ON EXTREMAL POLYNOMIALS

Kenneth S. Williams

(received April 9, 1967)

Let p denote a prime number and let k_p denote the finite field of p elements. Let $f(x) \varepsilon k_p[x]$ be of fixed degree $d \geq 2$. We suppose that p is also fixed, large compared with d, say, $p \geq p_o(d)$. By $V(f)$ we denote the number of distinct values of $f(x)$, $x \varepsilon k_p$. We call f maximal[1] if $V(f) = p$ and quasi-maximal[2] if $V(f) = p + O(1)$. Clearly a maximal polynomial is quasi-maximal but it is not known under what conditions the converse holds. As $dV(f) \geq p$, the minimum possible value of $V(f)$ is $\geq [\frac{p-1}{d}] + 1$. When $f(x) = x^d$ and $p \equiv 1 \pmod d$, $V(f) = \frac{p-1}{d} + 1$, so $[\frac{p-1}{d}] + 1$ is in fact the actual minimum. If $V(f) = [\frac{p-1}{d}] + 1$ we call f a minimal polynomial and if $V(f) = \frac{p}{d} + O(1)$ a quasi-minimal polynomial. Clearly a minimal polynomial is a quasi-minimal polynomial and Mordell has noted in an addendum to [7] that the converse is true for $p \geq p_o(d)$. It seems reasonable to conjecture that a quasi-maximal polynomial is maximal for $p \geq p_o(d)$.

It is the purpose of this paper to generalize the ideas of quasi-maximal and quasi-minimal. We set

$$(1) \qquad f^*(x, y) = \frac{f(x) - f(y)}{x-y}$$

---

[1] Dickson [6] calls such a polynomial a substitution polynomial.

[2] We shall see later that these are the exceptional polynomials of Davenport and Lewis [5]. (See Corollary 1 and Theorem 2.)

Canad. Math. Bull. vol. 10, no. 4, 1967

https://doi.org/10.4153/CMB-1967-057-8 Published online by Cambridge University Press

and call $f(x)$ an extremal polynomial of index ℓ if, in the (unique) decomposition of $f^*(x, y)$ into irreducible factors in $k_p[x, y]$, there are ℓ linear factors and no non-linear absolutely irreducible factors. Clearly $0 \leq \ell \leq d-1$. For example, $f(x) = x^4$ is extremal of index 1 when $p \equiv 3 \pmod 4$ since

$$\frac{x^4 - y^4}{(x-y)(x+y)} = x^2 + y^2$$

is irreducible but not absolutely irreducible. When $p \equiv 1 \pmod 4$ there exists $w \in k_p$ such that $w^2 = -1$ so that

$$\frac{x^4 - y^4}{x-y} = (x+y)(x+wy)(x-wy) ;$$

hence $f(x) = x^4$ is extremal of index 3 in this case. On the other hand, $f(x) = x^3 + x$ is not an extremal polynomial as

$$\frac{(x^3+x) - (y^3+y)}{x-y} = x^2+xy+y^2+1$$

is absolutely irreducible in $k_p[x, y]$ for any prime $p > 3$.

THEOREM 1. If $f(x)$ is extremal of index ℓ then

$$V(f) = \frac{p}{\ell + 1} + O(1) .$$

Proof. As $f(x)$ is extremal of index ℓ we can write

$$f^*(x, y) = \prod_{i=1}^{\ell} g_i(x, y) \prod_{j=1}^{m} h_j(x, y) ,$$

where each $g_i(x, y)$ is linear so that ℓ (possibly 0) is the index of f and each $h_j(x, y)$ is irreducible but not absolutely irreducible in $k_p[x, y]$. Clearly no two of $g_1, g_2, \ldots, g_\ell$ are associates and none is associated with $(x-y)$. Let

https://doi.org/10.4153/CMB-1967-057-8 Published online by Cambridge University Press

$$g_i(x, y) = a_i x + b_i y + c_i \qquad (i = 1, 2, \ldots, \ell)$$

and suppose that some $a_i = 0$. Then

$$f(x) - f(y) = (x-y)(b_i y + c_i) g(x, y)$$

for some $g(x, y) \in k_p[x, y]$. Now $b_i \neq 0$, otherwise g_i would not be linear, so on taking $y = -c_i/b_i$ we have

$$f(x) = f(-c_i/b_i) = \text{constant},$$

contradicting $d \geq 2$. Hence no $a_i = 0$ and similarly no $b_i = 0$. Set $a = \prod_{i=1}^{\ell} a_i$, $d_i = b_i/a_i$ and $e_i = c_i/a_i$ so that

$$f^*(x, y) = a \prod_{i=1}^{\ell} (x + d_i y + e_i) \prod_{j=1}^{m} h_j(x, y).$$

Now let N_r $(r = 2, 3, \ldots, d)$ denote the number of solutions of

$$f(x_1) = f(x_2) = \ldots = f(x_r)$$

with $x_i \neq x_j$ $(i \neq j,\ 1 \leq i,\ j \leq r)$. This system has the same number of solutions as the system

$$f^*(x_1, x_2) = f^*(x_1, x_3) = \ldots = f^*(x_1, x_r) = 0$$

i.e., $$\prod_{i=1}^{\ell} (x_1 + d_i x_2 + e_i) \prod_{j=1}^{m} h_j(x_1, x_2) = \ldots$$

$$= \prod_{i=1}^{\ell} (x_1 + d_i x_r + e_i) \prod_{j=1}^{m} h_j(x_1, x_r) = 0$$

with $x_i \neq x_j$ $(i \neq j,\ 2 \leq i,\ j \leq r)$. Now it is known (see for example [1]) that if $f(x, y) \in k_p[x, y]$ is irreducible but not absolutely irreducible then $f(x, y) = 0$ has $O(1)$ solutions. Hence N_r

differs from the number N'_r of solutions, with $x_i \neq x_j$ $(i \neq j,\ 2 \leq i,\ j \leq r)$, of

$$\prod_{i=1}^{\ell} (x_1 + d_i x_2 + e_i) = \ldots = \prod_{i=1}^{\ell} (x_1 + d_i x_r + e_i) = 0$$

by only $O(1)$. Since for any i and j with $i \neq j$, $1 \leq i,\ j \leq \ell$

$$x_1 + d_i y + e_i = x_1 + d_j y + e_j = 0$$

has 0 or 1 solutions (g_i, g_j are not associates)

$$N'_r = \sum_{1 \leq i_2, \ldots, i_r \leq \ell} N(i_2, i_3, \ldots, i_r) + O(1),$$

where $N(i_2, i_3, \ldots, i_r)$ denotes the number of solutions of

(2) $$x_1 + d_{i_2} x_2 + e_{i_2} = \ldots = x_1 + d_{i_r} x_r + e_{i_r} = 0$$

with $x_i \neq x_j$ $(i \neq j,\ 2 \leq i,\ j \leq r)$. Now

$$x_1 + d_{i_m} x_m + e_{i_m} = x_1 + d_{i_n} x_n + e_{i_n} = 0$$

with $i_m = i_n$ gives $x_m = x_n$ so

$$N'_r = \sum_{\substack{1 \leq i_2, \ldots, i_r \leq \ell \\ i_m \neq i_n \\ m \neq n \\ 2 \leq m,\ n \leq r}} N(i_2, \ldots, i_r) + O(1).$$

Let $N'(i_2, \ldots, i_r)$ denote the number of solutions of (2) without the conditions $x_i \neq x_j$ $(i \neq j,\ 2 \leq i,\ j \leq r)$. As

$$x_1 + d_{i_k} x_k + e_{i_k} = 0 \qquad (2 \leq k \leq r)$$

https://doi.org/10.4153/CMB-1967-057-8 Published online by Cambridge University Press

has one solution x_k for each x_1,

$$N'(i_2, i_3, \ldots, i_r) = p .$$

Now, as the number of solutions of

$$\begin{cases} x_1 + d_{i_m} x_m + e_{i_m} = x_1 + d_{i_n} x_n + e_{i_n} = 0 \\ x_m = x_n \end{cases}$$

(where $m \neq n$, $2 \leq m, n \leq r$) is 0 or 1,

$$N(i_2, \ldots, i_r) = N'(i_2, \ldots, i_r) + O(1)$$

giving

$$N_r = p \sum_{\substack{1 \leq i_2, \ldots, i_r \leq \ell \\ i_m \neq i_n \\ m \neq n \\ 2 \leq m, n \leq r}} 1 + O(1)$$

$$= \ell(\ell-1) \ldots (\ell-(r-2))p + O(1) .$$

Now let $M_r (r = 1, 2, \ldots, d)$ denote the number of $y \varepsilon k_p$ for which the equation $f(x) = y$ has precisely r distinct roots in k_p. Then

(3) $$V(f) = \sum_{r=1}^{d} M_r , \quad p = \sum_{r=1}^{d} rM_r$$

and

(4) $$N_r = \sum_{s=r}^{d} s(s-1) \ldots (s-(r-1))M_s \qquad (r = 2, 3, \ldots, d) .$$

https://doi.org/10.4153/CMB-1967-057-8 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Thus

$$\sum_{r=2}^{d} (-1)^r \frac{N_r}{r!} = \sum_{s=2}^{d} \Big\{ \sum_{r=2}^{s} \frac{(-1)^r}{r!} \; s(s-1) \ldots (s-(r-1)) \Big\} M_s$$

$$= \sum_{s=2}^{d} \{(1-1)^s - (1-s)\} M_s$$

$$= \sum_{s=1}^{d} (s-1) M_s$$

$$= p - V(f)$$

so that

$$V(f) = p - \sum_{r=2}^{d} (-1)^r \frac{N_r}{r!}$$

$$= p - p \sum_{r=2}^{d} \frac{(-1)^r}{r!} \; \ell(\ell-1) \ldots (\ell-(r-2)) + O(1)$$

$$= p\Big\{1 - \sum_{r=2}^{\ell+1} \frac{(-1)^r}{r!} \; \ell(\ell-1) \ldots (\ell-(r-2))\Big\} + O(1)$$

$$= \frac{p}{\ell+1} \sum_{r=1}^{\ell+1} (-1)^{r-1} \binom{\ell+1}{r} + O(1)$$

$$= \frac{p}{\ell+1} \{1-(1-1)^{\ell+1}\} + O(1)$$

$$= \frac{p}{\ell+1} + O(1)$$

as required.

COROLLARY 1. If $f(x)$ is extremal of index 0 then f is quasi-maximal.

COROLLARY 2. If $f(x)$ is extremal of index $d-1$ then f is quasi-minimal.

https://doi.org/10.4153/CMB-1967-057-8 Published online by Cambridge University Press

We now prove the converses of corollaries 1 and 2.

THEOREM 2. If $f(x)$ is quasi-maximal then $f(x)$ is extremal of index 0.

Proof. As $f(x)$ is quasi-maximal

$$V(f) = p + O(1) .$$

Set $M = M_2 + \ldots + M_d$ so that from (3) we have

$$M_1 + M = p + O(1), \quad M_1 + 2M \leq p .$$

Eliminating M_1 we have $M = O(1)$ so that each $M_i (i \geq 2)$ is $O(1)$. Hence $N_2 = O(1)$. Now if $f^*(x, y)$ has t absolutely irreducible factors (linear or non-linear) in $k_p[x, y]$ then by a result of Lang and Weil (see for example Lemma 8 in [4]), $f^*(x, y) = 0$ has $tp + O(p^{1/2})$ solutions. Hence $t = 0$ as required.

THEOREM 3. If $f(x)$ is quasi-minimal then $f(x)$ is extremal of index $d-1$.

Proof. This was proved by Mordell in [7].

Finally we calculate the number $V_n(f)$ of residues of an extremal polynomial in the sequence $1, 2, \ldots, h$, where $h \leq p$. (Here we are identifying the elements of k_p with the residues $1, 2, \ldots, p \pmod p$.) We require a lemma.

LEMMA. If $f(x)$ is an extremal polynomial of index ℓ then, for $r = 2, \ldots, d$,

$$\sum_{\substack{x_1, \ldots, x_r = 0 \\ x_i \neq x_j \ (i \neq j) \\ f(x_1) = \ldots = f(x_r)}}^{p-1} e(tf(x_r)) = O(p^{1/2}) ,$$

uniformly in $t \neq 0$, the implied constant depending only on d. ($e(u)$ denotes $\exp(2\pi i u/p)$).

https://doi.org/10.4153/CMB-1967-057-8 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Proof. From the proof of the estimation of N_r in Theorem 1 we see that

$$\sum_{\substack{x_1, \ldots, x_r = 0 \\ x_i \neq x_j \ (i \neq j) \\ f(x_1) = \ldots = f(x_r)}}^{p-1} e(tf(x_r)) = \sum_{\substack{1 \leq i_2, \ldots, i_r \leq \ell \\ i_m \neq i_n \\ m \neq n \\ 2 \leq m,\, n \leq r}} \Big| \sum_{\substack{x_1 + d_{i_2} x_2 + e_{i_2} \\ = \ldots \\ = x_1 + d_{i_r} x_r + e_{i_r} \\ = 0}} e(tf(x_r)) \Big| + O(1)$$

$$= O\{ \sum_{x_r = 0}^{p-1} e(tf(x_r)) \}$$

$$= O(p^{1/2}) ,$$

by a deep result of Carlitz and Uchiyama [3].

THEOREM 4. If $f(x)$ is an extremal polynomial of index ℓ the number $V_h(f)$ of residues of $f(x)$ (mod p) in the set $\{1, 2, \ldots, h\}$ is given by

$$\frac{h}{\ell + 1} + O(p^{1/2} \log p) .$$

Proof. Let $N_r(h)$ $(r = 2, 3, \ldots, d)$ denote the number of solutions of

$$f(x_1) = f(x_2) = \ldots = f(x_r) = y$$

with $y \in \{1, 2, \ldots, h\}$ and $x_i \neq x_j$ $(i \neq j)$. Then

$$N_r(h) = \sum_{y=1}^{h} \sum_{x_1, \ldots, x_r}' 1 ,$$

where the dash (') denotes summation over $x_1, \ldots, x_r$ satisfying $x_i \neq x_j$ $(i \neq j)$ and $f(x_1) = \ldots = f(x_r) = y$. Thus

$$pN_r(h) = \sum_{y=1}^{p} \sum_{x_1,\ldots,x_r}' \sum_{z=1}^{h} \sum_{t=1}^{p} e(t(y-z))$$

$$= h \sum_{y=1}^{p} \sum_{x_1,\ldots,x_r}' 1 + \sum_{t=1}^{p-1} \{\sum_{y=1}^{p} \sum_{x_1,\ldots,x_r}' e(ty)\}$$

$$\times \{\sum_{z=1}^{h} (-tz)\}$$

$$= hN_r + O(p^{1/2} \cdot p \log p) ,$$

by the lemma and the familiar result

$$\sum_{t=1}^{p-1} \left| \sum_{z=1}^{h} e(-tz) \right| \leq p \log p .$$

Hence appealing toTheorem 1 we obtain

$$N_r(h) = \ell(\ell-1) \ldots (\ell-(r-2))h + O(p^{1/2} \log p) .$$

Now if $M_r(h)$ $(r = 1, 2, \ldots, d)$ denotes the number of $y \in \{1, 2, \ldots, h\}$ for which the equation $f(x) = y$ has precisely r distinct roots in k_p we have

$$V_h(f) = \sum_{r=1}^{d} M_r(h)$$

and

$$\sum_{r=1}^{d} rM_r(h) = h + O(p^{1/2} \log p).$$

The first of these is obvious and the second is due to Mordell [8]. Corresponding to (4) we have

$$N_r(h) = \sum_{s=r}^{d} s(s-1) \ldots (s-(r-1))M_s(h)$$

and the rest of the proof is the same as in Theorem 1 with $V_h(f)$, $M_r(h)$, $N_r(h)$, h replacing $V(f)$, M_r, N_r, p respectively. This proves a conjecture of the author [9] in the case of extremal polynomials. When the index ℓ is ≥ 1 it shows that the least positive non-residue of $f(x) \pmod p$ is $O(p^{1/2} \log p)$. This has been proved for more general polynomials, without obtaining an asymptotic formula for $V_h(f)$, by Bombieri and Davenport [2], using the recent work of Bombieri on the L-functions corresponding to multiple exponential sums.

REFERENCES

1. B.J. Birch and D.J. Lewis, $\mathfrak{p}$-adic forms. Jour. Indian Math. Soc., 23 (1959), 11-32.

2. E. Bombieri and H. Davenport, On two problems of Mordell. Amer. J. Math., 88 (1966), 61-70.

3. L. Carlitz and S. Uchiyama, Bounds for exponential sums. Duke Math. Jour., 24 (1957), 37-41.

4. J.H.H. Chalk and K.S. Williams, The distribution of solutions of congruences. Mathematika, 12 (1965), 176-192.

5. H. Davenport and D.J. Lewis, Notes on congruences I. Quart. J. Math. Oxford (2), 14 (1963), 51-60.

6. L.E. Dickson, Linear groups. Dover Publications, Inc., N.Y. (1958), 54-64.

7. L.J. Mordell, A congruence problem of E.G. Straus. Jour. Lond. Math. Soc., 38 (1963), 108-110.

8. L.J. Mordell, On the least residue and non-residue of a polynomial. Jour. Lond. Math. Soc., 38 (1963), 451-453.

9. K.S. Williams, The distribution of the residues of a quartic polynomial. To appear in the Glasgow Math. Jour.

Carleton University, Ottawa