Numerical Results for Waring's Problem in $\text{GF}[q, x]$

By William A. Webb

Abstract. Let $p$ be a prime and let $K$ and $A_i$ denote polynomials whose coefficients are elements of the finite field with $p$ elements. Problems concerning the expression of an arbitrary polynomial $K$ as sums of a small number of squares or cubes of polynomials $A_i$ are discussed. In the problems treated the degrees of the $A_i$ are restricted to be as small as possible. In particular, it is shown that at least five cubes are necessary and that three squares seem to suffice in all but one special case.

1. Introduction. Let $p$ be a prime, $q$ a power of $p$, and let $\text{GF}[q, x]$ denote the ring of polynomials having coefficients in the finite field of $q$ elements. Waring's problem in $\text{GF}[q, x]$ is essentially the problem of solving the equation

$$K = A_1^k + A_2^k + \cdots + A_s^k,$$

for all $K \in \text{GF}[q, x]$, where $A_i \in \text{GF}[q, x]$ and $s$ is fixed, depending only on $k$.

The general Waring's problem has been considered by Paley [8] and Webb [9], while the case of sums of squares ($k = 2$) has been extensively studied by Carlitz ([1], [2], [3], [4]), Cohen ([5], [6]), and Leahey [7].

There are actually many possible versions of Waring's problem, depending on the conditions placed on the $A_i$. The most important condition appears to be whether we restrict the degree of the $A_i$. The version in which the degree of $A_i^k$ is required to be at most the degree of $K$ (or as close as possible) in many ways is the most natural (see [9]), the most difficult, and the most interesting computationally. Although there are still many possible versions of Waring's problem, we will consider the following two equations.

(1.1) \[ K = A_1^k + A_2^k + \cdots + A_s^k : \deg A_i \leq \left[ \frac{\deg K - 1}{k} \right] + 1. \]

The condition on the degree of the $A_i$ is merely that they are as small as possible.

(1.2) \[ K = \delta_i A_i^k + \cdots + \delta_i A_i^k : \deg K = nk, \deg A_i = n, \delta_i \in \text{GF}(q), \delta_i \neq 0; \]

also the $A_i$ must be primary (having leading coefficient of 1) and $\sum \delta_i = \text{sgn } K$, where sgn $K$ denotes the leading coefficient of $K$. The solution of (1.2) in general implies the solution of (1.1) by taking the $\delta_i$ to be $k$th powers of $\text{GF}(q)$.

For a given $k$, it is known that the above equations are solvable for a fixed $s$, but it is not known what the smallest value of $s$ is for which they are solvable. In this paper, we give some numerical results which suggest what the best value for $s$ is, if $k = 2$, or 3.
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There is the further complication that we could ask for the smallest value of $s$, for which (1.1) and (1.2) are solvable for all $K$ and all $q = p^s$, or we insist that (1.1) and (1.2) be solvable only for $K$ of sufficiently large degree, and/or for $p$ sufficiently large. It should be noted that, if $k = 2$, it is clearly necessary to assume $p = 2$, and, if $k = 3$, that $p > 3$. Although the corresponding questions concerning Waring’s problem for the rational integers yield very different values for $s$, it appears quite possible that over $\mathbb{GF}(q, x)$ the values of $s$ may be equal most of the time. Hence, we define the following numbers.

\[
g(k) = \text{minimum } s \text{ for which (1.1) is solvable for all } K \text{ and all } p > k.
\]

\[
g(k) = \text{minimum } s \text{ for which (1.2) is solvable for all } K, \text{ all choices of the } \delta_i, \text{ and all } p > k.
\]

Generally, we should expect the largest necessary value of $s$ will occur when degree $K$ is small, and $q$ is small. Thus, we consider only $q = p$ where $p$ will be a small prime, and degree $K \leq k$, or $\deg K \leq 2k$.

2. Sums of Squares. We first prove a theorem which shows that both $g(2)$ and $\tilde{g}(2)$ are at least 3. Our result is an immediate consequence of the following theorem of Cohen [5, Theorem 10].

**Theorem 2.1.** If $\deg K = 2n$, $\deg A \leq n$, $\deg B \leq n$, then the number of solutions of $K = A^2 + B^2$ is

\[
(q - 1) \sum_{D \mid K; \deg D = n} 1 \quad \text{if } p \equiv 1 \pmod{4},
\]

\[
(q + 1) \sum_{i=0}^{2n} (-1)^i \sum_{D \mid K; \deg D = i} (-1)^i 1 \quad \text{if } p \equiv 3 \pmod{4},
\]

where $\sum'$ denotes a sum over primary polynomials.

**Theorem 2.2.** If $\deg K = 2n$, $\deg A \leq n$, $\deg B \leq n$, then $K = A^2 + B^2$ has a solution if and only if

(i) $K$ is divisible by some polynomial of degree $n$—if $p \equiv 1 \pmod{4}$.

(ii) Every irreducible polynomial of odd degree which divides $K$ appears in the factorization of $K$ to an even power—if $p \equiv 3 \pmod{4}$.

**Proof.** (i) follows trivially from (2.1).

(ii) follows from (2.2) since $K = aP_1 \cdots P_r$ implies

\[
\sum_{j=0}^{2n} (-1)^j \sum_{D \mid K; \deg D = i} 1 = \prod_{P_i \mid K; \deg P_i \text{ even}} \left( \sum_{i=0}^{a_i} 1 \right) \prod_{P_i \mid K; \deg P_i \text{ odd}} \left( \sum_{j=0}^{a_i} (-1)^j \right).
\]

Note that if $p \equiv 3 \pmod{4}$ the conditions on the solvability of $K = A^2 + B^2$ are the same even if no restriction is placed on the degrees of $A$ and $B$, while if $p \equiv 1 \pmod{4}$ the results are different [7].

We also note that Theorem 13 of [5] implies both (1.1) and (1.2) have solutions for $k = 2$ if $s = 4$. Thus, $3 \leq g(2) \leq 4$ and $3 \leq \tilde{g}(2) \leq 4$.

In what follows in this section, when we refer to Eqs. (1.1) and (1.2), we will assume $k = 2$ and $s = 3$. We conjecture that both equations are solvable, with one exception.
The exception is that (1.1) is in general not solvable in GF[3, x]. This exception is not too surprising since the sum of 3 nonzero squares in GF(3) must be zero making this a rather special case. The following result was established by generating all possible sums of squares of 3 polynomials of degree \( \leq 2 \).

**Theorem 2.3.** There are exactly eight polynomials \( K \) of degree \( \leq 4 \), for which (1.1) is unsolvable in GF[3, x], \( k = 2, s = 3 \); namely: \( x^3 + 2x + 1, 2x^3 + x + 1, x^4 + x + 1, x^4 + 2x + 1, x^4 + x^3 + 1, x^4 + 2x^3 + 1, x^4 + 2x^3 + x \) and \( x^4 + x^3 + 2x \).

It would be interesting to know whether there are polynomials \( K \) of arbitrarily high degree for which (1.1) is unsolvable in GF[3, x], or if (1.1) is always solvable if \( \deg K \) is sufficiently large.

It appears that for \( p \neq 3 \), (1.1) is solvable in GF[\( p, x \)] for all \( K \), and that the number of solutions grows quite rapidly. For example, (1.1) is solvable for all \( K \) such that degree \( K \leq 2 \) in both GF[5, x] and GF[7, x]. In GF[7, x], every such \( K \) is expressible in the form (1.1) in at least 42 ways (counting different orderings).

It also appears that (1.2) is always solvable. In the case where all \( \delta_i = 1 \), we have

**Theorem 2.4.** If all \( \delta_i = 1 \), then Eq. (1.2) is solvable for all \( K \) of degree 2 having leading coefficient 3 in GF[\( p, x \)] for \( p \leq 83 \), and for all \( K \) of degree 4 having leading coefficient 3 in GF[5, x] and GF[7, x], \( k = 2, s = 3 \).

The case \( p = 3 \) is of course not included in the above theorem since \( 1 + 1 + 1 = 0 \) in GF(3), and the leading coefficient of \( K \) must be nonzero. Although the average number of solutions of (1.2) grows larger as \( p \) increases, there are polynomials for which (1.2) has an essentially unique solution (not counting order). Some of these polynomials occur when \( p \) is large, for example in GF[83, x], although none occur in GF[79, x] or GF[73, x].

Cases other than all \( \delta_i = 1 \) have also been considered and, in all examples so far, (1.2) has been solvable for all \( K \), with \( s = 3 \).

3. Sums of Cubes. Although the results in [9] imply that both (1.1) and (1.2) are solvable for every \( k \) and for a fixed \( s \) depending only on \( k \), the bounds obtained for \( s \) are clearly far from the best possible.

In this section, we will treat sums of cubes, and so, from now on, we assume \( k = 3 \) in (1.1) and (1.2). The amount of computation necessary to obtain a reasonable amount of numerical evidence for the cases \( k \geq 4 \) appears to be excessive.

**Theorem 3.1.** There are 336 polynomials \( K \) of degree 3 for which (1.1) is not solvable with \( k = 3, s = 4 \) in GF[7, x]. However, (1.1) is solvable for all \( K \) of degree 3 with \( k = 3, s = 4 \) in GF[5, x].

Theorem 3.1 implies that \( g(3) \geq 5 \), and it would seem reasonable to conjecture that \( g(3) \) may equal 5, although the evidence for this is still scanty.

**Theorem 3.2.** There are 14 polynomials of the form \( K = 6x^3 + ax^2 + bx + c \) for which (1.2) is unsolvable with \( k = 3, s = 6 \), and all \( \delta_i = 1 \) in GF[7, x]. However, (1.2) is solvable for all such \( K \), \( k = 3, s = 6 \), all \( \delta_i = 1 \) in GF[\( p, x \)] for \( p = 5, 11, 13 \).

Theorem 3.2 implies that \( g(3) \geq 7 \) and it appears likely that \( g(3) = 7 \). Cases other than all \( \delta_i = 1 \) have been considered, and, in these examples, (1.2) was solvable with \( s = 6 \). It is possible that (1.2) may be solvable with \( s = 6 \) with only finitely many exceptions.
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