

ON HAU'S LEMMA

W.K.A. LOH

Let $f \in \mathbb{Z}[X]$ and let q be a prime power $p^l (l \geq 2)$. Hua stated and proved that

$$\sum_{0 \leq x < q} \exp(2\pi i f(x)q^{-1}) < Cq^{(1-1/(M+1))},$$

for some unspecified constant $C > 0$ depending on the derivative f' of f ; M denoting the maximum multiplicity of the roots of the congruence

$$p^{-t} f'(x) \equiv 0 \pmod{p},$$

where t is an integer chosen so that the polynomial $p^{-t} f'(x)$ is primitive. An explicit value for C was given by Chalk for $p \geq 3$. Subsequently, Ping Ding (in two successive articles) obtained better estimates for $p \geq 2$.

This article provides a better result, based upon a more precise form of Hua's main lemma, previously overlooked.

1. INTRODUCTION

Let

$$(1) \quad f(X) = a_k X^k + \dots + a_1 X + a_0 \in \mathbb{Z}[X],$$

and let p denote any prime. The p -content $\nu_p(f)$ of f is defined by

$$\nu_p(f) = \alpha \text{ if } p^\alpha \mid (a_k, \dots, a_0), p^{\alpha+1} \nmid (a_k, \dots, a_0).$$

In particular,

$$\nu_p(a) = \alpha \text{ if } p^\alpha \mid a, p^{\alpha+1} \nmid a.$$

Let $e_q(\alpha) = \exp(2\pi i \alpha q^{-1})$ and let

$$(2) \quad S(q, f) = \sum_{0 \leq x < q} e_q[f(x)].$$

Received 1 February 1994

I wish to thank Professors J.H.H. Chalk and R.C. Vaughan for their very helpful advice, comments and suggestions.

Copyright Clearance Centre, Inc. Serial-fee code: 0004-9729/94 \$A2.00+0.00.

Now suppose that $q = p^l$ is a power of p and that

$$(3) \quad \nu_p[f(X) - f(0)] = 0, \quad \nu_p[f'(X)] = t \geq 0.$$

Let m, M denote the sum and the maximum, respectively, of the multiplicities of the roots of the congruence (where $\pmod p$ is denoted by (p) for convenience)

$$(4) \quad p^{-t}f'(x) \equiv 0 \pmod p, \quad (0 \leq x < p).$$

Let $r = r(f)$ denote the number of distinct roots of the congruence (4). If $r(f) > 0$, let $\mu_1, \mu_2, \dots, \mu_r$ denote the roots of (4) and let their multiplicities be m_1, m_2, \dots, m_r . Thus $m = m_1 + m_2 + \dots + m_r$ and $M = \max(m_1, m_2, \dots, m_r)$.

In [4], Hua derived the estimate

$$|S(p^l, f)| \leq k^3 p^{l(1-1/k)},$$

by induction on l . In [1], Chalk derived a more precise form of Hua's lemma.

THEOREM. *Suppose $f(X)$ satisfies (1) and (4), let $p \geq 2$ be a prime and l an integer ≥ 2 . Then*

- (i) $|S(p^l, f)| \leq m k p^{t/(M+1)} p^{l[1-1/(M+1)]}$, if $r(f) > 0$;
- (ii) $S(p^l, f) = 0$, if $r(f) = 0$; for all $l \geq 2(t+1)$. Otherwise $|S(p^l, f)| \leq p^{2t+1}$, where $p^t \leq k$.

Chalk further conjectured that

$$(5) \quad |S(p^l, f)| \leq m p^{t/(M+1)} p^{l(1-1/(M+1))}.$$

In [2], Ping Ding obtained a better upper bound

$$(6) \quad |S(p^n, f(x))| \leq m p^{\tau/(M+1)} p^{t/(M+1)} p^{n(1-1/(M+1))},$$

where $\tau = [\log k / \log p]$.

Loxton and Vaughan [5] proved that

$$|S(p^l, f)| \leq (k-1) p^{\sigma/(e+1)} p^{\tau/(e+1)} p^{l(1-1/(e+1))},$$

where

$$e = \max_{1 \leq i \leq s} e_i, \quad \tau = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } p \leq k; \\ 0, & \text{if } p > k. \end{cases}$$

Here

$$f'(x) = k a_k (X - \zeta_1)^{e_1} (X - \zeta_2)^{e_2} \dots (X - \zeta_s)^{e_s},$$

where $\zeta_1, \zeta_2, \dots, \zeta_s$ are the distinct roots of $f'(x)$ in a finite extension K_p of the p -adic field Q_p and

$$\delta = \nu_p[\theta(f')],$$

where $\theta(f')$ denotes the different of $f'(x)$ and ν_p the unique extension of the valuation in Q_p to K_p .

In this paper, we shall prove a result which is close to the conjecture of Chalk. We follow Chalk's argument in [1] using induction on l . The improved estimate stated in Theorem 1 is due to an improved form of Lemma 3 in [1].

THEOREM 1. *Suppose that f satisfies (4). Let $p \leq k$ be a prime and*

$$\theta(p) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } p \geq 3, \\ 2 & \text{if } p = 2. \end{cases}$$

Suppose that $l \geq 2$,

(i) if $r(f) > 0$, then

$$(7) \quad |S(p^l, f)| \leq mp^{(t+\theta)/(M+1)} p^{l(1-1/(M+1))};$$

(ii) if $r(f) = 0$, then

$$S(p^l, f) = 0,$$

for all $l > t + \theta$ and otherwise $|S(p^l, f)| \leq p^{t+\theta}$.

THEOREM 2. *Suppose that $r(f) > 0$, $l \geq 2$ and f is as in (1). Let $p > k \geq 2$ be a prime. Then*

$$(8) \quad |S(p^l, f)| \leq mp^{l(1-1/(M+1))}.$$

2. LEMMATA

LEMMA 1. (See Hua [3].)

(i) Suppose that

$$\nu_p[f(X) - f(0)] = 0, \text{ and } \nu_p[f(pX + \mu) - f(\mu)] = \sigma(\mu) = \sigma.$$

Then

$$1 \leq \sigma \leq k.$$

(ii) Suppose that

$$\nu_p[f(X) - f(0)] = 0, \text{ and } f(X) \equiv (X - \mu)^\omega h(X) \pmod{p},$$

where $(h(0), p) = 1$. Then

$$p^{-\sigma} f(pX + \mu) \equiv H(X)(p),$$

where $\sigma = \nu_p[f(pX + \mu)]$ and

$$(9) \quad \deg H(X) \leq \omega.$$

LEMMA 2. (See [1], Lemma 2.) Suppose that

$$\nu_p[f(X) - f(0)] = 0, \quad \nu_p[f'(X)] = t$$

and that μ ($0 \leq \mu < p$) is a root of the congruence

$$p^{-1} f(X) \equiv 0 \pmod{p}$$

with multiplicity $\omega \geq 1$. Let

$$g(X) = p^{-\sigma} [f(pX + \mu) - f(\mu)],$$

where $\sigma = \nu_p[f(pX + \mu) - f(\mu)]$. If $\nu_p[g'(X)] = \tau$, then

$$(10) \quad \sigma + \tau \leq \omega + 1 + t.$$

DEFINITION: Let

$$S_\mu = \sum_{0 \leq x < p^l, x \equiv \mu \pmod{p}} e_p^l \{f(x)\}.$$

Then

$$|S_\mu| \leq p^{l-1},$$

and

$$(11) \quad S(p^l, f) = \sum_{0 \leq \mu < p} S_\mu.$$

LEMMA 3. Suppose that $l \geq t + 2$ and $p \geq 3$. Then

- (i) $S_\mu = 0$, unless μ is a root of the congruence (4).
- (ii) If μ is any such root and

$$g(X) = p^{-\sigma} [f(pX + \mu) - f(\mu)],$$

where σ is chosen so that $\nu_p[g(X)] = 0$, then

$$(12) \quad |S_\mu| \leq p^{\sigma-1} |S(p^{l-\sigma}, g)|,$$

provided that

$$l > \sigma.$$

Further, (i) and (ii) hold in the special case $p = 2$, provided that $l \geq t + 3$.

PROOF: Put

$$x = y + p^{l-t-1}z, 0 \leq y < p^{l-t-1}, 0 \leq z < p^{t+1}.$$

Let

$$g(x) = p^{-t}f'(x), g'(x) = p^{-t}f''(x), \dots, g^{(n-1)}(x) = p^{-t}f^{(n)}(x), \dots$$

Now $p^{-t}f'(X)$ has integer coefficients. Therefore,

$$(13) \quad \frac{g^{(n-1)}(X)}{(n-1)!} = \frac{p^{-t}f^{(n)}(X)}{(n-1)!} \in \mathbb{Z}[X].$$

The coefficient a_n of z^n in the Taylor expansion of $f(y + p^{l-t-1}z)$ is

$$(14) \quad a_n = p^{n(l-t-1)} \frac{f^{(n)}(y)}{n!} = p^{n(l-t-1)} \frac{p^t g^{(n-1)}(y)}{n(n-1)!}.$$

Hence,

$$\nu_p(a_n) \geq n(l-t-1) + t - \nu_p(n).$$

For $n = 2$,

$$\begin{aligned} \nu_p(a_2) &\geq 2(l-t-1) + t - \nu_p(2), \\ &= (l-t-2 - \nu_p(2)) + l. \end{aligned}$$

If $p \geq 3$ and $l \geq t + 2$ or $p = 2$ and $l \geq t + 3$, then $\nu_p(a_2) \geq l$. For $n \geq 3$,

$$\begin{aligned} \nu_p(a_n) &\geq n(l-t-1) + t - \nu_p(n), \\ &= (n-1)(l-t-2) + n - \nu_p(n) - 2 + l. \end{aligned}$$

If $l \geq t + 2$, then $\nu_p(a_n) \geq l$ for all p . Therefore, the coefficient a_n has a p^l factor for $p \geq 3$ and $l \geq t + 2$ or $p = 2$ and $l \geq t + 3$. Hence, we have

$$\begin{aligned} S_\mu &= \sum_{\substack{0 \leq y < p^{l-t-1} \\ y \equiv \mu \pmod{p}}} \sum_{0 \leq z < p^{t+1}} e_p \{ [f(y) + p^{l-t-1}f'(y)z + p^{2l-2t-2}f''(y)z^2], \\ &= \sum_{\substack{0 \leq y < p^{l-t-1} \\ y \equiv \mu \pmod{p}}} \sum_{0 \leq z < p^{t+1}} e_p \{ [f(y) + p^{l-t-1}f'(y)z], \\ &= \sum_{\substack{0 \leq y < p^{l-t-1} \\ y \equiv \mu \pmod{p}}} e_p \{ [f(y)] \} \sum_{0 \leq z < p^{t+1}} e_p \{ [f'(y)z] \}. \end{aligned}$$

Now if $f'(y) \not\equiv 0 \pmod{p^{t+1}}$, then the inner sum equals 0 and as $y \equiv \mu \pmod{p}$, we see that $S_\mu = 0$, unless μ is a root of (4). Further, for any μ , we have the following reductive formula for S_μ :

$$\begin{aligned} S_\mu &= \sum_{0 \leq y < p^{l-1}} e_{p^l}[f(py + \mu)], \\ &= e_{p^l}[f(\mu)] \sum_{0 \leq y < p^{l-1}} e_{p^l}[p^\sigma g(y)], \\ &= e_{p^l}[f(\mu)] p^{\sigma-1} S(p^{l-\sigma}, g), \text{ if } l > \sigma. \end{aligned}$$

□

3. PROOF OF THE THEOREMS

PROOF OF THEOREM 1: (A) If $2 \leq l \leq t + \theta$, then by a trivial estimate

$$(15) \quad |S(p^l, f)| \leq p^l \leq p^{(t+\theta)/(M+1)} p^{l(1-1/(M+1))}.$$

(B) If $l > t + \theta$, $S_\mu = 0$, unless $\mu = \mu_i$ for some i , by Lemma 3. By lemma 2 we have

$$\sigma_i + t_i \leq m_i + 1 + t.$$

(i) If $l - \sigma_i \leq t_i + \theta$ for some i , a trivial estimate gives

$$(16) \quad |S_{\mu_i}| \leq p^{l-1} = p^{(l-m_i-1)/(m_i+1)} p^{l(1-1/(m_i+1))} \leq p^{(t+\theta)/(m_i+1)} p^{l(1-1/(m_i+1))},$$

since $l - m_i - l \leq \sigma_i + t_i + \theta - m_i - 1 \leq t + \theta$ by (10).

(ii) Otherwise, if $l > \sigma_i + t_i + \theta$ for some i , we obtain

$$(17) \quad |S_{\mu_i}| \leq p^{\sigma_i-1} |S(p^{(l-\sigma_i)}, g_i)|,$$

by Lemma 3. Since $m(g_i) \leq m_i$, by induction and (10),

$$\begin{aligned} |S_{\mu_i}| &\leq m(g_i) p^{\sigma_i-1} p^{(l-\sigma_i)(1-(1-(t_i+\theta)/(l-\sigma_i))/(M(g_i)+1))}, \\ &\leq m_i p^{\sigma_i-1} p^{(l-\sigma_i)(1-(1-(t_i+\theta)/(l-\sigma_i))/(m_i+1))}, \\ &= m_i p^{\sigma_i-1} p^{(t_i+\theta)/(m_i+1)} p^{(l-\sigma_i)(1-1/(m_i+1))}, \\ (18) \quad &= m_i p^{(\sigma_i+t_i+\theta)/(m_i+1)-1} p^{l(1-1/(m_i+1))}, \\ &\leq m_i p^{(t+\theta)/(m_i+1)} p^{l(1-1/(m_i+1))}, \\ &= m_i p^{l(1-(1-(t+\theta)/l)/(m_i+1))}, \\ &\leq m_i p^{(t+\theta)/(M+1)} p^{l(1-1/(M+1))}. \end{aligned}$$

For $r(f) > 0$, $l > t + \theta$, by (11), (16) and (18), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 |S(p^l, f)| &\leq \sum_{1 \leq i \leq r(f)} m_i p^{(t+\theta)/(M+1)} p^{l(1-(1/M+1))}, \\
 &= m p^{(t+\theta)/(M+1)} p^{l(1-(1/M+1))}.
 \end{aligned}$$

□

PROOF OF THEOREM 2: Since $p > k \geq 2$, therefore $t = 0$ and all $t_i = 0$. By Lemma 2 we have

$$(19) \quad \sigma_i \leq m_i + 1,$$

and by Lemma 3 we have

$$|S_{\mu}| \leq p^{\sigma-1} |S(p^{l-\sigma}, g)|.$$

(A) When $l = 2$, we have

$$|S_{\mu_i}| = \left| \sum_{0 \leq y < p} e_{p^2} [f(py + \mu_i) - f(\mu_i)] \right| = p,$$

and so

$$|S(p^l, f)| \leq mp = mp^{2(1-1/2)} \leq mp^{l(1-(1/M+1))}.$$

(B) When $l > 2$, we consider three cases:

Case (i). If $l \geq \sigma_i$ for some i , using the trivial estimate

$$(20) \quad |S_{u_i}| \geq p^{\ell-1} \geq p^{\ell(1/m_i+1)} \geq p^{\ell(1-(1/M+1))},$$

Case (ii). If $l - \sigma_i = 1$, then by Lemma 3 (ii)

$$|S_{\mu_i}| \leq p^{\sigma_i-1} |S(p, g)|.$$

Since

$$S(p, g) = \sum_{0 \leq y < p} e_p \left[\frac{f'(\mu_i)}{p^{l-2}} y + \frac{f''(\mu_i)}{2!p^{l-3}} y^2 + \dots + \frac{f^{(l-2)}(\mu_i)}{(l-2)!} y^{(l-1)} \right]$$

by Weil’s estimate, we have

$$|S(p, g)| \leq (l-2)p^{1/2},$$

since $l = \sigma_i + 1 \leq m_i + 2$. Therefore

$$|S(p, g)| \leq m_i p^{1/2}.$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned}
 (21) \quad |S_\mu| &\leq p^{\sigma_i-1} m_i p^{1/2}, \\
 &\leq m_i p^{\sigma_i-1} p^{(l-\sigma_i)(1-(1/M+1))}, \\
 &\leq m_i p^{l(1-(1/M+1))},
 \end{aligned}$$

since $\sigma_i \leq m_i + 1$.

Case (iii). Otherwise, if $2 \leq l - \sigma_i$, then by induction

$$\begin{aligned}
 (22) \quad |S_{\mu_i}| &\leq p^{\sigma_i-1} m(g_i) p^{(l-\sigma_i)(1-(1/M(g_i)+1))}, \\
 &\leq m_i p^{\sigma_i/(m_i+1)-1} p^{l(1-(1/(m_i+1)))}, \\
 &\leq m_i p^{l(1-(1/M+1))},
 \end{aligned}$$

since $m(g_i) \leq m_i$ and $\sigma_i \leq m_i + 1$.

For $r(f) > 0$ and $l \geq 2$, by (11), (20), (21) and (22), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 |S(p^l, f)| &\leq \sum_{1 \leq i \leq r(f)} m_i p^{l(1-(1/M+1))}, \\
 &= m p^{l(1-(1/M+1))}.
 \end{aligned}$$

□

REFERENCES

- [1] J.H.H. Chalk, 'On Hua's estimates for exponential sums', *Mathematika* **34** (1987), 115–123.
- [2] Ping Ding, 'An improvement to Chalk's estimation of exponential sums', *Acta Arith.* **LIX.2** (1991), 149–155.
- [3] Loo-Keng Hua, *Additive theory of prime numbers* (American Mathematical Society, Providence, 1965), pp. 2–7.
- [4] Loo-Keng Hua, 'Die abschätzung von Exponentialsummen und ihre Anwendung in der Zahlentheorie', *Enzyklopädie der Math. Wiss* **Bd 12, H.13, TI** (1959), p. 41.
- [5] J.H. Loxton and R.C. Vaughan, 'The estimation of complete exponential sums', *Canad. Math. Bull.* **28** (1985), 440–454.

Department of Mathematics
 Imperial College
 Huxley Building
 180 Queen's Gate
 London SW7 2BZ
 United Kingdom