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#### Abstract

In this paper we give an asymptotic formula for the quantity of diagonal del Pezzo surfaces of degree 2 which have a Brauer-Manin obstruction to the Hasse principle when ordered by height.
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## 1. Introduction

Given a variety $X$ over some number field $k$, a fundamental question to ask is whether $X(k) \neq \varnothing$ ? If $X(k) \neq \varnothing$, then since $X(k) \subseteq X\left(\mathbb{A}_{k}\right)$ we must also have that $X\left(\mathbb{A}_{k}\right) \neq \varnothing$. One may ask whether the reverse implication holds, that is, does $X\left(\mathbb{A}_{k}\right) \neq \varnothing \Longrightarrow X(k) \neq$ $\varnothing$ ? If this implication holds, we say that $X$ satisfies the Hasse principle. It is well-known that in general this fails to hold. For example, in [KT04, Ex. 6] it was shown that the surface

$$
-126 x_{0}^{4}-91 x_{1}^{4}+78 x_{2}^{4}=w^{2}
$$

has no $\mathbb{Q}$-point, but it is everywhere locally soluble. In this example, the failure of the Hasse principle is explained by the Brauer-Manin obstruction. It has been conjectured by Colliot-Thélène that for rationally connected $k$-varieties $X$, the Brauer-Manin obstruction is the only obstruction to $X$ satisfying the Hasse principle (see [CTS21, Conj. 14.1.2]). As

[^0]such it is of interest to determine how often a surface in this family has a Brauer-Manin obstruction to the Hasse principle.

In this paper we study the Brauer-Manin obstruction to the Hasse principle for diagonal del Pezzo surfaces of degree 2 over $\mathbb{Q}$ with integer coefficients (a subfamily of rationally connected $\mathbb{Q}$-varieties). Namely the surfaces

$$
S_{\mathbf{a}}: a_{0} x_{0}^{4}+a_{1} x_{1}^{4}+a_{2} x_{2}^{4}=w^{2} \subseteq \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{Q}}(1,1,1,2)
$$

where $a_{i} \in \mathbb{Z} \backslash\{0\}$. We are able to find an asymptotic formula for the number of such surfaces which have a Brauer-Manin obstruction to the Hasse principle:

Theorem 1.1. There exists a constant $A>0$ such that

$$
\#\left\{\begin{array}{ll} 
& \left|a_{i}\right| \leq T \text { for all } i \in\{0,1,2\} \\
\boldsymbol{a} \in(\mathbb{Z} \backslash\{0\})^{3}: & S_{a} \text { has a Brauer-Manin obstruction } \\
\text { to the Hasse principle }
\end{array}\right\} \sim A(T \log T)^{\frac{3}{2}}
$$

In fact, if we define the natural partition of the coefficients as follows:

$$
\begin{aligned}
N_{=\square}^{\mathrm{Br}}(T) & :=\left\{\mathbf{a} \in N^{\mathrm{Br}}(T):-a_{0} a_{1} a_{2} \in \mathbb{Q}^{\times 2}\right\}, \\
N_{=-\square}^{\mathrm{Br}}(T) & :=\left\{\mathbf{a} \in N^{\mathrm{Br}}(T):-a_{0} a_{1} a_{2} \in-\mathbb{Q}^{\times 2}\right\}, \\
N_{\neq \pm \square}^{\mathrm{Br}}(T) & :=\left\{\mathbf{a} \in N^{\mathrm{Br}}(T):-a_{0} a_{1} a_{2} \notin \pm \mathbb{Q}^{\times 2}\right\},
\end{aligned}
$$

then Theorem 1.1 arises as a special case of the following result:
Theorem 1.2. There exists $A, B>0$ such that

$$
\begin{gathered}
\# N_{=\square}^{\mathrm{Br}}(T)=O\left(T^{\frac{3}{2}} \log T\right), \\
\# N_{=-\square}^{\mathrm{Br}}(T) \sim A(T \log T)^{\frac{3}{2}}, \\
\# N_{\neq \pm \square}^{\mathrm{Br}}(T) \sim B T^{\frac{3}{2}}(\log T)^{\frac{9}{8}} .
\end{gathered}
$$

Recently there has been similar work carried out on a range of surfaces, for example; see [GLN22] and [San23] for K3-surfaces, [1BB14] and Rom19] for Châtelet surfaces, and [JS16] and [MS22] for del Pezzo surfaces. As far as the author is aware this is the first such result for any family of del Pezzo surfaces of degree 2. Furthermore, while the majority of papers were only able to obtain the correct order of magnitude, we are able to obtain an asymptotic formula.

In [KT04] the Brauer groups of the surfaces $S_{\mathbf{a}}$ were calculated, in which it was proved that $100 \%$ of these surfaces satisfy $\operatorname{Br} S_{\mathbf{a}} / \operatorname{Br} \mathbb{Q} \cong \mathbb{Z} / 2 \mathbb{Z}$, generated by an explicit quaternion
algebra $\mathcal{A}$. However, there is not a uniform generator across the family of these surfaces, adding further difficulty to our problem. Precisely, we prove the following result:

Theorem 1.3. Let $a_{0}, a_{1}, a_{2}$ be algebraically independent transcendental elements over $\mathbb{Q}$ and let $k:=\mathbb{Q}\left(a_{0}, a_{1}, a_{2}\right)$. Let $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathbb{P}_{k}(1,1,1,2)$ be the surface given by

$$
a_{0} x_{0}^{4}+a_{1} x_{1}^{4}+a_{2} x_{2}^{4}=w^{2}
$$

Then we have $\operatorname{Br} \mathcal{S} / \operatorname{Br} k=0$, however $H^{1}\left(k, \operatorname{Pic} \mathcal{S}_{\bar{k}}\right)=\mathbb{Z} / 2 \mathbb{Z}$.
This prevents us from being able to more easily construct families of the surfaces $S_{\mathbf{a}}$ which have a Brauer-Manin obstruction. We are however able to adapt the methods used in San23 to mitigate some of this difficulty.
1.1. Outline of the paper. In $\S 2$ we begin by constructing a representative $\mathcal{A}$ of an element of the Brauer group using the methods given in San23. We then proceed to calculate certain local invariant maps for $\mathcal{A}$ using similar methods as given in Bri11] and [San23]. We end this section by determining how said maps change when the coefficients of the surface vary.

In §3 we will prove the main theorem by following the methods used in [San23, §5]. We start by proving that the majority of surfaces with a Brauer-Manin obstruction actually have a Brauer-Manin obstruction induced by $\mathcal{A}$. We then prove that $50 \%$ of the surfaces for which $\operatorname{inv}_{p}(\mathcal{A}(-))$ is constant for all places $p$ and is everywhere locally soluble have a Brauer-Manin obstruction induced by $\mathcal{A}$. We lastly convert this set into a certain sum, and after simplifying the sum, provide an asymptotic formula which will complete the proof of the main theorem.

In §4 we prove that there is no uniform formula for $\mathcal{A}$ using the methods given in Uem16] and [San23]. While this section does not directly effect the rest of the paper it provides an explanation as to the difficulty of some of the proofs.
1.2. Notation and conventions used. Where possible we will use the notation given in [San23] to make the similarities between the papers clearer.

Definition 1.4. For $\mathbf{a}=\left(a_{0}, a_{1}, a_{2}\right) \in\left(\mathbb{Q}^{\times}\right)^{3}$ we let $S_{\mathbf{a}} \subseteq \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{Q}}(1,1,1,2)$ denote the surface given by the equation

$$
a_{0} x_{0}^{4}+a_{1} x_{1}^{4}+a_{2} x_{2}^{4}=w^{2},
$$

and let $X_{\mathbf{a}} \subseteq \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{Q}}^{3}$ denote the $K 3$ surface given by the equation

$$
a_{0} x_{0}^{4}+a_{1} x_{1}^{4}+a_{2} x_{2}^{4}=x_{3}^{4} .
$$

We let $\pi_{\mathbf{a}}: X_{\mathbf{a}} \rightarrow S_{\mathbf{a}} ;\left[x_{0}: x_{1}: x_{2}: x_{3}\right] \mapsto\left[x_{0}: x_{1}: x_{2}: x_{3}^{2}\right]$. We will write $\theta_{\mathbf{a}}:=-a_{0} a_{1} a_{2}$.
Acknowledgements. The author would like to thank Daniel Loughran for suggesting the problem and his tireless support throughout the process. The author would also like to thank Tim Santens for his useful comments on an earlier revision of this paper.

## 2. Calculating the local invariant maps

2.1. Brauer-Manin obstruction. In this section we will briefly recall the Brauer-Manin obstruction. Firstly recall from [CTS21, Def. 13.1.7] that for any place $p$ of $\mathbb{Q}$ we have a homomorphism

$$
\operatorname{inv}_{p}: \operatorname{Br} \mathbb{Q}_{p} \rightarrow \mathbb{Q} / \mathbb{Z}
$$

For a quaternion algebra $(a, b) \in \operatorname{Br} \mathbb{Q}_{p}[2]$ this map is given by

$$
\operatorname{inv}_{p}((a, b))=\rho\left((a, b)_{p}\right)
$$

where $(-,-)_{p}$ denotes the Hilbert symbol with respect to $p$, and $\rho: \mu_{2} \xrightarrow{\sim}(\mathbb{Q} / \mathbb{Z})[2]$ is the unique isomorphism given by $-1 \mapsto \frac{1}{2}$.

For a smooth variety $S$ over $\mathbb{Q}$, we define the Brauer group of $S$ to be $\operatorname{Br} S:=\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{e} t}^{2}\left(S, \mathbb{G}_{m, S}\right)$. Let $B \subseteq \operatorname{Br} S$ be any non-empty subset, and let

$$
S\left(\mathbb{A}_{\mathbb{Q}}\right)^{B}:=\bigcap_{\mathcal{A} \in B}\left\{\left(s_{p}\right)_{p} \in S\left(\mathbb{A}_{\mathbb{Q}}\right): \sum_{p} \operatorname{inv}_{p}\left(\mathcal{A}\left(s_{p}\right)\right)=0\right\} .
$$

We say $S$ has a Brauer-Manin obstruction to the Hasse principle if $S\left(\mathbb{A}_{\mathbb{Q}}\right) \neq \varnothing$ but $S\left(\mathbb{A}_{\mathbb{Q}}\right)^{\operatorname{Br} S}=\varnothing$. For any $\mathcal{A} \in \operatorname{Br} S$, we say $S$ has a Brauer-Manin obstruction induced by $\mathcal{A}$ if $S\left(\mathbb{A}_{\mathbb{Q}}\right) \neq \varnothing$ but $S\left(\mathbb{A}_{\mathbb{Q}}\right)^{\mathcal{A}}=\varnothing$. In particular, from [CTS21, Thm. 13.3.2] we know that $S(\mathbb{Q}) \subseteq S\left(\mathbb{A}_{\mathbb{Q}}\right)^{\mathrm{Br} S}$, and hence if $S$ has a Brauer-Manin obstruction to the Hasse principle, then it cannot satisfy the Hasse principle. Throughout the rest of the paper we will simply write Brauer-Manin obstruction when we mean Brauer-Manin obstruction to the Hasse principle.
2.2. Constructing an element of the Brauer group. In this section we will construct multiple elements of $\operatorname{Br} S_{\mathbf{a}}$, which we will use in $\$ 2.3$ and $\S 3$.

Definition 2.1. Let $Y_{\mathbf{a}} \subseteq \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{Q}}^{3}$ denote the smooth quadratic surface given by the equation

$$
a_{0} t_{0}^{2}+a_{1} t_{1}^{2}+a_{2} t_{2}^{2}=t_{3}^{2} .
$$

Let $\phi_{\mathbf{a}}: S_{\mathbf{a}} \rightarrow Y_{\mathbf{a}}$ denote the morphism given by $\left[x_{0}: x_{1}: x_{2}: w\right] \mapsto\left[x_{0}^{2}: x_{1}^{2}: x_{2}^{2}: w\right]$.

In particular, if $S_{\mathbf{a}}$ is everywhere locally soluble, then so is $Y_{\mathbf{a}}$, and hence by the HasseMinkowski Theorem $Y_{\mathbf{a}}(\mathbb{Q}) \neq \varnothing$.

Definition 2.2. Assume $\theta_{\mathbf{a}} \in \mathbb{Q}^{\times 2}$. Let $a_{3}:=-1, x_{3}^{2}:=w$ and $\{i, j, k, \ell\}:=\{0,1,2,3\}$. Let $Z_{\mathbf{a}}^{i j k} \subseteq \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{Q}}^{2}$ denote the conic given by

$$
a_{i} Z_{i}^{2}+a_{j} Z_{j}^{2}+a_{k} Z_{k}^{2}=0
$$

Fix a choice of $\sqrt{\theta_{\mathbf{a}}}$. Let $\gamma_{\sqrt{\boldsymbol{\theta}_{\mathbf{a}}}}: S_{\mathbf{a}} \rightarrow Z_{\mathbf{a}}^{i j k}$ denote the rational map given by

$$
Z_{i}=x_{i}^{2} x_{k}^{2}-\frac{\sqrt{\theta_{\mathbf{a}}}}{a_{i} a_{k}} x_{j}^{2} x_{\ell}^{2}, Z_{j}=\frac{\sqrt{\theta_{\mathbf{a}}}}{a_{j} a_{k}} x_{i}^{2} x_{\ell}^{2}+x_{j}^{2} x_{k}^{2}, Z_{k}=x_{k}^{4}+\frac{a_{\ell}}{a_{k}} x_{\ell}^{4} .
$$

We now adapt the construction of elements of $\operatorname{Br} X_{\mathbf{a}}$ in [San23, Prop. 3.1] to our case:
Proposition 2.3. Let $S_{a}$ be everywhere locally soluble.
(1) Let $P=\left[y_{0}: y_{1}: y_{2}: y_{3}\right] \in Y_{a}(\mathbb{Q})$. Let $g_{a}$ be the polynomial defining the tangent plane to $Y_{a}$ at $P$, that is

$$
g_{a}:=a_{0} y_{0} t_{0}+a_{1} y_{1} t_{1}+a_{2} y_{2} t_{2}-y_{3} t_{3} .
$$

Let $f_{\boldsymbol{a}}$ be the pullback of $g_{\boldsymbol{a}}$ via $\phi_{\boldsymbol{a}}$ to $S_{\boldsymbol{a}}$, that is

$$
f_{a}:=\phi_{a}^{*} g_{a}=a_{0} y_{0} x_{0}^{2}+a_{1} y_{1} x_{1}^{2}+a_{2} y_{2} x_{2}^{2}-y_{3} w .
$$

Then the quaternion algebra

$$
\mathcal{A}_{\boldsymbol{a}}:=\left(-a_{0} a_{1} a_{2}, f_{\boldsymbol{a}} / x_{0}^{2}\right)
$$

lies in $\operatorname{Br} S_{a}$. Furthermore, the class of $\left[\mathcal{A}_{a}\right]$ in $\operatorname{Br} S_{a} / \operatorname{Br} \mathbb{Q}$ is independent of the choice of $P$.
(2) Assume $\theta_{a} \in \mathbb{Q}^{\times 2}$. Let $a_{3}:=-1, x_{3}^{2}:=w$ and $\{i, j, k, \ell\}:=\{0,1,2,3\}$. Then the rational map $\gamma_{\sqrt{\theta_{a}}}: S_{a} \rightarrow Z_{a}^{i j k}$ can be extended to a morphism, and hence by the Hasse-Minkowski Theorem $Z_{a}^{i j k}(\mathbb{Q}) \neq \varnothing$. Let $P \in Z_{a}^{i j k}(\mathbb{Q})$, and let $h_{a}$ be the tangent line to $Z_{a}^{i j k}$ at $P$. Then the quaternion algebra

$$
\mathcal{B}_{i j k, \sqrt{\theta_{a}}}:=\left(-a_{i} a_{j} \sqrt{\theta_{a}}, \gamma_{\sqrt{\theta_{a}}}^{*} \frac{h_{a}}{Z_{k}}\right)
$$

lies in $\operatorname{Br} S_{a}$. Furthermore, the class of $\left[\mathcal{B}_{i j k, \sqrt{\theta_{a}}}\right]$ in $\operatorname{Br} S_{a} / \operatorname{Br} \mathbb{Q}$ is independent of choice of $P$.

Proof. The proof of this result follows from the proof of [San23, Prop. 3.1] by appropriately changing the variables.

Remark 2.4. Let $\mathcal{A}_{\mathbf{a}}^{\prime} \in \operatorname{Br} X_{\mathbf{a}}$ denote the element constructed in [San23, Prop. 3.1.(i)], and let $\mathcal{B}_{i j k, \sqrt{\theta_{\mathbf{a}}}}^{\prime} \in \operatorname{Br} X_{\mathbf{a}}$ denote the element constructed in [San23, Prop. 3.1.(ii)]. Under the pullback of the map $\pi_{\mathrm{a}}: X_{\mathrm{a}} \rightarrow S_{\mathrm{a}}$ we clearly have

$$
\pi_{\mathrm{a}}^{*} \mathcal{A}_{\mathbf{a}}=\mathcal{A}_{\mathbf{a}}^{\prime}, \text { and } \pi_{\mathbf{a}}^{*} \mathcal{B}_{i j k, \sqrt{\theta_{\mathbf{a}}}}=\mathcal{B}_{i j k, \sqrt{\theta_{\mathbf{a}}}}^{\prime}
$$

This fact will be used throughout the remaining sections to help simplify several proofs.
2.3. Computing the local invariant maps. In this section we analyse the local invariant maps associated to the quaternion algebra $\mathcal{A}_{\mathbf{a}}$. Throughout this section to simplify notation we will let $S:=S_{\mathbf{a}}, \mathcal{A}:=\mathcal{A}_{\mathbf{a}}, f:=f_{\mathbf{a}}$ and $Y:=Y_{\mathbf{a}}$.
2.3.1. Existence of local solutions. Before analysing the local invariant maps we provide criteria for the existence of local solution of $S$ :

Lemma 2.5. Let $p>33$ be a prime, then $S\left(\mathbb{Q}_{p}\right) \neq \varnothing$ if and only if one of the following holds:
(1) $a_{i} \in \mathbb{Q}_{p}^{\times 2}$ for some $i \in\{0,1,2\}$;
(2) $-\frac{a_{i}}{a_{j}} \in \mathbb{Q}_{p}^{\times 4}$ for some $i \neq j \in\{0,1,2\}$;
(3) there exists $i \neq j \in\{0,1,2\}$ and $s \in\{0,2\}$ such that $\nu_{p}\left(a_{i}\right) \equiv \nu_{p}\left(a_{j}\right) \equiv s \bmod 4$;
(4) we have $\nu_{p}\left(a_{0}\right) \equiv \nu_{p}\left(a_{1}\right) \equiv \nu_{p}\left(a_{2}\right) \bmod 4$.

Proof. The proceeding proof is adapted from the proof of [San23, Lem. 3.3]: Assume $S\left(\mathbb{Q}_{p}\right) \neq \varnothing$. Let $Q=\left[p^{n_{0}} \mu_{0}: p^{n_{1}} \mu_{1}: p^{n_{2}} \mu_{2}: p^{n_{3}} \mu_{3}\right] \in S\left(\mathbb{Z}_{p}\right)$, where $n_{i}=0$ for some $i \in\{0,1,2,3\}$ and $\mu_{j} \in \mathbb{Z}_{p}^{\times}$for all $j$. By definition we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
a_{0} p^{4 n_{0}} \mu_{0}^{4}+a_{1} p^{4 n_{1}} \mu_{1}^{4}+a_{2} p^{4 n_{2}} \mu_{2}^{4}-p^{2 n_{3}} \mu_{3}^{2}=0 \tag{2.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

Now if $m:=2 n_{3} \leq 4 n_{i}+\nu_{p}\left(a_{i}\right)$ for all $i \in\{0,1,2\}$, then multiplying (2.1) by $p^{-m}$ gives

$$
a_{0} p^{4 n_{0}-m} \mu_{0}^{4}+a_{1} p^{4 n_{1}-m} \mu_{1}^{4}+a_{2} p^{4 n_{2}-m} \mu_{2}^{4}-\mu_{3}^{2}=0
$$

Now consider this equation modulo $p$. Since $\mu_{3} \in \mathbb{Z}_{p}^{\times}$, there must exists at least one $j \in\{0,1,2\}$ such that $a_{j} p^{4 n_{j}-m} \mu_{j}^{4} \not \equiv 0 \bmod p$. If exactly one such $j$ exists, then $a_{j} p^{4 n_{j}-m}$ is a square modulo $p$. In particular since $\nu_{p}\left(a_{j}\right) \in 2 \mathbb{Z}$, by Hensel's Lemma we have $a_{j} \in \mathbb{Q}_{p}^{\times 2}$. If more than one such $j$ exists, let $J \subseteq\{0,1,2\}$ be the subset such that $a_{j} p^{4 n_{j}-m} \mu_{j}^{4} \not \equiv 0 \bmod p$ for all $j \in J$. For any $j \in J$ we have $4 n_{j}+\nu_{p}\left(a_{j}\right)=2 n_{3}$. In particular $\nu_{p}\left(a_{j}\right) \equiv \nu_{p}\left(a_{k}\right) \equiv$ $2 n_{3} \bmod 4$ for all $j, k \in J$.

Now if there exists $j \in\{0,1,2\}$ such that $m_{j}:=4 n_{j}+\nu_{p}\left(a_{j}\right) \leq 4 n_{i}+\nu_{p}\left(a_{i}\right)$ for all $i \in\{0,1,2\}$ and $m_{j}<2 n_{3}$, then multiplying (2.1) by $p^{-m_{j}}$ gives

$$
a_{0} p^{4 n_{0}-m_{j}} \mu_{0}^{4}+a_{1} p^{4 n_{1}-m_{j}} \mu_{1}^{4}+a_{2} p^{4 n_{2}-m_{j}} \mu_{2}^{4}-p^{2 n_{3}-m_{j}} \mu_{3}^{2}=0 .
$$

Consider this equation modulo $p$. Since $a_{j} p^{4 n_{j}-m_{j}} \mu_{j}^{4} \not \equiv 0 \bmod p$ there must exist at least one other $k \in\{0,1,2\}$ such that $a_{k} p^{4 n_{k}-m_{j}} \mu_{k}^{4} \neq 0 \bmod p$. If exactly one such $j$ exists, then we have

$$
a_{j} p^{4 n_{j}-m_{j}} \mu_{j}^{4} \equiv-a_{k} p^{4 n_{k}-m_{j}} \mu_{k}^{4} \bmod p,
$$

and hence by Hensel's Lemma we have

$$
-\frac{a_{k}}{a_{j}} \in \mathbb{Q}_{p}^{\times 4} .
$$

If more than one such $k$ exists, then $a_{k} p^{4 n_{k}-m_{j}} \mu_{j}^{4} \not \equiv 0 \bmod p$ for all $k \in\{0,1,2\}$. In particular we have $\nu_{p}\left(a_{0}\right) \equiv \nu_{p}\left(a_{1}\right) \equiv \nu_{p}\left(a_{2}\right) \bmod 4$.

Now assume (11) holds, without loss of generality assume $i=0$. Let $\gamma \in \mathbb{Q}_{p}^{\times}$such that $\gamma^{2}=a_{0}$, then $[1: 0: 0: \gamma] \in S\left(\mathbb{Q}_{p}\right)$.

Now assume (22) holds, without loss of generality assume $i=0$ and $j=1$. Let $\gamma \in \mathbb{Q}_{p}^{\times}$ such that $\gamma^{4}=\frac{-a_{0}}{a_{1}}$, then $[1: \gamma: 0: 0] \in S\left(\mathbb{Q}_{p}\right)$.

Now assume (3) holds, then by taking an equivalent surface we may assume the reduction of $S$ modulo $p$ is either

$$
\begin{equation*}
a_{0} x_{0}^{4}+a_{1} x_{1}^{4}+a_{2} x_{2}^{4}=w^{2} \tag{2.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

or the projective cone over the smooth curve given by

$$
\begin{equation*}
a_{1} x_{1}^{4}+a_{2} x_{2}^{4}=w^{2} \tag{2.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $a_{i} \not \equiv 0 \bmod p$ for all $i$ in both cases. If the reduction is given by (2.2), then the hyperplane $\left\{x_{0}=0\right\}$ of $S$ is exactly the smooth curve (2.3). In particular, it suffices to prove (2.3) has a $\mathbb{Q}_{p}$-point. Now since (2.3) is a genus 1 smooth geometrically irreducible curve, by the Hasse-Weil bound we have

$$
\left|S\left(\mathbb{F}_{p}\right)\right| \geq p^{\frac{1}{2}}\left(p^{\frac{1}{2}}-2\right)+1>0
$$

for $p \neq 2$. Thus by Hensel's Lemma we have $S\left(\mathbb{Q}_{p}\right) \neq \varnothing$.
Lastly assume (4) holds. If $\nu_{p}\left(a_{i}\right) \equiv 0,2 \bmod 4$, then the proof follows identically from the argument in case (3). If $\nu_{p}\left(a_{i}\right) \equiv \pm 1 \bmod 4$, then by taking an equivalent surface we may assume the reduction of $S$ modulo $p$ is the projective cone over the smooth curve
given by

$$
a_{0} x_{0}^{4}+a_{1} x_{1}^{4}+a_{2} x_{2}^{4}=0 .
$$

where $a_{i} \not \equiv 0 \bmod p$. In particular this is a genus 3 smooth geometrically irreducible curve, and hence by the Hasse-Weil bound we have

$$
\left|S\left(\mathbb{F}_{p}\right)\right| \geq p^{\frac{1}{2}}\left(p^{\frac{1}{2}}-6\right)+1>0
$$

for $p>33$. Thus by Hensel's Lemma we have $S\left(\mathbb{Q}_{p}\right) \neq \varnothing$.
Remark 2.6. Note that the condition $p>33$ in Lemma [2.5 is only required to prove the converse of (4) when $\nu_{p}\left(a_{i}\right) \neq 0 \bmod 4$; in all other cases this condition can be replaced by $p \neq 2$.

We will now assume throughout the rest of this section that $S$ is everywhere locally soluble. Furthermore, for any point $Q \in S\left(\mathbb{Q}_{p}\right)$ (and any prime $p$ ), we will consider the representation of this point such that all the coordinates are in $\mathbb{Z}_{p}$ and at least one coordinate is in $\mathbb{Z}_{p}^{\times}$. We will also let $\{i, j, k\}=\{0,1,2\}$.
2.3.2. Case 1: $p \neq 2$ divides exactly one coefficient once.

Lemma 2.7. If there exists a prime $p \neq 2$ such that $\nu_{p}\left(a_{i}\right)=1$ and $p \nmid a_{j} a_{k}$, then $S$ has no Brauer-Manin obstruction.

Proof. Let $\mathcal{S}$ be the integral model of $S$ over $\mathbb{Z}_{p}$ defined by the same equation. Clearly $\mathcal{S}$ is regular, and the reduction modulo $p$ is the projective cone over a smooth curve of genus 1. By [KT04, Thm. 1] we have that $\operatorname{Br} S / \operatorname{Br} \mathbb{Q}$ only has 2 and 4 -torsion and is at most $2^{3}$. Since $S$ is a del Pezzo surface, it is well-known that $H^{1}\left(S, \mathcal{O}_{S}\right)=0$ and $\operatorname{Pic} S_{\overline{\mathbb{Q}}}$ is torsion-free (see [Kol96, Lem. III.3.2.1] and [KT04, Prop. 2], respectively). Therefore by [Bri15, Thm. 7.4] the result holds for all $p \neq 2$.

Remark 2.8. Consider the surfaces

$$
X: 103 x_{0}^{4}+82297 x_{1}^{4}-47 x_{2}^{4}=x_{3}^{4},
$$

and

$$
S: 103 x_{0}^{4}+82297 x_{1}^{4}-47 x_{2}^{4}=w^{2}
$$

By [Bri11, Prop. 3.3] we have that $X\left(\mathbb{A}_{\mathbb{Q}}\right) \neq \varnothing\left(\right.$ and hence $\left.S\left(\mathbb{A}_{\mathbb{Q}}\right) \neq \varnothing\right)$ but $X\left(\mathbb{A}_{\mathbb{Q}}\right)^{\text {Br }}=\varnothing$. However, by Lemma [2.7 we have that $S\left(\mathbb{A}_{\mathbb{Q}}\right)^{\mathrm{Br}} \neq \varnothing$. In particular having a Brauer-Manin obstruction on a diagonal quartic surface does not imply a Brauer-Manin obstruction on the associated diagonal del Pezzo of degree 2.

### 2.3.3. Case 2: podd divides exactly one coefficient to an even power.

Definition 2.9. Let the notation be as in Proposition 2.3 and let $a_{3}:=-1$. We will say $\mathcal{A}$ is $p$-normalised if $a_{n} y_{n} \in \mathbb{Z}_{p}$ for all $n \in\{0,1,2,3\}$ and there exists $m \in\{0,1,2,3\}$ such that $a_{m} y_{m} \in\left(\mathbb{Z}_{p}\right)^{\times}$.

Lemma 2.10. Let $p \neq 2$ be a prime such that $\nu_{p}\left(a_{i}\right) \in 2 \mathbb{Z}$ and $p \nmid a_{j} a_{k}$. If $\mathcal{A}$ is $p$ normalised, then $\operatorname{inv}_{p}(\mathcal{A}(-))=0$.

Proof. The result follows by appropriately changing the variables in [San23, Lem. 3.6].
2.3.4. Case 3: $p$ odd divides exactly two coefficients to an odd power.

Proposition 2.11. Let $p \neq 2$ be a prime such that $\nu_{p}\left(a_{i}\right), \nu_{p}\left(a_{j}\right) \in \mathbb{Z} \backslash 2 \mathbb{Z}$ and $p \nmid a_{k}$. Assume $\mathcal{A}$ is $p$-normalised. Then $\operatorname{inv}_{p}(\mathcal{A}(-))$ is a surjection if and only if

$$
\left(\frac{\theta_{a} p^{-\nu_{p}\left(\theta_{a}\right)}}{p}\right)=-1,
$$

If $\operatorname{inv}_{p}(\mathcal{A}(-))$ is not a surjection, then $\operatorname{inv}_{p}(\mathcal{A}(-))=0$.
Proof. Without loss of generality assume $p$ divides $a_{0}$ and $a_{1}$. Firstly if $\left(\frac{\theta_{\mathbf{a}} p^{-\nu_{p}\left(\theta_{\mathbf{a}}\right)}}{p}\right)=1$, then by the properties of the Hilbert symbol we have $\operatorname{inv}_{p}(\mathcal{A}(Q))=0$ for all $Q \in S\left(\mathbb{Q}_{p}\right)$. Thus assume $\left(\frac{\theta_{\mathbf{a}} p^{-\nu_{p}\left(\theta_{\mathbf{a}}\right)}}{p}\right)=-1$, then since $f \neq 0$ modulo $p$ we must have that $p$ does not divide $y_{2}$ and $y_{3}$. Thus we have

$$
a_{2} y_{2}^{2} \equiv y_{3}^{2} \bmod p
$$

Therefore by Hensel's Lemma there exists $\gamma \in \mathbb{Z}_{p}^{\times}$such that $\gamma^{2}=a_{2}$ and $y_{2} \gamma \equiv y_{3} \bmod p$, and hence we have points $Q_{ \pm}=[0: 0: 1: \pm \gamma] \in S\left(\mathbb{Q}_{p}\right)$. Thus we have

$$
-a_{1} f\left(Q_{+}\right) f\left(Q_{-}\right)=-a_{1}\left(a_{2}^{2} y_{2}^{2}-a_{2} y_{3}^{2}\right)=a_{0} a_{1} a_{2} y_{0}^{2}+\left(a_{1} \gamma y_{1}\right)^{2} \in \mathrm{~N}_{\mathbb{Q}_{p}\left(\theta_{\mathbf{a}}\right) / \mathbb{Q}_{p}} \mathbb{Q}_{p}\left(\theta_{\mathbf{a}}\right)^{\times} .
$$

Therefore by the properties of the Hilbert symbol we have

$$
\operatorname{inv}_{p}\left(\mathcal{A}\left(Q_{+}\right)\right)=\operatorname{inv}_{p}\left(\mathcal{A}\left(Q_{-}\right)\right)+\operatorname{inv}_{p}\left(\left(\theta_{\mathbf{a}},-a_{1}\right)\right)=\operatorname{inv}_{p}\left(\mathcal{A}\left(Q_{-}\right)\right)+\frac{1}{2}
$$

We now split into the subcases $p \equiv \pm 1 \bmod 4$ :
Proposition 2.12. Let $p \equiv 3 \bmod 4$ be a prime such that $\nu_{p}\left(a_{i}\right)=\nu_{p}\left(a_{j}\right) \in \mathbb{Z} \backslash 2 \mathbb{Z}$ and $p \nmid a_{k}$. Then $\operatorname{inv}_{p}(\mathcal{A}(-))$ is a surjective if and only if

$$
\left(\frac{-a_{i} a_{j} p^{-\nu_{p}\left(a_{i} a_{j}\right)}}{p}\right)=-1 .
$$

Proof. Without loss of generality assume $p$ divides $a_{0}$ and $a_{1}$ such that $\nu_{p}\left(a_{0}\right) \in\{1,3\}$. If $\left(\frac{a_{2}}{p}\right)=1$, then after possibly changing rational point $P$ so that $\mathcal{A}$ is $p$-normalised, the result follows by Proposition 2.11. Thus assume $\left(\frac{a_{2}}{p}\right)=-1$. Since $S\left(\mathbb{Q}_{p}\right) \neq \varnothing$, by Lemma 2.5 we must have $\left(\frac{-a_{0} a_{j} p^{-\nu_{p}\left(a_{i} a_{j}\right)}}{p}\right)=1$. Thus it suffices to prove if $\left(\frac{a_{2}}{p}\right)=-1$, then $\operatorname{inv}_{p}(\mathcal{A}(-))$ is constant.

By Lemma 2.5 there exists $\gamma \in \mathbb{Z}_{p}^{\times}$such that $\gamma^{4}=-\frac{a_{0}}{a_{1}}$. Let $R_{ \pm}=[1: \pm \gamma: 0: 0] \in$ $S\left(\mathbb{Q}_{p}\right)$. For any $Q=\left[x_{0}: x_{1}: x_{2}: w\right] \in S\left(\mathbb{Q}_{p}\right)$, we must have that $p$ divides $x_{2}$ and $w$, and hence we have

$$
a_{0} p^{-\nu_{p}\left(a_{0}\right)} x_{0}^{4} \equiv-a_{1} p^{-\nu_{p}\left(a_{1}\right)} x_{1}^{4} \bmod p,
$$

where $p$ does not divide $x_{0}$ or $x_{1}$. In particular, the reduction modulo $p$ of any $Q \in S\left(\mathbb{Q}_{p}\right)$, denoted $\tilde{Q}$, is contained in the set $\left\{R_{ \pm}\right\}$. Let $\mathcal{S}$ be the integral model of $S$ over $\mathbb{Z}_{p}$ defined by the same equation, then we have $\mathcal{S}^{s m}\left(\mathbb{Z}_{p}\right)=S\left(\mathbb{Z}_{p}\right)$. Therefore by [Bri15, Prop. 5.1] we have

$$
\operatorname{inv}_{p}(\mathcal{A}(Q)) \in\left\{\operatorname{inv}_{p}\left(\mathcal{A}\left(R_{-}\right)\right), \operatorname{inv}_{p}\left(\mathcal{A}\left(R_{+}\right)\right)\right\}
$$

for any $Q \in S\left(\mathbb{Z}_{p}\right)$. In particular since $f\left(R_{+}\right)=f\left(R_{-}\right)$, the invariant map is constant.

Proposition 2.13. Let $p \equiv 1 \bmod 4$ be a prime such that $\nu_{p}\left(a_{i}\right)=\nu_{p}\left(a_{j}\right) \in \mathbb{Z} \backslash 2 \mathbb{Z}$ and $p \nmid a_{k}$. Then $\operatorname{inv}_{p}(\mathcal{A}(-))$ is constant if and only if

$$
\left(\frac{-a_{i} a_{j} p^{-\nu_{p}\left(a_{i} a_{j}\right)}}{p}\right)=\left(\frac{a_{k}}{p}\right)=1
$$

Proof. Without loss of generality assume $i=0, j=1$ and $k=2$. Firstly if $\left(\frac{a_{2}}{p}\right)=1$, then after possibly changing rational point $P$ so that $\mathcal{A}$ is $p$-normalised, the result follows by Proposition 2.11. Therefore assume $\left(\frac{a_{2}}{p}\right)=-1$, then by Lemma [2.5 we must have that $-\frac{a_{0}}{a_{1}} \in \mathbb{Q}_{p}^{\times 4}$. Let $\gamma, \delta \in \mathbb{Z}_{p}^{\times}$such that $\gamma^{4}=-\frac{a_{0}}{a_{1}}$ and $\delta^{2}=-1$, then we have four points $R_{ \pm}=[1: \pm \gamma: 0: 0], R_{ \pm}^{\prime}=[1: \pm \delta \gamma: 0: 0] \in S\left(\mathbb{Q}_{p}\right)$. Furthermore, we have

$$
-a_{1} f\left(R_{+}\right) f\left(R_{+}^{\prime}\right)=-a_{1}\left(a_{0}^{2} y_{0}^{2}+a_{0} a_{1} y_{1}^{2}\right)=a_{0} a_{1} a_{2} y_{2}^{2}-a_{0} a_{1} y_{3}^{2} \in \mathrm{~N}_{\mathbb{Q}_{p}\left(\theta_{\mathbf{a}}\right) / \mathbb{Q}_{p}} \mathbb{Q}_{p}\left(\theta_{\mathbf{a}}\right)^{\times} .
$$

Thus we have

$$
\operatorname{inv}_{p}\left(\mathcal{A}\left(R_{+}\right)\right)=\operatorname{inv}_{p}\left(\mathcal{A}\left(R_{+}^{\prime}\right)\right)+\operatorname{inv}_{p}\left(\left(\theta_{\mathbf{a}},-a_{1}\right)\right)=\operatorname{inv}_{p}\left(\mathcal{A}\left(R_{+}^{\prime}\right)\right)+\frac{1}{2}
$$

2.3.5. Changing $\mathcal{A}_{a}$ by $\boldsymbol{u} \in\left(\mathbb{Q}^{\times}\right)^{3}$. In this section we analyse how the local invariant map changes when the surface $S_{\mathbf{a}}$ changes.

Let $\mathbf{u}=\left(u_{0}, u_{1}, u_{2}\right) \in\left(\mathbb{Q}^{\times}\right)^{3}$ and let $\mathbf{a u}^{2}=\left(a_{0} u_{0}^{2}, a_{1} u_{1}^{2}, a_{2} u_{2}^{2}\right)$. By repeating the construction of $\mathcal{A}_{\mathbf{a}}$ given in Proposition 2.3 for $\mathbf{a u}^{2}$ we have

$$
\mathcal{A}_{\mathrm{au}^{2}}=\left(\theta_{\mathbf{a}}, \frac{u_{0} a_{0} y_{0} x_{0}^{2}+u_{1} a_{1} y_{1} x_{1}^{2}+u_{2} a_{2} y_{2} x_{2}^{2}-y_{3} w}{x_{0}^{2}}\right) \in \operatorname{Br} S_{\mathrm{au}^{2}} .
$$

The similarity between $\mathcal{A}_{\mathrm{a}}$ and $\mathcal{A}_{\mathrm{au}^{2}}$ allows us to express the associated invariant maps in terms of each other in certain cases (which we will use in $\S 3$ ):

Lemma 2.14. Let $p \equiv 3 \bmod 4, \theta_{a} \notin \mathbb{Q}_{p}^{\times 2}, \nu_{p}\left(a_{i}\right)=\nu_{p}\left(a_{j}\right) \in \mathbb{Z} \backslash 2 \mathbb{Z}$ and $p \nmid a_{k}$. Assume that $-\frac{a_{i}}{a_{j}} \in \mathbb{Q}_{p}^{\times 4}$. Then $\operatorname{inv}_{p}\left(\mathcal{A}_{a}(-)\right)$ is constant and for all $\boldsymbol{u} \in\left(\mathbb{Z}_{p}^{\times}\right)^{3} \cap\left(\mathbb{Q}^{\times}\right)^{3}$ we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
\operatorname{inv}_{p}\left(\mathcal{A}_{a u^{2}}(-)\right)=\operatorname{inv}_{p}\left(\mathcal{A}_{a}(-)\right)+\frac{\left(\frac{u_{i} u_{j}}{p}\right)-1}{4} \tag{2.4}
\end{equation*}
$$

Proof. Without loss of generality assume $i=0$ and $j=1$, then by Proposition 2.12 it suffices to prove that (2.4) holds.

Let $\mathcal{A}_{\mathbf{a}}^{\prime}$ and $\mathcal{A}_{\mathbf{a u}^{2}}^{\prime}$ denote the algebras $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{A}_{\mathbf{u}}$ in [San23, Prop. 3.8], then by [San23, Prop. 3.8] we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
\operatorname{inv}_{p}\left(\mathcal{A}_{\mathbf{a u}^{2}}\left(\pi_{\mathbf{a u}^{2}}(-)\right)\right) & =\operatorname{inv}_{p}\left(\mathcal{A}_{\mathbf{a u}^{2}}^{\prime}(-)\right) \\
& =\operatorname{inv}_{p}\left(\mathcal{A}_{\mathbf{a}}^{\prime}(-)\right)+\frac{\left(\frac{u_{i} u_{j}}{p}\right)-1}{4} \\
& =\operatorname{inv}_{p}\left(\mathcal{A}_{\mathbf{a}}\left(\pi_{\mathbf{a u}^{2}}(-)\right)\right)+\frac{\left(\frac{u_{i} u_{j}}{p}\right)-1}{4} .
\end{aligned}
$$

In particular since both invariant maps are constant (2.4) holds.

Lemma 2.15. Let $p$ be any place of $\mathbb{Q}$. Let $\boldsymbol{u} \in\left(\mathbb{Q}^{\times}\right)^{3}$, and let $\boldsymbol{v} \in\left(\mathbb{Z}_{p}^{\times}\right)^{3}$ such that $u_{n}=v_{n}^{2}$ for all $n$. Then

$$
\operatorname{inv}_{p}\left(\mathcal{A}_{a}(-)\right)=\operatorname{inv}_{p}\left(\mathcal{A}_{a u^{2}}(\phi(-))\right)
$$

where $\phi: S_{a}\left(\mathbb{Z}_{p}\right) \rightarrow S_{a u^{2}}\left(\mathbb{Z}_{p}\right)$ is the bijection given by $\left[x_{0}: x_{1}: x_{2}: w\right] \mapsto\left[x_{0} v_{0}^{-1}: x_{1} v_{1}^{-1}:\right.$ $\left.x_{2} v_{2}^{-1}: w\right]$.

Proof. The result is immediate.

Lemma 2.16. Let $a_{0}, a_{1}, a_{2}, u_{i}, u_{j} \in \mathbb{Z}_{p}^{\times}$and $u_{k} \in \mathbb{Z}_{p}$. Let $\boldsymbol{u}=\left(u_{0}, u_{1}, u_{2}\right)$, then $\mathcal{A}_{\boldsymbol{a}}$ is p-normalised if and only if $\mathcal{A}_{\text {au }}{ }^{2}$ is p-normalised.

Proof. Without loss of generality we may assume $u_{0} \in \mathbb{Z}_{p}$. If $\mathcal{A}_{\mathbf{a}}$ is $p$-normalised and $\mathcal{A}_{\text {au }}{ }^{2}$ is not $p$-normalised, then $p$ divides $y_{1}, y_{2}$ and $y_{3}$, but not $y_{0}$. However we have

$$
0=\nu_{p}\left(a_{0} y_{0}^{2}\right)=\nu_{p}\left(-a_{1} y_{1}^{2}-a_{2} y_{2}^{2}+y_{3}^{2}\right) \geq 2
$$

a contradiction. If $\mathcal{A}_{\mathbf{a u}^{2}}$ is $p$-normalised, then $p$ does not divide either $u_{0} y_{0}, y_{1}, y_{2}$ or $y_{3}$. Therefore $\mathcal{A}_{\mathbf{a}}$ must also be $p$-normalised.

## 3. Counting

3.1. Set-up. Throughout this section we will closely follow $\S 5$ in [San23]. To make the similarities between the papers clearer we will use the same notation as used in [San23] when appropriate to do so. Furthermore, unless explicitly stated otherwise, we let $\{i, j, k\}=$ $\{0,1,2\}$. We will write $\prod_{i}$ to mean the product over all $i \in\{0,1,2\}$. We will write $\prod_{i<j}$ to mean the product over all $i$ and $j$ in $\{0,1,2\}$ such that $i$ is less than $j$. Furthermore, we will write $\prod_{i \neq j}$ to mean the product over all $i$ in $\{0,1,2\}$ such that $i$ is not equal to $j$.

Let $S$ be the set of all primes less than 98 , and let

$$
\Phi(T):=\left\{\mathbf{A}=\left(A_{0}, A_{1}, A_{2}\right) \in(\mathbb{Z} \backslash\{0\})^{3}: \begin{array}{l}
\left|A_{i}\right| \leq T \text { for all } i, \\
\\
p \mid A_{1} A_{2} A_{3} \Longrightarrow\left[p \in S \text { or } p^{3} \mid A_{1} A_{2} A_{3}\right]
\end{array}\right\} .
$$

For $\mathbf{A} \in \Phi(T)$ we define $m_{\mathbf{A}}:=\operatorname{rad}\left(A_{0} A_{1} A_{2} \Pi_{p \in S} p\right)$ and $\theta_{\mathbf{A}}:=-A_{0} A_{1} A_{2}$. Let $\Omega$ denote the set of all 3-tuples of cosets of $\left(\mathbb{Z} / 8 m_{\mathbf{A}} \mathbb{Z}\right)^{\times 4}$ in $\left(\mathbb{Z} / 8 m_{\mathbf{A}} \mathbb{Z}\right)^{\times}$, and let $\Psi_{\mathbf{A}}:=\left\{\mathbf{M}=\left(M_{0}, M_{1}, M_{2}\right) \in \Omega: M_{0} M_{1} M_{2}=\gamma^{2}\left(\mathbb{Z} / 8 m_{\mathbf{A}} \mathbb{Z}\right)^{\times 4}\right.$, for some $\left.\gamma \in\left(\mathbb{Z} / 8 m_{\mathbf{A}} \mathbb{Z}\right)^{\times}\right\}$.

For any choice of $(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{M}) \in \Phi(T) \times \Psi_{\mathbf{A}}$ and $T \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, we define
$N_{\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{M}}(T):=\left\{\begin{array}{ll}(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{w}) & \left|A_{i} u_{i}^{2} \prod_{j \neq i} v_{i j} w_{i j}\right| \leq T, \text { for all } i, \\ \mathbf{u}=\left(u_{0}, u_{1}, u_{2}\right) \in \mathbb{N}^{3} & \mu\left(m_{\mathbf{A}} \prod_{i} u_{i} \prod_{j \neq i} v_{i j} w_{i j}\right)^{2}=1, \\ \mathbf{v}=\left(v_{01}, v_{02}, v_{12}\right) \in \mathbb{N}^{3} & : p\left|v_{i j} \Longrightarrow \theta_{\mathbf{A}} \in \mathbb{Q}_{p}^{\times 2}, p\right| w_{i j} \Longrightarrow \theta_{\mathbf{A}} \notin \mathbb{Q}_{p}^{\times 2}, \\ \mathbf{w}=\left(w_{01}, w_{02}, w_{12}\right) \in \mathbb{N}^{3} & u_{i}^{2} \prod_{j \neq i} v_{i j} w_{i j}\left(\bmod 8 m_{\mathbf{A}}\right) \in M_{i} \text { for all } i, \\ & S_{\mathbf{a}}\left(\mathbb{Q}_{p}\right) \neq \varnothing \text { for } p \nmid m_{\mathbf{A}}\end{array}\right\}$.
Now we define $a_{i}:=A_{i} u_{i}^{2} \prod_{j \neq i} v_{i j} w_{i j}$ and let $\mathbf{a}:=\left(a_{0}, a_{1}, a_{2}\right)$; these $a_{i}$ will be the coefficients of the surfaces $S_{\mathbf{a}}$ that we will be counting. We define $t_{i j}:=v_{i j} w_{i j}$. Lastly, let

$$
M_{\mathbf{A}}:= \begin{cases}\frac{1}{2}, & \text { if } \theta_{\mathbf{A}} \in-\mathbb{Q}^{\times 2} \\ \frac{3}{8}, & \text { if } \theta_{\mathbf{A}} \notin \mathbb{Q}^{\times 2}\end{cases}
$$

This will show up in the power of the $\log T$ term of the asymptotic formulas given in Theorem 1.2 .

Remark 3.1. If we are given a tuple a such that $a_{i}:=A_{i} u_{i}^{2} \prod_{j \neq i} v_{i j} w_{i j}$ for all $i$, where $(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{w}) \in N_{\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{M}}(T)$ for some $\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{M}$ and $T$, then the conditions on $N_{\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{M}}(T)$ uniquely determine $\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{M}, \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}$ and $\mathbf{w}$. In particular for any surface $S_{\mathbf{a}}$ there is at most one element in one set $N_{\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{M}}(T)$ corresponding to this surface.

Similarly, given $t_{i j}:=v_{i j} w_{i j}$ for some $(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{w}) \in N_{\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{M}}(T)$, the conditions on $N_{\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{M}}(T)$ uniquely determine $v_{i j}$ and $w_{i j}$. In particular if we write $\mathbf{t}=\left(t_{01}, t_{02}, t_{12}\right)$, then for each $(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{w}) \in N_{\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{M}}(T)$ there exists a unique tuple $(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{t})$ associated to it.

Remark 3.2. If $\left|A_{i}\right|>T$ for any $i$, then clearly $N_{\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{M}}(T)=\varnothing$ (hence our choice of $\Phi(T)$ ).
Remark 3.3. For any $(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{w}) \in N_{\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{M}}(T)$ we must have $\prod_{i} u_{i}^{2} \prod_{j \neq i} v_{i j}^{2} w_{i j}^{2} \in M_{0} M_{1} M_{2}$. Therefore if $M_{0} M_{1} M_{2}$ is not represented by a square element of $\left(\mathbb{Z} / 8 m_{\mathbf{A}} \mathbb{Z}\right)^{\times}$, then $N_{\mathbf{A}, \mathrm{M}}(T)=$ $\varnothing$ (hence our choice of $\left.\Psi_{\mathbf{A}}\right)$.

### 3.2. Reductions.

3.2.1. Reducing $N_{\neq \pm \square}^{\mathrm{Br}}(T)$ to $N_{\boldsymbol{A}, \boldsymbol{M}}^{\mathrm{Br}}(T)$. In this section we will prove that to find asymptotic formulae for $\# N_{=-\square}^{\mathrm{Br}}(T)$ and $\# N_{\neq \pm \square}^{\mathrm{Br}}(T)$ it suffices to find an asymptotic formula for another set (namely $\# N_{\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{M}}^{\mathrm{Br}}(T)$ ).
Let

$$
N_{\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{M}}^{\mathrm{Br}}(T):=\left\{(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{w}) \in N_{\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{M}}(T): S_{\mathbf{a}} \text { has a Brauer-Manin obstruction }\right\}
$$

then we have the following reduction:
Lemma 3.4. We have

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \# N_{=\square}^{\mathrm{Br}}(T)=\sum_{\substack{(\boldsymbol{A}, M) \in \Phi(T) \times \Psi_{A} \\
\theta_{A} \in\left(\mathbb{Q}^{\times}\right)^{2}}} \# N_{\boldsymbol{A}, \boldsymbol{M}}^{\mathrm{Br}}(T), \\
& \# N_{=-\square}^{\mathrm{Br}}(T)=\sum_{\substack{(\boldsymbol{A}, M) \in \Phi(T) \times \Psi_{A} \\
\theta_{A} \in-\left(\mathbb{Q}^{\times}\right)^{2}}} \# N_{\boldsymbol{A}, \boldsymbol{M}}^{\mathrm{Br}}(T), \\
& \# N_{\neq \pm \square}^{\mathrm{Br}}(T)=\sum_{\substack{(\boldsymbol{A}, M) \in \Phi(T) \times \Psi_{A} \\
\theta_{\boldsymbol{A}} \notin \pm\left(\mathbb{Q}^{\times}\right)^{2}}} \# N_{\boldsymbol{A}, \boldsymbol{M}}^{\mathrm{Br}}(T) .
\end{aligned}
$$

Proof. As in the above exposition, given $(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{w}) \in N_{\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{M}}^{\mathrm{Br}}(T)$, for some $(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{M}) \in \Phi(T) \times \Psi_{\mathbf{A}}$, we obtain a tuple $\mathbf{a}=\left(a_{0}, a_{1}, a_{2}\right)$ associated to it. In particular we can indeed view the right-hand side as a subset of the left-hand side. Furthermore as in Remark 3.1, any such
tuple $\mathbf{a}=\left(a_{0}, a_{1}, a_{2}\right)$ uniquely determines $\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{M}, \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}$ and $\mathbf{w}$, and hence each set on the right-hand side is disjoint from each other. Lastly, the only tuples a that may be counted in the left-hand side but are not counted in the right-hand side are those tuples such that $S_{\mathbf{a}}$ is everywhere locally soluble and there exists a prime $p \notin S$ such that $\nu_{p}\left(a_{0} a_{1} a_{2}\right)=1$. However by Lemma 2.7 such surfaces have no Brauer-Manin obstruction. In particular the left-hand side does not count these tuples either.

Lemma 3.5. If $\theta_{\boldsymbol{A}} \in \mathbb{Q}^{\times 2}$, then for $T>2$ we have

$$
\# N_{\boldsymbol{A}, \boldsymbol{M}}^{\mathrm{Br}}(T) \ll \frac{T^{\frac{3}{2}}(\log T)}{\left|\theta_{\boldsymbol{A}}\right|^{\frac{1}{2}}}
$$

Proof. Let $\mathcal{B}_{i j 3, \sqrt{\theta_{\mathbf{A}}}}$ be as in Proposition [2.3, then from Remark 2.4 we have $\pi_{\mathbf{a}}^{*} \mathcal{B}_{i j 3, \sqrt{\theta_{\mathbf{A}}}}=$ $\mathcal{B}_{i j 3, \sqrt{\theta_{\mathbf{A}}}}^{\prime}$, where $\mathcal{B}_{i j 3, \sqrt{\theta_{\mathbf{A}}}}^{\prime}$ is the algebra defined in San23, Prop. 3.1.(ii)]. In particular if we let $p>97$ be prime, $a_{n}, a_{n} a_{m} \neq \pm 1, \pm 2 \in \mathbb{Q}^{\times} / \mathbb{Q}^{\times 2}$ for all $n \neq m \in\{0,1,2\}$, $\nu_{p}\left(a_{k}\right) \equiv 2 \bmod 4$ and $p \nmid a_{i} a_{j}$, then by [San23, Lem. 3.5] we have that $\operatorname{inv}_{p}\left(\mathcal{B}_{i j 3, \sqrt{\theta_{\mathbf{A}}}}^{\prime}(-)\right)$ is surjective. Thus $\operatorname{inv}_{p}\left(\mathcal{B}_{i j 3, \sqrt{\theta_{\mathbf{A}}}}(-)\right)$ is surjective, and hence induces no Brauer-Manin obstruction. Furthermore from the magma code used in the proof of [KT04, Thm. 2] (which can be found in [Kre]) we know that under these hypothesis $\operatorname{Br} S_{\mathbf{a}} / \operatorname{Br} \mathbb{Q} \cong \mathbb{Z} / 2 \mathbb{Z}$, and hence it is generated by $\mathcal{B}_{i j 3, \sqrt{\theta_{\mathrm{A}}}}$. Therefore there is no Brauer-Manin obstruction in this case. Thus we can bound $N_{\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{M}}^{\mathrm{Br}}(T)$ by the three subsets of $N_{\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{M}}(T)$ defined by
(1) $a_{i} a_{j}= \pm 1, \pm 2 \in \mathbb{Q}^{\times} / \mathbb{Q}^{\times 2}$, for some $i \neq j$;
(2) $a_{k}= \pm 1, \pm 2 \in \mathbb{Q}^{\times} / \mathbb{Q}^{\times 2}$, for some $k$;
(3) $u_{i}=1$ for all $i$.

Consider the subset of $N_{\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{M}}(T)$ such that $a_{i} a_{j}= \pm 1, \pm 2 \in \mathbb{Q}^{\times} / \mathbb{Q}^{\times 2}$ for some $i \neq j$. We may assume $i=0$ and $j=1$. Suppose $t_{k \ell} \neq 1$ for some $(k, \ell) \neq(0,1)$, then there exists $p \notin S$ prime such that $p \mid t_{k \ell}$. However $\nu_{p}\left(a_{0} a_{1}\right)=1$, which contradicts our assumption. Thus $t_{k \ell}=1$ for all $(k, \ell) \neq(0,1)$, and hence we can bound this set by

$$
\ll \sum_{\substack{t_{1}, u_{k} \\\left|A_{k}\right| u_{k}^{2} \prod_{i \neq k}}} 1 \ll \frac{T^{\frac{3}{2}}}{\left|\theta_{\mathbf{A}}\right|^{\frac{1}{2}}} \sum_{t_{01} \leq T} \frac{1}{t_{01}} \ll \frac{T^{\frac{3}{2}} \log T}{\left|\theta_{\mathbf{A}}\right|^{\frac{1}{2}}}
$$

Now consider the subset of $N_{\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{M}}^{\mathrm{Br}}(T)$ such that $a_{i}= \pm 1, \pm 2 \in \mathbb{Q}^{\times} / \mathbb{Q}^{\times 2}$ for some $i$. We may assume $i=0$. Suppose $t_{k \ell} \neq 1$ for some $(k, \ell) \neq(1,2)$, then there exists $p \notin S$ prime such that $p \mid t_{k \ell}$. However $\nu_{p}\left(a_{0}\right)=1$, which contradicts our assumption. Thus $t_{k \ell} \neq 1$ for all $(k, \ell) \neq(1,2)$, and hence we can bound this set by

$$
\ll \sum_{\substack{t_{12},\left.u_{k} \\\left|A_{k}\right|\right|_{k} ^{2} \prod_{i \neq k} t_{i k} \leq T}} 1 \ll \frac{T^{\frac{3}{2}}}{\left|\theta_{\mathbf{A}}\right|^{\frac{1}{2}}} \sum_{t_{12} \leq T} \frac{1}{t_{12}} \ll \frac{T^{\frac{3}{2}} \log T}{\left|\theta_{\mathbf{A}}\right|^{\frac{1}{2}}} .
$$

For the third set, by [San23, Lem. 4.17] we can bound this set by

$$
\ll \sum_{\substack{t_{i j} \\\left|A_{i}\right| \prod_{i \neq j} t_{i j} \leq T}} 1 \ll \int_{t_{i j} \geq \frac{1}{2}}^{\left|A_{i}\right| \prod_{i \neq j} t_{i j} \leq T} \prod_{i<j} d t_{i j} .
$$

Thus we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
\int_{t_{i j} \geq \frac{1}{2}}^{\left|A_{i}\right| \prod_{i \neq j} t_{i j} \leq T} \prod_{i<j} d t_{i j} & \ll \frac{T}{\left|\theta_{\mathbf{A}}\right|} \int_{t_{02}, t_{12} \geq \frac{1}{2}}^{t_{02} t_{12} \leq T} \frac{1}{t_{02} t_{12}} d t_{02} d t_{12} \\
& \ll \frac{T(\log T)^{2}}{\left|\theta_{\mathbf{A}}\right|} \\
& \ll \frac{T^{\frac{3}{2}} \log T}{\left|\theta_{\mathbf{A}}\right|^{\frac{1}{2}}}
\end{aligned}
$$

Since we have now dealt with the case $\theta_{\mathbf{A}} \in \mathbb{Q}^{\times 2}$, we will assume $\theta_{\mathbf{A}} \notin \mathbb{Q}^{\times 2}$ for the rest of the paper, except in the proof of Theorem 1.2 ,
3.2.2. Reducing $N_{\boldsymbol{A}, \boldsymbol{M}}^{\mathrm{Br}}(T)$ to $N_{\boldsymbol{A}, \boldsymbol{M}}^{\mathcal{A}}(T)$. In this subsection we will prove that $\mathcal{A}_{\mathbf{a}}$ induces the Brauer-Manin obstruction on the majority of surfaces in $N_{\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{M}}^{\mathrm{Br}}(T)$. To do this we need the following result, which we will prove in $\$ 3.4$.

## Definition 3.6.

$$
N_{\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{M}}^{l o c}(T):=\left\{(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{w}) \in N_{\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{M}}(T): p \left\lvert\, w_{i j} \Longrightarrow\left[p \equiv 3 \bmod 4 \text { and }-\frac{a_{i}}{a_{j}} \in \mathbb{Z}_{p}^{\times 2}\right]\right.\right\}
$$

$N_{\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{M}}^{\mathcal{A}}(T):=\left\{(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{w}) \in N_{\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{M}}(T): S_{\mathbf{a}}\right.$ has a Brauer-Manin obstruction induced by $\left.\mathcal{A}_{\mathbf{a}}\right\}$.
Lemma 3.7. For all $\varepsilon, C>0, T>2$ and $k \in\{0,1,2\}$ we have

$$
\begin{align*}
& \#\left\{(\boldsymbol{u}, \boldsymbol{v}, \boldsymbol{w}) \in N_{\boldsymbol{A}, \boldsymbol{M}}^{l o c}(T): w_{i j} \leq\left(\log T^{\frac{3}{2}}\right)^{C} \text { for all }\{i, j\}\right\}<_{\varepsilon, C} \frac{T^{\frac{3}{2}}(\log T)^{\frac{5}{2} M_{\boldsymbol{A}}}}{\left|\theta_{\boldsymbol{A}}\right|^{\frac{1}{2}-\varepsilon}}  \tag{3.1}\\
& \#\left\{(\boldsymbol{u}, \boldsymbol{v}, \boldsymbol{w}) \in N_{\boldsymbol{A}, \boldsymbol{M}}^{l o c}(T): u_{i} \leq\left(\log T^{\frac{3}{2}}\right)^{C} \text { for all } i \neq k\right\}<_{\varepsilon, C} \frac{T^{\frac{3}{2}}(\log T)^{\frac{5}{2} M_{\boldsymbol{A}}}}{\left|\theta_{\boldsymbol{A}}\right|^{\frac{1}{2}-\varepsilon}} \tag{3.2}
\end{align*}
$$

Lemma 3.8. For $T>2$ we have

$$
\# N_{\boldsymbol{A}, \boldsymbol{M}}^{\mathrm{Br}}(T)=\# N_{\boldsymbol{A}, \boldsymbol{M}}^{\mathcal{A}}(T)+O_{\varepsilon}\left(\frac{T^{\frac{3}{2}}(\log T)^{\frac{5}{2} M_{\boldsymbol{A}}}}{\left|\theta_{\boldsymbol{A}}\right|^{\frac{1}{2}-\varepsilon}}\right)
$$

Proof. Firstly we can bound the number of surfaces which have a Brauer-Manin obstruction not induced by $\mathcal{A}_{\mathbf{a}}$ by the number of surfaces for which either $\left|\operatorname{Br} S_{\mathbf{a}} / \operatorname{Br} \mathbb{Q}\right|>2$ or $\mathcal{A}_{\mathbf{a}} \in$ $\operatorname{Br} \mathbb{Q}$. For the first case, from the magma code used in the proof of KT04, Thm. 2] (which can be found in [Kre]) it can be checked explicitly that in every case that $\left|\operatorname{Br} S_{\mathbf{a}} / \operatorname{Br} \mathbb{Q}\right|>2$ we have that $a_{i}$ or $a_{i} a_{j}= \pm 1, \pm 2 \in \mathbb{Q}^{\times} / \mathbb{Q}^{\times 2}$ for some $i \neq j$. Therefore the set in the first case can be bounded by the union of the two sets in $N_{\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{M}}^{\mathrm{Br}}(T)$ defined by these two conditions. Thus as in the proof of Lemma 3.5 both sets can be bounded by

$$
\ll \frac{T^{\frac{3}{2}} \log T}{\left|\theta_{\mathbf{A}}\right|^{\frac{1}{2}}}
$$

For the second case, $\mathcal{A}_{\mathbf{a}}^{\prime} \in \operatorname{Br} X_{\mathbf{a}}$ denote the element constructed in [San23, Prop. 3.1.(i)]. Recall we have $\pi^{*} \mathcal{A}_{\mathbf{a}}=\mathcal{A}_{\mathrm{a}}^{\prime}$ (see Remark [2.4). Thus if $\mathcal{A}_{\mathrm{a}} \in \operatorname{Br} \mathbb{Q}$, then $\mathcal{A}_{\mathrm{a}}^{\prime} \in \operatorname{Br} \mathbb{Q}$. In particular we can bound this set by the number of surfaces $X_{\mathbf{a}}$ such that $\mathcal{A}_{\mathbf{a}}^{\prime} \in \operatorname{Br} \mathbb{Q}$. By [San23, Prop. 3.7] this set is bounded by the set of tuples in $N_{\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{M}}(T)$ such that $w_{i j}=1$ for all $i, j$. This is equal to the subset on the left-hand side of (3.1) and hence by Lemma 3.7 the result holds.
3.2.3. Reducing $N_{\boldsymbol{A}, \boldsymbol{M}}^{\mathcal{A}}(T)$ to $N_{\boldsymbol{A}, \boldsymbol{M}}^{\text {loc }}(T)$. In this section we reduce counting $\# N_{\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{M}}^{\mathcal{A}}(T)$ to counting $\# N_{\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{M}}^{l o c}(T)$.

Fix a choice of $(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{w}) \in N_{\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{M}}(T)$ and consider the following condition:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\text { If } p \in S \cup\left\{p: p \mid \theta_{\mathbf{A}}\right\} \cup\{\infty\} \text {, then } S_{\mathbf{a}}\left(\mathbb{Q}_{p}\right) \neq \varnothing \text { and } \operatorname{inv}_{p}(\mathcal{A}(-)) \text { is constant. } \tag{3.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

Lemma 3.9. Condition (3.3) is independent of choice of $(\boldsymbol{u}, \boldsymbol{v}, \boldsymbol{w}) \in N_{\boldsymbol{A}, \boldsymbol{M}}(T)$.
Proof. Let $(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{w})$ and $\left(\mathbf{u}^{\prime}, \mathbf{v}^{\prime}, \mathbf{w}^{\prime}\right)$ be two different elements in $N_{\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{M}}(T)$. Let a and $\mathbf{a}^{\prime}$ denote the coefficients associated to these elements, respectively, then it suffices to prove $S_{\mathbf{a}} \cong S_{\mathbf{a}^{\prime}}$ over $\mathbb{Q}_{p}$ for all $p \in S \cup\left\{p: p \mid \theta_{\mathbf{A}}\right\} \cup\{\infty\}$.
For $i \in\{0,1,2\}$ we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{a_{i}}{a_{i}^{\prime}}=\frac{u_{i} \prod_{j \neq i} v_{i j} w_{i j}}{u_{i}^{\prime} \prod_{j \neq i} v_{i j}^{\prime} w_{i j}^{\prime}} \in M_{i}\left(M_{i}\right)^{-1}=\left(\mathbb{Z} / 8 m_{\mathbf{A}} \mathbb{Z}\right)^{\times 4} \tag{3.4}
\end{equation*}
$$

In particular by Hensel's Lemma we have

$$
\frac{a_{i}}{a_{i}^{\prime}} \in \mathbb{Q}_{p}^{\times 4}
$$

for all $p \neq 2 \in S \cup\left\{p: p \mid \theta_{\mathbf{A}}\right\}$. Thus we clearly have $S_{\mathbf{a}} \cong S_{\mathbf{a}}$, over $\mathbb{Q}_{p}$ for all such $p$.
If $p=2$, then by Hensel's Lemma we have an isomorphism $(\mathbb{Z} / 16 \mathbb{Z})^{\times} \xrightarrow{\sim}\left(\mathbb{Z}_{2}^{\times}\right) /\left(\mathbb{Z}_{2}\right)^{\times 4}$. Therefore by (3.4) (and since $2 \mid m_{\mathbf{A}}$ ) we have

$$
\frac{a_{i}}{a_{i}^{\prime}} \in\left(\mathbb{Z}_{2}\right)^{\times 4}
$$

Thus we have $S_{\mathbf{a}} \cong S_{\mathbf{a}}$, over $\mathbb{Q}_{2}$.
If $p=\infty$, then since every element of $N_{\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{M}}(T)$ is a tuple of strictly positive integers, a 4 -th root of every component of the tuple exist in $\mathbb{R}$. In particular we have that $S_{\mathbf{a}} \cong S_{\mathbf{a}}$, over $\mathbb{R}$.

In particular by Lemma 3.9 we know that condition (3.3) only depends on the choice of $\mathbf{A}$ and $\mathbf{M}$, and hence the following function is well-defined:

Definition 3.10. For $(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{M}) \in \Phi(T) \times \Psi_{\mathbf{A}}$ define

$$
\eta(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{M}):= \begin{cases}1, & \text { if condition (3.3) is satisfied } \\ 0, & \text { otherwise }\end{cases}
$$

We now have the following reduction:

Lemma 3.11. For $T>2$ we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
\# N_{\boldsymbol{A}, \boldsymbol{M}}^{\mathcal{A}}(T)=\frac{\eta(\boldsymbol{A}, \boldsymbol{M})}{2} \# N_{\boldsymbol{A}, \boldsymbol{M}}^{l o c}(T)+O_{\varepsilon}\left(\frac{T^{\frac{3}{2}}(\log T)^{\frac{5}{2} M_{\boldsymbol{A}}}}{\left|\theta_{\boldsymbol{A}}\right|^{\frac{1}{2}-\varepsilon}}\right) . \tag{3.5}
\end{equation*}
$$

Proof. We closely follow the proof of [San23, Lem. 5.6]: Firstly if $\eta(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{M})=0$, then clearly $\# N_{\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{M}}^{\mathcal{A}}(T)=0$.

If $\eta(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{M})=1$, then observe by Proposition 2.12 and Proposition 2.13 we have $N_{\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{M}}^{\mathcal{A}}(T) \subseteq$ $N_{\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{M}}^{l o c}(T)$. Let $(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{w}) \in N_{\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{M}}^{l o c}(T)$ and let $S_{\mathbf{a}}$ be the associated surface. We will construct a new set, denoted $N_{\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{M}}^{l o c^{\prime}}(T)$, which is bijective to $N_{\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{M}}^{l o c}(T)$ in order to remove the local solubility condition in $N_{\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{M}}(T)$, and hence remove the dependence between $t_{i j}$ and $u_{i}$ arising from this condition. We firstly determine when a local solution exists:
If $p \mid u_{i}$, then by Lemma 2.5 we have $S_{\mathbf{a}}\left(\mathbb{Q}_{p}\right) \neq \varnothing$.
If $p \mid w_{i j}$, then since $p \equiv 3 \bmod 4$ and $-\frac{a_{i}}{a_{j}} \in \mathbb{Z}_{p}^{\times 2}$, by Lemma 2.5 we have $S_{\mathbf{a}}\left(\mathbb{Q}_{p}\right) \neq \varnothing$.
If $p \mid v_{i j}$, then by Lemma 2.5 we have $S_{\mathbf{a}}\left(\mathbb{Q}_{p}\right) \neq \varnothing$ if and only if either $\frac{-a_{i}}{a_{j}} \in \mathbb{Z}_{p}^{\times 4}$ or $a_{k} \in$ $\mathbb{Z}_{p}^{\times 2}$. For each $p \mid v_{i j}$, fix an injection $\psi_{p}: \mathbb{Z}_{p}^{\times} / \mathbb{Z}_{p}^{\times 4} \hookrightarrow \mathbb{Z} / 4 \mathbb{Z}$. Let $\boldsymbol{\zeta}=\left(\zeta_{0}, \zeta_{1}\right) \in(\mathbb{Z} / 4 \mathbb{Z})^{2}$,
then we have a unique factorisation $v_{i j}=\prod_{\zeta \in(\mathbb{Z} / 4 \mathbb{Z})^{2}} v_{i j}^{\zeta}$, where

$$
v_{i j}^{\zeta}=\prod_{\psi_{p}\left(\frac{u_{i}}{u_{j}}\right)=\zeta_{0}, \psi_{p}\left(\frac{t_{i k}}{t_{j k}}\right)=\zeta_{1}} p
$$

Now let $\xi:=\psi_{p}\left(-\frac{A_{i}}{A_{j}}\right)$, and let

$$
\Omega_{p}:=\left\{\left(\zeta_{0}, \zeta_{1}\right) \in(\mathbb{Z} / 4 \mathbb{Z})^{2}: \xi \zeta_{0}^{2} \zeta_{1}=0 \in \mathbb{Z} / 4 \mathbb{Z}\right\}
$$

Since we have

$$
-\frac{a_{i}}{a_{j}}=-\frac{A_{i}}{A_{j}} \frac{u_{i}^{2}}{u_{j}^{2}} \frac{t_{i k}}{t_{j k}},
$$

we clearly have $\frac{-a_{i}}{a_{j}} \in \mathbb{Z}_{p}^{\times 4}$ if and only if $\boldsymbol{\zeta} \in \Omega_{p}$. Thus we have constructed the set $N_{\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{M}}^{\text {loc' }}(T)$, which is given by

$$
\left\{\begin{array}{ll} 
& \left|A_{i} u_{i}^{2} \Pi_{j \neq i} \Pi_{\zeta \in(\mathbb{Z} / 4 \mathbb{Z})^{2}} v_{i j}^{\zeta} w_{i j}\right| \leq T, \text { for all } i, \\
(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{w}) & \mu\left(m_{\mathbf{A}} \Pi_{i} u_{i} \Pi_{j \neq i} \Pi_{\zeta \in(\mathbb{Z} / 4 \mathbb{Z})^{2}} v_{i j}^{\zeta} w_{i j}\right)^{2}=1, \\
\mathbf{u}=\left(u_{0}, u_{1}, u_{2}\right) \in \mathbb{N}^{3} & p \mid v_{i j}^{\zeta} \Longrightarrow \theta_{\mathbf{A}} \in \mathbb{Q}_{p}^{\times 2} \text { and either }\left[a_{k} \in \mathbb{Z}_{p}^{\times 2}\right] \\
\mathbf{v}=\left(v_{01}^{\zeta}, v_{02}^{\zeta}, v_{12}^{\zeta}\right) \in\left(\mathbb{N}^{(\mathbb{Z} / 4 \mathbb{Z})^{2}}\right)^{3} & \text { or }\left[\zeta \in \Omega_{p}, \psi_{p}\left(\frac{u_{i}}{u_{j}}\right)=\zeta_{0} \text { and } \psi_{p}\left(\frac{t_{i k}}{t_{j j}}\right)=\zeta_{1}\right], \\
\mathbf{w}=\left(w_{01}, w_{02}, w_{12}\right) \in \mathbb{N}^{3} & p \mid w_{i j} \Longrightarrow \theta_{\mathbf{A}} \notin \mathbb{Q}_{p}^{\times 2}, p \equiv 3 \bmod 4 \text { and } \frac{-a_{j} \in \mathbb{Z}_{p}^{\times 2},}{a_{j}}, \\
& u_{i}^{2} \Pi_{j \neq i} \Pi_{\zeta \in(\mathbb{Z} / 4 \mathbb{Z})^{2}} v_{i j}^{\zeta} w_{i j}\left(\bmod 8 m_{\mathbf{A}}\right) \in M_{i} \text { for all } i
\end{array}\right\} .
$$

Now fix a choice of $\mathbf{v}^{\zeta}, \mathbf{w}$ in $N_{\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{M}}^{l o c^{\prime}}(T)$, we will prove that for any $\mathbf{u}$ in $N_{\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{M}}^{l o c^{\prime}}(T)$ the surface $S_{\mathbf{a}}$ having a Brauer-Main obstruction does not depend on the choice of $\mathbf{u}$. To prove this, we first prove $\operatorname{inv}_{p}\left(\mathcal{A}_{\mathbf{a}}(-)\right)$ is constant at all places $p$.

Choose any $\mathbf{u}$ in $N_{\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{M}}^{l o c^{\prime}}(T)$, then since $S_{\mathbf{a}}$ is everywhere locally soluble, we have $Y_{\mathbf{a}}(\mathbb{Q}) \neq$ $\varnothing$. Choose a rational point $P=\left[y_{0}: y_{1}: y_{2}: y_{3}\right] \in Y_{\mathbf{a}}(\mathbb{Q})$, then by Proposition 2.12 and 2.13 we have that $\operatorname{inv}_{p}\left(\mathcal{A}_{\mathbf{a}}(-)\right)$ is constant for all $p \mid v_{i j}^{\zeta}, w_{i j}$. By Lemma 2.10 the local invariant map is also constant for all primes $p \mid u_{i}$. By definition of $\eta(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{M})$, the local invariant map is also constant for all $p \in S \cup\left\{p: p \mid \theta_{\mathbf{A}}\right\} \cup\{\infty\}$, and hence $\operatorname{inv}_{p}\left(\mathcal{A}_{\mathbf{a}}(-)\right)$ is constant at all places $p$.

Now let $\mathbf{u}^{\prime} \neq \mathbf{u}$ be different tuple in $N_{\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{M}}^{l o c^{\prime}}(T)$ (with $\mathbf{v}^{\boldsymbol{\zeta}}$, w still fixed) and let $S_{\mathbf{a}}$, be the associated surface. Since $\mathcal{A}$ is an algebra on $S_{\mathbf{a}}$, we have that $\mathcal{A}_{\mathbf{u}^{\prime 2} \mathbf{u}^{-2}}$ is an algebra on $S_{\mathbf{a}}$. If $p \nmid m_{\mathbf{A}} \Pi_{i} u_{i} \prod_{j \neq i} \prod_{\zeta \in(\mathbb{Z} / 4 \mathbb{Z})^{2}} v_{i j}^{\zeta} w_{i j}$, then clearly $\mathcal{A}$ is $p$-normalised, and hence by Lemma 2.16 so is $\mathcal{A}_{\mathbf{u}^{\prime 2} \mathbf{u}^{-2}}$. If $p \nmid m_{\mathbf{A}} \prod_{i, j} \prod_{\zeta \in(\mathbb{Z} / 4 \mathbb{Z})^{2}} v_{i j}^{\zeta} w_{i j}$ and $p \mid u_{k}$ for some $k$, then by Lemma 2.16 $\mathcal{A}$ is $p$-normalised if and only if $\mathcal{A}_{\mathbf{x}^{2}}$ is $p$-normalised, where $x_{k}=p^{-1}$ and $x_{j}=1$ for $j \neq k$. Clearly $\mathcal{A}_{\mathbf{x}^{2}}$ is $p$-normalised and hence so is $\mathcal{A}$. Thus by Lemma 2.16 we have
that $\mathcal{A}_{\mathbf{u}^{\prime 2} \mathbf{u}^{-2}}$ is $p$-normalised. Therefore in either case, when $p \nmid m_{\mathbf{A}} \Pi_{i, j} \Pi_{\zeta \in(\mathbb{Z} / 4 \mathbb{Z})^{2}} v_{i j}^{\zeta} w_{i j}$, both algebras are $p$-normalised, and hence by Lemma 2.10 we have

$$
\operatorname{inv}_{p}(\mathcal{A}(-))=\operatorname{inv}_{p}\left(\mathcal{A}_{\mathbf{u}^{\prime 2} \mathbf{u}^{-2}}(-)\right)=0
$$

If $p \mid v_{i j}^{\zeta}$ for some $i \neq j$ and $\zeta \in(\mathbb{Z} / 4 \mathbb{Z})^{2}$, then $-a_{0} a_{1} a_{2} \in\left(\mathbb{Q}_{p}^{\times}\right)^{2}$ and hence by the properties of the Hilbert symbol we have

$$
\operatorname{inv}_{p}(\mathcal{A}(-))=\operatorname{inv}_{p}\left(\mathcal{A}_{\mathbf{u}^{2} \mathbf{u}^{-2}}(-)\right)=0
$$

If $p=\infty$, then since all entries of $\mathbf{u}^{\prime}, \mathbf{u}$ are natural numbers, there exists $b_{i} \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $u_{i}^{\prime} u_{i}^{-1}=b_{i}^{2}$ for all $i$. Thus by Lemma 2.15 we have

$$
\operatorname{inv}_{p}(\mathcal{A}(-))=\operatorname{inv}_{p}\left(\mathcal{A}_{\mathbf{u}^{2} \mathbf{u}^{-2}}(-)\right)
$$

If $p \mid m_{\mathbf{A}}$, then $p \nmid u_{i}, u_{i}^{\prime}$ for all $i$. In particular we have $u_{i}^{\prime} u_{i}^{-1} \in \mathbb{Z}_{p}^{\times}$for all $i$, and hence by Lemma 2.15 we have

$$
\operatorname{inv}_{p}(\mathcal{A}(-))=\operatorname{inv}_{p}\left(\mathcal{A}_{\mathbf{u}^{\prime 2} \mathbf{u}^{-2}}(-)\right)
$$

If $p \mid w_{i j}$ for some $i \neq j$, then by Lemma 2.14 we have

$$
\operatorname{inv}_{p}\left(\mathcal{A}_{\mathbf{u}^{\prime 2} \mathbf{u}^{-2}}(-)\right)=\operatorname{inv}_{p}(\mathcal{A}(-))+\frac{\left(\frac{u_{i}^{\prime} u_{i}^{-1} u_{j}^{\prime} u_{j}^{-1}}{p}\right)-1}{4}
$$

Therefore summing over all places $p$ we have

$$
\sum_{p} \operatorname{inv}_{p}\left(\mathcal{A}_{\mathbf{u}^{\prime} \mathbf{u}^{-2}}(-)\right)=\sum_{p} \operatorname{inv}_{p}(\mathcal{A}(-))+\frac{\prod_{i<j}\left(\frac{u_{i}^{\prime} u_{i}^{-1} u_{j}^{\prime} u_{j}^{-1}}{w_{i j}}\right)-1}{4}
$$

Thus the exists some function that does not depend on $\mathbf{u}$, say $\delta: N_{\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{M}}^{l o c_{\mathbf{\prime}}^{\prime}}(T) \rightarrow\{-1,1\}$, such that $S_{\mathbf{a}}$ has a Brauer-Manin obstruction if and only if

$$
\prod_{i<j}\left(\frac{u_{i} u_{j}}{w_{i j}}\right)=\delta\left(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{M}, \mathbf{v}^{\zeta}, \mathbf{w}\right)
$$

Therefore the indicator function on $N_{\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{M}}^{l o c^{\prime}}(T)$ for whether $S_{\mathbf{a}}$ has a Brauer-Manin obstruction induced by $\mathcal{A}$ is given by

$$
\frac{1}{2}+\frac{\delta\left(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{M}, \mathbf{v}^{\zeta}, \mathbf{w}\right)}{2} \prod_{i<j}\left(\frac{u_{i} u_{j}}{w_{i j}}\right)
$$

Thus to prove the result it suffices to prove

$$
\sum_{\left(\mathbf{v}^{\zeta}, \mathbf{w}, \mathbf{u}\right) \in N_{\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{M}}^{l o c^{\prime}}(T)} \delta\left(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{M}, \mathbf{v}^{\zeta}, \mathbf{w}\right) \prod_{i<j}\left(\frac{u_{i} u_{j}}{w_{i j}}\right)=O_{\varepsilon}\left(\frac{T^{\frac{3}{2}}(\log T)^{\frac{5}{2} M_{\mathbf{A}}}}{\left|\theta_{\mathbf{A}}\right|^{\frac{1}{2}-\varepsilon}}\right)
$$

Similar to the proof of [San23, Lem. 5.6], by applying [San23, Thm. 4.22] with $q_{\text {osc }}=O(1)$ and $A=6$ we have that this sum is bounded by a sum which counts the elements in $N_{\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{M}}^{l o c^{\prime}}(T)$ which are contained in the union of the two sets defined by the two conditions below:
(1) $u_{k} \leq\left(\log \left|\theta_{\mathbf{A}}\right|^{-\frac{1}{2}} T^{\frac{3}{2}}\right)^{C}$ for at least 2 different $k$;
(2) $w_{i j} \leq\left(\log \left|\theta_{\mathbf{A}}\right|^{-\frac{1}{2}} T^{\frac{3}{2}}\right)^{C}$ for all $i \neq j$,
where $C>0$ is some constant. In particular the sum over the set defined by condition (1) is bounded by (3.1) in Lemma 3.7 and the sum over the set defined by condition (22) is bounded by (3.2) in Lemma 3.7. Therefore the result holds.
3.3. Proof of the main theorem. Before proving Theorem 1.2 we state the following lemma, which we will prove in $\$ 3.5$, as well as define a function:

Lemma 3.12. For all $(\boldsymbol{A}, \boldsymbol{M}) \in \Phi(T) \times \Psi_{\boldsymbol{A}}$ there exists a positive constant $0<Q_{\boldsymbol{A}}<_{\varepsilon}$ $\left|\theta_{\boldsymbol{A}}\right|^{\varepsilon}$ for all $\varepsilon>0$ such that for $T>2$ we have

$$
\# N_{\boldsymbol{A}, \boldsymbol{M}}^{l o c}(T)=\left(Q_{\boldsymbol{A}}+O_{\varepsilon}\left(\frac{\left|\theta_{\boldsymbol{A}}\right|^{\varepsilon}}{(\log T)^{\frac{6}{5} M_{\boldsymbol{A}}}}\right)\right) \frac{T^{2}(\log T)^{3 M_{\boldsymbol{A}}}}{\left|\theta_{\boldsymbol{A}}\right|^{\frac{1}{2}}} .
$$

Definition 3.13. Let $\tau_{n}(m)$ denote the multiplicative function defined on primes by

$$
\tau_{n}\left(p^{k}\right)=\binom{n+k-1}{k} .
$$

We will use the divisor bound in the proof of Theorem [1.2, namely that for all $\varepsilon>0$ we have $\tau_{n}(m) \ll_{n, \varepsilon} m^{\varepsilon}$.

Proof of Theorem 1.2. We proceed as in the proof of San23, Thm. 1.2]. Firstly by Lemma 3.4 and Lemma 3.5 we have

$$
\# N_{=\square}^{\mathrm{Br}}(T)=\sum_{\substack{(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{M}) \in \Phi(T) \times \Psi_{\mathbf{A}} \\ \theta_{\mathbf{A}} \in \mathbb{Q}^{\times 2}}} O\left(\frac{T^{\frac{3}{2}} \log T}{\left|\theta_{\mathbf{A}}\right|^{\frac{1}{2}}}\right)
$$

By Lemma 3.4, 3.8, 3.11 and 3.12 we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \# N_{=-\square}^{\mathrm{Br}}(T)=T^{\frac{3}{2}}(\log T)^{\frac{3}{2}} \sum_{\substack{(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{M}) \in \Phi(T) \times \Psi_{\mathbf{A}} \\
\theta_{\mathbf{A}} \in-\mathbb{Q}^{\times 2}}} \frac{\eta(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{M})}{2\left|\theta_{\mathbf{A}}\right|^{\frac{1}{2}}}\left(Q_{\mathbf{A}}+O_{\varepsilon}\left(\frac{\left|\theta_{\mathbf{A}}\right|^{\varepsilon}}{(\log T)^{\frac{3}{5}}}\right)\right), \\
& \# N_{\neq \pm \square}^{\mathrm{Br}}(T)=T^{\frac{3}{2}}(\log T)^{\frac{9}{8}} \sum_{\substack{(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{M}) \in \Phi(T) \times \Psi_{\mathbf{A}} \\
\theta_{\mathbf{A}} \notin \pm \mathbb{Q}^{\times 2}}} \frac{\eta(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{M})}{2\left|\theta_{\mathbf{A}}\right|^{\frac{1}{2}}}\left(Q_{\mathbf{A}}+O_{\varepsilon}\left(\frac{\left|\theta_{\mathbf{A}}\right|^{\varepsilon}}{(\log T)^{\frac{9}{20}}}\right)\right) .
\end{aligned}
$$

Thus to prove this result it suffices to show the sums

$$
\begin{gather*}
\sum_{\substack{(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{M}) \in \Phi(T) \times \Psi_{\mathbf{A}} \\
\theta_{\mathbf{A}} \in \mathbb{Q}^{\times 2}}}\left|\theta_{\mathbf{A}}\right|^{-\frac{1}{2}}, \\
\sum_{\substack{(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{M}) \in \Phi(T) \times \Psi_{\mathbf{A}} \\
\theta_{\mathbf{A}} \in-\mathbb{Q}^{\times 2}}} \frac{\eta(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{M}) Q_{\mathbf{A}}}{2\left|\theta_{\mathbf{A}}\right|^{\frac{1}{2}}},  \tag{3.6}\\
\sum_{\substack{(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{M}) \in \Phi(T) \times \Psi_{\mathbf{A}} \\
\theta_{\mathbf{A}} \notin \pm \mathbb{Q} \times 2}} \frac{\eta(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{M}) Q_{\mathbf{A}}}{2\left|\theta_{\mathbf{A}}\right|^{\frac{1}{2}}}, \tag{3.7}
\end{gather*}
$$

converge and that the latter two converge to a positive constant.
Firstly assume the sums converge, then to prove the sums (3.6) and (3.7) converge to a positive constant it suffices to prove $\eta(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{M}) \neq 0$ for some $(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{M}) \in \Phi(T) \times \Psi_{\mathbf{A}}$. In particular in both cases it suffices to find a surface which is everywhere locally soluble and $\mathcal{A}$ induces a Bauer-Manin obstruction. The examples constructed in [KT04, Ex. 6] and [KT04, Ex. 4] give such surfaces for $\theta_{\mathbf{A}} \notin \pm \mathbb{Q}^{\times 2}$ and $\theta_{\mathbf{A}} \in-\mathbb{Q}^{\times 2}$, respectively.

Now since $0<Q_{\mathbf{A}}<_{\varepsilon}\left|\theta_{\mathbf{A}}\right|^{\varepsilon}$, by taking an upper bound of each sum, in order to prove each sum converges it suffices to prove the sum

$$
\sum_{\substack{\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{M}) \in \Phi(T) \times \Psi_{\mathbf{A}} \\\left|\theta_{\mathbf{A}}\right| \geq T}}\left|\theta_{\mathbf{A}}\right|^{-\frac{1}{2}+\varepsilon}
$$

tends to zero as $T \rightarrow \infty$ for sufficiently small $\varepsilon>0$. For each $\mathbf{A} \in \Phi(T)$ the number of $\mathbf{M} \in \Psi_{\mathbf{A}}$ can be bounded by the number of tuples $\left(n_{0}, n_{1}, n_{2}\right)$ of cosets of $\left(\mathbb{Z} / 8 m_{\mathbf{A}} \mathbb{Z}\right)^{\times 4}$ in $\left(\mathbb{Z} / 8 m_{\mathbf{A}} \mathbb{Z}\right)^{\times}$. The number of such cosets is $\ll \tau_{4}\left(\left|\theta_{\mathbf{A}}\right|\right)$, and hence there are $\ll \tau_{4}\left(\left|\theta_{\mathbf{A}}\right|\right)^{3} \ll \varepsilon$ $\left|\theta_{\mathbf{A}}\right|^{\varepsilon}$ possible $\mathbf{M} \in \Psi_{\mathbf{A}}$. Therefore we have

$$
\sum_{\substack{(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{M}) \in \Phi(T) \times \Psi_{\mathbf{A}} \\\left|\theta_{\mathbf{A}}\right| \geq T}}\left|\theta_{\mathbf{A}}\right|^{-\frac{1}{2}+\varepsilon} \lll \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{A} \in \Phi(T) \\\left|\theta_{\mathbf{A}}\right| \geq T}}\left|\theta_{\mathbf{A}}\right|^{-\frac{1}{2}+2 \varepsilon}
$$

Now for any $\mathbf{A} \in \Phi(T)$ we can write $\theta_{\mathbf{A}}=g h_{3}^{3} h_{4}^{4} h_{5}^{5}$, where if $p \mid g$, then $p \in S$ and $\nu_{p}(g) \leq 2$ (and hence there are finitely many choices for $g$ ). For fixed $h_{3}, h_{4}, h_{5} \in \mathbb{Z} \backslash\{0\}$, there are $\tau_{3}\left(g h_{3}^{3} h_{4}^{4} h_{5}^{5}\right)<_{\varepsilon}\left|g h_{3}^{3} h_{4}^{4} h_{5}^{5}\right|^{\varepsilon}$ possible tuples $\mathbf{A} \in \Phi(T)$ such that $\theta_{\mathbf{A}}=g h_{3}^{3} h_{4}^{4} h_{5}^{5}$. In particular we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
\sum_{\substack{\mathbf{A} \in \Phi(T) \\
\left|\theta_{\mathbf{A}}\right| \geq T}}\left|\theta_{\mathbf{A}}\right|^{-\frac{1}{2}+2 \varepsilon} \ll \sum_{\substack{g, h_{3}, h_{4}, h_{5} \\
\left|g h_{3}^{3} h_{4}^{4} h_{5}^{5}\right|>T}}\left|g h_{3}^{3} h_{4}^{4} h_{5}^{5}\right|^{-\frac{1}{2}+3 \varepsilon} & \ll \varepsilon \sum_{\substack{g, h_{3}, h_{4}, h_{5} \\
\left|g h_{3}^{3} h_{4}^{4} h_{5}^{5}\right|>T}}\left(h_{3}\right)^{-\frac{1}{2}+9 \varepsilon}\left(h_{4}^{4} h_{5}^{5}\right)^{-\frac{1}{2}+3 \varepsilon} \\
& \ll \sum_{h_{4}, h_{5}}\left(\frac{h_{4}^{\frac{4}{3}} h_{5}^{\frac{5}{3}}}{T^{\frac{1}{3}}}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}-9 \varepsilon}\left(h_{4}^{4} h_{5}^{5}\right)^{-\frac{1}{2}+3 \varepsilon} \\
& \ll T^{-\frac{1}{6}+3 \varepsilon} \sum_{h_{4}, h_{5}} h_{4}^{-2+\frac{2}{3}+12 \varepsilon-12 \varepsilon} h_{5}^{-\frac{5}{2}+\frac{5}{6}+15 \varepsilon-15 \varepsilon} \\
& \ll T^{-\frac{1}{6}+3 \varepsilon} .
\end{aligned}
$$

Therefore taking $\varepsilon<\frac{1}{18}$ we see that this sum tends to zero as $T \rightarrow \infty$, and hence the result holds.
3.4. The error terms. In this section we will convert $\# N_{\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{M}}^{l o c}(T)$ into a sum and simplify it. To do this, we will construct functions that will give us the conditions on $N_{\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{M}}^{l o c}(T)$. We split this section into subsections which will deal with each condition individually.

### 3.4.1. Converting $\# N_{\boldsymbol{A}, \boldsymbol{M}}^{\text {loc }}(T)$ into a sum.

Definition 3.14. Let $m \in \mathbb{N}$. We say a subset $U \subseteq \mathbb{N}^{m}$ is downward-closed if $\left(x_{n}\right)_{n=1}^{m} \in$ $U$ implies $\left\{\left(y_{n}\right)_{n=1}^{m} \in \mathbb{N}^{m}: y_{n} \leq x_{n}\right.$, for all $\left.1 \leq n \leq m\right\} \subseteq U$.

Let $U$ be a downward-closed subset of $\mathrm{N}_{\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{M}}(T)$, and let $N_{\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{M}}^{l o c, U}(T):=N_{\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{M}}^{l o c}(T) \cap U$, then we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
\# N_{\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{M}}^{l o c, U}(T)=\sum_{(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{w}) \in N_{\mathbf{A}, M}^{l o c, U}(T)} \sum 1 . \tag{3.8}
\end{equation*}
$$

3.4.2. Dealing with $\boldsymbol{M}$ condition on $N_{\boldsymbol{A}, \boldsymbol{M}}^{\text {loc }}(T)$. Let

$$
\Gamma_{\mathbf{A}}:=\left(\mathbb{Z} / 8 m_{\mathbf{A}}\right)^{\times} /\left(\mathbb{Z} / 8 m_{\mathbf{A}}\right)^{\times 4},
$$

then we can write the condition induced by $\mathbf{M}$ on $N_{\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{M}}^{l o c, U}(T)$ as the sum of characters

$$
\frac{1}{\left|\Gamma_{\mathbf{A}}\right|^{3}} \prod_{i} \sum_{\chi_{i} \in \Gamma_{\mathbf{A}}^{\vee}} \overline{\chi_{i}}\left(M_{i}\right) \chi_{i}\left(u_{i}^{2} \prod_{j \neq i} v_{i j} w_{i j}\right) .
$$

Substituting this into (3.8) we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
\# N_{\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{M}}^{l o c, U}(T)=\frac{1}{\left|\Gamma_{\mathbf{A}}\right|^{3}} \sum_{\chi \in\left(\Gamma_{\mathbf{A}}^{\vee}\right)^{3}} S_{\mathbf{A}}^{U}(\boldsymbol{\chi}, T) \prod_{i} \overline{\chi_{i}}\left(M_{i}\right), \tag{3.9}
\end{equation*}
$$

where

$$
\begin{equation*}
S_{\mathbf{A}}^{U}(\boldsymbol{\chi}, T):=\sum_{(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{w}) \in \bigsqcup_{N \in \Omega} \sum_{\mathbf{A}, \mathrm{N}} \sum^{l o c, U}} \prod_{i} \chi_{i}\left(u_{i}^{2} \prod_{j \neq i} v_{i j} w_{i j}\right) . \tag{3.10}
\end{equation*}
$$

We will let $S_{\mathbf{A}}(\boldsymbol{\chi}, T):=S_{\mathbf{A}}^{N_{\mathbf{A}, \mathrm{M}}^{l o c}(T)}(\boldsymbol{\chi}, T)$.
Remark 3.15. For $\chi_{i} \in \Gamma_{\mathbf{A}}^{\vee}$ we can extend $\chi_{i}$ to the map on $\left(\mathbb{Z} / 8 m_{\mathbf{A}}\right) /\left(\mathbb{Z} / 8 m_{\mathbf{A}}\right)^{4}$ defined by

$$
\tilde{\chi}_{i}(x)= \begin{cases}\chi_{i}(x), & \text { if } x \in \Gamma_{\mathbf{A}} \\ 0, & \text { otherwise }\end{cases}
$$

By definition, if $u_{i} \prod_{j \neq i} v_{i j} w_{i j}$ is not coprime to $m_{\mathbf{A}}$ for some $i$, then

$$
\tilde{\chi}_{\ell}\left(u_{i}^{2} \prod_{j \neq i} v_{i j} w_{i j}\right)=0
$$

for all $\ell$. In particular, the condition that $u_{i} \prod_{j \neq i} v_{i j} w_{i j}$ is coprime to $m_{\mathbf{A}}$ for all $i$ is contained in this condition induced by $\mathbf{M}$. By abuse of notation we will denote $\tilde{\chi}_{i}$ by $\chi_{i}$.
3.4.3. Dealing with local solubility condition on $N_{\boldsymbol{A}, \boldsymbol{M}}^{l o c}(T)$. We now deal with the existence of $\mathbb{Q}_{p}$-points when $p \nmid m_{\mathbf{A}}$. We first determine criteria for when a $\mathbb{Q}_{p}$-point exists:

Lemma 3.16. The condition $S_{a}\left(\mathbb{Q}_{p}\right) \neq \varnothing$ for $p \nmid m_{\boldsymbol{A}}$ in $N_{\boldsymbol{A}, \boldsymbol{M}}^{\text {loc }}(T)$ is equivalent to the conditions
(1) $p \left\lvert\, w_{i j} \Longrightarrow\left[p \equiv 3 \bmod 4, \frac{-a_{i}}{a_{j}} \in \mathbb{Q}_{p}^{\times 2}\right.$ and $\left.\theta_{\boldsymbol{A}} \notin \mathbb{Q}_{p}^{\times 2}\right]\right.$;
(2) $p \mid v_{i j} \Longrightarrow\left[a_{k} \in \mathbb{Z}_{p}^{\times 2}\right]$.

Proof. We split into cases depending on which variable a prime $p \nmid m_{\mathbf{A}}$ divides:
If $p \nmid m_{\mathbf{A}} \prod_{i} u_{i} \prod_{i \neq j} v_{i j} w_{i j}$, then by Lemma 2.5 we have that $S_{\mathbf{a}}\left(\mathbb{Q}_{p}\right) \neq \varnothing$.
If $p \mid u_{k}$, then by Lemma 2.5 we have that $S_{\mathbf{a}}\left(\mathbb{Q}_{p}\right) \neq \varnothing$.
If $p \mid w_{i j}, p \equiv 3 \bmod 4$ and $\frac{-a_{i}}{a_{j}} \in \mathbb{Z}_{p}^{\times 2}$, then either $\pm \sqrt{\frac{-a_{i}}{a_{j}}} \in \mathbb{Z}_{p}^{\times 2}$, and hence by Lemma 2.5 we have that $S_{\mathbf{a}}\left(\mathbb{Q}_{p}\right) \neq \varnothing$. In particular the condition $S_{\mathbf{a}}\left(\mathbb{Q}_{p}\right) \neq \varnothing$ when $p \mid w_{i j}$ is contained in the condition $p \left\lvert\, w_{i j} \Longrightarrow\left[p \equiv 3 \bmod 4, \frac{-a_{i}}{a_{j}} \in \mathbb{Q}_{p}^{\times 2}\right.$ and $\left.\theta_{\mathbf{A}} \notin \mathbb{Q}_{p}^{\times 2}\right]\right.$.
If $p \mid v_{i j}$, then since $\theta_{\mathbf{A}} \in \mathbb{Q}_{p}^{\times 2}$ we have $\frac{-a_{i}}{a_{j}}=a_{k} \in \mathbb{Z}_{p}^{\times} / \mathbb{Z}_{p}^{\times 2}$. Thus by Lemma 2.5 for a $\mathbb{Q}_{p}$-point to exist, we require the additional condition that $p \mid v_{i j} \Longrightarrow\left[a_{k} \in \mathbb{Z}_{p}^{\times 2}\right]$.

We now construct functions to encapsulate conditions (1) and (2) in Lemma 3.16.
Definition 3.17. Let $\gamma(w ; x, y)$ be the indicator function for the property

$$
w \text { square-free, } p \mid w \Longrightarrow p \equiv 3 \bmod 4 \text { and } x, y \notin \mathbb{Q}_{p}^{\times 2},
$$

and let $\omega(v ; x, y)$ be the indicator function for the property

$$
v \text { square-free, } p \mid v \Longrightarrow x, y \in \mathbb{Q}_{p}^{\times 2} .
$$

By Lemma 3.16 we know that $\omega\left(v_{i j} ; \theta_{\mathbf{A}}, a_{k}\right)$ and $\gamma\left(w_{i j} ; \theta_{\mathbf{A}}, a_{k}\right)$ encode the conditions for local solubility arising from $N_{\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{M}}^{\text {loc }}(T)$. Before substituting these functions into (3.10) we first prove they can both be written in terms of simpler $S$-frobenian multiplicative functions ([LM23, Def. 2.7]), the definition of which we recall below:

Definition 3.18. Let $S$ be a finite set of primes of $\mathbb{Q}$. We say a multiplicative function $f: \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ is a S-frobenian multiplicative function if it satisfies the following:

- There exists a constant $N \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\left|f\left(p^{k}\right)\right| \leq N^{k}$, for all primes $p$ and $k \in \mathbb{N}$;
- For all $\varepsilon>0$ there exists a constant $C_{\varepsilon} \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $|f(n)| \leq C_{\varepsilon} n^{\varepsilon}$, for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$;
- There exists a Galois extension $L / \mathbb{Q}$ and a class function $\phi: \operatorname{Gal}(L / \mathbb{Q}) \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ such that every prime that ramifies is contained in $S$ and for every prime $p \notin S$ we have

$$
f(p)=\phi\left(\operatorname{Frob}_{p}\right)
$$

Given such a S-frobenian multiplicative function $f$, we define its mean as

$$
\frac{1}{|\operatorname{Gal}(L / \mathbb{Q})|} \sum_{\gamma \in \operatorname{Gal}(L / \mathbb{Q})} \phi(\gamma) .
$$

Definition 3.19. Let $\alpha(w ; x)$ and $\beta(v ; x)$ be the multiplicative functions that take the following values on primes:

$$
\alpha(p ; x)=\left\{\begin{array}{l}
\frac{1}{2}, \text { if } p \equiv 3 \bmod 4 \text { and } x \notin \mathbb{Q}_{p}^{\times 2} \\
0, \text { otherwise }
\end{array}\right.
$$

and

$$
\beta(p ; x)= \begin{cases}\frac{1}{2}, & \text { if } x \in \mathbb{Q}_{p}^{\times 2} \\ 0, & \text { otherwise }\end{cases}
$$

Lemma 3.20. Let $x \in \mathbb{Z} \backslash\{0\}$ such that $x$ is not a square, then $\alpha(-; x)$ is a $\{p: p \mid$ $2 x\}$-frobenian multiplicative function of mean $\frac{1}{8}$ when $x \notin \pm \mathbb{Q}^{\times 2}$ and mean $\frac{1}{4}$ when $-x \in$ $\mathbb{Q}^{\times 2}$.

Proof. Clearly $\alpha(-; x)$ is multiplicative and satisfies the first two properties given in Definition 3.18, Let $L_{1}:=\mathbb{Q}(\sqrt{-1}), L_{2}:=\mathbb{Q}(\sqrt{x})$, and let $L:=L_{1} L_{2}$. Furthermore, let $<\sigma>:=\operatorname{Gal}\left(L_{1} / \mathbb{Q}\right)$ and let $<\tau>:=\operatorname{Gal}\left(L_{2} / \mathbb{Q}\right)$. Clearly all primes that ramify in $L$ are contained in $S:=\{p: p \mid 2 x\}$. For $p \notin S$ prime, we have that $p \equiv 3 \bmod 4$ and $x \notin \mathbb{Q}_{p}^{\times 2}$ if and only if $p$ is inert in $L_{1}$ and $L_{2}$. Furthermore for any such $p \notin S$, we have that $\operatorname{Frob}_{p}=(\sigma, \tau)$, when $x \notin \pm \mathbb{Q}^{\times 2}$, and $\operatorname{Frob}_{p}=\sigma$, when $-x \in \mathbb{Q}^{\times 2}$. Therefore in the case $x \notin \pm \mathbb{Q}^{\times 2}$, define the class function $\phi: \operatorname{Gal}(L / \mathbb{Q}) \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ by $\phi((\sigma, \tau))=\frac{1}{2}$, and $\phi(\delta)=0$, for all $\delta \neq(\sigma, \tau) \in \operatorname{Gal}(L / \mathbb{Q})$. In the case $-x \in \mathbb{Q}^{\times 2}$, define the class function $\phi: \operatorname{Gal}(L / \mathbb{Q}) \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ by $\phi(\sigma)=\frac{1}{2}$, and $\phi(1)=0$. By definition we have that the mean of $\alpha(-; x)$ is $\frac{1}{2|\operatorname{Gal}(L / \mathbb{Q})|}$, and hence the result follows.

Lemma 3.21. Let $x \in \mathbb{Z} \backslash\{0\}$ such that $x$ is not a square, then $\beta(-; x)$ is a $\{p: p \mid$ $2 x\}$-frobenian multiplicative function of mean $\frac{1}{4}$ when $x \notin \pm \mathbb{Q}^{\times 2}$ or when $x \in-\mathbb{Q}^{\times 2}$.

Proof. Clearly $\beta(-; x)$ is multiplicative and satisfies the first two properties given in Definition 3.18. Let $L:=\mathbb{Q}(\sqrt{x})$. Clearly all primes that ramify in $L$ are contained in $S:=\{p: p \mid 2 x\}$. For $p \notin S$ prime, we have that $x \in \mathbb{Q}_{p}^{\times 2}$ if and only if $p$ splits in $L$. Furthermore, for any split $p \notin S$ we have that $\operatorname{Frob}_{p}=1 \in \operatorname{Gal}(L / \mathbb{Q})$. Thus define the class function $\phi: \operatorname{Gal}(L / \mathbb{Q}) \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ by $\phi(1)=\frac{1}{2}$, and $\phi(\sigma)=0$, for all $\sigma \neq 1 \in \operatorname{Gal}(L / \mathbb{Q})$. By definition we have that the mean of $\beta(-; x)$ is $\frac{1}{2 \mid \operatorname{Gal}(L / \mathbb{Q})}$, and hence the result follows.

Lemma 3.22. For $x, y, w \in \mathbb{Z} \backslash\{0\}$, we have

$$
\gamma(w ; x, y)=\mu(w)^{2}\left[\sum_{h f=w} \alpha(h ; y) \alpha(f ; y)\left(\frac{-x}{f}\right)\right] .
$$

Proof. Firstly both sides are multiplicative in $w$ and are both 0 if $w$ is not square-free. Thus it suffices to prove this equality holds when $w$ is a prime, say $p$.

For a given prime $p$, if $p \not \equiv 3 \bmod 4$, then both sides are 0 , so we may assume $p \equiv 3 \bmod 4$. Furthermore, we can assume $y \notin \mathbb{Q}_{p}^{\times 2}$ as otherwise both sides are 0 . In this case the right side is given by

$$
\alpha(p ; y)+\alpha(p ; y)\left(\frac{-x}{p}\right)=\frac{1}{2}+\frac{1}{2}\left(\frac{-x}{p}\right)=\frac{1}{2}\left[1-\left(\frac{x}{p}\right)\right] .
$$

Thus this equation is 1 if and only if $x \notin \mathbb{Q}_{p}^{\times 2}$ (and 0 otherwise), and hence equality holds.

Lemma 3.23. For $x, y, v \in \mathbb{Z} \backslash\{0\}$, we have

$$
\omega(v ; x, y)=\mu(v)^{2}\left[\sum_{d e=v} \beta(d ; y) \beta(e: y)\left(\frac{x}{e}\right)\right] .
$$

Proof. Firstly both sides are multiplicative in $v$ and are both 0 if $v$ is not square-free. Thus it suffices to prove this equality holds when $v$ is a prime, say $p$. Furthermore, we can assume $y \in \mathbb{Q}_{p}^{\times 2}$ as otherwise both sides are 0 . In this case the right side is given by

$$
\beta(p ; y)+\beta(p ; y)\left(\frac{x}{p}\right)=\frac{1}{2}+\frac{1}{2}\left(\frac{x}{p}\right) .
$$

Thus this equation is 1 if and only if $x \in \mathbb{Q}_{p}^{\times 2}$ (and 0 otherwise), and hence equality holds.

Before substituting the functions in Lemma 3.22 and 3.23 into (3.10) we provide the following definition:

Definition 3.24. Let $q_{\text {frob }} \in \mathbb{Z}$. Let $\left(u_{n}\right)_{n \in I}$ be some tuple of variables indexed by some finite set $I$. Let $u_{\widehat{n}}:=\left(u_{\ell}\right)_{\ell \in I, \ell \neq n}$ and let $u_{\widehat{n m}}:=\left(u_{\ell}\right)_{\ell \in I, \ell \neq n, m}$. Let $f: \mathbb{N}^{I} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ be some function. Then
(1) For $n \neq m \in I$, we say $u_{n}$ and $u_{m}$ are linked if there exists two functions $a\left(-; u_{\widehat{n m}}\right), b\left(-; u_{\widehat{n m}}\right): \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ which satisfy the following:

- $f\left(\left(u_{n}\right)_{n \in I}\right)=a\left(u_{n} ; u_{\widehat{n m}}\right) b\left(u_{m} ; u_{\widehat{n m}}\right)\left(\frac{u_{n}}{u_{m}}\right)\left(\frac{u_{m}}{u_{n}}\right)$;
- $\left|a\left(u_{n} ; u_{\widehat{n m}}\right)\right| \leq 1$;
- $\left|b\left(u_{m} ; u_{\widehat{n m}}\right)\right| \leq 1$.
(2) For $n \in I$ we say $u_{n}$ is frobenian if there exists a constant $C\left(u_{\hat{n}}\right)$ which only depends on $u_{\widehat{n}}$ and a $\left\{p ; p \mid q_{\text {frob }}\right\} \cup\left\{p: p \mid u_{m}, m \neq n\right\}$-frobenian multiplicative function $\rho\left(-, u_{\widehat{n}}\right)$ which satisfy the following:
- $f\left(\left(u_{n}\right)_{n \in I}\right)=C\left(u_{\widehat{n}}\right) \rho\left(u_{n}, u_{\hat{n}}\right)$;
- $\left|C\left(u_{\hat{n}}\right)\right| \leq 1$;
- The conductor of $\rho\left(-, u_{\hat{n}}\right)$ is at most $q_{\text {frob }} \prod_{u_{m} \text { linked to } u_{n}} u_{m}^{6}$;
- If there exists $u_{m}$ linked to $u_{n}$ such that $u_{m} \neq 1$, then the mean of $\rho\left(-, u_{\hat{n}}\right)$ is 0.
(3) For $\varepsilon>0$ we say $\left(u_{n}\right)_{n \in I}$ satisfies $\star_{\varepsilon}$ if the following holds:
- For every frobenian variable $u_{n}$, if $u_{n}>e^{\left(\frac{3}{2} \log T\right)^{\varepsilon}}$, then all variables linked to $u_{n}$ are equal to 1 .

Remark 3.25. By [San23, Lem. 4.20] the function $\psi(x, y)=\left(\frac{x}{y}\right)\left(\frac{y}{x}\right)$ is a $\left(6,2^{24}\right)$-oscillating bilinear characters (see San23, Def. 4.19] for the definition), and hence our definition of linked variables is compatible with [San23, Thm. 4.22] by taking $A=6$ and $q_{\text {osc }}=O(1)$.

Lemma 3.26. For $T>2$ we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
& S_{\boldsymbol{A}}^{U}(\boldsymbol{\chi}, T)= \sum_{\substack{(u, h, \boldsymbol{d}) \in U\\
}} \prod_{i} \chi_{i}\left(u_{i}^{2}\right) \prod_{j \neq i} \chi_{i}\left(\chi_{j}\left(h_{i j} d_{i j}\right)\right) \alpha\left(h_{i j} ; \theta_{\boldsymbol{A}}\right) \beta\left(d_{i j} ; \theta_{\boldsymbol{A}}\right) \\
&+O_{\varepsilon}\left(\frac{\left.T_{j \neq i}^{\frac{3}{2}} h_{i j} d_{i j}\right)^{2}=1}{\mid \log T)^{\frac{5}{2} M_{\boldsymbol{A}}}}\right. \\
&\left|\theta_{\boldsymbol{A}}\right|^{\frac{1}{2}-\varepsilon}
\end{aligned} .
$$

Proof. We adapt the proof of [San23, Lem. 5.9]. Write $\mathbf{v}=\mathbf{d e}$ and $\mathbf{w}=\mathbf{h f}$. Let $d_{i j}$ and $e_{i j}$ denote the parts of $\mathbf{d}$ and $\mathbf{e}$ such that $d_{i j} e_{i j}=v_{i j}$, and similarly let $h_{i j}$ and $f_{i j}$ denote the parts of $\mathbf{h}$ and $\mathbf{f}$ such that $h_{i j} f_{i j}=w_{i j}$. Substituting Lemma 3.22 and Lemma 3.23 into (3.10) we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
S_{\mathbf{A}}^{U}(\boldsymbol{\chi}, T)= & \sum \sum_{\substack{(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{h f}, \mathbf{d e}) \in U\\
}} \sum_{i} \prod_{i} \chi_{i}\left(u_{i}^{2}\right) \prod_{j \neq i}\left[\chi_{i}\left(\chi_{j}\left(h_{i j} f_{i j} d_{i j} e_{i j}\right)\right)\right. \\
& \times \alpha\left(h_{i j} ; \theta_{\mathbf{A}}\right) \alpha\left(f_{i j} ; \theta_{\mathbf{A}}\right)\left(\frac{-A_{k} \prod_{\ell \neq k} d_{\ell k} e_{\ell k} f_{\ell k} h_{\ell k}}{f_{i j}}\right) \\
\times & \left.\beta\left(d_{i j} ; \theta_{\mathbf{A}}\right) \beta\left(e_{i j} ; \theta_{\mathbf{A}}\right)\left(\frac{A_{k} \prod_{\ell \neq k} d_{\ell k} e_{\ell k} f_{\ell k} h_{\ell k}}{e_{i j}}\right)\right] .
\end{aligned}
$$

We will let $F$ denote the function within the summation. Clearly we have that each of the pairs of variables $\left(f_{k i}, f_{k j}\right),\left(f_{k i}, d_{k j}\right),\left(f_{k i}, h_{k j}\right),\left(e_{k i}, e_{k j}\right),\left(e_{k i}, d_{k j}\right)$ and $\left(e_{k i}, h_{k j}\right)$ are linked. We now prove every variable is frobenian (with $q_{\text {frob }}=O(1)\left|\theta_{\mathbf{A}}\right|^{O(1)}$ ).

If we fix all variables other than $u_{i}$, then $F$ can be written as a constant whose absolute value is bounded by 1 (which does not depend on $u_{i}$ ) multiplied by $\chi_{i}\left(u_{i}^{2}\right)$.

If we fix all variables other than $h_{i j}$, then $F$ can be written as a constant whose absolute value is bounded by 1 (which does not depend on $h_{i j}$ ) multiplied by the function

$$
\chi_{i}\left(\chi_{j}\left(h_{i j}\right)\right) \alpha\left(h_{i j} ; \theta_{\mathbf{A}}\right)\left(\frac{h_{i j}}{\prod_{\ell \neq j} f_{i \ell} e_{i \ell}}\right) .
$$

If we fix all variables other than $d_{i j}$, then $F$ can be written as a constant whose absolute value is bounded by 1 (which does not depend on $d_{i j}$ ) multiplied by the function

$$
\chi_{i}\left(\chi_{j}\left(d_{i j}\right)\right) \beta\left(d_{i j} ; \theta_{\mathbf{A}}\right)\left(\frac{d_{i j}}{\prod_{\ell \neq k} f_{\ell k} e_{\ell k}}\right) .
$$

If we fix all variables other than $f_{i j}$, then $F$ can be written as a constant whose absolute value is bounded by 1 (which does not depend on $f_{i j}$ ) multiplied by the function

$$
\chi_{i}\left(\chi_{j}\left(f_{i j}\right)\right) \alpha\left(f_{i j} ; \theta_{\mathbf{A}}\right)\left(\frac{f_{i j}}{\prod_{\ell \neq k} f_{\ell k} e_{\ell k}}\right)\left(\frac{-A_{k} \prod_{\ell \neq k} d_{k \ell} e_{k \ell} f_{k \ell} h_{k \ell}}{f_{i j}}\right) .
$$

If we fix all variables other than $e_{i j}$, then $F$ can be written as a constant whose absolute value is bounded by 1 (which does not depend on $e_{i j}$ ) multiplied by the function

$$
\chi_{i}\left(\chi_{j}\left(e_{i j}\right)\right) \beta\left(e_{i j} ; \theta_{\mathbf{A}}\right)\left(\frac{e_{i j}}{\prod_{\ell \neq k} f_{\ell k} e_{\ell k}}\right)\left(\frac{A_{k} \prod_{\ell \neq k} d_{k \ell} e_{k \ell} f_{k \ell} h_{k \ell}}{e_{i j}}\right) .
$$

Each of the above functions listed are the product of frobenian multiplicative functions of conductor $O(1)\left|\theta_{\mathbf{A}}\right|^{O(1)}$. Thus by $[\operatorname{San} 23$, Lem. 4.3] these products are also frobenian multiplicative functions of conductor $O(1)\left|\theta_{\mathbf{A}}\right|^{O(1)}$. Furthermore, these frobenian multiplicative functions have mean 0 when there is a variable linked to $x$ that is not equal to 1 , and hence every variable is frobenian (for $q_{\text {frob }}=O(1)\left|\theta_{\mathbf{A}}\right|^{O(1)}$ ). Therefore by [San23, Thm. 4.22] we have

$$
S_{\mathbf{A}}^{U}(\boldsymbol{\chi}, T)=\sum_{\substack{(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{h f}, \mathbf{d e}) \in U \\ \\ \mu\left(\prod_{i} u_{i} \prod_{j \neq i} h_{i j} f_{i j} d_{i j} d_{i j}\right)^{2}=1}} \sum_{\substack{ \\\left.i_{\mathbf{A}}\right|^{2}}} F(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{h}, \mathbf{f}, \mathbf{d}, \mathbf{e})+O_{\varepsilon}\left(\frac{T^{\frac{3}{2}}(\log T)^{\frac{5}{2} M_{\mathbf{A}}}}{\left\lvert\, \theta_{\mathbf{A}}^{\frac{1}{2}-\varepsilon}\right.}\right)
$$

We now consider the case when one of the variables is not equal to 1 and compute its contribution to the overall sum. Let us fix such a variable and denote it by $x$. We can bound the part of $S_{\mathbf{A}}^{U}(\chi, T)$ which is the sum over all variables with $x$ fixed above by

$$
\sum_{\substack{\mathbf{u} \\\left|A_{i}\right| u_{i}^{2} \prod_{j \neq \neq}^{\mathbf{h}} i_{i j} d_{i j} f_{i j} e_{i j} \leq T}} \sum_{i<j} \sum_{\mathbf{d}} \sum_{\mathbf{i}} \prod_{i \leq e}^{\left(\frac{3}{2} \log T\right)^{\varepsilon}} \text {, for } y \operatorname{linked} \text { to } x .
$$

Summing over the $u_{i}$ and applying [San23, Prop. 4.12] we may bound this sum above by

$$
<_{\varepsilon} \frac{T^{\frac{3}{2}}(\log T)^{W}}{\left|\theta_{\mathbf{A}}\right|^{\frac{1}{2}-\varepsilon}} \sum_{\substack{y \operatorname{linked} \text { to } x \\ y \leq e^{\left(\frac{3}{2} \log T\right)^{\varepsilon}}}} \frac{1}{\prod_{y} y} \ll \varepsilon \varepsilon \frac{T^{\frac{3}{2}}(\log T)^{W+N \varepsilon}}{\left|\theta_{\mathbf{A}}\right|^{\frac{1}{2}-(N+1) \varepsilon}},
$$

where $N=15$ is the total number of variables and $W$ is the sum of the means of the frobenian multiplicative functions corresponding to the variables not linked to $x$ (that is, the mean of $\alpha\left(h_{i j} ; \theta_{\mathbf{A}}\right), \alpha\left(f_{i j} ; \theta_{\mathbf{A}}\right), \beta\left(d_{i j} ; \theta_{\mathbf{A}}\right)$ or $\beta\left(e_{i j} ; \theta_{\mathbf{A}}\right)$ if $h_{i j}, f_{i j}, d_{i j}$ or $e_{i j}$ are not linked to $x$, respectively).

If $x=f_{i j}$, then $x$ is not linked to $f_{i j}, e_{i j}, d_{i j}$ and $h_{i j}$. Thus we have

$$
W=\frac{1}{4}+\frac{1}{4}+\frac{1}{8}+\frac{1}{8}=\frac{3}{4}=2 M_{\mathbf{A}}
$$

when $\theta_{\mathbf{A}} \notin \pm \mathbb{Q}^{\times 2}$ and

$$
W=\frac{1}{4}+\frac{1}{4}+\frac{1}{4}+\frac{1}{4}=1=2 M_{\mathbf{A}}
$$

when $\theta_{\mathbf{A}} \in-\mathbb{Q}^{\times 2}$. Therefore the contribution of the sum when $f_{i j}$ is not equal to 1 is less than

$$
O_{\varepsilon}\left(\frac{T^{\frac{3}{2}}(\log T)^{\frac{5}{2} M_{\mathbf{A}}}}{\left|\theta_{\mathbf{A}}\right|^{\frac{1}{2}-\varepsilon}}\right)
$$

and hence we may assume $f_{i j}=1$ for all $i \neq j$.
If $x=e_{i j}$, then $x$ is not linked to $f_{i j}, e_{i j}, d_{i j}$ and $h_{i j}$. Thus we have

$$
W=\frac{1}{4}+\frac{1}{4}+\frac{1}{8}+\frac{1}{8}=\frac{3}{4}=2 M_{\mathbf{A}}
$$

when $\theta_{\mathbf{A}} \notin \pm \mathbb{Q}^{\times 2}$ and

$$
W=\frac{1}{4}+\frac{1}{4}+\frac{1}{4}+\frac{1}{4}=1=2 M_{\mathbf{A}}
$$

when $\theta_{\mathbf{A}} \in-\mathbb{Q}^{\times 2}$. Therefore the contribution of the sum when $e_{i j}$ is not equal to 1 is less than

$$
O_{\varepsilon}\left(\frac{T^{\frac{3}{2}}(\log T)^{\frac{5}{2} M_{\mathbf{A}}}}{\left|\theta_{\mathbf{A}}\right|^{\frac{1}{2}-\varepsilon}}\right)
$$

and hence we may assume $e_{i j}=1$ for all $i \neq j$. Thus the result follows.
Remark 3.27. The power of $\log T$ in the error term can actually be chosen to be any value strictly greater than $2 M_{\mathbf{A}}$. Our choice of $\frac{5}{2} M_{\mathbf{A}}$ was only chosen so that it does not interfere with the results in the following section.

Proof of Lemma 3.7. By substituting Lemma 3.26 into (3.9) for any downward-closed set $U$ we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
\# N_{\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{M}}^{l o c, U}(T) \ll_{\varepsilon} \sum_{(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{h}, \mathbf{d}) \in U} \sum_{i<j} \prod_{i<j} \alpha\left(h_{i j} ; \theta_{\mathbf{A}}\right) \beta\left(d_{i j} ; \theta_{\mathbf{A}}\right)+O_{\varepsilon}\left(\frac{T^{\frac{3}{2}}(\log T)^{\frac{5}{2} M_{\mathbf{A}}}}{\left|\theta_{\mathbf{A}}\right|^{\frac{1}{2}-\varepsilon}}\right) \tag{3.11}
\end{equation*}
$$

We now deal with the two sets independently:
Let $U$ be the left-hand side set in (3.1) (in Lemma 3.7), then summing over $u_{i}$ we have that the right-side of (3.11) is bounded by

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{T^{\frac{3}{2}}}{\left|\theta_{\mathbf{A}}\right|^{\frac{1}{2}}} \sum_{h_{i j} \leq\left(\log T^{\frac{3}{2}}\right)^{C}} \prod_{i<j} \frac{\alpha\left(h_{i j} ; \theta_{\mathbf{A}}\right)}{h_{i j}} \sum_{d_{i j} \leq T} \prod_{i<j} \frac{\beta\left(d_{i j} ; \theta_{\mathbf{A}}\right)}{d_{i j}} \tag{3.12}
\end{equation*}
$$

Now by [San23, Thm. 4.12] and partial summation we have

$$
\sum_{h_{i j} \leq\left(\log T^{\frac{3}{2}}\right)^{C}} \prod_{i<j} \frac{\alpha\left(h_{i j} ; \theta_{\mathbf{A}}\right)}{h_{i j}} \ll \varepsilon\left|\theta_{\mathbf{A}}\right|^{3 \varepsilon}\left(\log \left(\log T^{\frac{3}{2}}\right)^{C}\right)^{W_{1}}
$$

and

$$
\sum_{d_{i j} \leq T} \prod_{i<j} \frac{\beta\left(d_{i j} ; \theta_{\mathbf{A}}\right)}{d_{i j}} \lll\left|\theta_{\mathbf{A}}\right|^{3 \varepsilon}(\log T)^{W_{2}}
$$

where $W_{1}=\frac{3}{4}$ and $W_{2}=\frac{3}{4}$ if $\theta_{\mathbf{A}} \in-\mathbb{Q}^{\times 2}$ and $W_{1}=\frac{3}{8}$ and $W_{2}=\frac{3}{4}$ if $\theta_{\mathbf{A}} \notin \pm \mathbb{Q}^{\times 2}$. Therefore substituting into (3.12) we have

$$
<_{\varepsilon}\left|\theta_{\mathbf{A}}\right|^{6 \varepsilon-\frac{1}{2}} T^{\frac{3}{2}} \log T^{W_{2}}\left(\log \left(\log T^{\frac{3}{2}}\right)^{C}\right)^{W_{1}} \lll C \frac{T^{\frac{3}{2}}(\log T)^{\frac{5}{2} M_{\mathbf{A}}}}{\left|\theta_{\mathbf{A}}\right|^{-6 \varepsilon+\frac{1}{2}}}
$$

Now let $U$ be the left-hand side set in (3.2) (in Lemma 3.7), then without loss of generality assume $i=0$. Summing over $u_{0}$, we may bound (3.11) above by

$$
\frac{T^{\frac{1}{2}}}{\left|A_{0}\right|^{\frac{1}{2}}} \sum_{u_{1}, u_{2} \leq\left(\log T^{\frac{3}{2}}\right)^{C}} \sum_{h_{h_{i j}, d_{i j}} \sum_{\left|A_{i}\right| u_{i}^{2}} \prod_{i<j} h_{i j} d_{i j} \leq T} \alpha\left(h_{12} ; \theta_{\mathbf{A}}\right) \beta\left(d_{12} ; \theta_{\mathbf{A}}\right) \prod_{j \neq 0} \frac{\alpha\left(h_{0 j} ; \theta_{\mathbf{A}}\right)}{h_{0 j}^{\frac{1}{2}}} \frac{\beta\left(d_{0 j} ; \theta_{\mathbf{A}}\right)}{d_{0 j}^{\frac{1}{2}}} .
$$

Now summing over $h_{01}, h_{02}$ and using that $\alpha\left(h_{i j} ; \theta_{\mathbf{A}}\right) \leq 1$ we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{T^{\frac{3}{2}}}{\left|\theta_{\mathbf{A}}\right|^{\frac{1}{2}}} \sum_{u_{1}, u_{2} \leq\left(\log T^{\frac{3}{2}}\right)^{C}} \frac{1}{u_{1} u_{2}} \sum_{\substack{h_{12}, d_{i j} \\\left|A_{i}\right| u_{i}^{2} \prod_{i<j} h_{i j} d_{i j} \leq T}} \frac{\alpha\left(h_{12} ; \theta_{\mathbf{A}}\right)}{h_{12}} \prod_{i<j} \frac{\beta\left(d_{i j} ; \theta_{\mathbf{A}}\right)}{d_{i j}} . \tag{3.13}
\end{equation*}
$$

As in the previous argument, by using [San23, Thm. 4.12] and partial summation we have

$$
\begin{gathered}
\sum_{h_{12} \leq T} \frac{\alpha\left(h_{12} ; \theta_{\mathbf{A}}\right)}{h_{12}} \ll_{\varepsilon}\left|\theta_{\mathbf{A}}\right|^{\varepsilon}(\log T)^{W_{1}^{\prime}}, \\
\sum_{d_{i j} \leq T} \prod_{i<j} \frac{\beta\left(d_{i j} ; \theta_{\mathbf{A}}\right)}{d_{i j}} \lll \varepsilon_{\varepsilon}\left|\theta_{\mathbf{A}}\right|^{3 \varepsilon}(\log T)^{W_{2}^{\prime}},
\end{gathered}
$$

and

$$
\sum_{u_{1}, u_{2} \leq\left(\log T^{\frac{3}{2}}\right)^{C}} \frac{1}{u_{1} u_{2}} \ll\left(\log \left(\log T^{\frac{3}{2}}\right)^{C}\right)^{2}
$$

where $W_{1}^{\prime}=\frac{1}{4}$ and $W_{2}^{\prime}=\frac{3}{4}$ if $\theta_{\mathbf{A}} \in-\mathbb{Q}^{\times 2}$ and $W_{1}^{\prime}=\frac{1}{8}$ and $W_{2}^{\prime}=\frac{3}{4}$ if $\theta_{\mathbf{A}} \notin \pm \mathbb{Q}^{\times 2}$. Therefore substituting into (3.13) we have

$$
\ll \varepsilon\left|\theta_{\mathbf{A}}\right|^{4 \varepsilon-\frac{1}{2}} T^{\frac{3}{2}} \log T^{W_{1}^{\prime}+W_{2}^{\prime}}\left(\log \left(\log T^{\frac{3}{2}}\right)^{C}\right)^{2}<_{C} \frac{T^{\frac{3}{2}}(\log T)^{\frac{5}{2} M_{\mathbf{A}}}}{\left|\theta_{\mathbf{A}}\right|^{-4 \varepsilon+\frac{1}{2}}} .
$$

### 3.4.4. Simplifying $S_{A}^{U}(\boldsymbol{\chi}, T)$.

Lemma 3.28. Let $x \in \mathbb{Z} \backslash\{0\}$ such that $x$ is not a square. Let

$$
\lambda(t ; x):=\mu(t)^{2} \sum_{\substack{h d=t \\\left(x \prod_{p \in S}^{p, t)=1}\right.}} \alpha(h ; x) \beta(d ; x),
$$

where $(y, z)$ denotes the greatest common divisor of $y$ and $z$, then $\lambda(t: x)$ is a $S \cup\{p: p \mid x\}$ frobenian multiplicative function of mean $\frac{1}{2}$ when $x \in-\mathbb{Q}^{\times 2}$ and mean $\frac{3}{8}$ when $x \notin \pm \mathbb{Q}^{\times 2}$.

Proof. The proof follows from the discussion after the proof of [San23, Lem. 5.4] after appropriately changing the functions.

Now consider $S_{\mathbf{A}}(\boldsymbol{\chi}, T)$. As in Remark 3.15 we have that $\chi_{i}(x)=0$ when $\left(m_{\mathbf{A}}, x\right) \neq 1$, and hence substituting Lemma 3.28 into Lemma 3.26 we have

$$
\begin{align*}
S_{\mathbf{A}}(\boldsymbol{\chi}, T)= & \sum_{\mathbf{u}} \sum_{\mathbf{t}} \mu\left(\prod_{i} u_{i} \prod_{j \neq i} t_{i j}\right)^{2} \prod_{i} \chi_{i}\left(u_{i}^{2}\right) \prod_{j \neq i} \chi_{i}\left(\chi_{j}\left(t_{i j}\right)\right) \lambda\left(t_{i j} ; \theta_{\mathbf{A}}\right) \\
& +O_{\varepsilon}\left(\frac{T^{\frac{3}{2}}(\log T)^{\frac{5}{2} M_{\mathbf{A}}}}{\left|\theta_{\mathbf{A}}\right|^{\frac{1}{2}-\varepsilon}}\right) . \tag{3.14}
\end{align*}
$$

3.4.5. Dealing with $\mu(-)$ condition on $N_{\boldsymbol{A}, \boldsymbol{M}}^{l o c}(T)$.

Lemma 3.29. There exists a 6-variable multiplicative function $\kappa$ such that

$$
\mu\left(\prod_{i} u_{i} \prod_{j \neq i} t_{i j}\right)^{2}=\sum_{\substack{f \\ f_{i j} \mid t_{i j}}} \sum_{\substack{g \\ g_{i} \mid u_{i}}} \kappa(\boldsymbol{f}, \boldsymbol{g}) .
$$

Proof. This equality follows from Möbius inversion. Explicitly, let $\kappa$ denote the 6 -variable multiplicative function with the Dirichlet series

$$
F\left(\mathbf{s}, \mathbf{s}^{\prime}\right)=\sum_{\mathbf{u}} \sum_{\mathbf{t}} \frac{\mu\left(\prod_{i} u_{i} \prod_{j \neq i} t_{i j}\right)^{2}}{\prod_{i} u_{i}^{s_{i}} \prod_{j \neq i} t_{i j}^{s_{i j}^{\prime}}} \prod_{i} \zeta\left(s_{i}\right)^{-1} \prod_{j \neq i} \zeta\left(s_{i j}^{\prime}\right)^{-1} .
$$

For $s_{i}, s_{i j}^{\prime}>\frac{1}{2}$ we have

$$
F\left(\mathbf{s}, \mathbf{s}^{\prime}\right)=\prod_{p}\left(1+\sum_{i} p^{-s_{i}}+\sum_{i<j} p^{-s_{i j}^{\prime}}\right) \prod_{i}\left(1-p^{-s_{i}}\right) \prod_{j \neq i}\left(1-p^{-s_{i j}^{\prime}}\right) .
$$

Expanding out the terms of the product over $p$ we find that we can bound these inner terms by 1 , and hence the product converge absolutely. Thus this series converges absolutely when
$s_{i}, s_{i j}^{\prime}>\frac{1}{2}$ for all $i \neq j$. Therefore by Möbius inversion we have

$$
\mu\left(\prod_{i} u_{i} \prod_{j \neq i} t_{i j}\right)^{2}=\sum_{\substack{\mathbf{f} \\ f_{i j} \mid t_{i j}}} \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{g} \\ g_{i} \mid u_{i}}} \kappa(\mathbf{f}, \mathbf{g})
$$

Now rewriting $u_{i}=g_{i} u_{i}$ and $t_{i j}=f_{i j} t_{i j}$ for all $i \neq j$, and substituting Lemma 3.29 into (3.14) we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
S_{\mathbf{A}}(\boldsymbol{\chi}, T)= & \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{f} \\
\left|A_{i}\right| g_{i}^{2} u_{i}^{2} \prod_{\begin{subarray}{c}{\mathbf{g} \\
\text { j* }} }} \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{t} \\
\left(f_{i j} t_{i j}, t_{i j}\right)=1}} \sum_{i j} \leq T}\end{subarray}} \kappa(\mathbf{f}, \mathbf{g}) \prod_{i} \chi_{i}\left(g_{i}^{2} u_{i}^{2}\right) \prod_{j \neq i} \chi_{i}\left(\chi_{j}\left(f_{i j} t_{i j}\right)\right) \lambda\left(f_{i j} ; \theta_{\mathbf{A}}\right) \lambda\left(t_{i j} ; \theta_{\mathbf{A}}\right) \\
& +O_{\varepsilon}\left(\frac{T^{\frac{3}{2}}(\log T)^{\frac{5}{2} M_{\mathbf{A}}}}{\left|\theta_{\mathbf{A}}\right|^{\frac{1}{2}-\varepsilon}}\right) .
\end{aligned}
$$

3.4.6. Dealing with $\chi_{i}(-)$ condition on $S_{\boldsymbol{A}}(\chi, T)$.

Lemma 3.30. Let $\boldsymbol{\chi}=\left(\chi_{0}, \chi_{1}, \chi_{2}\right) \in\left(\Gamma_{\boldsymbol{A}}^{\vee}\right)^{3}$. If there exists $\chi \in \Gamma_{\boldsymbol{A}}^{\vee}[2]$ such that $\chi_{i}=\chi$ for all $i$, then we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
S_{\boldsymbol{A}}(\boldsymbol{\chi}, T)=S_{\boldsymbol{A}}(\mathbf{1}, T)= & \sum_{\substack{f \\
\left|A_{i}\right| g_{i}^{2} \sum_{i}^{2} \prod_{j \neq i} f_{i j} f_{i j} \leq t_{i j} \leq T \\
\left(m_{\boldsymbol{A}}, \prod_{i} u_{i} g_{i}\right)=\left(f_{i j}, t_{i j}\right)=1}} \kappa(\boldsymbol{f}, \boldsymbol{g}) \prod_{i<j} \lambda\left(f_{i j} ; \theta_{\boldsymbol{A}}\right) \lambda\left(t_{i j} ; \theta_{\boldsymbol{A}}\right) \\
& +O_{\varepsilon}\left(\frac{T^{\frac{3}{2}}(\log T)^{\frac{5}{2} M_{\boldsymbol{A}}}}{\left|\theta_{\boldsymbol{A}}\right|^{\frac{1}{2}-\varepsilon}}\right) .
\end{aligned}
$$

Otherwise we have

$$
S_{\boldsymbol{A}}(\boldsymbol{\chi}, T)=O_{\varepsilon}\left(\frac{T^{\frac{3}{2}}(\log T)^{\frac{5}{2} M_{\boldsymbol{A}}}}{\left|\theta_{\boldsymbol{A}}\right|^{\frac{1}{2}-\varepsilon}}\right)
$$

Proof. The proof follows from the proof of [San23, Lem. 5.11] after adjusting for the different variables.

Now substituting Lemma 3.30 into (3.10) we have

$$
\begin{align*}
\# N_{\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{M}}^{l o c}(T) & =\frac{1}{\left|\Gamma_{\mathbf{A}}\right|^{3}} \sum_{\chi \in \Gamma_{\mathbf{A}}^{\vee}[2]} S_{\mathbf{A}}(\mathbf{1}, T) \prod_{i} \bar{\chi}\left(M_{i}\right)+O_{\varepsilon}\left(\frac{T^{\frac{3}{2}}(\log T)^{\frac{5}{2} M_{\mathbf{A}}}}{\left|\theta_{\mathbf{A}}\right|^{\frac{1}{2}-\varepsilon}}\right)  \tag{3.15}\\
& =\frac{\left|\Gamma_{\mathbf{A}}^{\vee}[2]\right|}{\left|\Gamma_{\mathbf{A}}\right|^{3}} S_{\mathbf{A}}(\mathbf{1}, T)+O_{\varepsilon}\left(\frac{T^{\frac{3}{2}}(\log T)^{\frac{5}{2} M_{\mathbf{A}}}}{\left|\theta_{\mathbf{A}}\right|^{\frac{1}{2}-\varepsilon}}\right), \tag{3.16}
\end{align*}
$$

where the second equality follows from $M_{0} M_{1} M_{2}$ being a square in $\Gamma_{\mathbf{A}}$ for all $\mathbf{M} \in \Psi_{\mathbf{A}}$.
3.5. The main term. Before providing an asymptotic formula for $S_{\mathbf{A}}(\mathbf{1}, T)$, we give another result we will use within the proof:

Lemma 3.31. For any $T, f \geq 1$, there exists a constant $K_{A, f} \leq K_{A, 1}<_{\varepsilon}|\theta|^{\varepsilon}$ such that

$$
\sum_{\substack{t \leq T \\(t, f)=1}} \frac{\lambda\left(t ; \theta_{\boldsymbol{A}}\right)}{t}=K_{\boldsymbol{A}, f}(\log T)^{M_{\boldsymbol{A}}}+O_{\varepsilon}\left(\left(\left|\theta_{\boldsymbol{A}}\right| f\right)^{\varepsilon}\right)
$$

Proof. This follows from the discussion between the start of $\S 5.4$ and equation 5.21 in [San23].

Lemma 3.32. For all $(\boldsymbol{A}, \boldsymbol{M}) \in \Phi(T) \times \Psi_{\boldsymbol{A}}$ there exists a constant $0<Q_{\boldsymbol{A}}^{\prime}<_{\varepsilon}\left|\theta_{\boldsymbol{A}}\right|^{\varepsilon}$ for all $\varepsilon>0$ such that for $T>2$ we have

$$
S_{\boldsymbol{A}}(\mathbf{1}, T)=\left(Q_{\boldsymbol{A}}^{\prime}+O_{\varepsilon}\left(\frac{\left|\theta_{\boldsymbol{A}}\right|^{\varepsilon}}{(\log T)^{\frac{6}{5} M_{\boldsymbol{A}}}}\right)\right) \frac{T^{\frac{3}{2}}(\log T)^{3 M_{\boldsymbol{A}}}}{\left|\theta_{\boldsymbol{A}}\right|^{\frac{1}{2}}} .
$$

Proof. We adapt the proof of [San23, Lem. 5.12]. By Lemma 3.30 we have that $S_{\mathbf{A}}(\mathbf{1}, T)$ is equal to

$$
\sum_{\substack{\mathbf{f} \\
\left\lvert\, \begin{array}{l}
\mathbf{g} \\
\left|A_{i}\right| g_{i}^{2} u_{i}^{2} \prod_{j \neq i} \\
\left(m_{\mathbf{A}}, \prod_{i} \prod_{i} u_{i} g_{i}\right)=\left(f_{i j}, t_{i j}\right)=1 \\
f_{i j} t_{i j} \leq T
\end{array}\right.}} \sum_{i(\mathbf{f}, \mathbf{g})} \prod_{i<j} \lambda\left(f_{i j} ; \theta_{\mathbf{A}}\right) \lambda\left(t_{i j} ; \theta_{\mathbf{A}}\right)+O_{\varepsilon}\left(\frac{T^{\frac{3}{2}}(\log T)^{\frac{5}{2} M_{\mathbf{A}}}}{\left|\theta_{\mathbf{A}}\right|^{\frac{1}{2}-\varepsilon}}\right) .
$$

Since the summand does not depend on $u_{i}$, the contribution of the sum over any $u_{i}$ is

$$
\frac{\phi\left(m_{\mathbf{A}}\right) T^{\frac{1}{2}}}{m_{\mathbf{A}} g_{i}\left(\left|A_{i}\right| \prod_{j \neq i} f_{i j} t_{i j}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}}+O\left(\tau_{2}\left(m_{\mathbf{A}}\right)\right)
$$

where $\phi$ denotes Euler's totient function. Summing over $u_{2}, u_{1}$, and then $u_{0}$, the error term that arises is bounded by

$$
\ll \frac{\tau_{2}\left(m_{\mathbf{A}}\right) T}{\left|A_{1} A_{2}\right|^{\frac{1}{2}}} \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{f} \\\left|A_{i}\right| g_{i}^{2} \prod_{\mathbf{g}} \prod_{j \neq i} f_{i j} \\ f_{i j} t_{i j} \leq T \\\left(m_{\mathbf{A}}, \prod_{i} u_{i} g_{i}\right)=\left(f_{i j}, t_{i j}\right)=1}} \frac{|\kappa(\mathbf{f}, \mathbf{g})| g_{0} \prod_{k \neq 0} \sqrt{f_{0 k} t_{0 k}} \prod_{i<j} \lambda\left(f_{i j} ; \theta_{\mathbf{A}}\right) \lambda\left(t_{i j} ; \theta_{\mathbf{A}}\right)}{\prod_{i} g_{i} \prod_{j \neq i} f_{i j} t_{i j}} .
$$

Summing over $t_{01} \leq T / g_{0}^{2} t_{02} t_{03} \prod_{j \neq 0} f_{0 j}$ we obtain the upper bound

$$
\ll \frac{\tau_{2}\left(m_{\mathbf{A}}\right) T^{\frac{3}{2}}}{\left|\theta_{\mathbf{A}}\right|^{\frac{1}{2}}} \sum_{\mathbf{f}} \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{g} \\ t_{i j} \leq T}} \sum_{\substack{\left.\mathbf{t} \backslash t_{01}\right\}}} \frac{|\kappa(\mathbf{f}, \mathbf{g})| \prod_{i<j} \lambda\left(f_{i j} ; \theta_{\mathbf{A}}\right) \lambda\left(t_{i j} ; \theta_{\mathbf{A}}\right)}{\prod_{i} g_{i} \prod_{j \neq i} f_{i j} t_{i j}} .
$$

Summing over $t_{02}, t_{12} \leq T$, and using Lemma 3.31 we have obtain the upper bound

$$
<_{\varepsilon} \frac{T^{\frac{3}{2}}(\log T)^{3 M_{\mathbf{A}}}}{\left|\theta_{\mathbf{A}}\right|^{\frac{1}{2}-\varepsilon}} \sum_{\mathbf{f}} \sum_{\mathbf{g}} \frac{|\kappa(\mathbf{f}, \mathbf{g})|}{\prod_{i} g_{i} \prod_{j \neq i} f_{i j}},
$$

where we have used the divisor bound $\tau_{2}\left(m_{\mathbf{A}}\right)<_{\varepsilon}\left|\theta_{\mathbf{A}}\right|^{\varepsilon}$ and we have rescaled $\varepsilon>0$. Now by Lemma 3.29 we have that the sum over $\mathbf{f}$ and $\mathbf{g}$ is bounded by the sum of the absolute values of the summands defining $F(\mathbf{1}, \mathbf{1})$. In particular since $F$ converges absolutely at $(\mathbf{1}, \mathbf{1})$ this sum converges, and hence the error term is bounded by

$$
\lll \frac{T^{\frac{3}{2}}(\log T)^{3 M_{\mathbf{A}}}}{\left|\theta_{\mathbf{A}}\right|^{\frac{1}{2}-\varepsilon}}
$$

In particular summing over all $u_{i}$ we obtain

$$
\begin{align*}
S_{\mathbf{A}}(\mathbf{1}, T)= & \frac{\phi\left(m_{\mathbf{A}}\right)^{3} T^{\frac{3}{2}}}{m_{\mathbf{A}}^{3}\left|\theta_{\mathbf{A}}\right|^{\frac{1}{2}}} \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{f} \\
A_{i} g_{i}^{2} \prod_{\mathbf{g} \neq i} f_{i j} t_{i j} \leq T \\
\left(m_{\mathbf{A}}, \prod_{i} g_{i}\right)=\left(f_{i j}, t_{i j}\right)=1}} \frac{\kappa(\mathbf{f}, \mathbf{g}) \prod_{i<j} \lambda\left(f_{i j} ; \theta_{\mathbf{A}}\right) \lambda\left(t_{i j} ; \theta_{\mathbf{A}}\right)}{\prod_{i} g_{i} \prod_{j \neq i} f_{i j} t_{i j}} \\
& +O_{\varepsilon}\left(\frac{T^{\frac{3}{2}}(\log T)^{3 M_{\mathbf{A}}}}{\left|\theta_{\mathbf{A}}\right|^{\frac{1}{2}-\varepsilon}}\right) .
\end{align*}
$$

Now let

$$
\mathrm{R}_{\mathbf{A}}(T ; \mathbf{f}, \mathbf{g}):=\sum_{\substack{\mathbf{t} \\
A_{i} g_{i}^{2} \prod_{\begin{subarray}{c}{j \neq i} }} f_{i j} t_{i j} \leq T} \\
{\left(m_{\mathbf{A}}, \prod_{i} g_{i}\right)=\left(f_{i j}, t_{i j}\right)=1}\end{subarray}} \prod_{i<j} \frac{\lambda\left(t_{i j} ; \theta_{\mathbf{A}}\right)}{f_{i j} t_{i j}}, \text { and } \mathrm{R}_{\mathbf{A}}^{\prime}(T ; \mathbf{f}):=\sum_{\substack{\mathbf{t} \\
\prod_{\begin{subarray}{c}{i<j} }}^{\left(f_{i j} \leq t_{i j} \leq T\right.}}\end{subarray}} \prod_{i<j} \frac{\lambda\left(t_{i j} ; \theta_{\mathbf{A}}\right)}{t_{i j}} .
$$

Clearly that the difference of these sums is the subsum of $\mathrm{R}_{\mathbf{A}}^{\prime}(T ; \mathbf{f})$ defined by the additional condition that for each $i \in\{0,1,2\}$ we have

$$
\frac{T}{\left|A_{i}\right| g_{i}^{2} \prod_{j \neq i} f_{i j}} \leq \prod_{j \neq i} t_{i j} \leq T
$$

To evaluate this difference of sums we first sum over $t_{01}$ to obtain the upper bound

$$
\ll \log \left(\left|A_{0}\right| g_{0}^{2} \prod_{j \neq 0} f_{0 j}\right) \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{t} \backslash\left\{t_{01}\right\} \\ t_{i j} \leq T \\\left(f_{i j}, t_{i j}\right)=1}} \prod_{i<j} \frac{\lambda\left(t_{i j} ; \theta_{\mathbf{A}}\right)}{t_{i j}}
$$

Now summing over $t_{02}, t_{12} \leq T$ and using Lemma 3.31 we obtain the upper bound

$$
<_{\varepsilon} \log \left(\left|\theta_{\mathbf{A}}\right| \prod_{i} g_{i}^{2} \prod_{j \neq i} f_{i j}\right)\left|\theta_{\mathbf{A}}\right|^{2 \varepsilon}(\log T)^{2 M_{\mathbf{A}}}<_{\varepsilon}\left(\left|\theta_{\mathbf{A}}\right| \prod_{i} g_{i} \prod_{j \neq i} f_{i j}\right)^{3 \varepsilon}(\log T)^{2 M_{\mathbf{A}}}
$$

In particular we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{R}_{\mathbf{A}}(T ; \mathbf{f}, \mathbf{g})=\mathrm{R}_{\mathbf{A}}^{\prime}(T ; \mathbf{f})+O_{\varepsilon}\left(\left(\left|\theta_{\mathbf{A}}\right| \prod_{i} g_{i} \prod_{j \neq i} f_{i j}\right)^{3 \varepsilon}(\log T)^{2 M_{\mathbf{A}}}\right) \tag{3.19}
\end{equation*}
$$

Now consider $\mathbb{R}_{\mathbf{A}}^{\prime}(T ; \mathbf{f})$. Let $\hat{g_{i j}}, \hat{h_{i j}}, \hat{f_{i j}}: \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ be the functions given by

$$
\begin{gathered}
\hat{g_{i j}}(x):= \begin{cases}K_{\mathbf{A}, f_{i j}} \frac{d}{d x}(\log x)^{M_{\mathbf{A}}}, & \text { if } x \geq 1 \\
0, & \text { otherwise }\end{cases} \\
\hat{h_{i j}}(x):= \begin{cases}O_{\varepsilon}\left(\left(\left|\theta_{\mathbf{A}}\right| f_{i j}\right)^{\varepsilon}\right), & \text { if } \frac{1}{2} \leq x \leq 1 \\
0, & \text { otherwise }\end{cases} \\
\hat{f_{i j}}(x):= \begin{cases}\frac{\lambda\left(x ; \theta_{\mathbf{A}}\right)}{x}, & \text { if } x \geq 1 \\
0, & \text { otherwise }\end{cases}
\end{gathered}
$$

By Lemma 3.31 we may apply [San23, Lem. 4.17] to $\hat{g_{i j}}, \hat{h_{i j}}$ and $\hat{f_{i j}}$, and hence obtain

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{R}_{\mathbf{A}}^{\prime}(T ; \mathbf{f})= & \int_{1 \leq t_{i j}}^{\prod_{j \neq i} t_{i j} \leq T} \prod_{i<j} K_{\mathbf{A}, f_{i j} j} \frac{d}{d t_{i j}}\left(\log t_{i j}\right)^{M_{\mathbf{A}}} d t_{i j} \\
& +O_{\varepsilon}\left(\sum_{J \subsetneq\{0,1,2\}} \int_{0 \leq t_{i j}}^{\prod_{j \neq i} t_{i j} \leq T} \prod_{i, j \in J} \hat{g_{i j}}\left(t_{i j}\right) d t_{i j} \prod_{m, n \in\{0,1,2\} \backslash J} \hat{h_{i j}}\left(t_{i j}\right) d t_{m n}\right) .
\end{aligned}
$$

The integral within the error term can be bounded above by

$$
\prod_{i, j \in J} K_{\mathbf{A}, f_{i j}} \int_{1}^{4 T} \frac{d}{d t_{i j}}\left(\log t_{i j}\right)^{M_{\mathbf{A}}} d t_{i j} \prod_{m, n \in\{0,1,2\} \backslash J}\left(\left|\theta_{\mathbf{A}}\right| f_{m n}\right)^{\varepsilon} \int_{\frac{1}{2}}^{1} d t_{m n}
$$

Since $|J| \leq 2$ for any choice of $J$, we can bound this by

$$
\ll_{\varepsilon} O_{\varepsilon}\left(\left(\left|\theta_{\mathbf{A}}\right| \prod_{i<j} f_{i j}\right)^{3 \varepsilon}(\log T)^{2 M_{\mathbf{A}}}\right)
$$

Thus we have

$$
\begin{align*}
\mathrm{R}_{\mathbf{A}}^{\prime}(T ; \mathbf{f})= & \int_{1 \leq t_{i j}}^{\prod_{j \neq i} t_{i j} \leq T} \prod_{i<j} K_{\mathbf{A}, f_{i j}} \frac{d}{d t_{i j}}\left(\log t_{i j}\right)^{M_{\mathbf{A}}} d t_{i j} \\
& +O_{\varepsilon}\left(\left(\left|\theta_{\mathbf{A}}\right| \prod_{i<j} f_{i j}\right)^{3 \varepsilon}(\log T)^{2 M_{\mathbf{A}}}\right) \tag{3.20}
\end{align*}
$$

Now by making the change of variables $s_{i j}=\left(\frac{\log t_{i j}}{\log T}\right)^{M_{\mathbf{A}}}$, we have that the main term of (3.20) becomes

$$
\begin{equation*}
\prod_{i<j} K_{\mathbf{A}, f_{i j}}(\log T)^{3 M_{\mathbf{A}}} \int_{0 \leq s_{i j}}^{\sum_{j \neq i}\left(s_{i j}\right)^{\frac{1}{M_{\mathbf{A}}}} \leq 1} \prod_{i<j} d s_{i j} . \tag{3.21}
\end{equation*}
$$

In particular the integral is equal to some constant $0<L_{\mathbf{A}} \leq 1$. Therefore substituting (3.21) and (3.20) into (3.19) we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{R}_{\mathbf{A}}(T ; \mathbf{f}, \mathbf{g})=L_{\mathbf{A}} \prod_{i<j} K_{\mathbf{A}, f_{i j}}(\log T)^{3 M_{\mathbf{A}}}+O_{\varepsilon}\left(\left(\left|\theta_{\mathbf{A}}\right| \prod_{i} g_{i} \prod_{j \neq i} f_{i j}\right)^{3 \varepsilon}(\log T)^{2 M_{\mathbf{A}}}\right) \tag{3.22}
\end{equation*}
$$

Furthermore, substituting (3.22) into (3.18) we have that $S_{\mathbf{A}}(\mathbf{1}, T)$ is equal to

$$
\begin{gather*}
\frac{\phi\left(m_{\mathbf{A}}\right)^{3} L_{\mathbf{A}} T^{\frac{3}{2}}(\log T)^{3 M_{\mathbf{A}}}}{m_{\mathbf{A}}^{3}\left|\theta_{\mathbf{A}}\right|^{\frac{1}{2}}} \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{f} \\
A_{i} g_{i}^{2} \prod_{j \neq i} f_{i j} \leq T \\
\left(m_{\mathbf{A}}, \prod_{i} g_{i}\right)=1}} \frac{\kappa(\mathbf{f}, \mathbf{g}) \prod_{i<j} K_{\mathbf{A}, f_{i j}} \lambda\left(f_{i j} ; \theta_{\mathbf{A}}\right)}{\prod_{i} g_{i} \prod_{j \neq i} f_{i j}} \\
+O_{\varepsilon}\left(\frac{T^{\frac{3}{2}}(\log T)^{3 M_{\mathbf{A}}}}{\left|\theta_{\mathbf{A}}\right|^{\frac{1}{2}-\varepsilon}}+\frac{T^{\frac{3}{2}}(\log T)^{2 M_{\mathbf{A}}}}{\left|\theta_{\mathbf{A}}\right|^{\frac{1}{2}-\varepsilon}} \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{f} \\
A_{i} g_{i}^{2} \prod_{j \neq i} \\
\left(m_{\mathbf{A}}, \prod_{i} g_{i j} \leq T\right.}} \sum_{\substack{\text { g } \\
\left.g_{i}\right)=1}} \frac{\kappa(\mathbf{f}, \mathbf{g}) \prod_{i<j} K_{\mathbf{A}, f_{i j}} \lambda\left(f_{i j} ; \theta_{\mathbf{A}}\right)}{\prod_{i} g_{i}^{1-\varepsilon} \prod_{j \neq i} f_{i j}^{1-\varepsilon}}\right) . \tag{3.23}
\end{gather*}
$$

Now consider the sum

$$
\begin{equation*}
\sum_{\substack{\mathbf{f} \\ \sum_{\mathbf{g}}}} \frac{\kappa(\mathbf{f}, \mathbf{g}) \prod_{i<j} K_{\mathbf{A}, f_{i j}} \lambda\left(f_{i j} ; \theta_{\mathbf{A}}\right)}{\prod_{i} g_{i}^{1-\varepsilon} \prod_{j \neq i} f_{i j}^{1-\varepsilon}} . \tag{3.24}
\end{equation*}
$$

By Lemma 3.31 we have $K_{\mathbf{A}, f_{i j}} \leq K_{\mathbf{A}, 1} \ll_{\varepsilon}\left|\theta_{\mathbf{A}}\right|^{\varepsilon}$, and hence this is bounded above by

$$
<_{\varepsilon}\left|\theta_{\mathbf{A}}\right|^{3 \varepsilon} \sum_{\mathbf{f}} \sum_{\mathbf{g}} \frac{|\kappa(\mathbf{f}, \mathbf{g})|}{\prod_{i} g_{i}^{1-\varepsilon} \prod_{j \neq i} f_{i j}^{1-\varepsilon}}
$$

The above series is the sum of the absolute values of the summands defining $F(\mathbf{1}-\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}, \mathbf{1}-\boldsymbol{\varepsilon})$, and hence converges for sufficiently small $\varepsilon>0$. Since the sum in the leading term of (3.23) is clearly bounded above by (3.24) it also converges, and hence it is equal to some constant $0<F_{\mathbf{A}} \ll{ }_{\varepsilon}\left|\theta_{\mathbf{A}}\right|^{\varepsilon}$. Therefore substituting this constant into (3.23)) we obtain

$$
\frac{\phi\left(m_{\mathbf{A}}\right)^{3} T^{\frac{3}{2}}(\log T)^{3 M_{\mathbf{A}}}}{m_{\mathbf{A}}^{3}\left|\theta_{\mathbf{A}}\right|^{\frac{1}{2}}} F_{\mathbf{A}} L_{\mathbf{A}}+O_{\varepsilon}\left(\frac{T^{\frac{3}{2}}(\log T)^{\frac{5}{2} M_{\mathbf{A}}}}{\left|\theta_{\mathbf{A}}\right|^{\frac{1}{2}-\varepsilon}}\right) .
$$

Letting $Q_{\mathbf{A}}^{\prime}:=\phi\left(m_{\mathbf{A}}\right)^{3} F_{\mathbf{A}} L_{\mathbf{A}} / m_{\mathbf{A}}^{3}$ we obtain the result.
Proof of Lemma 3.12. Substituting Lemma 3.32 into (3.16) we obtain the result.

## 4. Uniform Formula

In the paper [KT04], the authors were able to calculate $\operatorname{Br} S_{\mathbf{a}} / \operatorname{Br} \mathbb{Q}$ for all choices of $\mathbf{a} \in\left(\mathbb{Q}^{\times}\right)^{3}$. In their method, they utilised the fact that $H^{3}\left(\mathbb{Q}, \overline{\mathbb{Q}}^{*}\right)=0$ and the exact sequence below which arises from the Hochschild-Serre spectral sequence

$$
0 \rightarrow \operatorname{Pic} S_{\mathbf{a}} \rightarrow\left(\operatorname{Pic} S_{\mathbf{a}, \overline{\mathbb{Q}}}\right)^{G} \rightarrow \operatorname{Br} \mathbb{Q} \rightarrow \operatorname{Br} S_{\mathbf{a}} \rightarrow \mathrm{H}^{1}\left(\mathbb{Q}, \operatorname{Pic} S_{\mathbf{a}, \overline{\mathbb{Q}}}\right) \xrightarrow{d_{S}^{1,1}} \mathrm{H}^{3}\left(\mathbb{Q}, \overline{\mathbb{Q}}^{*}\right),
$$

where $\overline{\mathbb{Q}}$ denotes an algebraic closure of $\mathbb{Q}$ and $G:=\operatorname{Gal}(\overline{\mathbb{Q}} / \mathbb{Q})$. Let $a_{0}, a_{1}, a_{2}$ be algebraically independent transcendental elements over $\mathbb{Q}$. In this section we consider the surface given by

$$
\mathcal{S}: a_{0} x_{0}^{4}+a_{1} x_{1}^{4}+a_{2} x_{2}^{4}=w^{2} \subseteq \mathbb{P}_{k}(1,1,1,2),
$$

defined over $k:=\mathbb{Q}\left(a_{0}, a_{1}, a_{2}\right)$. By [Uem16, Lem. 3.3] we have that $\mathrm{H}^{3}\left(k, \bar{k}^{*}\right)$ is non-trivial, and hence the same method cannot be used to calculate $\operatorname{Br} \mathcal{S} / \operatorname{Br} k$. Instead, we will prove the last differential map in the above exact sequence is injective and hence obtain Theorem 1.3:

Proof of Theorem 1.3. We adapt the methods used in $\S 6$ of [San23] to prove the differential map is injective. Firstly, we can calculate $\mathrm{H}^{1}\left(k, \operatorname{Pic} \mathcal{S}_{\bar{k}}\right)$ in exactly the same manner as $\mathrm{H}^{1}\left(\mathbb{Q}, \operatorname{Pic} S_{\overline{\mathbb{Q}}}\right)$ was calculated for the generic case in [KT04, Prop. 6]. In particular we have $\mathrm{H}^{1}\left(k, \operatorname{Pic} \mathcal{S}_{\bar{k}}\right)=\mathbb{Z} / 2 \mathbb{Z}$.

Let $U$ be the affine $k$-variety defined by the equation

$$
a_{0} x_{0}^{2}+a_{1} x_{1}^{2}+a_{2} x_{2}^{2}-1=0
$$

and let $X \subseteq \mathbb{P}_{k}^{3}$ denote the compactification of $U$ given by

$$
a_{0} x_{0}^{2}+a_{1} x_{1}^{2}+a_{2} x_{2}^{2}-t^{2}=0 .
$$

Consider the affine open $V:=\{\omega \neq 0\} \subseteq \mathcal{S}$. Then we get a morphism

$$
f: V \rightarrow U ;\left[x_{0}: x_{1}: x_{2}: \omega\right] \mapsto\left[x_{0}^{2}: x_{1}^{2}: x_{2}^{2}: \omega\right]
$$

where we are viewing $U$ inside $X$. Therefore by the functoriality of the Hochschild-Serre spectral sequence we obtain a commutative diagram

where by abuse of notation $\left.\cdot\right|_{V}$ and $f^{*}$ denote the maps on the first cohomology induced by the maps $\left.\right|_{V}: \operatorname{Pic} \mathcal{S}_{\bar{k}} \rightarrow \operatorname{Pic} V_{\bar{k}}$ and $f^{*}: \operatorname{Pic} U_{\bar{k}} \rightarrow \operatorname{Pic} V_{\bar{k}}$, respectively. Let $\gamma:=\sqrt{-\frac{a_{0}}{a_{1} a_{2}}}$. From the proof of Uem16, Prop. 2.2] we know that

$$
\mathrm{H}^{1}\left(k, \operatorname{Pic} U_{\bar{k}}\right) \cong \mathrm{H}^{1}\left(\operatorname{Gal}(k(\gamma) / k), \operatorname{Pic} U_{\bar{k}}\right) \cong \mathbb{Z} / 2 \mathbb{Z},
$$

where the first isomorphism is the inflation map. Furthermore, by [Uem16, Thm. 3.1] we know that $d_{U}^{1,1}$ is injective. Thus if we can find $\psi \in \mathrm{H}^{1}\left(k, \operatorname{Pic} \mathcal{S}_{\bar{k}}\right)$ such that $\left.\psi\right|_{V}=f^{*} \phi$ for some generator $\phi \in \mathrm{H}^{1}\left(k, \operatorname{Pic} U_{\bar{k}}\right)$, then by injectivity we have

$$
d_{\mathcal{S}}^{1,1}(\psi)=d_{V}^{1,1}\left(\left.\psi\right|_{V}\right)=d_{V}^{1,1}\left(f^{*} \phi\right)=d_{U}^{1,1}(\phi) \neq 0
$$

In particular, since $\mathrm{H}^{1}\left(k, \operatorname{Pic} \mathcal{S}_{\bar{k}}\right)=\mathbb{Z} / 2 \mathbb{Z}$ we would have that $d_{\mathcal{S}}^{1,1}$ is injective. Therefore to prove the result it suffices to find such $\psi$ and $\phi$.

Let $\alpha:=\sqrt{-\frac{a_{1}}{a_{0}}}$ and $\beta:=\alpha \gamma$. Let $\operatorname{Gal}(k(\gamma) / k)=<\sigma>$ and

$$
L_{1}:=\left\{x_{0}-\alpha x_{1}=x_{2}-\beta t=0\right\} \subseteq X_{\bar{k}}
$$

By Uem16, Cor. 2.3] the class of the 1-cocycle $\phi: \operatorname{Gal}(k(\gamma) / k) \rightarrow \operatorname{Pic} U_{\bar{k}}$ defined by

$$
\phi(1)=[0], \quad \phi(\sigma)=\left[L_{1}\right],
$$

generates $\mathrm{H}^{1}\left(\operatorname{Gal}(k(\gamma) / k), \operatorname{Pic} U_{\bar{k}}\right)$, where by abuse of notation $\left[L_{1}\right]$ denotes the class of $L_{1}$ on $U_{\bar{k}}$. Now let

$$
\hat{L_{1}}:=\left\{x_{0}^{2}+\alpha x_{1}^{2}=x_{2}^{2}+\beta \omega=0\right\} \subseteq \mathcal{S}_{\bar{k}},
$$

then by applying $f^{*}$ to $\phi$ we obtain the 1-cochain $f^{*} \phi: \operatorname{Gal}(k(\gamma) / k) \rightarrow \operatorname{Pic} V_{\bar{k}}$ defined by

$$
\phi(1)=[0], \quad \phi(\sigma)=\left[\hat{L}_{1} \cap V\right],
$$ where $\left[\hat{L}_{1} \cap V\right]$ denotes the class of the divisor associated to $\hat{L}_{1}$ on $V_{\bar{k}}$. Now let $\psi$ : $\operatorname{Gal}(k(\gamma) / k) \rightarrow \operatorname{Pic} \mathcal{S}_{\bar{k}}$ be the 1-cocycle defined by

$$
\psi(1)=[0], \quad \psi(\sigma)=\left[\hat{L_{1}}\right]-H
$$

where $H \in \operatorname{Pic} \mathcal{S}_{\bar{k}}$ is the hyperplane class. We claim that $\left[\hat{L}_{1}\right]$ is $\operatorname{Gal}(\bar{k} / k(\gamma))$-invariant and $\psi$ is a cochain. If these claims hold, then $[\psi] \neq 0 \in \mathrm{H}^{1}\left(\operatorname{Gal}(k(\gamma) / k),\left(\operatorname{Pic} \mathcal{S}_{\bar{k}}\right)^{\operatorname{Gal}(\bar{k} / k(\gamma))}\right)$. Thus since the inflation map is injective, we get a cochain $\inf (\psi) \neq 0 \in \mathrm{H}^{1}\left(k, \operatorname{Pic} \mathcal{S}_{\bar{k}}\right)$. Clearly $\left.\inf (\psi)\right|_{V}=f^{*} \inf (\phi)$, and hence our result holds if these claims hold.

We firstly prove $\left[\hat{L_{1}}\right]$ is $\operatorname{Gal}(\bar{k} / k(\gamma))$-invariant. For any element $\theta \in \operatorname{Gal}(\bar{k} / k(\gamma))$, we have $\theta \cdot\left[\hat{L_{1}}\right] \in\left\{\left[\hat{L_{1}}\right],\left[\hat{L_{1}^{\prime}}\right]\right\}$, where

$$
\hat{L_{1}^{\prime}}:=\left\{x_{0}^{2}-\alpha x_{1}^{2}=x_{2}^{2}-\beta \omega=0\right\} \subseteq S_{\bar{k}}
$$

Thus it suffices to prove $\left[\hat{L_{1}}\right]=\left[\hat{L_{1}^{\prime}}\right]$. Let $\alpha^{\prime}:=\sqrt{-\frac{a_{2}}{a_{0}}}$, then we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left[\hat{L}_{1}\right] \bigcup\left[\left\{x_{0}^{2}-\alpha^{\prime} x_{2}^{2}=\alpha x_{1}^{2}-\alpha^{\prime} \beta \omega=0\right\}\right] \subseteq\left[\left\{x_{0}^{2}-\alpha x_{1}^{2}-\alpha^{\prime} x_{2}^{2}+\alpha^{\prime} \beta \omega=0\right\}\right]=: X_{1} \tag{4.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

Substituting $\omega=\frac{-1}{\alpha^{\prime} \beta}\left(x_{0}^{2}-\alpha x_{1}^{2}-\alpha^{\prime} x_{2}^{2}\right)$ into $\mathcal{S}_{\bar{k}}$ gives the equation

$$
0=2\left(x_{0}-\sqrt{\alpha} x_{1}\right)\left(x_{0}+\sqrt{\alpha} x_{1}\right)\left(x_{0}-\sqrt{\alpha^{\prime}} x_{2}\right)\left(x_{0}+\sqrt{\alpha^{\prime}} x_{2}\right)
$$

In particular $X_{1}$ has the same 4 irreducible components as the left-side of (4.1), and hence they must be equal. Therefore

$$
\begin{equation*}
X_{1}=\left[\hat{L}_{1}\right]+\left[\left\{x_{0}^{2}-\alpha^{\prime} x_{2}^{2}=\alpha x_{1}^{2}-\alpha^{\prime} \beta \omega=0\right\}\right] \tag{4.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

By the same argument as above we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
X_{2}=\left[\hat{L}_{1}^{\prime}\right]+\left[\left\{x_{0}^{2}-\alpha^{\prime} x_{2}^{2}=\alpha x_{1}^{2}-\alpha^{\prime} \beta \omega=0\right\}\right] \tag{4.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

where

$$
X_{2}:=\left[\left\{x_{0}^{2}+\alpha x_{1}^{2}-\alpha^{\prime} x_{2}^{2}-\alpha^{\prime} \beta \omega=0\right\}\right] \in \operatorname{Pic} \mathcal{S}_{\bar{k}}
$$

Combining equations (4.2) and (4.3) gives the desired result.
We now prove $\psi$ is a cochain. Let

$$
\hat{L_{2}}:=\left\{x_{0}^{2}-\alpha x_{1}^{2}=x_{2}^{2}+\beta \omega=0\right\} \subseteq \mathcal{S}_{\bar{k}}
$$

Clearly we have

$$
\left[\left\{x_{0}^{2}-\alpha x_{1}^{2}=0\right\}\right]=\left[\hat{L_{1}}\right]+\left[\hat{L_{2}}\right] .
$$

Therefore since we have $\sigma\left[\hat{L_{1}}\right]=\left[\hat{L_{2}}\right]$, it follows that

$$
\left[\hat{L}_{1}\right]+\sigma\left[\hat{L}_{1}\right]=\left[\left\{x_{0}^{2}-\alpha x_{1}^{2}=0\right\}\right]=2 H
$$
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