PERMUTATIONS, HYPERPLANES AND POLYNOMIALS OVER FINITE FIELDS

ANDRÁS GÁCS, TAMÁS HÉGER, ZOLTÁN LÓRÁNT NAGY, AND DÖMÖTÖR PÁLVÖLGYI

Abstract. Starting with a result in combinatorial number theory we prove that (apart from a couple of exceptions that can be classified), for any elements $a_1, \dots, a_n$ of $GF(q)$, there are distinct field elements $b_1, \dots, b_n$ such that $a_1b_1 + \cdots + a_nb_n = 0$. This implies the classification of hyperplanes lying in the union of the hyperplanes $X_i = X_j$ in a vector space over $GF(q)$, and also the classification of those multisets for which all reduced polynomials of this range are of reduced degree $q-2$. The proof is based on the polynomial method.

1. Introduction

This paper is devoted to a result formulated in three different terminologies. We start with a result in combinatorial number theory which might resemble Snevily's conjecture [10]. Then we derive two consequences (which are essentially equivalent to the original result), one about the range of polynomials over a finite field, and one about hyperplanes in a vector space over a finite field fully lying in the union of certain fixed hyperplanes.

Although perhaps the consequence about the range of polynomials solves a more natural question (and raises interesting open problems), our proof is most easily formulated in the additive combinatorial terminology, so we start with this result. It was motivated by a result of Stéphane Vinatier [11].

Theorem 1.1. *Suppose $\{a_1, a_2, \dots, a_p\}$ is a multiset in the finite field $GF(p)$, p prime. Then after a suitable permutation of the indices, either $\sum_i ia_i = 0$, or $a_1 = a_2 = \cdots = a_{p-2} = a$, $a_{p-1} = a + b$, $a_p = a - b$ for some field elements a and b, $b \neq 0$.*

In the paper [11] Vinatier proves a similar result (though with a slightly different terminology) with the extra assumption that $a_1, \dots, a_p$, when considered as integers, satisfy $a_1 + \cdots + a_p = p$.

Before going further, let us recall that Snevily's conjecture states that for any abelian group G of odd order (written multiplicatively), and positive integer $n \leq |G|$, for any sets $\{a_1, \dots, a_n\}$ and $\{b_1, \dots, b_n\}$ of elements of G, there is a permutation π of the indices, such that the elements $a_1b_{\pi(1)}$, $a_2b_{\pi(2)}$, $\dots$,$a_nb_{\pi(n)}$ are different. Alon proved this for groups of prime degree [2] and later Dasgupta, Károlyi, Serra and Szegedy [6] for cyclic groups. Alon's result is in fact more general: he only assumes that $\{a_1, \dots, a_n\}$ is a multiset. Let us remark that if this general version was true for cyclic groups (it is obviously not), then there would be no exception in Theorem 1.1, and the proof would easily follow from this general version.

Date: 9 February 2009.

The authors were supported by OTKA grants T 67867, T 049662 and Bolyai scholarship.

Theorem 1.1 will follow from the following more general result, where p is replaced by an arbitrary prime power q.

THEOREM 1.2. *Suppose $\{a_1, a_2, \dots, a_q\}$ is a multiset in the finite field $GF(q)$. There are no distinct field elements $b_1, b_2, \dots, b_q$ such that $\sum_i a_i b_i = 0$ if and only if after a suitable permutation of the indices, $a_1 = a_2 = \cdots = a_{q-2} = a$, $a_{q-1} = a + b$, $a_q = a - b$ for some field elements a and b, $b \neq 0$.*

Note that if we let $q = p$, p prime in Theorem 1.2, then we get Theorem 1.1 (since q different elements are in fact all the elements in some permutation).

We may formulate it in a more general form which follows easily from the $n = q$ case.

COROLLARY 1.3. *Suppose $\{a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n\}$ is a multiset in the finite field $GF(q)$, with $n \leq q$. Then one can find distinct field elements $b_1, b_2, \dots, b_n$ such that $\sum_i a_i b_i = 0$, unless one of the following holds:*

(i) *$n = q$ and after a suitable permutation of the indices, $a_1 = a_2 = \cdots = a_{q-2} = a$, $a_{q-1} = a + b$, $a_q = a - b$ for some field elements a and b, $b \neq 0$.*
(ii) *$n = q-1$, and after a suitable permutation of the indices, $a_1 = a_2 = \cdots = a_{q-2} = a$, $a_{q-1} = 2a$ for a field element $a \neq 0$.*
(iii) *$n < q-1$ and after a suitable permutation of the indices, $a_1 = a_2 = \cdots = a_{n-2} = 0$, $a_{n-1} = b$, $a_n = -b$ for a field element $b \neq 0$.*
(iiii) *$n = q - 2$, q is even, and after a suitable permutation of the indices, $a_1 = a_2 = \cdots = a_{n-2} = a$ for a field element $a \neq 0$.*

Proof. If $n < q$, then extend the set of a_is to a set of size q with $a_{n+1} = \cdots = a_q = 0$, then apply the theorem. □

In Sections 2 and 3 we derive two consequences of Theorem 1.2. The proof of the theorem will be given in Section 4. Finally, Section 5 is devoted to remarks and open problems.

We end this introduction with recalling Lucas' theorem and Alon's Combinatorial Nullstellensatz.

Lucas' theorem tells how binomial coefficients behave modulo a prime p. Let the p-adic expansion of n and k be $n = \sum_{i=1}^{r} n_i p^{i-1}$ and $k = \sum_{i=1}^{r} k_i p^{i-1}$, respectively. Then $\binom{n}{k} \equiv \binom{n_1}{k_1} \cdots \binom{n_r}{k_r}$ modulo p. For a proof, see [8]. We will use this often without explicitly referring to it.

Alon's Combinatorial Nullstellensatz [1] states that if a polynomial vanishes for all substitutions on the direct product of certain sets, then it is in a certain ideal. This can be interpreted as a consequence of a division algorithm for multivariate polynomials [4]. We will only use the following particular case:

THEOREM 1.4. *If a polynomial $G(Y_1, \dots, Y_k)$ over the finite field $GF(q)$ vanishes for all substitutions, then it can be written in the following form:*

$$G(Y_1, \dots, Y_k) = (Y_1^q - Y_1) f_1 + \cdots + (Y_k^q - Y_k) f_k,$$

where the f_is are polynomials in $Y_1, \dots, Y_k$ of degree at most $\deg(G) - q$.

Finally, let us recall that for any finite field $GF(q)$, $\sum_{x\in GF(q)} x^k = 0$ when $1 \le k \le q-2$, and $\sum x^{q-1} = -1$.

2. A result about polynomials of prescribed range

In this section we give another formulation of Theorem 1.2. Although it might seem to be a consequence, it is essentially equivalent to the original result.

Before explaining the problem to be solved, recall that over the finite field $GF(q)$ any function can be uniquely represented by a polynomial of degree at most $q-1$. The degree of such a polynomial is called the *reduced degree* of the polynomial (function). Before stating our result, let us state a lemma, which can be easily proved using the fact mentioned at the end of the introduction.

Lemma 2.1. *Suppose $f(x) = c_{q-1}x^{q-1} + \cdots + c_0$ is a polynomial over $GF(q)$. Then $\sum_x f(x) = -c_{q-1}$ and $\sum_x xf(x) = -c_{q-2}$.*

For a multiset M of size q of field elements we say that M is the *range* of the polynomial f if $M = \{f(x) : x \in GF(q)\}$ as a multiset (that is, not only values, but also multiplicities need to be the same). Suppose we have a multiset M and wish to find a low degree polynomial with range M. By Lemma 2.1, if the sum of elements of M is not zero, then every reduced polynomial of this range will have reduced degree $q-1$ and vice versa, if the sum is zero, then a reduced polynomial of range M will automatically have degree at most $q-2$.

Theorem 2.2. *Let $M = \{a_1, \ldots, a_q\}$ be a multiset in $GF(q)$, with $a_1 + \cdots + a_q = 0$. There is no polynomial with range M of reduced degree at most $q-3$ if and only if M consists of $q-2$ a-s, one $a+b$ and one $a-b$ for field elements a and b, $b \neq 0$.*

Proof. By Lemma 2.1, polynomials with range M have reduced degree $q-1$ if and only if $\sum a_i \neq 0$. Since $\sum a_i = 0$, the second statement of Lemma 2.1 shows that a polynomial f with range M has reduced degree at most $q-3$ if and only if $\sum_x xf(x) = 0$.

On the other hand, there is a bijection between polynomials with range M and the ordered sets $(b_1, \ldots, b_q)$ (that is, permutations) of $GF(q)$: a permutation corresponds to the function $f(b_i) = a_i$. Under this correspondence the condition $\sum_x xf(x) = 0$ translates to $\sum a_i b_i = 0$. Hence our claim follows from Theorem 1.2.

□

Though the statement of the above theorem looks very innocent, it seems that one needs the whole machinery of Section 4 for the proof. After this result, the natural question is to look for polynomials of degree lower than $q-3$ with prescribed range. This seems to be a very difficult problem.

One might conjecture that the only reason for a multiset (with sum equal to zero) not to be the range a polynomial of degree less than $q-k$ is that there is a value of multiplicity at least $q-k$. (Note that a value of mutiplicity $m \le q-1$ in the range guarantees that any polynomial of this range has degree at least m, since the corresponding reduced polynomial f is such that $f-a$ has m roots in $GF(q)$). We will get back to this in Section 5.

3. A consequence about hyperplanes of a vector space over $GF(q)$

In this section we prove a result about vector spaces over finite fields, which is again essentially equivalent to Theorem 1.2

Let q denote a prime power and denote by V the vector space of dimension n over the finite field $GF(q)$ consisting of all n-tuples $(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n)$. Finally, denote by H_{ij} the hyperplane with equation $x_i = x_j$ $(i \neq j)$. We are interested in hyperplanes fully contained in $\cup_{i\neq j} H_{ij}$. Note that if $n > q$, then by the pigeon-hole principle the whole space is contained in this union, so the problem is non-trivial only for $n \leq q$. Our main result is the following.

Theorem 3.1. *Suppose $n \leq q$ and $H \subseteq \cup_{i\neq j} H_{ij}$ is a hyperplane in V, $H \neq H_{ij}$ for any $i \neq j$. Then one of the following holds:*

(i) *$n = q$, $H = \{(x_1, \dots, x_n) : c(x_j - x_k) + \sum_i x_i = 0\}$ for a field element $c \neq 0$ and indices $j \neq k$;*
(ii) *$n = q - 1$, $H = \{(x_1, \dots, x_n) : x_j + \sum_i x_i = 0\}$ for an index j.*

Proof. Let $H =< (a_1, \dots, a_n) >^{\perp}$. The condition that H is contained in $\cup_{i\neq j} H_{ij}$ translates to the condition that whenever $a_1x_1 + \cdots + a_nx_n = 0$, necessarily $x_i = x_j$ for an $i \neq j$, or equivalently, there are no distinct elements $x_1, \dots, x_n$ such that $a_1x_1 + \cdots + a_nx_n = 0$. Hence we are in (i) or (ii) or (iii) of Corollary 1.3.

It is easy to see that Corollary 1.3 (i) implies (i) of the theorem being proved. If we have (ii) from Corollary 1.3, then (ii) holds here, finally, from 1.3 (iii) we get that $H = H_{ij}$ for an i and j, a contradiction. □

It is not difficult to see that the hyperplanes given in (i) and (ii) are really contained in the union.

Finally we show that affine hyperplanes only give one more example.

Theorem 3.2. *All affine hyperplanes contained in $\cup_{i\neq j} H_{ij}$ are linear (for $n \leq q$), except when $n = q$ and the hyperplane is a translate of $(1, \dots, 1)^{\perp}$.*

Proof. Suppose the affine hyperplane $\{(x_1, \dots, x_n) : a_1x_1 + \cdots + a_nx_n = c\}$ is contained in $\cup_{i\neq j} H_{ij}$. First choose arbitrary distinct field elements $x_1, \dots, x_n$. Let $d = a_1x_1 + \cdots + a_nx_n$. By the assumption, $d \neq c$. If $d \neq 0$, then $(\frac{c}{d}x_1, \dots, \frac{c}{d}x_n)$ is in our hyperplane, a contradiction, unless $c = 0$, what we wanted to prove.

If $d = 0$, then interchange the values of two coordinates, x_i and x_j say, to have $a_1x_1 + \cdots + a_nx_n = (a_i - a_j)(x_j - x_i)$. This is non-zero for well-chosen i and j (unless all the a_is are the same), so we can make the above trick to prove $c = 0$.

Finally, if all the a_is are the same, say $a_1 = \cdots = a_n = 1$, then one can easily find distinct x_is to give $a_1x_1 + \cdots + a_nx_n \neq 0$ (and make the above trick), unless $n = q$, which was the exceptional case in the claim. □

4. Proof of Theorem 1.2

The proof will be carried out in several steps. We will assume $q \geq 11$. Small cases can be handled easily. We will also suppose q is odd in general, though our combinatorial observations in the first subsection hold also for q even, except Lemma 4.2. For the proof of the even case (which is relatively easier) see the last subsection of the present section.

In Subsection 1 we make some easy observations (with elementary combinatorial proofs). As we will see, the theorem easily follows from the $n = q$ case (that is why results in Sections 2 and 3 are essentially equivalent to the result being proved).

In Subsection 2, using algebraic methods, we will derive an identity about a polynomial that will reflect the combinatorial properties of a multiset $\{a_1, \dots, a_k\}$ for which one cannot find distinct field elements $b_1, \dots, b_k$ such that $a_1b_1 + \cdots + a_kb_k = 0$. The proof will be another application of the Combinatorial Nullstellensatz, in the spirit of Károlyi's approach [7].

The essential part of the proof of Theorem 1.2 will be carried out in Subsection 3, where (after supposing that one cannot find distinct field elements $b_1, \dots, b_q$ such that $a_1b_1 + \cdots + a_qb_q = 0$), we will use the information gained in Subsection 2 to deduce first that most of the a_is are equal, and later that exactly $q - 2$ of them are equal.

Subsection 4 will be devoted to the q even case.

4.1. **Easy combinatorial observations.**

Lemma 4.1. *If for a multiset $\{a_1, \dots, a_q\}$ there is no ordering $b_1, \dots, b_q$ of the elements of $GF(q)$ such that $\sum a_ib_i = 0$, then the same holds for any translation $\{a_1 + c, \dots, a_q + c\}$ and any non-zero multiple $\{ca_1, \dots, ca_q\}$.*

Proof. Straightforward. □

Note that if the a_is are different, then it is easy to find a suitable ordering for which $\sum_i b_ia_i = 0$ holds (for instance let $b_i = a_i$). Hence by the previous lemma, we can suppose that 0 is not among the a_is.

Lemma 4.2. *Theorem 1.2 is true if $n = q$ odd and the a_is admit at most 3 different values.*

Proof. If all the a_is are the same, then any ordering results in $\sum_i a_ib_i = 0$, so suppose there are at least two values.

After transformation suppose that 0 is the value with largest multiplicity and the remaining two values are 1 and a (here $a = 1$ is possible).

First suppose $a = 1$ and that the 1-s are $a_1 = \cdots = a_m = 1$. We determine an appropriate ordering recursively. Let $b_1 \neq 0$ arbitrary, $b_2 = -b_1$, b_3 any non-zero value, which has not been used, $b_4 = -b_3$,... If m is even, then after we determined the first m b_is, the rest of the values is arbitrary. If m is odd, then $b_m = 0$ and the rest is arbitrary.

Next suppose $a \neq 1$ and that $a_1 = \cdots = a_m = 1$, $a_{m+1} = \cdots = a_{m+l} = a$, and the rest is zero. If at most one of m and l is odd, then we can do the same as above. If m and l are both odd, then we can get rid of one 1 and one a by letting $b_1 = -a$ and $b_{m+1} = 1$

and do the same trick as above for the rest of the values (note that q is large enough and $m + l < 2q/3$).

This does not work if $a = -1$. If $m = l = 1$, then we have that our set is $q - 2$ zeros, a 1 and a -1, this is the exceptional case of the claim of the theorem. If one of them, m say, is at least 3, then $b_1 = A$, $b_2 = B$, $b_3 = C$, $b_{m+1} = A + B + C$ with well-chosen A, B and C, and the same trick again. □

In subsection 3, using algebraic tools we will be able to prove equations of the form $(a_1 - a_2)(a_2 - a_3)... = 0$ for any permutation of the indices. From this, we will try to deduce that most of the a_is are the same. The following easy observations will be very useful tools for this.

LEMMA 4.3. *Suppose the multiset $\{a_1, \dots, a_k\}$ contains at least 3 different values and denote by l the maximal multiplicity in the set. Let m_1, m_2 and m_3 be natural numbers with $m_1 + 2m_2 + 3m_3 = k$. Then one can partition the a_is into m_3 classes of size 3, m_2 classes of size 2 and m_1 classes of size 1 in such a way, that elements in the same class are pairwise different, provided we have one of the following cases.*

(i) $m_2 = 0$, $m_1 = 1$, $l \le m_3$;
(ii) $m_2 = 1$, $m_1 = 0$, $l \le m_3 + 1$;
(iii) $m_3 = 0$, $l \le m_1 + m_2$;
(iv) $m_3 = 1$, $m_2 = 0$, $l \le m_1$;
(v) $m_3 = 1$, $m_2 = 1$, $l \le m_1 + 1$.

Proof. First permute the a_is in such a way that equal elements have consecutive indices. This implies that if $|i - j| \ge l$, then a_i and a_j are different.

(i) We have $k = 3m_3 + 1$ and $l \le m_3$. Let the i-th class consist of a_i, a_{i+m_3} and a_{i+2m_3} for $i = 1, \dots, m_3$; and let a_k be the last class (of size 1).
(ii) We have $k = 3m_3 + 2$ and $l \le m_3 + 1$. Let the i-th class consist of a_i, a_{i+m_3+1} and a_{i+2m_3+2} for $i = 1, \dots, m_3$; and let a_{m_3+1} and a_{2m_3+2} form the last class (of size 2).
(iii) We have $k = 2m_2 + m_1$ and $l \le m_1 + m_2$. Let the i-th class consist of a_i and $a_{i+m_1+m_2}$ for $i = 1, \dots, m_2$; and the rest of the classes (of size 1) is arbitrary.
(iv) We know that our multiset has at least three different values, that is all we need for this case.
(v) If we have at least 4 different values, then it is easy to see that the arrangement is possible. If there are exactly 3 different values, then at least two values occur at least twice because we have at least 5 elements, it is again easy to find the desired arrangement.

□

4.2. **The algebraic tool.**

After the above easy observations, we introduce the main tool of the proof.

THEOREM 4.4. *Suppose $a_1, \dots, a_k$ are non-zero field elements with the property that there are no distinct field elements $b_1, \dots, b_k$ such that $\sum_i a_i b_i = 0$. Define the following polynomial:*

$$G(Y_1,\dots,Y_k)=\big((Y_1+\cdots+Y_k)^{q-1}-1\big)\,D(Y_1,\dots,Y_k),$$

where D is the following determinant:

$$\begin{vmatrix} a_1^{k-1} & a_1^{k-2}Y_1 & a_1^{k-3}Y_1^2 & . & . & . & Y_1^{k-1} \\ . & . & . & . & . & & \\ . & . & . & . & . & & \\ . & . & . & . & . & & \\ a_k^{k-1} & a_k^{k-2}Y_k & a_k^{k-3}Y_k^2 & . & . & . & Y_k^{k-1} \end{vmatrix}$$

Then

$$G(Y_1,\dots,Y_k)=\sum_{i=1}^{k}(Y_i^q-Y_i)f_i,$$

where the f_is are polynomials in $Y_1,\dots,Y_k$ of degree at most the degree of G minus q.

Proof. First we will prove that the following polynomial vanishes for all substitutions:

$$F(X_1,\dots,X_k)=\big((a_1X_1+\cdots+a_kX_k)^{q-1}-1\big)\prod_{1\le i<j\le k}(X_i-X_j).$$

Note that $\prod_{1\le i<j\le k}(X_i-X_j)$ assures that F can only be non-zero if the substituted values for $X_1,\dots,X_k$ are pairwise different.

On the other hand, $(a_1X_1+\cdots+a_kX_k)^{q-1}-1=0$ if and only if $a_1X_1+\cdots+a_kX_k\neq 0$. By the assumption, such X_is cannot be all distinct.

Before going further note that $\prod_{1\le i<j\le k}(X_i-X_j)$ is (maybe -1 times) the following Vandermonde determinant:

$$\begin{vmatrix} 1 & X_1 & X_1^2 & . & . & . & X_1^{k-1} \\ . & . & . & . & . & . & . \\ . & . & . & . & . & . & . \\ . & . & . & . & . & . & . \\ 1 & X_k & X_k^2 & . & . & . & X_k^{k-1} \end{vmatrix}$$

Now replace the variables of F with $Y_i:=a_iX_i$ $(i=1,\dots,k)$. Using that $\prod_{1\le i<j\le k}(X_i-X_j)$ is essentially the Vandermonde determinant, this shows that F is zero everywhere if and only if this is true about

$$\big((Y_1+\cdots+Y_k)^{q-1}-1\big)\,D_1(Y_1,\dots,Y_k),$$

where D_1 is the following determinant:

$$\begin{vmatrix} 1 & (Y_1/a_1) & (Y_1/a_1)^2 & . & . & . & (Y_1/a_1)^{k-1} \\ . & . & . & . & . & & \\ . & . & . & . & . & & \\ . & . & . & . & . & & \\ 1 & (Y_k/a_k) & (Y_k/a_k)^2 & . & . & . & (Y_k/a_k)^{k-1} \end{vmatrix}$$

Finally note that one can get G from this polynomial by multiplying the i-th row of the determinant by $a_i^{k-1} \neq 0$ for $i = 1, \ldots, k$.

Hence G is zero for all substitutions. By Theorem 1.4, G has the claimed form. □

Note that the above theorem shows that in any term of G of maximal degree, at least one of the Y_is has degree at least q. The main idea of the proofs of the next subsection is that we determine the coefficient (in terms of the a_is) of well-chosen terms with all degrees at most $q-1$ to deduce conditions on the a_is.

4.3. **The essential part of the proof.**

Now we are ready to prove that there is a value among the a_is with large multiplicity. We have to deal with the prime case (which is much easier) separately.

Lemma 4.5. *Suppose $q = p$ prime and there is no ordering $b_1, \ldots, b_p$ of the elements of $GF(p)$ such that $\sum_i a_i b_i = 0$. Then at least $\frac{p+2}{3}$ of the a_is are the same.*

Proof. After transformation suppose 0 is not among the a_is. Consider the polynomial G from Theorem 4.4 with $k = p$. The theorem states that terms of maximal degree of G have at least one Y_i with degree at least p. We distinguish two cases according to whether $p \equiv 1 \pmod 3$ or $p \equiv 2 \pmod 3$.

First suppose $3|p-1$ and let us determine the coefficient of the following term:

$$(Y_1Y_2Y_3)^{p-1}(Y_4Y_5Y_6)^{p-4}\cdots(Y_{p-3}Y_{p-2}Y_{p-1})^3.$$

First of all note that the degree of this term equals the degree of G, which is $\frac{(p-1)(p+2)}{2}$. According to the remark after the proof of Theorem 4.4, the coefficient (depending on the a_is) has to be zero. However, there is another way to express this coefficient.

Claim 4.6. *Apart from a nonzero scalar (depending on the a_is), the coefficient of the term $(Y_1Y_2Y_3)^{p-1}(Y_4Y_5Y_6)^{p-4}\cdots(Y_{p-3}Y_{p-2}Y_{p-1})^3$ is*

$$(a_1-a_2)(a_2-a_3)(a_3-a_1)\cdot(a_4-a_5)(a_5-a_6)(a_6-a_4)\cdots(a_{p-3}-a_{p-2})(a_{p-2}-a_{p-1})(a_{p-1}-a_{p-3}).$$

Proof. To see this note that all terms of D (the determinant defined earlier, in the statement of Theorem 4.4) are of the form $Y_{\pi(1)}^{p-1}Y_{\pi(2)}^{p-2}\cdots Y_{\pi(p)}^{0}$, where π is a permutation of the indices $\{1, \ldots, p\}$. In order to obtain the monomial $(Y_1Y_2Y_3)^{p-1}\cdots(Y_{p-3}Y_{p-2}Y_{p-1})^3$, this must be multiplied by a factor of the form $Y_1^{n_1}\cdots Y_p^{n_p}$ (coming from $(Y_1+\cdots+Y_p)^{p-1}-1$) for which $n_p = 0$ and for all $0 \leq i \leq \frac{p-4}{3}$ we have $\{n_{1+3i}, n_{2+3i}, n_{3+3i}\} = \{0, 1, 2\}$. Under this condition, one can always find a unique complementary factor from D, notably:

$$\prod_{i=0}^{r-1} Y_{1+3i}^{3(r-i)-n_{1+3i}} Y_{2+3i}^{3(r-i)-n_{2+3i}} Y_{3+3i}^{3(r-i)-n_{3+3i}}$$

where $r = \frac{p-1}{3}$. One can then deduce that the terms from D that contribute are those from the determinant given below.

$$\begin{vmatrix} & & & & & & & & a_1^2Y_1^{p-3} & a_1Y_1^{p-2} & Y_1^{p-1} \\ & & & & & & & & a_2^2Y_2^{p-3} & a_2Y_2^{p-2} & Y_2^{p-1} \\ & & & & & & & & a_3^2Y_3^{p-3} & a_3Y_3^{p-2} & Y_3^{p-1} \\ & & & & & & a_4^5Y_4^{p-6} & a_4^4Y_4^{p-5} & a_4^3Y_4^{p-4} & & \\ & & & & & & a_5^5Y_5^{p-6} & a_5^4Y_5^{p-5} & a_5^3Y_5^{p-4} & & \\ & & & & & & a_6^5Y_6^{p-6} & a_6^4Y_6^{p-5} & a_6^3Y_6^{p-4} & & \\ & & a_7^8Y_7^{p-9} & a_7^7Y_7^{p-8} & a_7^6Y_7^{p-7} & & & & & & \\ & & a_8^8Y_8^{p-9} & a_8^7Y_8^{p-8} & a_8^6Y_8^{p-7} & & & & & & \\ & & a_9^8Y_9^{p-9} & a_9^7Y_9^{p-8} & a_9^6Y_9^{p-7} & & & & & & \\ & \vdots & & & & & & & & & \\ a_p^{p-1} & & & & & & & & & & \end{vmatrix}$$

It is easy to see that the coefficient of $(Y_1Y_2Y_3)^{p-1}\cdots(Y_{p-3}Y_{p-2}Y_{p-1})^3$ equals, up to a nonzero scalar, the determinant of this matrix after substituting 1 for all Y_is. The determinant of this matrix is the product of the determinants of the blocks of rank 3, thus we finished the proof of the claim. □

Before we write up G, we can permute the a_is, hence we get that for any permutation π of the indices,

$$(a_{\pi(1)} - a_{\pi(2)})(a_{\pi(2)} - a_{\pi(3)})(a_{\pi(3)} - a_{\pi(1)}) \cdot (a_{\pi(4)} - a_{\pi(5)})(a_{\pi(5)} - a_{\pi(6)})(a_{\pi(6)} - a_{\pi(4)}) \cdots$$
$$\cdots (a_{\pi(p-3)} - a_{\pi(p-2)})(a_{\pi(p-2)} - a_{\pi(p-1)})(a_{\pi(p-1)} - a_{\pi(p-3)}) = 0. \quad (1)$$

Now suppose the maximal multiplicity in the multiset $\{a_1, \ldots, a_p\}$ is $l \leq \frac{p-1}{3}$. By Lemma 4.3 (i), this implies that we can find a permutation of the indices such that the first 3 elements are different, the second 3 are different,..., the last 3 are different. This contradicts (1), so the proof of the $3|p-1$ case is done.

Now suppose $3|p+1$ and let us find the coefficient of the following term:

$$(Y_1Y_2Y_3)^{p-1}(Y_4Y_5Y_6)^{p-4}\cdots(Y_{p-4}Y_{p-3}Y_{p-2})^4Y_{p-1}Y_p.$$

We claim that apart from a nonzero scalar (depending on the a_is), this coefficient is

$$(a_1 - a_2)(a_2 - a_3)(a_3 - a_1) \cdot (a_4 - a_5)(a_5 - a_6)(a_6 - a_4) \cdots$$
$$\cdots (a_{p-4} - a_{p-3})(a_{p-3} - a_{p-2})(a_{p-2} - a_{p-4}) \cdot (a_{p-1} - a_p).$$

The rest is similar to the proof of the previous case. Here we need to use Lemma 4.3 (ii) at the end. □

LEMMA 4.7. *Suppose $q = p^h > 9$ for an odd prime p and $h > 1$, and that there is no ordering $b_1, \dots, b_q$ of the elements of $GF(q)$ such that $\sum_i a_i b_i = 0$. Then at least $\frac{q+3}{2}$ of the a_is are the same.*

Proof. The proof is similar to the previous one, but it will be much more difficult to determine the coefficient of the appropriate term in G.

After transformation suppose 0 is not among the a_is. Consider the polynomial G from Theorem 4.4 with $k = q$. By 4.4, terms of maximal degree of G have at least one Y_i with degree at least q.

The term to give information about the a_is this time is the following:

$$(\prod_{i=1}^{q} Y_i^{i-1}) \cdot (Y_1 Y_3 Y_5 \cdots Y_{2p-3})(Y_{2p-1} Y_{2p} \cdots Y_{3p-3})^p (Y_{p^2+1} Y_{p^2+2} \cdots Y_{p^2+p-1})^{p^2} \cdots$$
$$\cdots (Y_{p^{h-1}+1} Y_{p^{h-1}+2} \cdots Y_{p^{h-1}+p-1})^{p^{h-1}}$$

The degree of this term is $1+2+\cdots+(q-1)+(p-1)(1+p+p^2+\cdots+p^{h-1}) = \binom{q}{2}+q-1$, this is the degree of G. A little calculation shows that all Y_is have degree at most $q-1$ in this term.

It is easy to see that one way to get this term in G is to take $\prod_{i=1}^{q} Y_i^{i-1}$ from the Vandermonde part and the rest from $(Y_1+\cdots+Y_q)^{q-1}$. We will prove that besides this, the only way to get this term with a non-zero coefficient is to interchange the role of some pairs of variables with the same degree. These pairs are:
Y_1 and Y_2 (both of degree 1), Y_3 and Y_4 (both of degree 3),..., Y_{2p-3} and Y_{2p-2} (both of degree $2p-3$);
Y_{2p-1} and Y_{3p-1} (both of degree $3p-2$), Y_{2p} and Y_{3p} (both of degree $3p-1$),...,Y_{3p-3} and Y_{4p-3} (both of degree $4p-4$);
Y_{p^2+1} and Y_{2p^2+1} (both of degree $2p^2$), Y_{p^2+2} and Y_{2p^2+2} (both of degree $2p^2+1$),...,Y_{p^2+p-1} and Y_{2p^2+p-1} (both of degree $2p^2+p-2$);
...;
$Y_{p^{h-1}+1}$ and $Y_{2p^{h-1}+1}$ (both of degree $2p^{h-1}$), $Y_{p^{h-1}+2}$ and $Y_{2p^{h-1}+2}$ (both of degree $2p^{h-1}+1$),...,$Y_{p^{h-1}+p-1}$ and $Y_{2p^{h-1}+p-1}$ (both of degree $2p^{h-1}+p-2$).

Let us look for the term in question. From the Vandermonde part, all terms are of the form $Y_{\pi(1)}^0 \cdots Y_{\pi(q)}^{q-1}$ for a permutation π of the indices. In the term in question, we have only two Y_is of degree less than 2: Y_1 and Y_2, hence $\{\pi(1), \pi(2)\} = \{1, 2\}$. Similarly we get that $\{\pi(2k-1), \pi(2k)\} = \{2k-1, 2k\}$ for $k \le p-1$. This shows that the beginning part of the term coming from $(Y_1+\cdots+Y_q)^{q-1}$ is $Y_{\pi(1)} Y_{\pi(3)} \cdots Y_{\pi(2p-3)}$. The coefficient of such a term in $(Y_1+\cdots+Y_q)^{q-1}$ is $(q-1)(q-2)\cdots(q-p+1)$ times something depending on the degrees of the rest of the Y_is. If the degree of any of the rest of the Y_is is not divisible by p, then (by Lucas' theorem) the coefficient is zero, since it is divisible by $(q-1)(q-2)\cdots(q-p+1)\binom{q-p}{k}$ with a k not divisible by p. Hence we only have to consider those possibilities, when the term coming from $(Y_1+\cdots+Y_q)^{q-1}$ starts with $Y_{\pi(1)} Y_{\pi(3)} \cdots Y_{\pi(2p-3)}$ and continues with all the Y_is having degree divisible by p.

So far we have identified all Y_is come from the Vandermonde part of degree at most $2p-3$. After this in the term in question we have $(Y_{2p-1} Y_{3p-1})^{3p-2} (Y_{2p} Y_{3p})^{3p-1} \cdots (Y_{3p-3} Y_{4p-3})^{4p-4}$.

These should come from the Vandermonde part from the terms of degrees between $2p-2$ and $4p-4$. Since we know that the corresponding terms of the part coming from $(Y_1+\cdots+Y_q)^{q-1}$ all need to have degree divisible by p, the only possibility is that we have $\{\pi(2p-1),\pi(3p-1)\}=\{2p-1,3p-1\}$, $\{\pi(2p),\pi(3p)\}=\{2p,3p\}$,...,$\{\pi(3p-3),\pi(4p-3)\}=\{3p-3,4p-3\}$.

After this there are terms with unique degrees, hence the Vandermonde part has to have this part: $Y_{4p-2}^{4p-3}Y_{4p-1}^{4p-2}\cdots Y_{p^2}^{p^2-1}$.

Hence we already know that the part coming from $(Y_1+\cdots+Y_q)^{q-1}$ starts with $p-1$ terms of degree 1, then $p-1$ terms of degree p. This means that the rest of the Y_is have to have degree divisible by p^2, since otherwise we would get a coefficient starting with

$$(q-1)(q-2)\cdots(q-p+1)\binom{q-p}{p}\binom{q-2p}{p}\cdots\binom{q-(p-1)p}{p}\binom{q-p^2}{k},$$

where k is not divisible by p^2, but this is zero.

One can continue by induction on i to show that the part coming from the Vandermonde determinant has to have the following form:

$$\prod_{i=1}^{q} Y_{\pi(i)}^{i-1},$$

where (as we promised above) π is a permutation of the indices such that $\pi(i)=i$, except for a couple of values: $\{\pi(1),\pi(2)\}=\{1,2\}$, $\{\pi(3),\pi(4)\}=\{3,4\}$,..., $\{\pi(2p-3),\pi(2p-2)\}=\{2p-3,2p-2\}$;

$\{\pi(2p-1),\pi(3p-1)\}=\{2p-1,3p-1\}$, $\{\pi(2p),\pi(3p)\}=\{2p,3p\}$,...,$\{\pi(3p-3),\pi(4p-3)\}=\{3p-3,4p-3\}$;

$\{\pi(p^2+1),\pi(2p^2+1)\}=\{p^2+1,2p^2+1\}$, $\{\pi(p^2+2),\pi(2p^2+2)\}=\{p^2+2,2p^2+2\}$,...,$\{\pi(p^2+p-1),\pi(2p^2+p-1)\}=\{p^2+p-1,2p^2+p-1\}$;

...

$\{\pi(p^{h-1}+1),\pi(2p^{h-1}+1)\}=\{p^{h-1}+1,2p^{h-1}+1\}$, $\{\pi(p^{h-1}+2),\pi(2p^{h-1}+2)\}=\{p^{h-1}+2,2p^{h-1}+2\}$,...,$\{\pi(p^{h-1}+p-1),\pi(2p^{h-1}+p-1)\}=\{p^{h-1}+p-1,2p^{h-1}+p-1\}$.

This means that apart form a non-zero constant (including powers of those a_i for which we did not have a choice for $\pi(i)$), the term coming from the Vandermonde part is the product of 2×2 determinants of the form

$$\begin{vmatrix} a_i^{q-1-k}Y_i^k & a_i^{q-1-k-p^m}Y_i^{k+p^m} \\ a_j^{q-1-k}Y_j^k & a_j^{q-1-k-p^m}Y_j^{k+p^m} \end{vmatrix}.$$

Dividing such a term with the non-zero $(a_ia_j)^{q-1-k-p^m}$ and using that $x\to x^{p^m}$ is an automorphism of the field, we end up in a situation similar to the prime case:

$$(a_1-a_2)(a_3-a_4)\cdots(a_{2p-3}-a_{2p-2})\cdot$$
$$(a_{2p-1}-a_{3p-1})(a_{2p}-a_{3p})\cdots(a_{3p-3}-a_{4p-3})\cdot$$

$$(a_{p^2+1} - a_{2p^2+1})(a_{p^2+2} - a_{2p^2+2}) \cdots (a_{p^2+p-1} - a_{2p^2+p-1}) \cdot$$
$$\dots$$
$$(a_{p^{h-1}+1} - a_{2p^{h-1}+1})(a_{p^{h-1}+2} - a_{2p^{h-1}+2}) \cdots (a_{p^{h-1}+p-1} - a_{2p^{p-1}+p-1}) = 0$$

Similarly to the prime case, this is true after any permutation of the indices. The number of brackets here is $h(p-1)$, so by Lemma 4.3 (iii), we only need $q - p(h-1) \geq \frac{q+1}{2}$, this is true for $q > 9$ odd.

□

Let N denote the maximal multiplicity in the multiset $\{a_1, ..., a_q\}$. By the previous two claims N is large. After translation, suppose the value in question is zero. We need to show that if there is no ordering b_i of the field elements achieving $\sum_i a_i b_i = 0$, then $N = q - 2$. The plan is to use the same machinery for the remaining non-zero a_is.

Lemma 4.8. *Suppose $a_1, \dots, a_k$ are non-zero elements of $GF(q)$ with $k < 2q/3$ if $q = p$ prime and $k \leq \frac{q-3}{2}$ if $q = p^h$, $h \geq 2$, admitting at least 3 different values and with the property that no value occurs more than $q - k$ times. Either there are different elements $b_1, \dots, b_k$ such that $\sum a_i b_i = 0$ or $k = 3$.*

Proof. Consider the polynomial G from Theorem 4.4. By 4.4, terms of maximal degree of G have at least one Y_i with degree at least q.

Just like previously, we look for appropriate terms in G to gain information about the a_is.

If $4 \leq k \leq \frac{q+3}{2}$ holds, then consider the following term (of maximal degree):

$$Y_1^{(q-5)/2+k} Y_2^{(q-5)/2+k} Y_3^{k-3} Y_4^{k-3} Y_5^{k-5} Y_6^{k-6} \cdots Y_k^0.$$

It is easy to see that there are only four terms coming from $(Y_1 + \cdots + Y_q)^{q-1}$ that (multiplied by the appropriate term coming from the Vandermonde part) can contribute to this term. These four terms are $Y_i Y_j^{\frac{q-1}{2}} Y_k^{\frac{q-3}{2}}$, where $i = 3$ or 4 and $\{j, k\} = \{1, 2\}$. Each of them comes with coefficient $(q-1)\binom{q-2}{(q-1)/2} \neq 0$. Hence we have $(a_1 - a_2)(a_3 - a_4) = 0$. Just like previously, this is true for any permutation of the indices. By Lemma 4.3, this implies that there is a value among the a_is with multiplicity at least $k - 1$ contradicting the assumption that the a_is admit at least 3 values.

Now consider the $k > \frac{q+3}{2}$ case, and note that this case can occur only if $q = p$ prime. We have to distinguish between two cases according to whether $p \equiv 1$ or 2 (mod 3).

If $3|p-1$, then consider the following term (of maximal degree):

$$Y_1^{k+(p-7)/3} Y_2^{k+(p-7)/3} Y_3^{k+(p-7)/3} Y_4^{k-4} Y_5^{k-5} \cdots Y_k^0.$$

It is easy to see that the coefficient is a non-zero term times

$$(a_1 - a_2)(a_2 - a_3)(a_3 - a_1),$$

implying (by Lemma 4.3) that there is a value among the a_is with multiplicity at least $k - 2$. This contradicts the assumption that no value has multiplicity more than $q - k$.

If $3|p+1$, then one should consider the following term (of maximal degree):

$$Y_1^{k+(p-8)/3}Y_2^{k+(p-8)/3}Y_3^{k+(p-8)/3}Y_4^{k-4}Y_5^{k-4}Y_6^{k-6}Y_7^{k-7}\cdots Y_{k-1}^1Y_k^0.$$

Here the coefficient is essentially

$$(a_1-a_2)(a_2-a_3)(a_3-a_1)(a_4-a_5).$$

It is not difficult to see that similarly to the previous case, this leads to contradiction.

□

Proof. (*of Theorem 1.2*) By Lemma 4.2 that there are at least 4 different values among the a_is. Suppose there is no ordering $b_1,\dots,b_q$ of the elements of $GF(q)$ giving $\sum_i a_ib_i=0$. We have to find a contradiction. After transformation (by Lemma 4.1 and the sentence after its proof) suppose 0 is not among the a_is. Apply Lemma 4.5 or 4.7 to get that a significant part of the elements must be identical. Apply a transformation to make this value zero and apply Lemma 4.8 for the rest of the a_is. We cannot have different b_is for these indices such that $\sum a_ib_i=0$ (here the sum is only for those i-s, for which $a_i\neq 0$), because otherwise the b_is could be easily extended to an ordering of the field such that $\sum_i a_ib_i=0$. Hence we have $k=3$, that is, the multiset $\{a_1,\dots,a_q\}$ contains $q-3$ zeros and 3 distinct non-zero elements, a, b and c say. Suppose $a+b\neq 0$. Then $ba+(-a)b+0c=0$, a contradiction. □

4.4. **Proof for q even.**

The proof is similar for q even. We can use Lemma 4.1 (the proof presented works for q even). Lemma 4.2 should be replaced by the following.

LEMMA 4.9. *If our multiset has only* 1 *or* 2 *different values and $n=q$ is even, then Theorem 1.2 is true.*

Proof. If our set has only one value (of multiplicity q) then any ordering of $GF(q)$ is good, so suppose we have two values.

After transformation we can achieve that 0 is the value with multiplicity larger than $q/2$ and 1 is the other value with multiplicity smaller than $q/2$. Hence all we need is that for any $m\leq q/2$, there are distinct field elements $b_1,\dots,b_m$ such that $b_1+\cdots+b_m=0$. Dentoe by G an additive subgroup of $GF(q)$ of index 2. Let $b_1,\cdots,b_{m-1}$ be arbitrary disting elements of G. If $b_1+\cdots+b_{m-1}$ is distinct from all the b_is, then let $b_m=b_1+\cdots+b_{m-1}$ and we have the m elements we were looking for.

If $b_1+\cdots+b_{m-1}$ equals one of the b_is, b_{m-1} say, then we have $b_1+\cdots+b_{m-2}=0$. Let $a\in GF(q)\setminus G$. Replace b_{m-2} with $b_{m-2}+a$, keep b_{m-1}, and let $b_m=b_{m-1}+a$. It is easy to see that the b_is are distinct and their sum is zero. □

Lemma 4.3 and Theorem 4.4 are true for q even (the proofs presented did not assume q is odd). Lemma 4.7 should be replaced by the following.

LEMMA 4.10. *Suppose $q=2^h>8$, and that there is no ordering $b_1,\dots,b_q$ of the elements of $GF(q)$ such that $\sum_i a_ib_i=0$. Then at least $\frac{q+3}{2}$ of the a_is are the same.*

Proof. After transformation suppose 0 is not among the a_is. Consider the polynomial G from Theorem 4.4 with $k = q$. By 4.4, terms of maximal degree of G have at least one Y_i with degree at least q.

Consider the following term:

$$Y_1 \prod_{i=1}^{h-1} Y_{i+2}^{2^{h-i}} \prod_{i=1}^{h} Y_i^{i-1}$$

Similarly to the proof of Lemma 4.7, one can use Lucas' theorem to find the coefficient of this term. This is the sum of some subterms from $G(Y_1, \dots, Y_q)$. If a subterm from $G(Y_1, \dots, Y_q)$ is non-zero, then from the $((Y_1 + \cdots + Y_k)^{q-1} - 1)$ part we need h variables on powers $1, 2, 4, \dots, 2^{h-1}$. Using similar observations as before, we can conclude that this must imply that the coefficient of our term (apart from the usual non-zero constant) is

$$(a_1 - a_2) \prod_{i=1}^{h-1} (a_{i+2} - a_{i+2+2^{h-1}}).$$

Thus this number must equal zero for any permutation of the indices which implies that one of the a_is has multiplicity $q - h + 1$ because of Lemma 4.3 (iii).

□

Instead of Lemma 4.8, one can immediately prove the following.

Lemma 4.11. *Suppose $a_1, \dots, a_k$ are non-zero elements of $GF(q)$, q even with $1 < k < q/2$. Either there are different elements $b_1, \dots, b_k$ such that $\sum a_i b_i = 0$ or all the a_is are the same.*

Proof. Consider the polynomial G from Theorem 4.4. By 4.4, terms of maximal degree of G have at least one Y_i with degree at least q.

Considering the following term:

$$(Y_k Y_{k-1})^{q/2+k-2} \cdot Y_{k-2}^{k-3} \cdots Y_2^1 Y_1^0.$$

It is easy to see that there are only two possibilyties to get this term and the coefficient we have (apart from a non-zero constant) is $a_k - a_{k-1}$. This implies $a_{k-1} = a_k$ and, since we can permute the indices at the begining, that all the a_is are the same. □

After these lemmas, the proof is easy.

5. Final remarks

We would like to remark that for the prime case, that is Theorem 1.1, Péter Csikvári found a relatively short elementary proof [5]. It very much seems however that for general prime powers there is no proof without algebraic techniques.

The result presented in this paper raises natural problems, that seem to be very hard. Instead of the problem considered in Theorem 1.2, one can ask for distinct element $b_1, \dots, b_k$ such that $\sum_i b_i^l a_i = 0$ for $l = 1, ..., L$, where L is a prescribed integer (we get back our result if we let $L = 1$). This more or less corresponds to looking for polynomials of prescribed range of degree at most $q - 2 - L$, a problem already mentioned in Section 2. Let us formulate a conjecture about this.

Conjecture 5.1. *Suppose $M = \{a_1, \dots, a_q\}$ is a multiset of $GF(q)$ with $a_1 + \cdots + a_q = 0$, where $q = p^h$, p prime. Let $k < \sqrt{p}$. If there is no polynomial with range M of degree less than $q - k$, then M contains an element of multiplicity at least $q - k$.*

To explain why one needs an upper bound on k in the above conjecture, let us suppose that $q = p$ is prime and define the multiset as 1 with multiplicity m, $-m$ with multiplicity 1 and 0 with mutliplicity $p - m - 1$. By a result of Biró [3], all polynomials of this range have degree at least roughly $3p/4$, unless $m = \frac{p-1}{2}$ or $\frac{p-1}{3}$ or $2\frac{p-1}{3}$. This shows that for $q = p$ prime, we need $k < p/4$.

The problem considered in Theorem 1.1 could also be generalized to finite (abelian) groups (written multiplicatively) by taking any elements $a_1, \dots, a_n$ of the group and looking for different degrees $b_1, \dots, b_n$ from $[1, |G|]$ such that $a_1^{b_1} \cdots a_k^{b_k} = 1$. (Here, to avoid trivial cases, for every i one should not allow those b_is for which $a_i^{b_i} = 1$ holds.) The forthcoming paper [9] is devoted to this generalization on cyclic (abelian) groups.

Acknowledgment

We would like to thank the anonymous referees for their several suggestions which greatly helped to improve the presentation of our results.

References

[1] N. Alon, Combinatorial Nullstellensatz, *Combinatorics, Probability and Computing* **8 (12)** (1999) 729.
[2] N. Alon, Additive Latin transversals. *Israel J. Math.* **117** (2000), 125-130.
[3] A. Biró, On polynomials over prime fields taking only two values on the multiplicative group, *Finite Fields and Their Appl.* **6** (2000), 302-308.
[4] D. A. Cox, J. B. Little, D. O'Shea Ideals, Varieties, and Algorithms, *Springer* (2007).
[5] P. Csikvári, private communication.
[6] S. Dasgupta, Gy. Károlyi, O. Serra, B. Szegedy, Transversals of additive Latin squares, *Israel J. Math.* **126** (2001), 17-28.
[7] Gy. Károlyi, An inverse theorem for the restricted est addition in Abelian groups, *Journal of Algebra* **290** (2005), 557-593.
[8] R. Lidl, H. Niederreiter, Finite fields, *Cambridge University Press* (1997).
[9] Z. L. Nagy, Permutations over cyclic groups, manuscript.
[10] H. S. Snevily, The Cayley addition table of Z_n, *The American Mathematical Monthly* **106** (1999), 584-585.
[11] S. Vinatier, Permuting the partitions of a prime, *Journal de Theorie des Nombres de Bordeaux*, **Vol. 21 no. 2** (2009), 455-465.