

# ON A CHARACTER SUM PROBLEM OF H. COHN

PÄR KURLBERG

ABSTRACT. Let  $f$  be a complex valued function on a finite field  $F$  such that  $f(0) = 0$ ,  $f(1) = 1$ , and  $|f(x)| = 1$  for  $x \neq 0$ . Cohn asked if it follows that  $f$  is a nontrivial multiplicative character provided that  $\sum_{x \in F} f(x)\overline{f(x+h)} = -1$  for  $h \neq 0$ . We prove that this is the case for finite fields of prime cardinality under the assumption that the nonzero values of  $f$  are roots of unity.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Let  $p$  be prime and let  $F_{p^k}$  be the finite field with  $p^k$  elements. Let  $f : F_{p^k}^\times \rightarrow \mathbf{C}$  be a nontrivial multiplicative character, and extend  $f$  to a function on  $F_{p^k}$  by letting  $f(0) = 0$ . It is then easy to see that the following holds:

$$(1.1) \quad \sum_{x \in F_{p^k}} f(x)\overline{f(x+h)} = \begin{cases} -1 & \text{if } h \neq 0 \\ p^k - 1 & \text{if } h = 0 \end{cases}$$

Cohn asked (see p. 202 in [3]) if the converse is true in the following sense: if a function  $f : F_{p^k} \rightarrow \mathbf{C}$  satisfies

$$(1.2) \quad f(0) = 0, \quad f(1) = 1, \quad \text{and } |f(x)| = 1 \text{ for } x \neq 0$$

and equation 1.1, does it follow that  $f$  is a multiplicative character?

The problem has recently received some attention. In [2], Choi and Siu proved that the converse is not true for  $k > 1$ . One of the arguments given is quite pretty, and proceeds as follows: Let  $\lambda$  be a linear automorphism of  $F_{p^k}$  so that  $\lambda(1) = 1$ . If  $f$  satisfies 1.1 and 1.2, so does  $f$  composed with  $\lambda$ . Now, if  $f$  is an injective multiplicative character then the converse being true implies that  $f$  composed with  $\lambda$  must be an injective multiplicative character. On the other hand, a simple counting argument shows that the number of possible  $\lambda$ 's is greater than the number of injective characters.

However, the case  $k = 1$  remains unresolved. In [1], Biro proved that there are only finitely many functions satisfying equation 1.1 and 1.2

---

Author supported in part by the National Science Foundation (DMS 0071503).

for each  $p$ . Biro also solved the following “characteristic  $p$ ” version of the problem ([1], Theorem 2):

**Theorem** (Biro). *Let  $p$  be a prime, let  $F_p$  be the finite field with  $p$  elements, and  $F \supset F_p$  any field of characteristic  $p$ . Assume that there is given an  $a_i \in F$  for every  $i \in F_p$  such that  $a_0 = 0, a_1 = 1, a_i \neq 0$  for  $i \neq 0$ , and*

$$\sum_{i \in F_p^\times} \frac{a_{i+j}}{a_i} = -1$$

for every  $j \in F_p^\times$ . Then  $a_i = i^A$  for every  $i \in F_p$  with some  $1 \leq A \leq p - 2$ .

Using this Biro deduces that the converse holds for functions taking values in  $\{-1, 0, 1\}$ .<sup>1</sup> In fact, if  $m$  is coprime to  $p$ , then the case of the nonzero values of  $f$  being  $m$ -th roots of unity can be deduced in a similar way: Let  $\mathfrak{O}$  be the ring of integers in  $\mathbf{Q}(e^{2\pi i/m})$ , and let  $\mathfrak{P} \subset \mathfrak{O}$  be a prime ideal lying above  $p$ . The result then follows from the theorem by letting  $F = \mathfrak{O}/\mathfrak{P}$  and noting that  $m$ -th roots of unity are distinct modulo  $p$ . (Since  $|f(x)| = 1$  for  $x \neq 0$  we have  $\overline{f(x)} = 1/f(x)$ .)

The aim of this paper is to show that the converse is true for the case  $k = 1$ , under the additional assumption that the nonzero values of  $f : F_p \rightarrow \mathbf{C}$  are  $m$ -th roots of unity, including the case  $p|m$ . We begin by giving a proof that does not depend on Biro’s result for the case  $(m, p) = 1$ , and we then show how to modify the argument for the general case.

*Acknowledgements:* I would like to thank Ernest Croot, Andrew Granville, Robert Rumely, and Mark Watkins for helpful and stimulating discussions. I would also like to thank the referee for several suggestions on how to improve the exposition, and for pointing out that the case  $p|m$  can be deduced independently of Biro’s theorem.

## 2. PRELIMINARIES

In what follows we assume that  $p$  is odd since the case  $p = 2$  is trivial.

We will use the following conventions: if a function  $f$  takes values in  $\mathbf{C}$  and  $\sigma \in \text{Aut}(\mathbf{C}/\mathbf{Q})$ , then we let  $f^\sigma$  be the function defined by  $f^\sigma(x) = \sigma(f(x))$ . We regard  $\psi(x) = e^{2\pi i x/p}$  as a nontrivial additive character of  $F_p$ . For an integer  $t$ ,  $\psi_t$  will denote the character  $\psi_t(x) = \psi(tx)$ . By  $\zeta_m$  we denote the  $m$ -th root of unity  $\zeta_m = e^{2\pi i/m}$ .

<sup>1</sup>There appears to be several independent proofs of this result, see the introduction in [2].

Let  $m$  be even and large enough so that all nonzero values of  $f$  are  $m$ -th roots of unity, and write  $m = np^k$ , where  $(n, p) = 1$ . Let  $K = \mathbf{Q}(\zeta_n)$ ,  $L = K(\zeta_p, \zeta_{p^k})$ , and let  $G = \text{Gal}(L/\mathbf{Q})$ ,  $H = \text{Gal}(L/K)$  denote the Galois groups of  $L/\mathbf{Q}$  and  $L/K$ . By  $\mathfrak{D}_K$  and  $\mathfrak{D}_L$  we will denote the ring of integers in  $K$  respectively  $L$ .

The ‘‘Gauss sum’’

$$G(f, \psi) = \sum_{x=0}^{p-1} f(x)\psi(x)$$

is clearly an algebraic integer. As in the case of classical Gauss sums, the absolute value of  $G(f, \psi)$  can easily be determined:

**Lemma 1.** *If  $f$  satisfies 1.1, then*

$$|G(f, \psi_t)| = \begin{cases} \sqrt{p} & \text{if } t \not\equiv 0 \pmod{p}, \\ 0 & \text{if } t \equiv 0 \pmod{p}. \end{cases}$$

*Proof.* We have

$$\begin{aligned} |G(f, \psi_t)|^2 &= \sum_{x, y \in F_p} f(x)\overline{f(y)}\psi(t(x-y)) = \sum_{x, h \in F_p} f(x)\overline{f(x+h)}\psi(-th) \\ &= \psi(0) \sum_{x \in F_p} f(x)\overline{f(x)} + \sum_{h \in F_p^\times} \psi(-th) \sum_{x \in F_p} f(x)\overline{f(x+h)} \\ &= p - 1 - \sum_{h \in F_p^\times} \psi(-th) = \begin{cases} p & \text{if } t \not\equiv 0 \pmod{p}, \\ 0 & \text{if } t \equiv 0 \pmod{p}, \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

□

The action of complex conjugation on  $K$  is given by an element in  $G$ , and since  $G$  is abelian, equation 1.1 is  $G$ -invariant. I.e., if  $f$  satisfies 1.2, so does  $f^\sigma$  for all  $\sigma \in G$ . But if  $\sigma \in G$  then  $\sigma(G(f, \psi)) = G(f^\sigma, \psi_t)$ , where  $\sigma(\zeta_p) = \zeta_p^t$ . Since  $f^\sigma$  also satisfies 1.1, we find that  $|G(f^\sigma, \psi_t)| = p^{1/2}$ , and hence the  $\mathbf{Q}$ -norm of  $G(f, \psi)$  is a power of  $p$ . The factorization of the principal ideal  $G(f, \psi)\mathfrak{D}_L$  thus consists only of prime ideals  $\mathfrak{P}_L|p$ .

It is well known that  $\mathbf{Q}(\zeta_{p^k})/\mathbf{Q}$  is totally ramified over  $p$ , and that  $\mathbf{Q}(\zeta_n)/\mathbf{Q}$  does not ramify at  $p$  if  $(n, p) = 1$ . Comparing ramification indices gives that if  $\mathfrak{P}_K$  is a prime ideal in  $\mathfrak{D}_K$  that divides  $p$ , then  $\mathfrak{P}_K$  is totally ramified in  $L$ . In particular, if  $\mathfrak{P}_L$  is any prime ideal in the ring of integers in  $\mathfrak{D}_L$  that lies above  $p$ , then  $\sigma(\mathfrak{P}_L) = \mathfrak{P}_L$  for all  $\sigma \in H$ .

Let  $l = \max(1, k)$ . Then  $H$  consists of elements  $\sigma_t$  such that

$$\sigma_t(\zeta_{p^l}) = \zeta_{p^l}^t, \quad \sigma_t(\zeta_n) = \zeta_n.$$

Choose  $t$  so that  $\sigma_t$  generates  $H$ . Applying  $\sigma_t$  to the principal ideal

$$G(f, \psi)\mathfrak{D}_L = \prod_{\mathfrak{P}_L|p} \mathfrak{P}_L^{\eta(\mathfrak{P}_L)}$$

we find that

$$\sigma_t(G(f, \psi)\mathfrak{D}_L) = \sigma_t\left(\prod_{\mathfrak{P}_L|p} \mathfrak{P}_L^{\eta(\mathfrak{P}_L)}\right) = \prod_{\mathfrak{P}_L|p} \mathfrak{P}_L^{\eta(\mathfrak{P}_L)} = G(f, \psi)\mathfrak{D}_L$$

and hence  $\sigma_t(G(f, \psi)) = uG(f, \psi)$  for some unit  $u$ .

Since the absolute value of any complex embedding of  $G(f, \psi)$  equals  $\sqrt{p}$ , we find that all conjugates of  $u = \sigma(G(f, \psi))/G(f, \psi)$  has absolute value one. Hence  $u$  is in fact a root of unity, and there are integers  $a, b$  such that

$$(2.1) \quad \sigma_t(G(f, \psi)) = \zeta_{p^l}^a \zeta_n^b G(f, \psi).$$

### 3. THE CASE $(m, p) = 1$

Since  $f$  is fixed by  $H$  we find that  $\sigma_t(G(f, \psi)) = G(f, \psi_t)$ , and equation 2.1 can, after the change of variable  $x \rightarrow t^{-1}x$ , be written as

$$(3.1) \quad \sum_{x=1}^{p-1} f(x)\psi(x) = \zeta_p^{-a} \zeta_n^{-b} \sum_{x=1}^{p-1} f(t^{-1}x)\psi(x).$$

**Lemma 2.** *If  $f$  takes values in  $n$ -th roots of unity for  $x \not\equiv 0 \pmod{p}$  and equation 3.1 holds then  $a \equiv 0 \pmod{p}$ .*

*Proof.* From 3.1 we obtain that

$$(3.2) \quad \sum_{i=1}^{p-1} A_i \zeta_p^i = \sum_{i=0}^{p-1} B_i \zeta_p^i$$

where  $A_i = f(i)$  and  $B_i = \zeta_n^{-b} f(t^{-1}(i+a))$ . (Note that  $B_{p-a} = 0$ .) Since  $1 = -\sum_{i=1}^{p-1} \zeta_p^i$  we may rewrite 3.2 as

$$(3.3) \quad \sum_{i=1}^{p-1} A_i \zeta_p^i = \sum_{i=1}^{p-1} (B_i - B_0) \zeta_p^i.$$

The elements  $\{\zeta_p, \zeta_p^2, \zeta_p^3, \dots, \zeta_p^{p-1}\}$  are linearly independent over  $K$ , hence  $A_i = B_i - B_0$ . From lemma 1 we have  $\sum_{x=0}^{p-1} f(x) = 0$ , which implies

that  $\sum_{i=1}^{p-1} A_i = 0$ , as well as  $\sum_{i=0}^{p-1} B_i = 0$ . Therefore,

$$0 = \sum_{i=1}^{p-1} A_i = \sum_{i=1}^{p-1} (B_i - B_0) = \sum_{i=0}^{p-1} B_i - pB_0 = -pB_0.$$

But  $B_0 = \zeta_n^{-b} f(t^{-1}(0+a))$  which is nonzero unless  $a \equiv 0 \pmod{p}$ .  $\square$

Thus

$$(3.4) \quad \sum_{x=1}^{p-1} f(x)\psi(x) = \zeta_n^{-b} \sum_{x=1}^{p-1} f(t^{-1}x)\psi(x)$$

and the linear independence of  $\{\zeta_p, \zeta_p^2, \zeta_p^3, \dots, \zeta_p^{p-1}\}$  over  $K$  implies that

$$f(t^{-1}x) = f(x)\zeta_n^b$$

for all  $x \neq 0$ . Thus

$$f(t^{-k}) = f(t^{-(k-1)})\zeta_n^b = \dots = f(1)\zeta_n^{kb} = \zeta_n^{kb}.$$

Taking  $k = p-1$  we find that  $\zeta_n^b$  is a  $(p-1)$ -th root of unity, and that  $f$  is a multiplicative character.

#### 4. THE GENERAL CASE

In this case  $m = np^k$  where  $(n, p) = 1$  and  $k > 0$ . We will need the following:

**Lemma 3.** *If  $a_i \in K$  and  $\sum_{i=0}^{p^k-1} a_i \zeta_{p^k}^i \in K(\zeta_p)$  then*

$$(4.1) \quad \sum_{i=0}^{p^k-1} a_i \zeta_{p^k}^i = \sum_{j=0}^{p-1} a_{p^{k-1}j} \zeta_p^j$$

*Proof.* We may assume that  $k > 1$ . The minimal polynomial for  $\zeta_{p^k}$  (over  $K$  as well as over  $\mathbf{Q}$ ) is given by

$$\frac{x^{p^k} - 1}{x^{p^{k-1}} - 1} = 1 + x^{p^{k-1}} + x^{2p^{k-1}} + \dots + x^{(p-1)p^{k-1}}.$$

Hence, by letting  $\tilde{i} \in [0, p^{k-1} - 1]$  be a representative of  $i$  modulo  $p^{k-1}$ , we can rewrite the left hand side of equation 4.1 as

$$\sum_{i=0}^{(p-1)p^{k-1}-1} (a_i - a_{(p-1)p^{k-1}+\tilde{i}}) \zeta_{p^k}^i$$

with no further relations among the  $\zeta_{p^k}^i$ 's, and thus

$$\sum_{i=0}^{(p-1)p^{k-1}-1} (a_i - a_{(p-1)p^{k-1}+\tilde{i}}) \zeta_{p^k}^i \in K(\zeta_p)$$

if and only if  $a_i - a_{(p-1)p^{k-1}+i} = 0$  for all  $i$  not congruent to zero modulo  $p^{k-1}$ .  $\square$

Recall from equation 2.1 (note that  $l = k$  since  $k \geq 1$ ) that

$$\sigma_t(G(f, \psi)) = \zeta_{p^k}^a \zeta_n^b G(f, \psi).$$

Let  $\tilde{G} = \zeta_{p^k}^s G(f, \psi)$  where  $\sigma_t(\zeta_{p^k}^s)/\zeta_{p^k}^s = \zeta_{p^k}^{-a}$ . (Such an  $s$  exists as  $\sigma_t(\zeta_{p^k}^s)/\zeta_{p^k}^s = \zeta_{p^k}^{(t-1)s}$ , and  $t \not\equiv 1 \pmod{p}$  since  $\sigma_t$  generates  $H$ .) We then have

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_t(\tilde{G}) &= \sigma_t(\zeta_{p^k}^s G(f, \psi)) \\ &= \sigma_t(\zeta_{p^k}^s) \sigma_t(G(f, \psi)) = \sigma_t(\zeta_{p^k}^s) \zeta_{p^k}^a \zeta_n^b G(f, \psi) = \zeta_n^b \tilde{G}. \end{aligned}$$

The following lemma shows that  $\tilde{G}$  must transform by a nontrivial  $n$ -th root of unity:

**Lemma 4.** *There is no integer  $s$  such that  $\zeta_{p^k}^s G(f, \psi) \in K$ .*

*Proof.* We first assume that  $\zeta_{p^k}^s = 1$ . Let  $G(f, \psi)\mathfrak{D}_L = \prod_{\mathfrak{P}_L|p} \mathfrak{P}_L^{\eta(\mathfrak{P}_L)}$  be the factorization of the principal ideal  $G(f, \psi)\mathfrak{D}_L$ . Since  $p$  does not ramify in  $K$ , we have  $p\mathfrak{D}_K = \prod_{\mathfrak{P}_K|p} \mathfrak{P}_K$ , and hence  $p\mathfrak{D}_L = \prod_{\mathfrak{P}_L|p} \mathfrak{P}_L^e$  where  $e$  is the ramification index of  $\mathfrak{P}_K$  in  $L$ .

Since  $\psi(x) = \zeta_p^x$  is congruent to 1 modulo  $\mathfrak{P}_L$  for all  $x$ , we find that

$$G(f, \psi) = \sum_{x=0}^{p-1} f(x)\psi(x) \equiv \sum_{x=1}^{p-1} f(x) \pmod{\mathfrak{P}_L}$$

for all  $\mathfrak{P}_L|p$ . Now, since  $f(0) = 0$ , we have  $\sum_{x=1}^{p-1} f(x) = G(f, \psi_0)$  and by lemma 1,  $G(f, \psi_0) = 0$ . Thus  $G(f, \psi) \in \mathfrak{P}_L$  for all  $\mathfrak{P}_L|p$ , i.e.,  $\eta(\mathfrak{P}_L) > 0$  for all  $\mathfrak{P}_L|p$ . But if  $G(f, \psi) \in K$  then  $e|\eta(\mathfrak{P}_L)$  for all  $\mathfrak{P}_L|p$ , and since complex conjugation permutes the set of primes of  $\mathfrak{D}_L$  that lies above  $p$ , and

$$p = G(f, \psi)\overline{G(f, \psi)},$$

we get that  $\mathfrak{P}_L^{2e}|p\mathfrak{D}_L$  for all  $\mathfrak{P}_L$ , contradicting that the ramification index is  $e$ .

For the general case, the previous argument carries through by noting that  $\zeta_{p^k}^s$  is a unit (and thus multiplication of  $G(f, \psi)$  by  $\zeta_{p^k}^s$  does not change the ideal factorization) and that  $G(f, \psi) \in \mathfrak{P}_L$  if and only if  $\zeta_{p^k}^s G(f, \psi) \in \mathfrak{P}_L$ .  $\square$

Since  $\sigma_t$  has order  $p^{k-1}(p-1)$  and  $(n, p) = 1$  we find that  $\zeta_n^b$  must be a nontrivial  $(p-1)$ -th root of unity. Hence there exists a nontrivial multiplicative character  $\chi$  of  $F_p^\times$  such that  $\chi(t^{-1}) = \zeta_n^b$ . But

$\sigma_t(G(\chi, \psi)) = G(\chi, \psi_t) = \chi(t^{-1})G(\chi, \psi)$  and thus

$$\delta = \frac{\tilde{G}}{G(\chi, \psi)}$$

is  $\sigma_t$ -invariant and hence an element of  $K$ . Moreover,  $|\delta| = 1$  (for all complex embeddings) since  $|\tilde{G}| = |G(\chi, \psi)| = p^{1/2}$ .

Write  $f(x) = f_1(x)f_2(x)$  where  $f_1(x)$  takes values in  $p^k$ -th roots of unity and  $f_2(x)$  takes values in  $n$ -th roots of unity. We will show that  $f_1(x)$  must be constant.

**Lemma 5.** *Let*

$$a_i = \sum_{x: \zeta_{p^k}^s f_1(x) \psi(x) = \zeta_{p^k}^i} f_2(x)$$

If

$$(4.2) \quad \zeta_{p^k}^s \sum_{x=1}^{p-1} f(x) \psi(x) = \delta \sum_{x=1}^{p-1} \chi(x) \psi(x),$$

then  $|a_i| = 0$  unless  $i = p^{k-1}j$  for  $j = 1, 2, \dots, p-1$ , in which case  $|a_i| = 1$ . In particular,  $\zeta_{p^k}^s f_1(x) \psi(x)$  ranges over all nontrivial  $p$ -th roots of unity.

*Proof.* Collecting terms in 4.2 according to the values of  $\zeta_{p^k}^s f_1(x) \psi(x)$ , we obtain

$$(4.3) \quad \sum_{i=0}^{p^k-1} a_i \zeta_{p^k}^i = \delta \sum_{i=1}^{p-1} \chi(i) \zeta_p^i \in K(\zeta_p).$$

Clearly  $a_i \in K$  and  $a_i \neq 0$  for at most  $p-1$  values of  $i$ . Letting  $A_i = a_{p^{k-1}i}$  we may, by lemma 3, write equation 4.3 as

$$\sum_{i=0}^{p-1} A_i \zeta_p^i = \delta \sum_{i=1}^{p-1} \chi(i) \zeta_p^i.$$

Since  $1 = -\sum_{i=1}^{p-1} \zeta_p^i$  we get that

$$\sum_{i=1}^{p-1} (A_i - A_0) \zeta_p^i = \sum_{i=0}^{p-1} A_i \zeta_p^i = \delta \sum_{i=1}^{p-1} \chi(i) \zeta_p^i$$

and hence  $A_i - A_0 = \delta \chi(i)$  for all  $i$ .

Since  $a_i \neq 0$  for at most  $p-1$  values of  $i$ ,  $A_0 \neq 0$  implies that  $A_j = 0$  for some  $j \neq 0$ , and thus  $|A_0| = |\delta \chi(j) - A_j| = 1$ . Since

$$0 = \delta \sum_{i=1}^{p-1} \chi(i) = \sum_{i=1}^{p-1} (A_i - A_0) = \sum_{i=0}^{p-1} A_i - pA_0,$$

we find that  $|\sum_{i=0}^{p-1} A_i| = p|A_0| = p$ . On the other hand,  $|\sum_{i=0}^{p-1} A_i| \leq \sum_{x=1}^{p-1} |f_2(x)| = p-1$ . Thus  $A_0 = 0$ , and it follows that  $A_i = \delta\chi(i)$  for  $i \neq 0$ . In other words,  $a_{p^{k-1}j} = A_j = \delta\chi(j)$  for  $j = 1, 2, \dots, p-1$ , and since there are at most  $p-1$  nonzero values among the  $a_i$ 's, the remaining ones must all be equal to zero.  $\square$

Now, the lemma gives that  $\zeta_{p^k}^s f_1(1)\psi(1) = \zeta_{p^k}^s \zeta_p$  is a  $p$ -th root of unity, hence  $p^{k-1}$  must divide  $s$ , and the nonzero values of  $f_1(x)\psi(x)$  are thus distinct  $p$ -th roots of unity. Replacing  $\psi$  by  $\psi_r$ , for  $r \not\equiv 0 \pmod{p}$ , in the previous argument gives that  $f_1(x)\psi(rx)$  also ranges over distinct  $p$ -th roots of unity. On the other hand, if  $f_1(x)$  is not constant, then there exists  $r \not\equiv 0 \pmod{p}$  such that the set  $\{f_1(x)\psi_r(x)\}_{x=1}^{p-1}$  contains strictly less than  $p-1$  elements. (If  $f_1(x_1) \neq f_1(x_2)$ , write  $f_1(x_1) = \zeta_p^{y_1}$ ,  $f_1(x_2) = \zeta_p^{y_2}$  and take  $r \equiv -(y_2 - y_1)(x_2 - x_1)^{-1} \pmod{p}$ .) Hence  $f_1(x)$  must be constant, and since  $f_1(1) = 1$ , we find that the nonzero values of  $f(x)$  are in fact  $n$ -th roots of unity. The result has thus been reduced to the case  $(m, p) = 1$ .

#### REFERENCES

1. A. Biro, *Notes on a problem of H. Cohn*, J. of Number Theory **77** (1999), no. 2, 200–208.
2. K.K.S Choi and M.K. Siu *Counter-Examples to a Problem of Cohn on Classifying Characters*, to appear in J. of Number Theory.
3. H. Montgomery, *Ten lectures on the interface between analytic number theory and harmonic analysis*, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 1994.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA, ATHENS GA 30602 (kurlberg@math.uga.edu)