x) - Q(y))$. The next definition and lemma are adapted from [2, Chapter 12].

**Definition 2.1.** For $1 \leq j \leq n$, the $j$th minimum of $L$ is that positive integer $\mu_j$ such that
(i) \( \dim(\text{span}\{x \in L : Q(x) \leq \mu_j\}) \geq j \) and 
(ii) \( \dim(\text{span}\{x \in L : Q(x) < \mu_j\}) < j \).

The values \( \mu_1, \ldots, \mu_n \) will be collectively referred to as the “successive minima” of \( L \). The existence of linearly independent vectors \( \mathbf{m}_1, \ldots, \mathbf{m}_n \in L \) with \( Q(\mathbf{m}_j) = \mu_j \) can be established by induction on the dimension, using the following lemma.

**Lemma 2.2.** For some \( j \in \{2, \ldots, n\} \), suppose there exist linearly independent vectors \( \mathbf{m}_1, \ldots, \mathbf{m}_{j-1} \in L \) such that \( Q(\mathbf{m}_i) = \mu_i \) for \( i = 1, \ldots, j-1 \). If \( c \in L \) satisfies the inequality \( Q(c) < \mu_j \), then \( c \in \text{span}\{\mathbf{m}_1, \ldots, \mathbf{m}_{j-1}\} \).

**Proof.** Let \( l \) be the smallest subscript such that \( Q(c) < \mu_l \) (so \( 2 \leq l \leq j \) and \( \mu_{l-1} \leq Q(c) < \mu_l \)). If \( c \notin \text{span}\{\mathbf{m}_1, \ldots, \mathbf{m}_{l-1}\} \) then \( c \notin \text{span}\{\mathbf{m}_1, \ldots, \mathbf{m}_{l-1}, c\} \), and it follows that \( \dim(\text{span}\{\mathbf{m}_1, \ldots, \mathbf{m}_{l-1}, c\}) = l \). But then
\[
\dim(\text{span}\{x \in L : Q(x) \leq Q(c)\}) \geq l
\]
and it follows that \( Q(c) \geq \mu_l \), a contradiction. \( \square \)

The following proposition gives two fundamental inequalities relating the discriminant of \( L \) and the product of its successive minima.

**Proposition 2.3.** Let \( L \) be a lattice of discriminant \( D \) with successive minima \( \mu_1, \ldots, \mu_n \). Then there exists a constant \( C = C(n) \) such that
\[
D \leq \mu_1 \cdots \mu_n \leq CD.
\]

**Proof.** The existence of a constant \( C \) for which the second inequality holds is a classical result of Minkowski (see, e.g., [2, Chapter 12]). The proof of the first inequality requires only real linear algebra, but we sketch a proof in the present context for completeness. Let \( B = \{v_1, \ldots, v_n\} \) be a basis for \( L \), and \( M = (B(v_i, v_j)) \); so \( D = \det(M) \). Let \( \mathbf{m}_1, \ldots, \mathbf{m}_n \) be linearly independent vectors of \( L \) such that \( Q(\mathbf{m}_i) = \mu_i \), let \( x_i \) be the coordinate vector (written as a column vector) for \( \mathbf{m}_i \) with respect to \( B \), and let \( X \in M_n(\mathbb{Z}) \) be the matrix with columns \( x_1, \ldots, x_n \). The matrix \( A = X^tMX \) is positive definite and so is orthogonally similar over \( \mathbb{R} \) to \( I_n \); thus, there exists \( P \in M_n(\mathbb{R}) \) such that \( A = P^tP \). Write \( P = TP_1 \) with \( T \) orthogonal and \( P_1 \) upper triangular, and denote the \( i \)-th entry of \( P_1 \) by \( p_{ij} \). Then \( A = P_1^tP_1 \) and the \( i \)-th diagonal entry of \( A \) is seen to be
\[
\mu_i = Q(\mathbf{m}_i) = \sum_{j=1}^{i} p_{ij}^2 \geq p_{ii}^2.
\]

So
\[
\prod_{i=1}^{n} \mu_i \geq \prod_{i=1}^{n} p_{ii}^2 = (\det(P_1))^2 = \det(A) = (\det(X))^2D.
\]

The desired inequality now follows since \( \det(X) \) is an integer. \( \square \)

We close this section with a specialized result which is tailored to its application in the proof of Theorem 4.3.

**Lemma 2.4.** Let \( L \) be a lattice of rank 4 with successive minima \( \mu_1, \ldots, \mu_4 \), let \( \mathbf{m}_1, \ldots, \mathbf{m}_4 \) be linearly independent vectors in \( L \) with \( Q(\mathbf{m}_i) = \mu_i, 1 \leq i \leq 4 \).
and let $M = \text{span}\{m_1, m_2, m_3\} \cap L$. Let $K$ be a binary lattice with successive minima $\mu'_1, \mu'_2$. If $K$ is represented by $L$, but not by $M$, then $\mu_4 \leq \mu'_2$.

Proof. Without loss of generality, we may assume that $K \subseteq L$. Let $m'_1, m'_2 \in K$ be linearly independent vectors such that $Q(m'_1) = \mu'_1$ and $Q(m'_2) = \mu'_2$. Note that $Q(m'_1 + m'_2) \geq \mu'_2$ implies that $|B(m'_1, m'_2)| \leq \frac{1}{2}Q(m'_1)$.

We first establish that $K = Zm'_1 + Zm'_2$. If not, then there exist $r, s \in \mathbb{Q}$, not both integers, such that $v = rm'_1 + sm'_2 \in K$ (since $m'_1, m'_2 \text{ span } K$). Subtracting off integral multiples of $m'_1$ and $m'_2$, if necessary, we may assume that $0 \leq r, s \leq \frac{1}{2}$, with not both $r$ and $s$ equal $0$. So

$$Q(v) = Q(rm'_1 + sm'_2) \leq \frac{1}{4}Q(m'_1) + \frac{1}{4}Q(m'_2) + \frac{1}{2}|B(m'_1, m'_2)|$$

$$\leq \frac{3}{4}Q(m'_2) < Q(m'_2).$$

If $s \neq 0$, then $\text{dim}(\text{span}\{m'_1, v\}) = 2$ and $Q(v) < \mu'_2$, a contradiction. If $s = 0$, then $v = rm'_1 \in K$ and $Q(v) < \mu'_1$, again a contradiction. Hence it must be that $K = Zm'_1 + Zm'_2$, as claimed.

Now $K \nsubseteq M$, by assumption. So, since $K = Zm'_1 + Zm'_2$, we must have either $m'_1 \notin M$ or $m'_2 \notin M$. Then $\mu'_2 \geq \mu_4$ follows from Lemma 2.2. □

3. Estimation of character sums

The material in this section closely parallels the estimation of character sums in Watson's original paper [10], and indeed the main terms in the estimates remain unchanged. However, detailed proofs of some results are included here, since it is the precise form of the error terms which will play a critical role in later arguments. In this regard, it is the use of the character sum estimate of Burgess [1], rather than that of Pólya [9], which leads to the needed improvement.

The notation in this section is largely independent of that in the rest of the paper. Throughout the section, $\chi_1, \ldots, \chi_r$ will denote a set of Dirichlet characters modulo $k_1, \ldots, k_r$, respectively, $\eta_1, \ldots, \eta_r$ will be values from the set $\{\pm 1\}$, and $\Gamma$ will be the least common multiple of $k_1, \ldots, k_r$. Our goal here is to estimate the number $S(H)$ of positive integers $n$ less than some value $H$ which satisfy the conditions

$$\chi_i(n) = \eta_i, \quad \text{for } i = 1, \ldots, r \quad \text{(3.1)}$$

and

$$\gcd(n, \Delta) = 1, \quad \text{(3.2)}$$

where $\Delta$ is a positive integer relatively prime to $\Gamma$.

An inequality of the form $A \ll B$ will mean that there exists a constant $k$ such that $|A| < kB$. Alternatively we will write $A = B + O(C)$ when $(A - B) \ll C$. Moreover, a statement of the type "$A \ll B^{1+\varepsilon}$" will always mean "for any $\varepsilon > 0$, $A \ll B^{1+\varepsilon}$, where the implied constant depends only on $\varepsilon$". In particular, the symbol $\varepsilon$ is used throughout in a generic sense and is not assumed to have the same value at every occurrence.

It will be convenient to introduce some additional notations for the proof of the next result. We will denote the two-element set $\{1, 2\}$ by $T$ and use the notation $e = (e_1, \ldots, e_r)$ for elements of the product set $T^r$. For any such $e$, the following holds.
\( \pi_e = \prod_{i=1}^{r}(\eta_i \chi_i)^{e_i} \) is a Dirichlet character modulo \( \Gamma \). If \( e = e_0 = (2, 2, \ldots, 2) \), then \( \pi_e \) is the principal character modulo \( \Gamma \). We will say that \( \chi_1, \ldots, \chi_r \) are “independent” if \( \pi_e \) is a nonprincipal character for all \( e \neq e_0 \).

**Lemma 3.1.** If \( \chi_1, \ldots, \chi_r \) are independent, then

\[
\sum_{0<n<H} 1 = 2^{-r} \sum_{0<n<H \atop \gcd(n, \Gamma) = 1} 1 + O(H^{1/2} \Gamma^{1/2} + \epsilon).
\]

**Proof.** If (3.1) holds for \( n \), then \( \pi_e(n) = 1 \) for all \( e \in T^r \). On the other hand, if (3.1) fails for \( n \), then there exists \( j \) such that either \( \chi_j(n) = 0 \) (if \( \gcd(n, k_j) \neq 1 \)) or \( \eta_j \chi_j(n) = -1 \) (if \( \gcd(n, k_j) = 1 \)). If \( \chi_j(n) = 0 \), then \( \pi_e(n) = 0 \) for all \( e \in T^r \). If \( \eta_j \chi_j(n) = -1 \), then \( \sum_{e \in T^r} (\eta_j \chi_j(n))^{e_j} = 0 \). So we obtain

\[
\sum_{e \in T^r} \pi_e(n) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if (3.1) fails for } n, \\ 2^r & \text{if (3.1) holds for } n. \end{cases}
\]

Hence,

\[
2^r \sum_{0<n<H} 1 = \sum_{0<n<H \atop \gcd(n, \Gamma) = 1} \left( \sum_{e \in T^r} \pi_e(n) \right) = \sum_{e \in T^r} \left( \sum_{0<n<H} \pi_e(n) \right)
\]

\[
= \sum_{0<n<H} \pi_{e_0}(n) + \sum_{e \in T^r} \left( \sum_{0<n<H} \pi_e(n) \right)
\]

\[
= \sum_{0<n<H} 1 + \sum_{e \in T^r \atop e \neq e_0} \left( \sum_{0<n<H} \pi_e(n) \right).
\]

So

\[
\left| 2^r \sum_{0<n<H} 1 - \sum_{0<n<H \atop \gcd(n, \Gamma) = 1} 1 \right| \leq \sum_{e \in T^r \atop e \neq e_0} \left| \sum_{0<n<H} \pi_e(n) \right|.
\]

For each \( e \neq e_0 \), \( \pi_e \) is a nonprincipal character modulo \( \Gamma \), and it follows from [1, Theorem 2] that

\[
\left| \sum_{0<n<H} \pi_e(n) \right| \ll H^{1/2} \Gamma^{1/2} + \epsilon.
\]

Hence,

\[
\left| 2^r \sum_{0<n<H} 1 - \sum_{0<n<H \atop \gcd(n, \Gamma) = 1} 1 \right| \ll 2^{r-1} H^{1/2} \Gamma^{1/2} + \epsilon,
\]

and the desired result follows. \( \Box \)

Proceeding exactly as in the proof of Lemma 4 in [10], the following estimate for \( S(H) \) can now be derived from Lemma 3.1.

**Proposition 3.2.** If \( \chi_1, \ldots, \chi_r \) are independent, then

\[
S(H) = 2^{-r} \frac{\phi(\Gamma \Delta)}{\Gamma \Delta} H + O \left( H^{1/2} \Gamma^{1/2} + \epsilon \Delta^c \right),
\]

where \( \phi \) denotes Euler’s phi-function.
The main use of this result in later arguments will be to obtain an upper bound, in terms of the magnitudes of \( \Gamma \) and \( \Delta \), for the smallest positive integer \( h \) for which conditions (3.1) and (3.2) hold. In terms of the sums \( S(H) \), \( h \) can be characterized as \( \min \{ H \in \mathbb{N} : S(H) > 0 \} \).

**Corollary 3.3.** Suppose that \( \chi_1, \ldots, \chi_r \) are independent and \( r \leq \omega(\Gamma) + 1 \), where \( \omega(\Gamma) \) denotes the number of distinct prime divisors of \( \Gamma \). Then \( h \ll \Gamma^\frac{1}{2} + e^\Delta \).

**Proof.** By Proposition 3.2, there exists a positive constant \( C \) such that, for all \( H \),

\[
S(H) \geq 2^{-r} \frac{\phi(\Gamma \Delta)}{\Gamma \Delta} H - CH^\frac{1}{2} \Gamma^\frac{1}{2} + e^\Delta.
\]

It follows that \( S(H) > 0 \) whenever

\[
\sqrt{H} > 2^r C \frac{\Gamma \Delta}{\phi(\Gamma \Delta)} \Gamma^\frac{1}{2} + e^\Delta.
\]

Furthermore, \( 2^r \ll 2^{\omega(\Gamma)} \leq \tau(\Gamma) \ll \Gamma^e \), where \( \tau(\Gamma) \) denotes the number of positive divisors of \( \Gamma \), and \( \frac{\Gamma \Delta}{\phi(\Gamma \Delta)} \ll (\Gamma \Delta)^e \) (e.g., see [5]). The desired inequality \( h \ll \Gamma^\frac{1}{2} + e^\Delta \) follows. □

The following minor refinement of Corollary 3.3 will also be needed.

**Corollary 3.4.** Let \( n_0 \) satisfy (3.1) and (3.2), and let \( h_0 = \min \{ n \in \mathbb{N} : (3.1) \) and (3.2) hold, and \( n \neq \lambda^2 n_0 \) for any \( \lambda \in \mathbb{N} \}. Then, under the assumptions of Corollary 3.3, \( h_0 \ll \Gamma^\frac{1}{2} + e^\Delta \).

**Proof.** Let

\[
S_0(H) = \sum_{0 < n < H, \ (n, \ (3.1), (3.2) \ n \neq \lambda^2 n_0} 1.
\]

Then

\[
S_0(H) = S(H) - \sum_{1 < \lambda < \sqrt{H}/n_0} 1 = S(H) - \left[ \frac{\sqrt{H}}{n_0} \right].
\]

As

\[
\left[ \frac{\sqrt{H}}{n_0} \right] = O(H^\frac{1}{2})
\]

we obtain from Proposition 3.2

\[
S_0(H) = 2^{-r} \frac{\phi(\Gamma \Delta)}{\Gamma \Delta} H + O(H^\frac{1}{2} \Gamma^\frac{3}{16} + e^\Delta).
\]

The proof now follows as for Corollary 3.3. □

4. Representation by Quaternion Lattices

Let \( (V, Q) \) be a positive definite rational quadratic space of dimension 4 and let \( L \) be a \( \mathbb{Z} \)-lattice on \( V \) of scale \( \mathbb{Z} \) and discriminant \( D \). Such a lattice \( L \) is said to be even (odd, respectively) if its norm ideal \( nL \) is \( 2\mathbb{Z} \) (\( \mathbb{Z} \), respectively). Write \( D = \prod D_p \), where \( D_p = p^{ord_p D} \) and the product is taken.
over all primes \( p \). To distinguish between orthogonal splittings of lattices and spaces, it will be convenient to use the notation \( \langle \alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_n \rangle \) for the former and \( [\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_n] \) for the latter. For each odd prime \( p \), \( L_p \) has a splitting of the type \( L_p \cong \langle \alpha_p, p^r \beta_p \rangle \perp L_p' \), where \( \alpha_p, \beta_p \in \mathbb{Z}_p \), \( r_p \) is a nonnegative integer, and \( sL_p' \subseteq p^r \mathbb{Z}_p \). Let \( T_1 \) \( (T_2, \text{ respectively}) \) denote the set of odd primes \( p \) for which \( r_p \geq 1 \) \( (r_p = 0 \text{ and } sL_p' \subseteq p\mathbb{Z}_p \text{, respectively}) \), and let \( T = T_1 \cup T_2 \cup \{2\} \).

For each \( p \in T \), we have \( p^{3r_p} \leq D_p \) and so \( p^{r_p} \leq D_p^{\frac{1}{3}} \); for \( p \in T_2 \), \( p^2|D \) implies that \( p \leq D_p^{\frac{1}{3}} \). For the prime 2, there are two possible types of splittings to consider. If \( nL_2 = 2\mathbb{Z}_2 \), let \( r_2 = 0 \). On the other hand, if \( nL_2 = \mathbb{Z}_2 \) then there is a splitting \( L_2 = L_2' \perp \mathbb{Z}_2 \) with \( Q(x) \in \mathbb{Z}_2 \) and \( sL_2' \subseteq \mathbb{Z}_2 \); in this case, let \( r_2 \) denote that nonnegative integer such that \( nL_2' = 2^{r_2}\mathbb{Z}_2 \). Note that \( sL_2' \subseteq 2^{n\mathbb{Z}_2} \), and it follows that \( vL_2' \subseteq 2^{(r_2 - 1)\mathbb{Z}_2} \); thus, \( 3(r_2 - 1) \leq \text{ord}_2 dL_2 = \text{ord}_2 D \) and \( 2^n \leq (8D_2)^{\frac{1}{3}} \). Let \( \Omega \) denote the product \( \prod_{p \in T} p^{r_p} \). From the above inequalities it follows that \( \Omega \leq (8 \prod_{p \in T} D_p)^{\frac{1}{3}} \leq (8D)^{\frac{1}{3}} \).

**Lemma 4.1.** For each \( p \in T \), there exists a binary \( \mathbb{Z}_p \)-lattice \( N(p) \subseteq L_p \) such that \( sN(p) = \mathbb{Z}_p \) and \( \text{ord}_p dN(p) = r_p \).

**Proof.** For odd \( p \in T \), simply take \( N(p) \subseteq L_p \) such that \( N(p) \cong \langle \alpha_p, p^r \beta_p \rangle \). So we consider further only \( p = 2 \). To analyze the splitting of \( L_2 \), it is helpful to first summarize some facts regarding the splitting of lattices over \( \mathbb{Z}_2 \) (for details and proofs, see [8, §93]). If \( K \) is a \( \mathbb{Z}_2 \)-lattice with scale \( 2^l\mathbb{Z}_2 \), then any \( \mathbb{Z}_2 \)-splitting of \( K \) contains a \( 2^l\mathbb{Z}_2 \)-modular component \( M \). Moreover, \( nK = 2^l\mathbb{Z}_2 \) holds if and only if \( nM = 2^l\mathbb{Z}_2 \), which in turn holds if and only if \( M \) has an orthogonal basis. Otherwise, \( M \) (and hence \( K \)) is split by a plane isometric to \( 2^l A(2, b) \) for either \( b = 0 \) or \( b = 2 \). Returning now to the situation at hand, we see that if \( nL_2 = 2\mathbb{Z}_2 \) then \( L_2 \) is split by a binary unimodular sublattice \( N(2) \) as desired. In case \( nL_2 = \mathbb{Z}_2 \), consider further the splitting \( L_2 = L_2' \perp L_2'' \) with \( Q(x) \in \mathbb{Z}_2 \) and \( sL_2' \subseteq \mathbb{Z}_2 \). If \( nL_2' = sL_2' \), then \( L_2'' = \mathbb{Z}_2 y \perp L_2'' \) for some \( y \in L_2' \) with \( \text{ord}_2 Q(y) = r_2 \). If \( nL_2' = 2sL_2' \), then \( L_2'' \) is split by a plane \( \mathbb{Z}_2 y + \mathbb{Z}_2 w \) with \( \text{ord}_2 Q(y) = r_2 \). In either case, \( (2^l\mathbb{Z}_2)^{\frac{1}{l}} \mathbb{Z}_2 y \) has the required properties.

For the remainder of the section, for each \( p \in T \) fix a lattice \( N(p) \) satisfying the conditions in Lemma 4.1, and let \( \delta_p \in \mathbb{Z}_p \) be such that \( dN(p) = \delta_p \).

**Proposition 4.2.** Let \( q \) and \( q' \) be primes not dividing \( D \). If \( n \) is a positive integer such that \( qq' n\Omega \cong \delta_p \) for all \( p \in T \) and \( \gcd(n, 2qq'D) = 1 \), then there exists a binary \( \mathbb{Z} \)-lattice \( K \) \( (= K(n, q, q')) \) such that

(i) \( dK = qq' n\Omega \),
(ii) \( S_q(\Theta K) = +1 \),
(iii) \( \Theta K \rightarrow V \), and
(iv) \( K_p \rightarrow L_p \) for all \( p \) in the set \( S \) of all nonarchimedean prime spots on \( \mathbb{Q} \).

**Proof.** For simplicity, we write \( \Theta \) \( (= \Theta(n, q, q')) \) for the product \( qq' n\Omega \). For \( p \neq q, q' \), let \( U(p) \) denote a binary space over \( \mathbb{Q}_p \) such that

\[
U(p) \cong \begin{cases} \mathbb{Q}_p N(p) & \text{if } p \in T, \\ [1, \Theta] & \text{if } p \notin T \cup \{q, q'\}. \end{cases}
\]
Since \( \Theta \notin -Q^2_q \) and \( \Theta \notin -Q^2_{q'} \), there exist binary spaces \( U(q) \) and \( U(q') \) over \( Q_q \) and \( Q_{q'} \), respectively, with \( dU(q) = \Theta \), \( dU(q') = \Theta \), \( S_q U(q) = +1 \) and \( S_{q'} U(q') = \prod_{p \nmid q'} S_p U(p) \) [8, 63:23]. Note that \( \Theta \) is a positive integer such that \( dU(p) = \Theta \) holds for all \( p \) (for \( p \in T \) this follows from the assumption that \( \Omega q^n \Theta \equiv \Omega_p \)). Since \( S_p U(p) = +1 \) holds for almost all \( p \) and \( \prod_{p} S_p U(p) = +1 \), there exists a global binary space \( W \) over \( Q \) for which \( W_p \cong U(p) \) for all \( p \) [8, 72:1].

Next we will show that \( W_p \rightarrow V_p \) holds for all \( p \). Such a representation is guaranteed to exist unless \( dV_p = -dW_p \) and \( V_p \nsubseteq W_p \perp H \), where \( H \) is a hyperbolic plane [8, 63:21]. First, for \( p \in T \), \( W_p \rightarrow V_p \) follows from the fact that \( W_p \cong Q_p N(p) \) and \( Q_p N(p) \subseteq V_p \). Next, if \( p \mid D \) but \( p \notin T \), then \( L_p \) has a ternary unimodular Jordan component \( L'_p \). As \( \Theta \in \mathbb{Z}_p \), it follows from [8, 92:1a] that \( L'_p \cong \langle 1, \Theta, \Theta u \rangle \) for some \( u \in \mathbb{Z}_p \); so \( W_p \rightarrow V_p \). Now consider those primes \( p \) for which \( p \nmid 2D \). If \( \operatorname{ord}_p \Theta \) is odd (note that this includes the cases \( p = q, q' \)), then \( dV_p = -dW_p \) does not hold and we are assured that \( W_p \rightarrow V_p \). If \( \operatorname{ord}_p \Theta \) is even, then \( S_p (W_p \perp H) = S_p (1, \Theta, 1, -1) = 1 = S_p V_p \), the last equality holding since \( L_p \cong \langle 1, 1, 1, D \rangle \) with \( D \in \mathbb{Z}_p \) [8, 92:1]. So again \( W_p \rightarrow V_p \). Finally, for the infinite spot \( p \), \( W_p \rightarrow V_p \) holds since \( \Theta > 0 \) and thus \( W_p \) is positive definite. We have now completed the verification that \( W_p \rightarrow V_p \) holds for all \( p \). It follows from the Hasse-Minkowski Theorem that \( W \rightarrow V \).

Now we turn to the construction of a lattice \( K \) on \( W \) having the required properties. Note first that there exist \( x, y \in W \) such that \( W = Qx \perp Qy \) and \( Q(x)Q(y) = \Theta \). For the lattice \( M = \mathbb{Z}x \perp \mathbb{Z}y \), \( sM_p = \mathbb{Z}_p \) holds for all primes \( p \) outside some finite set \( \Sigma \). We proceed to define local lattices \( J(p) \) for each \( p \in S \). For each \( p \notin \Sigma \), let \( J(p) = M_p \). For \( p \in T \), let \( J(p) \) be a lattice on \( W_p \) isometric to the lattice \( N(p) \). For \( p \in \Sigma \setminus (T \cup \{q, q'\}) \), let \( J(p) \) be a lattice on \( W_p \) isometric to \( \langle 1, \Theta \rangle \). If \( q \in \Sigma \), proceed as follows to define \( J(q) \). Since \( \operatorname{ord}_q dW_q = 1 \), \( W_q \) represents an element \( \alpha \in Q_q \) with \( \operatorname{ord}_q \alpha \) even. So there exists some \( w \in W_q \) such that \( Q(w) \in \mathbb{Z}_p^q \), and \( W_q \) has a splitting \( W_q = Q_q w \perp Q_q z \) with \( Q(z) \in q \mathbb{Z}_p^q \); let \( J(q) = \mathbb{Z}_p w \perp \mathbb{Z}_p z \). Finally, if \( q' \in \Sigma \), obtain a lattice \( J(q') \) exactly as described for \( J(q) \). So for all \( p \in \Sigma \) we have now defined local lattices \( J(p) \) on \( W_p \) with the properties that \( dJ(p) = \Theta \) and \( sJ(p) = \mathbb{Z}_p \). Moreover, \( J(p) = M_p \) for almost all \( p \).

So there exists a \( Z \)-lattice \( K \) on \( W \) such that \( K_p = J(p) \) for all \( p \in S \) [8, 81:14]. In particular, \( sK = \mathbb{Z} \) and \( dK = \Theta \).

To complete the proof, it remains to show that \( K_p \rightarrow L_p \) for all \( p \in S \) or, equivalently, that \( J(p) \rightarrow L_p \) for all \( p \in S \). For \( p \in T \) this follows immediately from the definition of \( J(p) \). For \( p \mid 2D \), \( p \notin T \), \( J(p) \rightarrow L_p \) follows from [8, 92:1a] (since \( dJ(p) \in \mathbb{Z}_p^q \) and \( L_p \) has a ternary unimodular Jordan component). Finally, for \( p \nmid 2D \), \( L_p \) is unimodular and \( sK_p = \mathbb{Z}_p \); so [7, Theorem 1] reduces the representation problem to the corresponding problem for the spaces spanned by the two lattices. As \( W_p \rightarrow V_p \) has already been established, it again follows that \( K_p \rightarrow L_p \), and the proof is now complete.

\[ \square \]

**Theorem 4.3.** There exist only finitely many inequivalent 2-regular primitive positive definite quaternary lattices.
Proof. Let \( L \) be a 2-regular primitive positive definite quaternary lattice. We continue the notations for the local splittings of \( L \) established in the first paragraph of this section. For each \( p \in T_1 \cup T_2 \), define \( \Psi_p \) to be the character modulo \( p \) defined by the Legendre symbol \( \left( \frac{x}{p} \right) \) and define \( \nu_p \in \{ \pm 1 \} \) by

\[
\nu_p = \begin{cases} 
(\alpha_p, p) & \text{if } L \text{ is odd}, \\
\left( \frac{2}{p} \right)(\alpha_p, p) & \text{if } L \text{ is even},
\end{cases}
\]

where \( (\alpha_p, p) \) denotes the Hilbert symbol. To handle the prime 2, we need to introduce two characters. Let \( \Psi_{-1} \) and \( \Psi_{2} \) be the characters modulo 8 defined by the Jacobi symbols \( \left( \frac{-1}{8} \right) \) and \( \left( \frac{2}{8} \right) \), respectively. If \( nL_2 = \mathbb{Z}_2 \) (\( nL_2 = 2\mathbb{Z}_2 \), respectively) then there exists \( x \in L_2 \) such that \( Q(x) \in 2\mathbb{Z}_2 \) (\( Q(x) \in 2\mathbb{Z}_2 \), respectively); let \( \xi \in \{1, 3, 5, 7\} \) be such that \( Q(x) \in \xi 2\mathbb{Z}_2 \) (\( Q(x) \in 2\xi \mathbb{Z}_2 \), respectively). For odd integers \( k \), the values of \( \Psi_{-1}(k) \) and \( \Psi_{2}(k) \) determine the congruence class of \( k \) modulo 8. So there exist \( \nu_{-1}, \nu_2 \in \{ \pm 1 \} \) such that \( \Psi_{-1}(k) = \nu_{-1} \) and \( \Psi_{2}(k) = \nu_2 \) hold if and only if \( k \equiv \xi \) (mod 8).

Now suppose that \( k \) is a positive integer satisfying

\[(4.1) \quad \Psi_p(k) = \nu_p \quad \text{for all } p \in T_1 \cup \{-1, 2\}\]

and

\[(4.2) \quad \gcd(k, D) = 1.\]

If \( L \) is odd (even, respectively), then the condition (4.1) guarantees that \( k \) (2k, respectively) is represented by \( L_p \) for all \( p \in T_1 \cup \{2\} \). For the primes \( p \in T_2 \), \( L_p \) has a binary unimodular Jordan component and thus (4.2) guarantees that \( L_p \) represents both \( k \) and 2k [8, 92:1b]. For those primes \( p \) outside \( T \), \( L_p \) has a unimodular Jordan component which is at least ternary and again \( L_p \) represents both \( k \) and 2k [8, 92:1b]. Hence, \( L \) locally represents all integers \( k \) (if \( L \) is odd) or all integers of the form 2k (if \( L \) is even) for which (4.1) and (4.2) hold. Since \( L \) is 2-regular (and hence regular), it follows that \( L \) globally represents all such integers.

Let \( \mu_1 \) be the minimum of \( L \). Applying Corollary 3.3 with characters \( \{ \Psi_p : p \in T_1 \cup \{-1, 2\} \} \), specified values \( \{ \nu_p : p \in T_1 \cup \{-1, 2\} \} \) and \( \Delta \) the product of all primes dividing \( D \) but not in \( T_1 \cup \{2\} \), we obtain

\[
\mu_1 \ll \left( 8 \prod_{p \in T_1} p \right)^{\frac{1}{4} + \varepsilon} \Delta^e
\]

and, since \( 2 \prod_{p \in T_1} p \leq \Omega \leq (8D)^{\frac{1}{4}} \), this yields

\[(4.3) \quad \mu_1 \ll D^{\frac{1}{4} + \varepsilon}.\]

Now let \( m_1 \in L \) be such that \( Q(m_1) = \mu_1 \). If \( n \in Q(L) \) and \( n \neq \gamma^2 \mu_1 \) for any \( \gamma \in \mathbb{Z} \), then \( \dim(\text{span}\{x \in L : Q(x) \leq n\}) \geq 2 \) and it follows that the second minimum \( \mu_2 \) of \( L \) satisfies \( \mu_2 \leq n \). Applying Corollary 3.4 with characters, specified values and \( \Delta \) as above and \( n_0 = \mu_1 \), we obtain

\[(4.4) \quad \mu_2 \ll D^{\frac{1}{4} + \varepsilon}.\]

Let \( m_1, m_2 \) be linearly independent vectors in \( L \) such that \( Q(m_i) = \mu_i \) for \( i = 1, 2 \), and let \( G = \text{span}\{m_1, m_2\} \cap L \). The successive minima of the binary lattice \( G \) are \( \mu_1 \) and \( \mu_2 \). So \( dG \leq \mu_1 \mu_2 \) by Proposition 2.3, and it
follows from (4.3) and (4.4) that \( dG \ll D^{1+\varepsilon} \). Let \( f \) be the smallest prime not dividing \( 2D \) for which \( \left( \frac{-dG}{f} \right) = -1 \). To estimate the size of \( f \), apply Corollary 3.3 in the case that \( r = 1 \), the only character is the character modulo \( 8dG \), defined by the Jacobi symbol \( \left( \frac{-dG}{*} \right) \), the corresponding value of \( \eta \) is \(-1\), and \( \Delta \) is the product of the odd prime divisors of \( D \) which do not divide \( dG \). This yields \( f \ll dG^{\frac{3}{2}+\varepsilon} \) which, combined with the estimate for \( dG \) above, gives \( f \ll D^\frac{7}{2}+\varepsilon \). Next, let \( m \) be the smallest positive integer for which \( \gcd(m, fD) = 1 \) and \( \Psi_p(m) = \Psi_p(f)\nu_p \) holds for \( p \in T_1 \cup \{ -1, 2 \} \). Arguing as in the preceding paragraph (with \( \nu_p \) replaced by \( \Psi_p(f)\nu_p \) and the \( \Delta \) used there replaced by \( f\Delta \)), we obtain \( m \ll D^\frac{3}{2}+\varepsilon \). Since the conditions (4.1) and (4.2) hold for \( k = fm \), either \( fm \) or \( 2fm \) is represented by \( L \). However, neither \( fm \) nor \( 2fm \) is represented by \( G \). To see this for \( fm \), compare the Hasse symbols at \( f \) of the spaces \( \{ fm, fmdG \} \) and \( QG \). On the one hand, \( S_f(QG) = +1 \) since \( f \nmid dG \). But \( S_f([fm, fmdG]) \) is easily computed to be \( \left( \frac{-fG}{f} \right) = -1 \), using the conditions \( f \nmid dG \) and \( f \nmid m \). The verification for \( 2fm \) is identical. Thus, there exists \( y \in L \) such that \( Q(y) \leq 2fm \) and \( y \notin G \). So \( \dim(\text{span}\{x \in L : Q(x) \leq 2fm\}) \geq 3 \), and it follows that the third minimum \( \mu_3 \) of \( L \) satisfies

\[
(4.5) \quad \mu_3 \ll D^\frac{3}{2}+\varepsilon.
\]

Now let \( m_1, m_2, m_3 \) be linearly independent vectors of \( L \) with \( Q(m_i) = \mu_i \) for \( i = 1, 2, 3 \), and let \( M = \text{span}\{m_1, m_2, m_3\} \cap L \). The successive minima of the ternary lattice \( M \) are \( \mu_1, \mu_2 \) and \( \mu_3 \). So \( dM \leq \mu_1\mu_2\mu_3 \) by Proposition 2.3 and it follows from (4.3)–(4.5) that \( dM \ll D^\frac{23}{2}+\varepsilon \). Let \( q \) be the smallest prime not dividing \( 2D \) for which \( \left( \frac{dM}{q} \right) = -1 \). Arguing as for \( f \) in the preceding paragraph yields \( q \ll D^\frac{3}{2}+\varepsilon = D^\frac{33}{2}+\varepsilon \). Let \( q' \) be the smallest prime not dividing \( 2qD \). Then \( q' \ll D^{\varepsilon} \) follows from Corollary 3.3 (applied in the case that there are no character conditions). Let \( n \) be the smallest positive integer for which \( qq'n\Omega \cong \delta_p \) holds for all \( p \in T \) and \( \gcd(n, 2qq'D) = 1 \). For each \( p \in T \), \( \delta_p(qq'n\Omega)^{-1} \in \mathbb{Z}_p \) and \( qq'n\Omega \cong \delta_p \) is equivalent to \( n \in \delta_p(qq'O)^{-1}\mathbb{Z}_p^2 \). So there exist \( \sigma_{-1} \) and \( \{ \sigma_p : p \in T \} \) in \( \{ \pm 1 \} \) such that the conditions \( \Psi_{-1}(n) = \sigma_{-1} \) and \( \Psi_p(n) = \sigma_p \) hold for all \( p \in T \) if and only if \( qq'n\Omega \cong \delta_p \) holds for all \( p \in T \). Applying Corollary 3.3 with characters \( \{ \Psi_p : p \in T \cup \{ -1 \} \} \), specified values \( \{ \sigma_p : p \in T \cup \{ -1 \} \} \) and \( \Delta \) equal to the product of all prime divisors of \( qq'D \) which do not lie in \( T \), we obtain \( n \ll \Gamma^{\frac{1}{4}+\varepsilon}D^{\varepsilon} \), where \( \Gamma = 8\prod_{p \in T} P \).

Now \( \prod_{p \in T_1} p \leq \prod_{p \in T_1} p^{r_p} \leq \prod_{p \in T_1} D_p^{\frac{1}{4}} \) and \( \prod_{p \in T_2} p \leq \prod_{p \in T_2} D_p^{\frac{1}{4}} \). So

\[
\Gamma^{\frac{1}{4}}\Omega = 8^{\frac{1}{4}}\left( \prod_{p \in T_1} p^{\frac{1}{4}} \right) \left( \prod_{p \in T_2} p^{\frac{1}{4}} \right) 2^{r_2} \left( \prod_{p \in T_1} p^{r_p} \right) 
\ll D_2^{\frac{1}{2}} \left( \prod_{p \in T_1} D_p^{\frac{1}{4}} \right) \left( \prod_{p \in T_2} D_p^{\frac{3}{4}} \right) \leq D^{\frac{3}{2}}.
\]

Thus,

\[
(4.6) \quad qq'n\Omega \ll D^{\frac{45}{2}+\frac{3}{4}+\varepsilon} = D^{\frac{43}{2}+\varepsilon}.
\]

By Proposition 4.2, there exists a binary \( \mathbb{Z} \)-lattice \( K (= K(n, q, q')) \) such that \( dK = qq'n\Omega \), \( S_q(QK) = +1 \) and \( K_p \leftrightarrow L_p \) for all \( p \). Since \( L \) is
2-regular, the last condition implies that $K \to L$. However, $K$ is not represented by the ternary sublattice $M$. To see this, compare the Hasse symbols at $q$ of $QM$ and $QK \perp [dK \cdot dM]$. On the one hand, $S_q(QM) = +1$ since $q \nmid dM$. On the other hand, $S_q(QK \perp [dK \cdot dM]) = S_q(QK) \cdot (dK \cdot dM, -1)_q = (dK, -1)_q = (q, -1)_q$ since $q \nmid q' n \Omega dM$, and $(dK, -1)_q = (dK, -dM)_q = (q, -dM)_q$. So

$$S_q(QK \perp [dK \cdot dM]) = (q, dM)_q = \left( \frac{dM}{q} \right) = -1 \neq S_q(QM).$$

Let $\mu_1, \mu_2$ be the successive minima of $K$. Then $\mu_1 \leq \mu_1'$ and, by Lemma 2.4, $\mu_4 \leq \mu_2'$, where $\mu_4$ is the fourth successive minimum of $L$. So $\mu_1 \mu_2 \mu_3 \mu_4 \leq \mu_1 \mu_2 \mu_3 \mu_3$, and, by Proposition 2.3, $\mu_1 \mu_2 \ll dK = q q' n \Omega$. Combining (4.4)–(4.6) yields

$$(4.7) \quad \mu_1 \mu_2 \mu_3 \mu_4 \ll D^{1 + \frac{1}{2} + \frac{4}{13} + \varepsilon} = D^{\frac{17}{13} + \varepsilon}.$$

For $\varepsilon$ sufficiently small that $\frac{751}{768} + \varepsilon < 1$, (4.7) is consistent with the inequality $D \leq \mu_1 \mu_2 \mu_3 \mu_4$ from Proposition 2.3 for only finitely many values of the discriminant $D$. Thus, we conclude that the discriminant of a 2-regular primitive positive definite quaternary lattice must be bounded. Hence, such forms can lie in only finitely many equivalence classes. \qed
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