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#### Abstract

Let $p$ be any odd prime and let $h(p)$ be the class number of the real quadratic field $\mathscr{2}(\sqrt{p})$. The results of a computer run to determine the density of the field $\mathscr{2}(\sqrt{p})$ with $h(p)=1$ and $p<10^{8}$ are presented. Similar results are given for pure cubic fields $\mathscr{2}(\sqrt[3]{p})$ with $p<10^{6}$.


1. Introduction. Let $p$ be any odd prime and let $h=h(p)$ be the class number of the quadratic field $\mathscr{2}(\sqrt{p})$. It is well known that $h(p)$ is odd, but the problem of how frequently $h(p)=1$, although it goes back to Gauss, is still unsolved.

If we let $\pi(a, b ; x)$ denote the number of primes of the form $a+b k$ less than or equal to $x$ and $f(a, b ; x)$ denote the number of these primes $p$ for which $h(p)=1$, we find (see Lakein [5]) from a large table of Kuroda [4], that

$$
r(1,4 ; x)=f(1,4 ; x) / \pi(1,4 ; x)=.7765
$$

for $x=2776817$; that is, over $77 \%$ of all the primes $(\equiv 1(\bmod 4))$ up to 2776817 have $h(p)=1$. Indeed, according to the recent heuristic results of Cohen and Lenstra (see Cohen [1]), we would expect that $h(p)=1$ with probability .75446 .

In order to test this heuristic, we developed and ran a computer program which determined whether or not $h(p)=1$ for all primes $p<10^{8}$. In the next section of this note we give the results of this computer run. In the following section we present some data for certain pure cubic fields $\mathscr{2}(\sqrt[3]{p})$ with $p<10^{6}$.
2. The Quadratic Case. In order to find $h(p)$, we made use of the well-known formula

$$
2 h R=\sqrt{\Delta} L(1, \chi)
$$

where $\Delta$ is the discriminant of $\mathscr{2}(\sqrt{p}), R$ is the regulator, and $L(1, \chi)$ is the value of the Dirichlet $L$-function

$$
\sum_{n=1}^{\infty}\left(\frac{\Delta}{n}\right) \frac{1}{n^{s}}
$$

for $s=1$. To evaluate $L(1, \chi)$ we employed a routine similar to the SPEEDY routine mentioned in Shanks [8]. Most of the time needed to find $h(p)$ was taken up computing $R$. This was done by using the techniques developed by Lenstra [6] and Schoof [7] (see, also, Williams [10]). The implementation of these ideas permitted us

[^0]Table 1

| $x$ | $a=-1, b=4$ |  |  | $a=1, b=4$ |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\pi(a, b ; x)$ | $f(a, b ; x)$ | $r(a, b ; x)$ | $\pi(a, b ; x)$ | $f(a, b ; x)$ | $r(a, b ; x)$ |
| 5000000 | 174319 | 134661 | .7724975 | 174193 | 134862 | .7742102 |
| 10000000 | 332398 | 255697 | .7692495 | 332180 | 256345 | .7717051 |
| 15000000 | 485429 | 372854 | .7680917 | 485274 | 373925 | .7705441 |
| 20000000 | 635436 | 487699 | .7675029 | 635170 | 488752 | .7694821 |
| 25000000 | 783173 | 600560 | .7668293 | 783059 | 602016 | .7688003 |
| 30000000 | 929079 | 712172 | .7665355 | 928779 | 713887 | .7686296 |
| 35000000 | 1073601 | 822569 | .7661775 | 1073173 | 824136 | .7679433 |
| 40000000 | 1216966 | 932017 | .7658529 | 1216687 | 933970 | .7676337 |
| 45000000 | 1359235 | 1040345 | .7653900 | 1358924 | 1042888 | .7674366 |
| 50000000 | 1500681 | 1148210 | .7651259 | 1500452 | 1151039 | .7671282 |
| 55000000 | 1641343 | 1255778 | .7650917 | 1640856 | 1258288 | .7668485 |
| 60000000 | 1781444 | 1362483 | .7648194 | 1780670 | 1365129 | .7666378 |
| 65000000 | 1920648 | 1468646 | .7646617 | 1919905 | 1471506 | .7664472 |
| 70000000 | 2059345 | 1574494 | .7645605 | 2058718 | 1577494 | .7662506 |
| 75000000 | 2197469 | 1679748 | .7644012 | 2196834 | 1682861 | .7660392 |
| 80000000 | 2335008 | 1784833 | .7643798 | 2334373 | 1787874 | .7658904 |
| 85000000 | 2472052 | 1889752 | .7644467 | 2471678 | 1892924 | .7658457 |
| 90000000 | 2608560 | 1993991 | .7644029 | 2608393 | 1997296 | .7657189 |
| 95000000 | 2745067 | 2098012 | .7642844 | 2744681 | 2101465 | .7656500 |
| 100000000 | 2880950 | 2201430 | .7641333 | 2880504 | 2205112 | .7655299 |

to evaluate $R$ much more rapidly than was done in Williams and Broere [11]. Indeed, without this innovation we would not have been able to complete our calculations because of time constraints. If we define

$$
r(a, b ; x)=f(a, b ; x) / \pi(a, b ; x)
$$

the results of running our program are summarized in Table 1.
Notice that the value of $r(a, b ; x)$ in both cases is tending to decrease more slowly as $x$ increases. These results are certainly consistent with the heuristic we get from [1].
3. The Pure Cubic Case. Let $H(p)$ denote the class number of $\mathscr{2}(\sqrt[3]{p})$. In order for $H(p)=1$, we must have $p=3$ or $p \equiv-1(\bmod 3)(H o n d a[3])$ also, it has been noted by Eisenbeis, Frey, and Ommerborn [2] that $H(p)$ tends to be 1 more frequently for $p \equiv-1(\bmod 9)$, an observation that was tested empirically by Williams and Shanks [13]. Thus, in the cubic case we performed our computations on the primes in each of the residue classes $-1,2,5(\bmod 9)$.

Let $F(a, b ; x)$ be the number of primes $p$ of the form $a+b k$ less than or equal to $x$ for which $H(p)=1$, and put $R(a, b ; x)=F(a, b ; x) / \pi(a, b ; x)$. The results of our computer runs for the pure cubic case are given in Tables 2 and 3. These tables were computed by making use of the algorithms given in Williams, Dueck and

Table 2

| $x$ | $a=-1, b=9$ |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\pi(a, b ; x)$ | $F(a, b ; x)$ | $R(a, b ; x)$ |
| 200000 | 2993 | 1827 | .6104 |
| 250000 | 3671 | 2240 | .6102 |
| 300000 | 4337 | 2627 | .6057 |
| 350000 | 4992 | 3041 | .6092 |
| 400000 | 5650 | 3437 | .6083 |
| 450000 | 6287 | 3820 | .6076 |
| 500000 | 6924 | 4199 | .6064 |
| 550000 | 7550 | 4568 | .6050 |
| 600000 | 8174 | 4940 | .6044 |
| 650000 | 8802 | 5332 | .6058 |
| 700000 | 9416 | 5701 | .6055 |
| 750000 | 10033 | 6065 | .6045 |
| 800000 | 10670 | 6435 | .6031 |
| 850000 | 11282 | 6789 | .6018 |
| 900000 | 11890 | 7157 | .6019 |
| 950000 | 12487 | 7523 | .6025 |
| 1000000 | 13094 | 7903 | .6036 |

Table 3

| $x$ | $a=2, b=9$ |  |  | $a=5, b=9$ |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\pi(a, b ; x)$ | $F(a, b ; x)$ | $R(a, b ; x)$ | $\pi(a, b ; x)$ | $F(a, b ; x)$ | $R(a, b ; x)$ |
| 200000 | 2994 | 1200 | .4008 | 2988 | 1293 | .4327 |
| 250000 | 3679 | 1440 | .3914 | 3677 | 1559 | .4240 |
| 300000 | 4328 | 1699 | .3926 | 4341 | 1845 | .4250 |
| 350000 | 5007 | 1965 | .3925 | 4999 | 2096 | .4193 |
| 400000 | 5651 | 2224 | .3936 | 5647 | 2366 | .4190 |
| 450000 | 6281 | 2471 | .3934 | 6296 | 2628 | .4174 |
| 500000 | 6916 | 2755 | .3984 | 6945 | 2873 | .4137 |
| 550000 | 7541 | 2987 | .3961 | 7577 | 3124 | .4123 |
| 600000 | 8176 | 3223 | .3942 | 8204 | 3366 | .4103 |
| 650000 | 8829 | 3472 | .3932 | 8806 | 3607 | .4096 |

Schmid [12]. Since precision problems in our implementation of these algorithms occur later for Dedekind type 2 fields than for type 1 fields, we were able to compute Table 2 out somewhat further than Table 3.

In Table 2 we notice that the surprisingly flat behavior of $R(-1,9 ; x)$ for $1.5 \times 10^{5}<x<2 \times 10^{5}$, which was pointed out in [13], persists (although it does tend to decrease slightly) up to $10^{6}$. These results, then, are still consistent with the
conjectures made in [13]. In Table 3 we see that the values of $R(2,9 ; x)$ and $R(5,9 ; x)$ are coming closer together. This indicates that the peculiar behavior of these ratios for $x<2 \times 10^{5}$ noted in Williams [9] was simply a result of this range of $x$ values being too small.
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