



# Modular forms and ellipsoidal $T$ -designs

Badri Vishal Pandey<sup>1</sup>

Received: 23 March 2021 / Accepted: 8 March 2022 / Published online: 27 April 2022  
© The Author(s), under exclusive licence to Springer Science+Business Media, LLC, part of Springer Nature 2022

## Abstract

In recent work, Mieziaki introduced the notion of a *spherical  $T$ -design* in  $\mathbb{R}^2$ , where  $T$  is a potentially infinite set. As an example, he offered the  $\mathbb{Z}^2$ -lattice points with fixed integer norm (a.k.a. shells). These shells are *maximal spherical  $T$ -designs*, where  $T = \mathbb{Z}^+ \setminus 4\mathbb{Z}^+$ . We generalize the notion of a spherical  $T$ -design to special ellipses, and extend Mieziaki's work to the norm form shells for rings of integers of imaginary quadratic fields with class number 1.

**Keywords** Modular forms · Combinatorics · Number theory · Spherical  $t$ -designs · Hecke eigenforms

**Mathematics Subject Classification** Primary 11F11 · 11F27 · 11E41; Secondary 05B30 · 11F30

## 1 Introduction and statement of results

*Spherical  $t$ -designs* were introduced in 1977 by Delsarte, Goethals and Seidel [5], and they have played an important role in algebra, combinatorics, number theory and quantum mechanics (for background see [2–4, 6, 9, 10]). A spherical  $t$ -design is a nonempty finite set of points on the unit sphere with the property that the average value of any real polynomial of degree  $\leq t$  over this set equals the average value over the sphere. Namely, if  $S^{n-1}$  denotes the unit sphere in  $\mathbb{R}^n$  centered at the origin, then a finite nonempty subset  $X \subset S^{n-1}$  is a spherical  $t$ -design if

$$\frac{1}{|X|} \sum_{x \in X} P(x) = \frac{1}{\text{Vol}(S^{n-1})} \int_{S^{n-1}} P(x) d\sigma(x) \quad (1.1)$$

---

✉ Badri Vishal Pandey  
bp3aq@virginia.edu

<sup>1</sup> Department of Mathematics, University of Virginia, Charlottesville, VA 22904, USA

for all polynomials  $P(x)$  of degree  $\leq t$ . The right-hand side of (1.1) is the usual surface integral over  $S^{n-1}$ . In general, a finite nonempty subset  $X$  of  $S_{n-1}(r)$ , the sphere of radius  $r$  centered at the origin, is a spherical  $t$ -design if  $\frac{1}{|X|} \sum_{x \in X} P(x)$  satisfies (1.1). Since a spherical  $t$ -design is also a spherical  $t'$ -design for all  $t' \leq t$ , we say that  $X$  has *strength*  $t$  if it is the maximum of all such numbers.

Delsarte, Goethals and Seidel developed a very simple criterion for determining spherical  $t$ -designs. This criterion involves *homogeneous harmonic* polynomials of bounded degree. A polynomial in  $n$  variables is *harmonic* if it is annihilated by the Laplacian operator  $\Delta := \sum_{i=1}^n \partial^2/\partial x_i^2$ , and they showed [5] that  $X \subset S^{n-1}$  is a spherical  $t$ -design if

$$\sum_{x \in X} P(x) = 0 \tag{1.2}$$

for all homogeneous harmonic polynomials  $P(x)$  of nonzero degree  $\leq t$ . This criterion is a consequence of two results from harmonic analysis. The first result is the mean value property for harmonic functions [1,p. 5], which implies that the integral of a harmonic polynomial over a sphere centered at the origin vanishes, combined with the fact that homogeneous polynomials of fixed degree are spanned by certain harmonic polynomials [1,Theorem 5.7].

In view of this framework, it is natural to ask whether there are generalizations of spherical  $t$ -designs to other curves, surfaces and varieties. Here we consider certain *ellipsoids*<sup>1</sup> in dimension two. To be precise, for square-free  $D \geq 1$  we define the norm  $r$  ellipses

$$C_D(r) := \begin{cases} \{(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2 : x^2 + Dy^2 = r\} & \text{if } D \equiv 1, 2 \pmod{4}, \\ \{(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2 : x^2 + xy + \frac{1+D}{4}y^2 = r\} & \text{if } D \equiv 3 \pmod{4}. \end{cases} \tag{1.3}$$

**Remark** These ellipses arise from certain imaginary quadratic orders.

For  $D \equiv 1, 2 \pmod{4}$ , we say that a finite nonempty subset  $X \subset C_D(r)$  is an *ellipsoidal  $t$ -design* if

$$\frac{1}{|X|} \sum_{(x,y) \in X} P(x, y) = \frac{1}{2\pi\sqrt{D}} \int_{C_D(r)} \frac{P(x, y)}{\sqrt{x^2/D^2 + y^2}} d\sigma(x, y) \tag{1.4}$$

for all polynomials  $P(x, y)$  of degree  $\leq t$  over  $\mathbb{R}$ . For  $D \equiv 3 \pmod{4}$ , instead we require

$$\frac{1}{|X|} \sum_{(x,y) \in X} P(x, y) = \frac{\sqrt{D}}{\pi} \int_{C_D(r)} \frac{P(x, y)}{\sqrt{20x^2 + (D^2 + 2D + 5)y^2 + (20 + 4D)xy}} d\sigma(x, y). \tag{1.5}$$

Here the right-hand sides are line integrals. As in the case of spherical  $t$ -designs, every ellipsoidal  $t$ -design is also an ellipsoidal  $t'$ -design for all  $t' \leq t$ , and the maximum of

<sup>1</sup> We do not use the term *ellipse* to avoid possible confusion that might arise with the term *elliptical*.

all such  $t$ 's is called the *strength* of  $X$ . These definitions coincide with the notion of a spherical  $t$ -design when  $D = 1$ .

In analogy to Delsarte, Goethals and Seidel, we have a natural criterion for confirming ellipsoidal  $t$ -designs. To this end, we consider the 2-dimensional real vector space

$$H_{D,j}^{\mathbb{R}}[x, y] := \begin{cases} \langle \operatorname{Re}(x + \sqrt{-D}y)^j, \operatorname{Im}(x + \sqrt{-D}y)^j \rangle & \text{if } D \equiv 1, 2 \pmod{4}, \\ \langle \operatorname{Re}(x + \frac{1+\sqrt{-D}}{2}y)^j, \operatorname{Im}(x + \frac{1+\sqrt{-D}}{2}y)^j \rangle & \text{if } D \equiv 3 \pmod{4}. \end{cases} \tag{1.6}$$

In terms of these vector spaces of polynomials, we have the following ellipsoidal  $t$ -design criterion.

**Theorem 1.1** *A finite nonempty set  $X \subset C_D(r)$  is an ellipsoidal  $t$ -design if*

$$\sum_{x \in X} P(x, y) = 0$$

for all  $P(x, y) \in H_{D,j}^{\mathbb{R}}[x, y]$  for all  $0 < j \leq t$ .

**Remark** (1) Observe that if  $X \subset S^1$  is a spherical  $t$ -design, then  $Y = \{(x, y/\sqrt{D}) \mid (x, y) \in X\} \subset C_D$  (resp.  $Y = \{(x + y/\sqrt{D}, 2y/\sqrt{D}) \mid (x, y) \in X\} \subset C_D$ ) is an ellipsoidal  $t$ -design for  $D \equiv 1, 2 \pmod{4}$  (resp.  $D \equiv 3 \pmod{4}$ ). Therefore, the existence of a spherical  $t$ -design implies the existence of a corresponding ellipsoidal  $t$ -design. In fact, there is a one-to-one correspondence between spherical  $t$ -designs and ellipsoidal  $t$ -designs. However, the proof of Theorem 1.1 is not a direct consequence because care is required for justifying the role of the vector spaces  $H_{D,j}^{\mathbb{R}}[x, y]$ .

(2) Since there is one-to-one correspondence between spherical and ellipsoidal  $t$ -designs, we get a lower bound [5, p. 2] on the size of ellipsoidal  $t$ -design  $X$ ,

$$|X| \geq t + 1.$$

Recently, Miezaki in [9] introduced a generalization of the notion of spherical  $t$ -designs. Instead of restricting to polynomials of degree  $\leq t$ , he considered harmonic polynomials of degree  $j \in T \subset \mathbb{N}$ , where  $T$  is a potentially infinite set. The main theorem from [9] gives infinitely many spherical  $T$ -designs for  $T := \mathbb{Z}^+ \setminus 4\mathbb{Z}^+$  in dimension two. Namely, he considered norm  $r$  shells, integer points on  $x^2 + y^2 = r$  for fixed  $r \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ . He showed that these  $r$ -shells are spherical  $T$ -designs. Moreover, these sets have strength  $T$ , meaning that (1.2) fails if any multiple of 4 is added to  $T$ . His proof makes use of theta functions arising from complex multiplication by  $\mathbb{Z}[i]$ .

We generalize Miezaki's work to ellipsoidal  $T$ -designs. We call  $X \subset C_D$  an *ellipsoidal  $T$ -design* if the condition in Theorem 1.1 is satisfied for all polynomials in  $H_{D,j}^{\mathbb{R}}[x, y]$  with  $j \in T$ . We say  $X$  has strength  $T$  if it is maximal among such sets. For each square-free positive integer  $D$ , let  $\mathcal{O}_D$  be the ring of integers of

$\mathbb{Q}(\sqrt{-D})$ . In particular, this means that

$$\mathcal{O}_D = \begin{cases} \mathbb{Z}[\sqrt{-D}] & \text{if } D \equiv 1, 2 \pmod{4}, \\ \mathbb{Z}[\frac{1+\sqrt{-D}}{2}] & \text{if } D \equiv 3 \pmod{4}. \end{cases} \tag{1.7}$$

We consider  $D \in \{1, 2, 3, 7, 11, 19, 43, 67, 163\}$ , the square-free positive integers for which  $\mathcal{O}_D$  has class number 1. To make this precise, we define the *norm  $r$  shells* in  $C_D(r)$  by

$$\Lambda_D^r := \mathcal{O}_D \cap C_D(r). \tag{1.8}$$

Generalizing Mieziaki’s work for  $D = 1$ , we obtain the following theorem.

**Theorem 1.2** *If  $D \in \{1, 2, 3, 7, 11, 19, 43, 67, 163\}$ , then every non-empty shell  $\Lambda_D^r$  is an ellipsoidal  $T_D$  design with strength  $T_D$ , where*

$$T_D := \begin{cases} \mathbb{Z}^+ \setminus 4\mathbb{Z}^+ & \text{if } D = 1, \\ \mathbb{Z}^+ \setminus 6\mathbb{Z}^+ & \text{if } D = 3, \\ \mathbb{Z}^+ \setminus 2\mathbb{Z}^+ & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

**Remark** The method used here seems to be well-poised only for the dimension 2 cases. It would be interesting to obtain higher dimensional analogues.

**Example** We consider  $D = 3$ , and  $r = 691$ . Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} \Lambda_3^{691} = \{ & (11, 19), (-11, -19), (19, 11), (-19, -11), \\ & (11, -30), (-11, 30), (30, -19), (-30, 19), \\ & (30, -11), (-30, 11), (19, -30), (-19, 30) \}. \end{aligned}$$

We consider the polynomial  $P(x, y) = 2x^2 + 3462xy + 1729y^2 \in H_{3,2}^{\mathbb{R}}[x, y]$ , and we find that  $\sum_{(x,y) \in \Lambda_3^{691}} P(x, y) = 0$  which shows that  $\Lambda_3^{691}$  is an elliptical 2-design and  $2 \in T_3$ . On the other hand, Theorem 1.2 implies that  $\Lambda_3^{691}$  is not an ellipsoidal 6-design. To see this we choose  $Q(x, y) = 2x^2 + 6x^5y - 15x^4y^2 - 40x^3y^3 - 15x^2y^4 + 6xy^5 + 2y^6 \in H_{3,6}^{\mathbb{R}}(x, y)$ , and we find that  $\sum_{(x,y) \in \Lambda_3^{691}} Q(x, y) = -4818834696 \neq 0$ .

In Sect. 2 we prove Theorem 1.1, criterion for confirming that a set is an ellipsoidal  $t$ -design, and in Section 3 we recall the theory of theta functions arising from complex multiplication, and we prove Theorem 1.2.

## 2 Criterion for ellipsoidal $t$ -design

In this section we prove Theorem 1.1, criterion for confirming ellipsoidal  $t$ -designs. Throughout this section we assume that  $D \geq 1$  is square-free and  $j \geq 1$ .

To prove that Theorem 1.1 is indeed a criterion for confirming ellipsoidal  $t$ -designs, we first need to show that the spaces  $H_{D,k}^{\mathbb{R}}[x, y]$ , for  $0 < k \leq j$ , generate all the

polynomials of degree  $\leq j$  when restricted to  $C_D(r)$ . It suffices to show this for  $P_j^{\mathbb{R}}[x, y]$ , the set of homogeneous polynomials of degree  $j$ .

**Lemma 2.1** *If  $D \geq 1$  is square-free and  $j \geq 1$ , then the following are true:*

(1) *If  $D \equiv 3 \pmod{4}$ , then we have*

$$P_j^{\mathbb{R}}[x, y] = \bigoplus_{k=0}^{\lfloor j/2 \rfloor} (x^2 + Dy^2)^k H_{D, j-2k}^{\mathbb{R}}[x, y].$$

(2) *If  $D \equiv 1 \pmod{4}$ , then we have*

$$P_j^{\mathbb{R}}[x, y] = \bigoplus_{k=0}^{\lfloor j/2 \rfloor} \left(x^2 + xy + \frac{1+D}{4}y^2\right)^k H_{D, j-2k}^{\mathbb{R}}[x, y].$$

**Proof** The lemma is well known for homogeneous harmonic polynomials (for example, see [1, Theorem 5.7]). Namely, if  $H_k^{\mathbb{R}}[x, y]$  is the set of homogeneous harmonic polynomials of degree  $k$  then

$$P_j^{\mathbb{R}}(x, y) = \bigoplus_{k=0}^{\lfloor j/2 \rfloor} (x^2 + y^2)^k H_{j-2k}^{\mathbb{R}}[x, y].$$

We extend it to general  $D$ . It is well known that  $H_j^{\mathbb{R}}[x, y] = \langle \text{Re}(x + iy)^j, \text{Im}(x + iy)^j \rangle$ , and so if we do the change of variable for  $D \equiv 1, 2 \pmod{4}$  (resp.  $D \equiv 3 \pmod{4}$ ),  $x' = x, y' = \sqrt{D}y$  (resp.  $x' = x + y/2, y' = 2y/\sqrt{D}$ ), then  $H_{j-2}^{\mathbb{R}}(x', y') = \langle \text{Re}(x' + iy')^j, \text{Im}(x' + iy')^j \rangle$  gives

$$P_j^{\mathbb{R}}[x', y'] = \bigoplus_{k=0}^{\lfloor j/2 \rfloor} (x'^2 + y'^2)^k H_{j-2k}^{\mathbb{R}}[x', y'].$$

Therefore, if  $D \equiv 1, 2 \pmod{4}$ , then we have

$$P_j^{\mathbb{R}}(x, y) = \bigoplus_{k=0}^{\lfloor j/2 \rfloor} (x^2 + Dy^2)^k H_{D, j-2k}^{\mathbb{R}}[x, y].$$

If  $D \equiv 3 \pmod{4}$ , then we have

$$P_j^{\mathbb{R}}(x, y) = \bigoplus_{k=0}^{\lfloor j/2 \rfloor} \left(x^2 + xy + \frac{1+D}{4}y^2\right)^k H_{D, j-2k}^{\mathbb{R}}[x, y].$$

□

We now prove Theorem 1.1.

**Proof of Theorem 1.1** Lemma 2.1 shows that the set of polynomials when restricted to  $C_D$  are generated by the spaces  $H_{D,j}^{\mathbb{R}}[x, y]$  since  $x^2 + Dy^2 = r$  (resp.,  $x^2 + xy + \frac{1+D}{4}y^2 = r$ ) on  $C_D(r)$ . Therefore, it suffices to show that if  $P(x, y) \in H_{D,j}^{\mathbb{R}}[x, y]$ , then the following are true:

(1) If  $D \equiv 1, 2 \pmod 4$ , then we have

$$\int_{C_D(r)} \frac{P(x, y)}{\sqrt{x^2/D^2 + y^2}} d\sigma(x, y) = 0.$$

(2) If  $D \equiv 3 \pmod 4$ , then we have

$$\int_{C_D(r)} \frac{P(x, y)}{\sqrt{20x^2 + (D^2 + 2D + 5)y^2 + (20 + 4D)xy}} d\sigma(x, y) = 0.$$

As  $H_{D,j}^{\mathbb{R}}[x, y]$  is a vector space, it is enough to show these claims for basis vectors. Since  $X \subset C_D(r)$  is an ellipsoidal  $t$ -design if and only if  $\frac{1}{r}X \subset C_D(1)$  is an ellipsoidal  $t$ -design, it's enough to consider  $r = 1$ . For  $D \equiv 1, 2 \pmod 4$ ,  $H_{D,j}^{\mathbb{R}}[x, y] = \langle \text{Re}(x + \sqrt{-D}y)^j, \text{Im}(x + \sqrt{-D}y)^j \rangle$ . By the parametrization of  $C_D(1) : x^2 + Dy^2 = 1$  as  $\gamma := \{(\cos \theta, \sin \theta/\sqrt{D}) | 0 \leq \theta \leq 2\pi\}$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{C_D(1)} \frac{\text{Re}(x + \sqrt{-D}y)^j}{\sqrt{x^2/D^2 + y^2}} d\sigma(x, y) \\ &= \int_0^{2\pi} \frac{\text{Re}(\cos \theta + \sqrt{-D}(\sin \theta/\sqrt{D}))^j}{\sqrt{\cos^2 \theta/D^2 + \sin^2 \theta/D}} \sqrt{\sin^2 \theta + \cos^2 \theta/D} d\theta \\ &= \sqrt{D} \int_0^{2\pi} \text{Re}(\cos \theta + i \sin \theta)^j d\theta \\ &= \sqrt{D} \int_{S^1} \text{Re}(x + iy)^j dz = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Since  $\text{Re}(x + iy)^j$  is harmonic, the last integral over  $S^1$  is 0.

A similar argument shows that

$$\int_{C_D(1)} \frac{\text{Im}(x + \sqrt{-D}y)^j}{\sqrt{x^2/D^2 + y^2}} d\sigma(x, y) = 0.$$

If  $D \equiv 3 \pmod 4$ ,  $H_{D,j}^{\mathbb{R}}[x, y] = \langle \text{Re}(x + \frac{1+\sqrt{-D}}{2}y)^j, \text{Im}(x + \frac{1+\sqrt{-D}}{2}y)^j \rangle$ . By the parametrization of  $C_D(1) : x^2 + xy + \frac{1+D}{4}y^2 = 1$  as  $\gamma := \{(\cos \theta -$

$\sin \theta / \sqrt{D}, 2 \sin \theta / \sqrt{D} : 0 \leq \theta \leq 2\pi$ }, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{C_D(1)} \frac{\operatorname{Re}(x + (1 + \sqrt{-D})y/2)^j}{\sqrt{20x^2 + (D^2 + 2D + 5)y^2 + (20 + 4D)xy}} d\sigma(x, y) \\ &= \int_0^{2\pi} \frac{\operatorname{Re}(\cos \theta - \sin \theta / \sqrt{D} + (1 + \sqrt{-D} \sin \theta / \sqrt{D})^j}{\sqrt{4D \sin^2 \theta + 20 \cos^2 \theta + 8\sqrt{D} \sin \theta \cos \theta}} \\ & \quad \times \sqrt{\sin^2 \theta + 5 \cos^2 \theta / D + 2 \sin \theta \cos \theta / \sqrt{D}} d\theta \\ &= \frac{1}{2\sqrt{D}} \int_0^{2\pi} \operatorname{Re}(\cos \theta + i \sin \theta)^j d\theta = \frac{1}{2\sqrt{D}} \int_{S^1} \operatorname{Re}(x + iy)^j dz = 0. \end{aligned}$$

A similar argument shows that

$$\int_{C_D(1)} \frac{P(x)}{\sqrt{20x^2 + (D^2 + 2D + 5)y^2 + (20 + 4D)xy}} d\sigma(x, y) = 0.$$

□

### 3 Ellipsoidal $T$ -designs

Here we prove Theorem 1.2, the construction of ellipsoidal  $T$ -designs arising from the ring of integers of imaginary quadratic fields with class number 1. We use the theory of theta functions with complex multiplication. Throughout, we shall assume that  $D \in \{1, 2, 3, 7, 11, 19, 43, 67, 163\}$ .

#### 3.1 Theta functions

Given an  $n$ -dimensional lattice  $\Lambda$  and a polynomial  $P(x)$  of degree  $j$  in  $n$  variables, the theta function of  $P(x)$  over the lattice  $\Lambda$  is defined by the Fourier series (note  $q := e^{2\pi iz}$ )

$$\Theta(\Lambda, P; z) := \sum_{x \in \Lambda} P(x)q^{N(x)} = \Theta(\Lambda, P; z) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} a(\Lambda, P, n)q^n, \tag{3.1}$$

where  $N(x)$  is the standard norm in  $\mathbb{R}^n$ . The theta functions for  $\Lambda_D = \mathcal{O}_D$  play an important role in the study of ellipsoidal  $T$ -designs. Namely, if  $\Theta(\Lambda_D, P; z) = \sum_{r=0}^{\infty} a(\Lambda_D, P, r)q^r$ , then

$$a(\Lambda_D, P, r) = \sum_{(x,y) \in \Lambda_D^r} P(x, y). \tag{3.2}$$

The theta function  $\Theta(\Lambda_D, P; z) \in \mathcal{M}_k(\Gamma_0(4D), \chi)$ , the space of holomorphic modular forms with weight  $k = j + 1$  and nebentypus  $\chi(A) = \left(\frac{-D}{d}\right)$ , where  $A = \begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{pmatrix}$  [7, Theorem 10.8]. Moreover,  $\Theta(\Lambda_D, P; z)$  is a cusp form when  $j > 0$ .

To ease the study of these theta function, it is convenient to introduce the following the polynomials for each  $j \geq 1$ :

$$R_{D,j}(x, y) := \begin{cases} \operatorname{Re}(x + \sqrt{-D}y)^j & \text{if } D \equiv 1, 2 \pmod{4}, \\ \operatorname{Re}(x + \frac{1+\sqrt{-D}}{2}y)^j & \text{if } D \equiv 3 \pmod{4}, \end{cases} \tag{3.3}$$

and

$$I_{D,j}(x, y) := \begin{cases} \operatorname{Im}(x + \sqrt{-D}y)^j & \text{if } D \equiv 1, 2 \pmod{4}, \\ \operatorname{Im}(x + \frac{1+\sqrt{-D}}{2}y)^j & \text{if } D \equiv 3 \pmod{4}. \end{cases} \tag{3.4}$$

By definition, we have that  $H_{D,j}^{\mathbb{R}}[x, y] = \langle R_{D,j}(x, y), I_{D,j}(x, y) \rangle$ . In particular,  $\Theta(\Lambda_D, R_{D,j}; z)$  and  $\Theta(\Lambda_D, I_{D,j}; z)$  are cusp forms. Theorem 1.1 together with the discussion above gives the following lemma which transforms the problem of determining ellipsoidal  $T$ -designs into the vanishing of certain coefficients of special theta functions.

**Lemma 3.1** *The norm  $r$  shell  $\Lambda_D^r = \Lambda_D \cap C_D(r)$  is an ellipsoidal  $T$ -design if and only if  $a(\Lambda_D, R_{D,j}, r) = 0$  and  $a(\Lambda_D, I_{D,j}, r) = 0$  for all  $j \in T$ .*

We require some standard facts from the theory of newforms. Since  $\mathcal{O}_D$  has class number 1, each Hecke character mod  $\mathcal{O}_D$  is defined by its values on principal ideals. Let  $(\alpha) \subset \mathcal{O}_D$  be a principal ideal. Let  $u_D$  be the number of units in  $\mathcal{O}_D$ , namely

$$u_D := \begin{cases} 4 & \text{if } D = 1, \\ 6 & \text{if } D = 3, \\ 2 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \tag{3.5}$$

For each positive  $j_D \equiv 0 \pmod{u_D}$ , define Hecke characters mod  $\mathcal{O}_D$  by:

$$\zeta_{j_D}((\alpha)) = \left(\frac{\alpha}{|\alpha|}\right)^{j_D}$$

Then by [8, Theorem 4.8.2], we have the following well known lemma about the modular form

$$f_{j_D}(\zeta_{j_D}; z) := \begin{cases} \Theta(\Lambda_D, (x + \sqrt{-D}y)^{j_D}; z) & \text{if } D \equiv 1, 2 \pmod{4}, \\ \Theta\left(\Lambda_D, \left(x + \frac{1+\sqrt{-D}}{2}y\right)^{j_D}; z\right) & \text{if } D \equiv 3 \pmod{4} \end{cases}$$

**Lemma 3.2** *Assuming the notations above, we have*

$$f_{j_D}(\zeta_{j_D}; z) = \sum_{(\alpha) \subset \mathcal{O}_D} \zeta_{j_D}((\alpha)) N(\alpha)^{j/2} q^{N(\alpha)} \in \mathcal{S}_{k_D}(\Gamma_0(N), \chi),$$



the space of cusp forms of weight  $k_D = j_D + 1$  with nebentypus  $\chi \pmod{N}$ . Here  $N := |\Delta_{\mathcal{O}_D}|$ , the absolute value of the discriminant of  $\mathcal{O}_D$ . Moreover,  $f_{j_D}(\zeta_{j_D}; z)$  is a newform.

### 3.2 Other propositions and lemmas

Recall that  $\Lambda_D^r = C_D(r) \cap \mathcal{O}_D$ . Using well known facts about the positive definite binary quadratic forms corresponding to class number 1 norm forms, we have the following lemma.

**Lemma 3.3** *Suppose  $r$  is a positive integer. Then  $\Lambda_D^r$  is nonempty if and only if  $r$  is even for every prime  $p \nmid r$  for which  $\Lambda_D^p$  is nonempty.*

Rewriting (3.2), we have

$$a(\Lambda_D, P, r) = \sum_{(x,y) \in \Lambda_D^r} P(x, y). \tag{3.6}$$

Lemma 3.1 implies that  $\Lambda_D^r$  is an ellipsoidal  $T$ -design if and only if  $a(\Lambda_D, R_{D,j}, r)$  and  $a(\Lambda_D, I_{D,j}, r)$  vanish for all  $j \in T$ . Since  $\Lambda_D^r$  is antipodal (i.e.  $-\Lambda_D^r = \Lambda_D^r$  for all  $r$ ),  $a(\Lambda_D, R_{D,j}, r)$  and  $a(\Lambda_D, I_{D,j}, r)$  are 0 for all  $j \in \mathbb{Z}^+ \setminus 2\mathbb{Z}^+$ . Therefore, we have that following proposition.

**Proposition 3.1** *Suppose  $r \in \mathbb{Z}^+$  such that  $\Lambda_D^r$  is nonempty. Then  $\Lambda_D^r$  is an ellipsoidal  $\mathbb{Z}^+ \setminus 2\mathbb{Z}^+$ -design.*

Our objective is to find maximal set  $T_D$  for which  $\Lambda_D^r$  is ellipsoidal  $T$ -design. By proposition above we have that  $\mathbb{Z}^+ \setminus 2\mathbb{Z}^+ \subset T_D$ . So we only look for all even  $j$  which can be in  $T_D$ .

**Proposition 3.2** *Suppose  $j \equiv 0 \pmod{2}$ , and  $r \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ . Then the following are true:*

- (1) *We have that  $a(\Lambda_D, I_{D,j}, r) = 0$ .*
- (2) *We have that  $a(\Lambda_D, R_{D,j}, r) = \begin{cases} \sum_{(x_0, y_0) \in \Lambda_D^r} (x + \sqrt{-D}y)^j & \text{if } D \equiv 1, 2 \pmod{4}, \\ \sum_{(x_0, y_0) \in \Lambda_D^r} \left(x + \frac{1+\sqrt{-D}}{2}y\right)^j & \text{if } D \equiv 3 \pmod{4} \end{cases}$*

**Proof** Part (2) is an obvious consequence of part (1). So it is enough to prove part (1). The idea is to show that points in  $\Lambda_D^r$  occur in pairs on which value of  $I_{D,j}$  cancel. If  $D \equiv 1, 2 \pmod{4}$ , then  $I_{D,j} = \text{Im}(x + \sqrt{-D}y)^j$ . In this case  $(a, b), (a, -b) \in \Lambda_D^r$  such that  $I_{D,j}(a, b) + I_{D,j}(a, -b) = 0$ . This is true because each term of  $I_{D,j}(x, y)$  has odd power in both the variables  $x, y$ . If  $D \equiv 3 \pmod{4}$ , then  $I_{D,j} = \text{Im}\left(\left(x + \frac{1}{2}y\right) + \frac{\sqrt{-D}}{2}y\right)^j$ . In this case  $(a, b), (a+b, -b) \in \Lambda_D^j$  such that  $I_{D,j}(a, b) + I_{D,j}(a+b, -b) = 0$ . This is because each term of  $I_{D,j}(x, y)$  has odd power in  $x + y/2, y$ .  $\square$

We notice that if  $(x_0, y_0) \in \mathcal{O}_D$ , then we have

$$\sum_{\alpha_D \in \mathcal{O}_D: |\alpha_D|=1} R_{D,j}(\alpha_D(x_0, y_0)) = R_{D,j}(x_0, y_0) \sum_{\alpha_D \in \mathcal{O}_D: |\alpha_D|=1} \alpha_D^j. \tag{3.7}$$

**Proposition 3.3** *If  $r \geq 1, 1 \leq j \not\equiv 0 \pmod{u_D}$ , and  $\Lambda_D^r$  nonempty, then  $a(\Lambda_D^r, R_{D,j}, r) = 0$*

**Proof** The idea is that if  $(x_0, y_0) \in \Lambda_D^r$  then  $\alpha_D(x_0, y_0) \in \Lambda_D^r$  where  $\alpha_D$  is a unit in  $\mathcal{O}_D$ . Therefore enough to show that the sum in RHS of (3.7) is 0. For  $D = 1$ , number of units in  $\mathcal{O}_D, u_D = 4$  which are  $\{1, -1, i, -i\}$ . We have  $1^j + (-1)^j + i^j + (-i)^j = 0$ . For  $D = 3$ , number of units in  $\mathcal{O}_D, u_D = 6$  which are  $\{\pm 1, \frac{\pm 1 \pm \sqrt{-3}}{2}\}$ . A brute force calculation shows the result. For other  $D$ , the number of units in  $\mathcal{O}_D, u_D = 2$  which are  $\{1, -1\}$ . For all  $j$  odd,  $(1)^j + (-1)^j = 0$  □

From here on we will only consider the theta function  $\Theta\left(\Lambda_D, \frac{1}{u_D}R_{D,j}; z\right)$  so let's give its coefficients a shorthand.

$$\Theta\left(\Lambda_D, \frac{1}{u_D}R_{D,j}; z\right) = \sum_{r=0}^{\infty} a(D, j, r)q^r. \tag{3.8}$$

Proposition 3.2 together with Lemma 3.2 give us that if  $j \equiv 0 \pmod{u_D}$ , then the theta function  $\Theta\left(\Lambda_D, \frac{1}{u_D}R_{D,j}; z\right) \in \mathcal{S}_{j+1}(\Gamma_0(N), \chi)$  is a Hecke eigenform. So we have the following lemma.

**Lemma 3.4** *Suppose  $j \in u_D\mathbb{Z}^+$ . Then the following is true:*

(1) *If  $\gcd(r_1, r_2) = 1$  then*

$$a(D, j, r_1r_2) = a(D, j, r_1)a(D, j, r_2).$$

(2) *For  $p$  prime and  $\alpha > 0$ , we have*

$$a(D, j, p^\alpha) = a(D, j, p)a(D, j, p^{\alpha-1}) - \chi(p)p^j a(D, j, p^{\alpha-2}).$$

(3) *For  $p$  prime and  $\alpha > 0$ , we have*

$$a(D, j, p^\alpha) = a(D, j, p)^\alpha \pmod{p}.$$

Suppose  $p$  be a prime such that  $\Lambda_D^p$  be nonempty. Let  $(x_p, y_p) \in \Lambda_D^p$  and  $j \equiv 0 \pmod{u_D}$ . When  $p = D$  then it ramifies in  $\mathcal{O}_D$  and there are exactly  $u_D$  points in  $\Lambda_D^p$ . From (3.7) we have  $a(D, j, p) = R_{D,j}(x_p, y_p)$ . If  $p \neq D$  then it's unramified and we get exactly  $2u_D$  solutions. In this case  $a(D, j, p) = 2R_{D,j}(x_p, y_p)$ .

**Lemma 3.5** *Suppose  $j \in u_D\mathbb{Z}^+$  and  $p$  be an odd prime such that  $\Lambda_D^p$  is nonempty. Let  $(x_p, y_p) \in \Lambda_D^p$  then  $R_{D,j}(x_p, y_p) \not\equiv 0 \pmod{p}$ . In particular,  $a(D, j, p)$  is non-zero.*

**Proof** We will consider two cases,  $D \equiv 1, 2 \pmod{4}$  and  $D \equiv 3 \pmod{4}$ . Proof is essentially same in both the cases.

If  $D \equiv 1, 2 \pmod{4}$  then  $p = x_p^2 + Dy_p^2$ , in particular  $x_p \not\equiv 0 \pmod{p}$ . we consider the binomial expansion

$$\begin{aligned} R_{D,j}(x_p, y_p) &= \operatorname{Re}(x_p + \sqrt{-D}y_p)^j \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{n=0}^{j/2} \binom{j}{2n} x_p^{j-2n} (-1)^n (Dy_p^2)^n \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{n=0}^{j/2} \binom{j}{2n} x_p^{j-2n} (-1)^n (p - x_p^2)^n \\ &\equiv \frac{1}{2} x_p^j \sum_{n=0}^{j/2} \binom{j}{2n} \equiv 2^{j-2} x_p^j \not\equiv 0 \pmod{p} \end{aligned}$$

If  $D \equiv 1, 2 \pmod{4}$  then  $p = (x_p + y_p/2)^2 + Dy_p^2/4$ , in particular  $x_p + y_p/2 \not\equiv 0 \pmod{p}$ . we consider the binomial expansion

$$\begin{aligned} R_{D,j}(x_p, y_p) &= \operatorname{Re}\left(x_p + y_p/2 + \sqrt{-D}y_p/2\right)^j \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{n=0}^{j/2} \binom{j}{2n} \left(x_p + \frac{y_p}{2}\right)^{j-2n} (-1)^n \left(\frac{Dy_p^2}{4}\right)^n \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{n=0}^{j/2} \binom{j}{2n} \left(x_p + \frac{y_p}{2}\right)^{j-2n} (-1)^n \left(p - \left(x_p + \frac{y_p}{2}\right)^2\right)^n \\ &\equiv \frac{1}{2} \left(x_p + \frac{y_p}{2}\right)^j \sum_{n=0}^{j/2} \binom{j}{2n} \equiv 2^{j-2} \left(x_p + \frac{y_p}{2}\right)^j \not\equiv 0 \pmod{p} \end{aligned}$$

□

**Proposition 3.4** For prime 2,  $\Lambda_D^2$  is nonempty only for  $D = 1, 2, 7$ . In this case  $a(D, j, 2)$  does not vanish for all  $j \in 2\mathbb{Z}^+$ . Moreover, we have that  $a(7, j, 2) \equiv 1 \pmod{2}$

**Proof** For  $D = 1, 2, 2|\Delta_{\mathcal{O}_D}(= -4D)$  so the ideal (2) is ramified in  $\mathcal{O}_D$ , in particular there are elements of norm 2. For  $D \in \{3, 7, 11, 19, 43, 67, 163\}$ ,  $2 \nmid \Delta_{\mathcal{O}_D}(= -D)$ . So the ideal (2) is unramified in  $\mathcal{O}_D$ . Here we need to check whether 2 splits or not. We have the condition that 2 splits if and only if  $-D \equiv 1 \pmod{8}$ . Only  $D = 7$  satisfies the condition.

A brute force calculation shows that  $a(1, j, 2) = (1 + i)^j \neq 0$ ,  $a(2, j, 2) = i^j 2^{j+1} \neq 0$ , and  $a(7, j, 2) = 4\operatorname{Re}\left(\frac{1+\sqrt{-7}}{2}\right)^j \neq 0$ .

We prove that  $a(7, j, 2) \equiv 1 \pmod{2}$  using induction on even  $j$ . First, note that  $a(7, 2, 2) = -3 \equiv 1 \pmod{2}$ . Now we assume that  $a(7, j, 2) \equiv 1 \pmod{2}$ , which implies that  $\operatorname{Re}\left(\frac{1+\sqrt{-7}}{2}\right)^j = (2k + 1)/2$  for some  $k$ . The norm of  $\left(\frac{1+\sqrt{-7}}{2}\right)^j$  is even,

so we get that  $\text{Im}\left(\frac{1+\sqrt{-7}}{2}\right)^j = \sqrt{7}(2k'+1)/2$  for some  $k'$ . An easy calculation shows that  $a(7, j+2, 2) = -3\text{Re}\left(\frac{1+\sqrt{-7}}{2}\right)^j - \sqrt{7}\text{Im}\left(\frac{1+\sqrt{-7}}{2}\right)^j \equiv 1 \pmod{2}$ .  $\square$

### 3.3 Proof of Theorem 1.2

Propositions 3.1, 3.2 and 3.3 together imply that  $a(\Lambda_D, R_{D,j}, r)$  and  $a(\Lambda_D, I_{D,j}, r)$  vanish for all  $j \not\equiv 0 \pmod{u_D}$ , which implies that every nonempty shell  $\Lambda_D^r$  is an ellipsoidal  $T_D$ -design (remember that  $T_D = \mathbb{Z}^+ \setminus u_D\mathbb{Z}^+$ ).

Now we prove the maximality of  $T_D$ . We show that  $a(D, j, r) \neq 0$  (note that  $a(D, j, r) = \frac{1}{u_D}a(\Lambda_D, R_{D,j}, r)$ ) for all  $j \notin T_D$  and  $\Lambda_D^r$  nonempty. By Lemma 3.4, enough to take  $r$  to be a prime power. Suppose  $p$  be a prime and  $\alpha \geq 1$  be such that  $\Lambda_D^{p^\alpha} \neq \emptyset$ . There are two cases possible, either  $\Lambda_D^{p^\alpha}$  is empty or it is not. First suppose  $\Lambda_D^{p^\alpha}$  is nonempty. If  $p$  is 2 then  $a(D, j, 2) \neq 0$  by Proposition 3.4. By part(2) of Lemma 3.4, we have that  $a(D, j, 2^\alpha) = a(D, j, 2)^\alpha \neq 0$  for  $D = 1, 2$  since  $\chi(2) = 0$ . When  $D = 7$  then part(3) of Lemma 3.4, we have  $a(7, j, 2^\alpha) \neq 0$ . If  $p$  is an odd prime, then Lemma 3.5 implies that  $a(D, j, p) \neq 0$ . Now using part(3) of Lemma 3.4 again, we have  $a(D, j, p^\alpha) \neq 0$ . Suppose  $\Lambda_D^{p^\alpha}$  is empty then  $a(D, j, p) = 0$  and Lemma 3.3 implies  $\alpha$  is even. Now by part(2) of Lemma 3.5, we get  $a(D, j, p^\alpha) = p^{j\alpha/2} \neq 0$  (note that this case includes 2 too). So we get that  $a(D, j, p^\alpha) \neq 0$  whenever  $\Lambda_D^{p^\alpha}$  is nonempty.

**Acknowledgements** I would like to thank Prof Ken Ono for suggesting me this problem and guiding through. I also thank Will Craig and Wei-Lun Tsai for reviewing my paper and giving useful comments. I thank Matthew McCarthy for helping me with Sage Math. Lastly, I would like to thank the reviewers for their useful comments.

## References

1. Axler, S., Bourdon, P., Ramey, W.: Harmonic Function Theory, Graduate Texts in Mathematics, 137. Springer, New York (1992)
2. Bannai, E.: Spherical t-designs which are orbits of finite groups. J. Math. Soc. Jpn. **36**(2), 341–354 (1984)
3. Bannai, E., Okuda, T., Tagami, M.: Spherical designs of harmonic index t. J. Approx. Theory **195**, 1–18 (2015)
4. Chen, X., Frommer, A., Lang, B.: Computational existence proofs for spherical t-designs. Numer. Math. **117**(2), 289–305 (2011)
5. Delsarte, P., Goethals, J.M., Seidel, J.J.: Spherical codes and designs. Geom. Dedicata. **6**(3), 363–388 (1977)
6. Hayashi, A., Hashimoto, T., Horibe, M.: Reexamination of optimal quantum state estimation of pure states. Phys. Rev. A **73**, 3 (2005)
7. Iwaniec H.: *Topics in Classical Automorphic Forms*, Graduate Studies in Mathematics, 17. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 1997. xii+259 pp
8. Miyake, T.: Modular forms, Translated from the 1976 Japanese original by Yoshitaka Maeda. Springer Monographs in Mathematics. Springer, Berlin (2006)
9. Mieziaki, T.: On a generalization of spherical designs. Discrete Math. **313**(4), 375–380 (2013)

10. Seki, G.: On some nonrigid spherical  $t$ -designs. Mem. Fac. Sci. Kyushu Univ. Ser. A **46**(1), 169–178 (1992)

**Publisher's Note** Springer Nature remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.