arXiv:2202.07236v1 [math.NT] 15 Feb 2022

QUANTITATIVE OPPENHEIM CONJECTURE FOR QUADRATIC FORMS IN 5 VARIABLES OVER FUNCTION FIELDS

STEPHAN BAIER AND ARKAPRAVA BHANDARI

Abstract. We translate Davenport's and Heilbronn's work [4] on a quantitative version of the Oppenheim conjecture for indefinite diagonal quadratic forms in 5 variables into the setting of function fields.

Contents

1. Introduction and main result 1
1.1. Notation 2
1.2. Translation into the function field setting 2
2. Preliminaries 3
3. Completion of the proof 10
3.1. Proof of Theorem 2 11
References 12

1. Introduction and main result

The Oppenheim conjecture, famously proved by Margulis [5], states that if Q is a non-degenerate indefinite quadratic form over $\mathbb{R}$ in at least 3 variables which is not a multiple of a form with rational coefficients, then for any $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists a nonzero vector $\mathbf{x}$ with integer components such that $Q(\mathbf{x}) < \varepsilon$. There has been a long history of this problem. We would like to point the interested reader to [6] for a comprehensive account. One of the first important results on the Oppenheim conjecture was due to Davenport and Heilbronn who proved it for diagonal forms in 5 variables using an entirely analytic method which yielded a quantitative version of the Oppenheim conjecture. Their approach used a variant of the circle method. In contrast, the work of Margulis [5] used ergodic theory, yielding a qualitative result. There has been a more recent quantitative result for *generic* diagonal forms in 3 variables due to Bourgain [3] which made use of mean value estimates for Dirichlet polynomials. In the context of function fields, the Oppenheim conjecture was established, in qualitative form, by Mohammadi [7], following the original ergodic theoretic proof of Margulis. However, the authors are not aware of a function field version of the above-mentioned work of Davenport and Heilbronn [4] in the literature. In this article, we produce a version of their result for function fields. Since this is a quantitative result, it does not follow from the above-mentioned work of Mohammadi [7]. Our arguments are similar to those in [4], and we present the material essentially in the same order. At some points, the arguments become simpler, and at other points we need to use extra ideas to make them work. In particular, we will employ results on quadratic exponential sums and integrals for function fields in [1]. We recall the original result of Davenport and Heilbronn [4, Theorem*] below.

Theorem 1 (Davenport-Heilbronn)**.** *Let $\lambda_1, ..., \lambda_5$ be real numbers, not all of the same sign, and none of them zero, such that one at least of the ratios λ_i/λ_j is irrational. Then there exist arbitrarily large integers P such that the inequalities*

$$1 \le x_1 \le P, ..., 1 \le x_5 \le P, \quad |Q(x_1, ..., x_5)| < 1$$

have more than γP^3 solutions, where $\gamma = \gamma(\lambda_1, ..., \lambda_5)$.

First, we aim to translate this statement into the setting of function fields K in one variable over the finite field $\mathbb{F}_q$. To this end, we need to introduce some notation. For background material about function fields, see [8], for example.

2020 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 11H50,11H55,11J25,11L03,11L05,11L07,11R58.
Key words and phrases. Oppenheim conjecture, quadratic forms, function fields, quadratic exponential sums and integrals, circle method.

1.1. **Notation.** Let q be a prime power and denote by $\mathbb{F}_q$ the field with q elements. We set $\mathbf{A} := \mathbb{F}_q[T]$, the polynomial ring in one variable over $\mathbb{F}_q$, and $K := \mathbb{F}_q(T)$, its quotient field. We denote by K_∞ the completion of the rational function field K with respect to the norm at infinity, given by

$$\left|\frac{f}{g}\right|_\infty = q^{\deg f - \deg g} \quad \text{for } (f,g) \in \mathbf{A} \times \mathbf{A}^*.$$

For simplicity, we will drop the subscript ∞ on the left-hand side throughout the sequel. We recall that every element of K_∞ is of the form

$$x = \sum_{n=-\infty}^{M} a_n T^n,$$

where $a_n \in \mathbb{F}_q$, and the norm of x equals

$$|x| = q^M$$

if $a_M \neq 0$. In this situation, the coefficient a_M is referred to as *leading coefficient* of x and we define

$$\deg x := M.$$

We denote by $\mathcal{B}(x, M)$ the open ball of radius q^M around $x \in K_\infty$, i.e.

$$\mathcal{B}(x, M) := \{y \in K_\infty : |y - x| < q^M\}.$$

The valued field K_∞ has a unique Haar measure μ which on these balls takes the values

$$\mu(\mathcal{B}(x, M)) = q^M.$$

This Haar measure gives rise to a unique Haar integral on measurable subsets of K_∞. An important instance is that of Fourier integrals, giving rise to a Fourier transform over K_∞. Suppose that $q = p^n$, where p is a prime. The exponential function replacing $\exp(2\pi i x)$ over the reals is in this context defined as

$$e(x) := \exp\left(2\pi i \cdot \frac{\mathrm{Tr}(a_{-1})}{p}\right),$$

where

$$x = \sum_{n=-\infty}^{M} a_n T^n$$

with $M \geq -1$ (if $\deg x < -1$, then set $a_i := 0$ if $i > \deg x$) and Tr: $\mathbb{F}_q \to \mathbb{F}_p$ is the trace map (see [1], for example). Similarly as for functions on the real numbers, we define the Fourier transform of a function $f : K_\infty \to \mathbb{C}$ as

$$\hat{f}(y) := \int_{K_\infty} f(x) e(-xy) d\mu(x),$$

if existent.

1.2. **Translation into the function field setting.** Now we translate Theorem 1 into the function field setting. In this situation, the λ_i's in Theorem 1 are replaced by elements of K_∞^* such that at least one ratio λ_i/λ_j is not in K, which is analogous to being irrational. We further observe that the condition of the λ_i's not being of equal sign in Theorem 1 is equivalent to at least one of the signed ratios $-\lambda_k/\lambda_l$ with $k \neq l$ being positive. Being positive is characterized by being a square of an element in $\mathbb{R}^*$. Therefore, an analogous condition in the function field setting is that at least one of the signed ratios $-\lambda_k/\lambda_l$ with $k \neq l$ is a square of an element in K_∞^*. Further, the variable P in Theorem 1 is now replaced by q^M with $M \in \mathbb{N}$ and the condition $1 \leq x_i \leq P$ by $|x_i| < q^M$. (We prefer "$<$" over "$\leq$" because $|x_i| < q^N$ is the same as $x_i \in \mathcal{B}(0, M)$.) Of course, the condition of x_i being an integer is replaced by $x_i \in \mathbf{A}$. Now we are ready to formulate our main result.

Theorem 2 (Theorem of Davenport and Heilbronn in the setting of function fields)**.** *Let $q = p^n > 2^{16}$, where p is an odd prime. Let $\lambda_1, \cdots, \lambda_5 \in K_\infty^*$ such that at least one of the ratios λ_i/λ_j is not an element of K and at least one of the signed ratios $-\lambda_k/\lambda_l$ with $k \neq l$ is a square of on element in K_∞^*. Then there exist arbitrarily large positive integers M such that the inequalities*

$$\max_{1 \leq i \leq 5} |x_i| < q^M, \qquad |Q(x_1, \ldots, x_5)| < 1, \qquad x_1, \ldots, x_5 \in \mathbf{A}$$

have more than γq^{3M} solutions, where $\gamma = \gamma(\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_5) > 0$.

In the following, we will translate Davenport's and Heilbronn's proof of their Theorem 1 into a proof of Theorem 2. The restriction to odd primes p above is needed because we use results in [1] in which this was assumed.

Acknowledgements. The authors would like to thank the Ramakrishna Mission Vivekananda Educational and Research Institute for providing excellent working conditions. The second-named author would like to thank CSIR, Govt. of India for financial support in the form of a Junior Research Fellowship.

2. Preliminaries

Throughout the sequel, we assume that $M \in \mathbb{N}$. For any $\alpha \in K_\infty$ we define

$$S(\alpha) := \sum_{x \in \mathcal{B}(0,M)} e(\alpha x^2) \quad \text{and} \quad I(\alpha) := \int_{\mathcal{B}(0,M)} e(\alpha x^2) d\mu(x).$$

Here and throughout the sequel, we tacitly assume in summations that the summation variable runs over elements of $\mathbf{A}$ (so by $x \in \mathcal{B}(0,M)$ we really mean $x \in \mathcal{B}(0,M) \cap \mathbf{A}$). We shall need the following version of the Dirichlet approximation theorem for K_∞.

Lemma 1. *Let L be any non-negative integer. Then for any $\alpha \in K_\infty$ there exist $a, r \in \mathbf{A}$ with $r \neq 0$ such that*

$$|r| \leq q^L \text{ and } \left|\alpha - \frac{a}{r}\right| < q^{-(L+N)} \text{ where } |r| = q^N.$$

Proof. This is the one-dimensional case of Theorem 5.5 in [1]. □

Consider the characteristic function

$$\chi_{\mathcal{B}(0,1)}(x) := \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } |x| < 1 \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

We shall need the following result on its Fourier transform.

Lemma 2. *The Fourier transform of $\chi_{\mathcal{B}(0,1)}$ is the function itself, that is,*

$$\hat{\chi}_{\mathcal{B}(0,1)}(x) = \int_{K_\infty} \chi_{\mathcal{B}(0,1)}(y) e(-xy) d\mu(y) = \chi_{\mathcal{B}(0,1)}(x). \tag{2.1}$$

Proof. See [1, Lemma 5.4]. □

We shall also use the Poisson summation formula for function fields.

Lemma 3 (Poisson Summation Formula)**.** *Let $\Phi : K_\infty \to \mathbb{C}$ be a function such that*

$$F(x) = \sum_{f \in \mathbf{A}} |\Phi(f + x)|$$

is uniformly convergent in compact subsets of K_∞ and

$$\sum_{g \in \mathbf{A}} |\hat{\Phi}(g)|$$

is convergent. Then

$$\sum_{f \in \mathbf{A}} \Phi(f) = \sum_{g \in \mathbf{A}} \hat{\Phi}(g).$$

Proof. See [1, Lemma 5.3]. □

The following is a result on incomplete quadratic Gauss sums.

Lemma 4. *If $a, r \in \mathbf{A}$ with $r \neq 0$, $(a, r) = 1, |r| = q^N$ and $0 \leq l \leq N$, then for any $x_0 \in K_\infty$,*

$$\left| \sum_{x \in \mathcal{B}(x_0, l)} e\left(\frac{a}{r} x^2\right) \right| \leq q^{N/2}.$$

Proof. Multiplying out the modulus square gives

$$\left|\sum_{x\in\mathcal{B}(x_0,l)} e\left(\frac{a}{r}x^2\right)\right|^2 = \left|\sum_{x,y\in\mathcal{B}(x_0,l)} e\left(\frac{a}{r}(x^2-y^2)\right)\right|$$
$$= \left|\sum_{X\in\mathcal{B}(x_0,l)}\sum_{Y\in\mathcal{B}(0,l)} e\left(\frac{a}{r}XY\right)\right| \qquad \text{(where } X=x+y \text{ and } Y=x-y\text{)}.$$

Now,

$$\sum_{Y\in\mathcal{B}(0,l)} e\left(\frac{a}{r}XY\right) = \sum_{Y\in\mathbf{A}} e\left(\frac{a}{r}XY\right)\cdot\chi_{\mathcal{B}(0,1)}(T^{-l}Y).$$

Using Lemmas 2 and 3, the above equals

$$q^l\sum_{Y\in\mathbf{A}}\chi_{\mathcal{B}(0,1)}\left(T^l\left(Y-\frac{a}{r}X\right)\right).$$

We observe that

$$\sum_{Y\in\mathbf{A}}\chi_{\mathcal{B}(0,1)}\left(T^l\left(Y-\frac{a}{r}X\right)\right) = \begin{cases}1, & \text{if } \|aX/r\|<q^{-l},\\ 0, & \text{otherwise.}\end{cases}$$

Here $||\cdot||$ denotes the norm of the fractional part, that is,

$$\left\|\sum_{n=-\infty}^{N} a_nT^n\right\| := \left|\sum_{n=-\infty}^{-1} a_nT^n\right|,$$

where we set $a_i=0$ if $N<i\le -1$. So, $\|X\| = \min_{X_0\in\mathbf{A}}|X-X_0|$.

Now if $aX\equiv R \bmod r$ with $|R|<|r|=q^N$, then $\|aX/r\| = q^{-N}\cdot|R|$. We observe that if $X_1, X_2\in\mathcal{B}(x_0,l)$ with $X_1\neq X_2$ and $l\le N$, then $X_1\not\equiv X_2 \bmod r$, which implies $aX_1\not\equiv aX_2 \bmod r$ as $(a,r)=1$. Hence,

$$\left|\sum_{X\in\mathcal{B}(x_0,l)}\sum_{Y\in\mathcal{B}(0,l)} e\left(\frac{a}{r}XY\right)\right| \le q^l\cdot\#\{X\in\mathcal{B}(x_0,l):\|aX/r\|<q^{-l}\}$$
$$\le q^l\cdot\#\{R\in\mathbf{A}:|R|<q^{N-l}\}$$
$$= q^N.$$

□

If $|\alpha|$ is small enough, then it turns out that $S(\alpha)$ equals $I(\alpha)$:

Lemma 5. *If $|\alpha|<q^{-M}$, then $S(\alpha)=I(\alpha)$.*

Proof. We observe that if $|z_1-z_2|<q^{-1}$ for some $z_1,z_2\in K_\infty$, then $e(z_1)=e(z_2)$. Now let $x\in\mathcal{B}(0,M)\cap\mathbf{A}$ and $y\in\mathcal{B}(x,0)$. Then as $|\alpha|<q^{-M}$, we have $|x|<q^M\le q^{-1}|\alpha|^{-1}$, which implies $\max\{1,|x|\}<q^{-1}|\alpha|^{-1}$. This in turn gives $|y+x|<q^{-1}|\alpha|^{-1}$. So, $|\alpha y^2-\alpha x^2| = |\alpha|\cdot|y-x|\cdot|y+x|<q^{-1}$. Hence we get $e(\alpha y^2)=e(\alpha x^2)$ for all $y\in\mathcal{B}(x,0)$. Therefore,

$$I(\alpha) = \int\limits_{\mathcal{B}(0,M)} e(\alpha x^2) = \sum_{x\in\mathcal{B}(0,M)}\int\limits_{\mathcal{B}(x,0)} e(\alpha y^2)d\mu(y) = \sum_{x\in\mathcal{B}(0,M)} e(\alpha x^2)\cdot\mu(\mathcal{B}(x,0)) = \sum_{x\in\mathcal{B}(0,M)} e(\alpha x^2) = S(\alpha).$$

□

If α is near a quotient a/r in K, then we have the following bound.

Lemma 6. *If $\alpha=a/r+\beta$ with $a,r\in\mathbf{A}$, $r\neq 0$, $|r|=q^N$ and $|\beta|\le q^{-(N+M)}$, then*

$$S(\alpha) = O\left(q^{N(1/2+\varepsilon)} + q^{M-N(1/2-\varepsilon)}\right).$$

Proof. We write $a_0=0$ and $\mathbb{F}_q^* = \{a_1,\dots,a_{q-1}\}$. Let $j=u_sq^s+u_{s-1}q^{s-1}+\cdots+u_0$ be the q-adic representation of $j\in\mathbb{N}$. We set

$$x_j = a_{u_s}T^s + a_{u_{s-1}}T^{s-1}+\cdots+a_{u_0}T^0.$$

Then it follows that

$$\sum_{x\in\mathcal{B}(0,M)} e(\alpha x^2) = \sum_{i=0}^{q^M-1} e(\alpha x_i^2).$$

We further observe that $x_0 = 0$ and $|x_i - x_{i-1}| = q^{\mathrm{ord}_q(i)}$ if $i > 0$ (where $\mathrm{ord}_q(i)$ is the largest n such that $q^n|i$). Now we have

$$\begin{aligned} S(\alpha) &= \sum_{x\in\mathcal{B}(0,M)} e(\alpha x^2) = \sum_{i=0}^{q^M-1} e(\alpha x_i^2) \\ &= \sum_{i=0}^{q^M-1} e\left(\frac{a}{r}x_i^2\right)\cdot e(\beta x_i^2) \\ &= \sum_{i=0}^{q^M-1} (A_i - A_{i-1})\cdot e(\beta x_i^2) \quad \text{where } A_i := \sum_{k=0}^{i} e\left(\frac{a}{r}x_k^2\right) \\ &= \sum_{i=0}^{q^M-1} A_i(e(\beta x_i^2) - e(\beta x_{i+1}^2)) + A_{q^M-1}e(\beta x_{q^M}^2). \end{aligned} \tag{2.2}$$

If $j = u_s q^s + u_{s-1}q^{s-1} + \cdots + u_0$, then

$$\begin{aligned} A_j = &\sum_{i=0}^{u_s q^s-1} e\left(\frac{a}{r}x_i^2\right) + \sum_{i=0}^{u_{s-1}q^{s-1}-1} e\left(\frac{a}{r}x_{u_s q^s+i}^2\right) + \sum_{i=0}^{u_{s-2}q^{s-2}-1} e\left(\frac{a}{r}x_{u_s q^s+u_{s-1}q^{s-1}+i}^2\right) + \cdots \\ &+ \sum_{i=0}^{u_0} e\left(\frac{a}{r}x_{u_s q^s+u_{s-1}q^{s-1}+\ldots+u_1 q+i}^2\right). \end{aligned}$$

This can be written in the form

$$\begin{aligned} A_j = &\sum_{k=0}^{u_s-1} \sum_{|x-a_k T^s|<q^s} e\left(\frac{a}{r}x^2\right) + \sum_{k=0}^{u_{s-1}-1} \sum_{|x-(a_{u_s}T^s+a_k T^{s-1})|<q^{s-1}} e\left(\frac{a}{r}x^2\right) + \cdots \\ &+ \sum_{k=0}^{u_1-1} \sum_{|x-(a_{u_s}T^s+a_{u_{s-1}}T^{s-1}+\ldots+a_{u_2}T^2+a_k T)|<q} e\left(\frac{a}{r}x^2\right) + O(q). \end{aligned} \tag{2.3}$$

If $l \geq N$, then

$$\sum_{|x-x_0|<l} e\left(\frac{a}{r}x^2\right) = \sum_{x\in\mathcal{B}(x_0,l)} e\left(\frac{a}{r}x^2\right) = q^{l-N} \sum_{x\in\mathcal{B}(0,N)} e\left(\frac{a}{r}x^2\right) = q^{l-N}A_{q^N-1}.$$

Note that $|A_{q^N-1}| \leq q^{N/2}$ by Lemma 4. For $l < N$, by the same Lemma 4,

$$\left|\sum_{|x-x_0|<q^l} e\left(\frac{a}{r}x^2\right)\right| \leq q^{N/2}.$$

Thus we can write, for $l < N$,

$$\sum_{|x-x_0|<q^l} e\left(\frac{a}{r}x^2\right) = q^{l-N}A_{q^N-1} + O(q^{N/2}). \tag{2.4}$$

(In this case, since $|A_{q^N-1}| \leq q^{N/2}$, the main term is just dominated by the error term.) We set

$$E_l = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } l < N, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Then from (2.3) and (2.4) it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} A_j =& \left(u_s q^{s-N} A_{q^N-1} + O(qE_s q^{N/2})\right) + \left(u_{s-1} q^{s-1-N} A_{q^N-1} + O(qE_{s-1} q^{N/2})\right) + \cdots \\ &+ \left(u_0 q^{0-N} A_{q^N-1} + O(qE_0 q^{N/2})\right) \\ =&(u_s q^s + u_{s-1} q^{s-1} + \cdots + u_0 q^0) q^{-N} A_{q^N-1} + O(qNq^{N/2}) \\ =&jq^{-N} A_{q^N-1} + O(Nq^{N/2+1}). \end{aligned} \tag{2.5}$$

Arguing as before, we have

$$q^{-N} A_{q^N-1} S(\beta) = q^{-N} A_{q^N-1} \sum_{i=0}^{q^M-1} i \left(e(\beta x_i^2) - e(\beta x_{i+1}^2)\right) + q^{-N} A_{q^N-1}(q^M-1) e(\beta x_{q^M}^2). \tag{2.6}$$

Subtracting (2.6) from (2.2) and using (2.5) and $|A_{q^N-1}| \le q^{N/2}$, we get

$$S(\alpha) - q^{-N} A_{q^N-1} S(\beta) = O\left(q^{N(1/2+\varepsilon)} \left(1 + \sum_{i=0}^{q^M-1} \left|e(\beta x_i^2) - e(\beta x_{i+1}^2)\right|\right) + q^{M-N/2}\right).$$

We have $e(\beta x_i^2) - e(\beta x_{i+1}^2) = 0$ if and only if $e(\beta(x_{i+1}^2 - x_i^2)) = 1$. This is the case if $|\beta(x_{i+1}^2 - x_i^2)| < q^{-1}$. Now

$$|\beta(x_{i+1}^2 - x_i^2)| = |\beta(x_{i+1} + x_i)(x_{i+1} - x_i)| \le |\beta| \cdot \max\{|x_i|, |x_{i+1}|\} \cdot q^{\mathrm{ord}_q(i+1)} \le |\beta| \cdot q^{M + \mathrm{ord}_q(i+1)}.$$

So we have $|\beta(x_{i+1}^2 - x_i^2)| < q^{-1}$ if i is such that $|\beta| \cdot q^{M+\mathrm{ord}_q(i+1)} < q^{-1}$. This implies

$$\sum_{i=0}^{q^M-1} \left|e(\beta x_i^2) - e(\beta x_{i+1}^2)\right| \ll \sum_{\substack{i=1 \\ |\beta| \cdot q^{M+\mathrm{ord}_q(i+1)} \ge q^{-1}}}^{q^M} 1 \ll |\beta| \cdot q^{2M}.$$

Hence we arrive at

$$S(\alpha) - q^{-N} A_{q^N-1} S(\beta) = O\left(q^{N(1/2+\varepsilon)} + q^{M-N/2+N\varepsilon}\right)$$

provided that $|\beta| \le q^{-(N+M)}$. Moreover, estimating $S(\beta)$ trivially,

$$q^{-N} A_{q^N-1} S(\beta) \ll q^{-N} A_{q^N-1} q^M \ll q^{M-N/2}.$$

Putting everything together we get

$$S(\alpha) = O\left(q^{N(1/2+\varepsilon)} + q^{M-N(1/2-\varepsilon)}\right).$$

□

For small $|\alpha|$, we obtain the following bound.

Lemma 7. *If $\alpha = O(q^{-M})$ then $S(\alpha) = O\left(|\alpha|^{-1/2-\varepsilon}\right)$.*

Proof. By Lemma 1, there exist a, r such that $|r| \le q^M$ and $|\alpha - a/r| < q^{-(N+M)}$ where $|r| = q^N \le q^M$. So $\beta = \alpha - a/r$ satisfies the conditions in Lemma 6, and hence

$$S(\alpha) = O\left(q^{N(1/2+\varepsilon)} + q^{M-N(1/2-\varepsilon)}\right).$$

Now $\alpha = O(q^{-M})$ implies $q^M = O(|\alpha|^{-1})$. So,

$$q^{N(1/2+\varepsilon)} \le q^{M(1/2+\varepsilon)} \ll |\alpha|^{-(1/2+\varepsilon)}.$$

We also observe that

$$\left|\alpha - \frac{a}{r}\right| < q^{-(N+M)} < q^{-N} \le \left|\frac{a}{r}\right|,$$

and thus we have $|\alpha| = |a/r| \ge |1/r| = q^{-N}$. Therefore,

$$S(\alpha) = O\left(q^{N(1/2+\varepsilon)} + q^M q^{-N(1/2-\varepsilon)}\right) = O\left(|\alpha|^{-(1/2+\varepsilon)} + |\alpha|^{-1} |\alpha|^{1/2-\varepsilon}\right) = O\left(|\alpha|^{-1/2-\varepsilon}\right).$$

□

A key point, as in Davenport-Heilbronn's original proof, is the following fourth moment bound. Throughout the sequel, we set

$$\gamma := \log_q 2.$$

Lemma 8. *For $1 \le i \le 5$,*

$$\int_{\mathcal{B}(0,1)} |S(\lambda_i \alpha)|^4 d\mu(\alpha) = O\left(q^{2M(1+\gamma)}\right).$$

Proof. Making a linear change of variables, we have

$$\int_{\mathcal{B}(0,1)} |S(\lambda_i \alpha)|^4 d\mu(\alpha) = \frac{1}{|\lambda_i|} \int_{\mathcal{B}(0,|\lambda_i|)} |S(\alpha)|^4 d\mu(\alpha).$$

If $|\lambda_i| \le 1$, we get

$$\frac{1}{|\lambda_i|} \int_{\mathcal{B}(0,|\lambda_i|)} |S(\alpha)|^4 d\mu(\alpha) \ll \int_{\mathcal{B}(0,1)} |S(\alpha)|^4 d\mu(\alpha).$$

If $|\lambda_i| > 1$, then by periodicity, $S(\alpha) = S(\alpha + h)$ for every $h \in \mathbf{A}$, we get

$$\frac{1}{|\lambda_i|} \int_{\mathcal{B}(0,|\lambda_i|)} |S(\alpha)|^4 d\mu(\alpha) = \frac{1}{|\lambda_i|} \cdot |\lambda_i| \int_{\mathcal{B}(0,1)} |S(\alpha)|^4 d\mu(\alpha) = \int_{\mathcal{B}(0,1)} |S(\alpha)|^4 d\mu(\alpha).$$

Now we write $|S(\alpha)|^4 = |S(\alpha)^2|^2$ and

$$S(\alpha)^2 = \left(\sum_{x \in \mathcal{B}(0,M)} e(\alpha x^2) \right)^2 = \sum_{(x_1,x_2) \in \mathcal{B}(0,M)^2} e(\alpha(x_1^2 + x_2^2)) = \sum_{y \in \mathcal{B}(0,2M)} a(y) e(\alpha y),$$

where $a(y) := \#\{(x_1, x_2) \in \mathcal{B}(0,M)^2 : x_1^2 + x_2^2 = y\}$.

We can write $x_1^2 + x_2^2 = (x_1 + ix_2)(x_1 - ix_2)$ where $i^2 = -1 \in \mathbb{F}_q$. So we need to count the number of divisors of y in $\mathbb{F}_q(i)[T]$. If -1 is a square in $\mathbb{F}_q$, then $\mathbb{F}_q(i) = \mathbb{F}_q$, otherwise $[\mathbb{F}_q(i) : \mathbb{F}_q] = 2$ and hence $\mathbb{F}_q(i) \cong \mathbb{F}_{q^2}$. In the first case, y has at most $\#(\mathbb{F}_q^*) \cdot 2^{\deg y} = (q-1)2^{\deg y}$ divisors in $\mathbb{F}_q(i)[T]$, and in the second case at most $\#(\mathbb{F}_{q^2}^*) \cdot 2^{\deg y} = (q^2-1)2^{\deg y}$. So

$$a(y) \ll 2^{\deg y} = |y|^{\log_q 2} = |y|^{\gamma}.$$

Now

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathcal{B}(0,1)} |S(\alpha)|^4 \, d\mu(\alpha) &= \int_{\mathcal{B}(0,1)} \left| \sum_{y \in \mathcal{B}(0,2M)} a(y) e(\alpha y) \right|^2 d\mu(\alpha) \\ &= \sum_{(y_1,y_2) \in \mathcal{B}(0,2M)^2} a(y_1)\overline{a(y_2)} \int_{\mathcal{B}(0,1)} e(\alpha(y_1 - y_2)) d\mu(\alpha). \end{aligned}$$

Using the orthogonality relation

$$\int_{\mathcal{B}(0,1)} e(\alpha h) d\mu(\alpha) = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } h = 0, \\ 0, & \text{if } h \in \mathbf{A} \smallsetminus \{0\}, \end{cases}$$

we obtain that

$$\int_{\mathcal{B}(0,1)} |S(\alpha)|^4 \, d\mu(\alpha) = \sum_{y \in \mathcal{B}(0,2M)} |a(y)|^2 = O\left(q^{2M(1+\gamma)}\right) \text{ as } a(y) = O(|y|^{\gamma}).$$

(The first equation on the left-hand side is Parseval's identity in this setting.) □

To prove Theorem 2, we will need to bound the quantity

$$\sum_{x_1 \in \mathcal{B}(0,M)} \cdots \sum_{x_5 \in \mathcal{B}(0,M)} \chi_{\mathcal{B}(0,1)}(Q(x_1, \ldots, x_5)) \tag{2.7}$$

from below. It is not surprising that this discrete quantity is related to the corresponding continuous quantity,

$$\int_{\mathcal{B}(0,M)} \cdots \int_{\mathcal{B}(0,M)} \chi_{\mathcal{B}(0,1)}(Q(x_1, \ldots, x_5)) d\mu(x_1) \ldots d\mu(x_5). \tag{2.8}$$

The following lemma expresses these two quantities by means of integrals involving $S(\alpha)$ and $I(\alpha)$.

Lemma 9. *We have*

$$\sum_{x_1\in\mathcal{B}(0,M)}\dots\sum_{x_5\in\mathcal{B}(0,M)}\chi_{\mathcal{B}(0,1)}(Q(x_1,\dots,x_5))=\int\limits_{\mathcal{B}(0,1)}S(\lambda_1y)\dots S(\lambda_5y)d\mu(y) \tag{2.9}$$

and

$$\int\limits_{\mathcal{B}(0,M)}\dots\int\limits_{\mathcal{B}(0,M)}\chi_{\mathcal{B}(0,1)}(Q(x_1,\dots,x_5))d\mu(x_1)\dots d\mu(x_5)=\int\limits_{\mathcal{B}(0,1)}I(\lambda_1y)\dots I(\lambda_5y)d\mu(y). \tag{2.10}$$

Proof. We observe that

$$\int\limits_{K_\infty}\chi_{\mathcal{B}(0,1)}(y)e(-xy)d\mu(y)=\int\limits_{K_\infty}\chi_{\mathcal{B}(0,1)}(y)e(xy)d\mu(y)$$

since $\chi_{\mathcal{B}(0,1)}(y)=\chi_{\mathcal{B}(0,1)}(-y)$. This together with Lemma 2 implies the Fourier inversion formula for $\chi_{\mathcal{B}(0,1)}$,

$$\chi_{\mathcal{B}(0,1)}(x)=\int\limits_{K_\infty}\hat{\chi}_{\mathcal{B}(0,1)}(y)e(xy)d\mu(y).$$

Hence, we may write

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{x_1\in\mathcal{B}(0,M)}\dots\sum_{x_5\in\mathcal{B}(0,M)}\chi_{\mathcal{B}(0,1)}(Q(x_1,\dots,x_5))\\
&=\int\limits_{K_\infty}\hat{\chi}_{\mathcal{B}(0,1)}(y)\sum_{x_1\in\mathcal{B}(0,M)}\dots\sum_{x_5\in\mathcal{B}(0,M)}e(y(\lambda_1x_1^2+\dots+\lambda_5x_5^2))d\mu(y)\\
&=\int\limits_{K_\infty}\chi_{\mathcal{B}(0,1)}(y)S(\lambda_1y)\dots S(\lambda_5y)d\mu(y)\qquad\text{(using Lemma 2)}\\
&=\int\limits_{\mathcal{B}(0,1)}S(\lambda_1y)\dots S(\lambda_5y)d\mu(y),
\end{aligned}$$

proving (2.9). We obtain (2.10) by a similar argument. □

The following lemma gives an important lower bound for the quantity in (2.8).

Lemma 10. *Suppose that $-\lambda_4/\lambda_5$ is a square of an element in K_∞^*. Then*

$$\int\limits_{\mathcal{B}(0,M)}\dots\int\limits_{\mathcal{B}(0,M)}\chi_{\mathcal{B}(0,1)}(Q(x_1,\dots,x_5))d\mu(x_1)\dots d\mu(x_5)\gg q^{3M} \tag{2.11}$$

if $M\geq\max\{(1-\deg\lambda_5)/2,1-(\deg\lambda_4+\deg\lambda_5)/4\}$.

Proof. We note that $x\in K_\infty^*$ is a square of an element in K_∞^* if and only if it has even degree and the leading coefficient is a square of an element in $\mathbb{F}_q^*$.

Let $C\in\mathbb{N}_0$ be a parameter, only depending on $\lambda_1,...,\lambda_5$ and to be fixed later and set $M'=M-C$ so that $M'\leq M$. For $n\in\mathbb{Z}$ let $\mathcal{S}(0,n)$ be the sphere

$$\mathcal{S}(0,n):=\mathcal{B}(0,n+1)\smallsetminus\mathcal{B}(0,n)=\{x\in K_\infty:|x|=q^n\}.$$

Certainly, there exists $D\in\mathbb{N}_0$, only depending on $\lambda_1,...,\lambda_5$, such that whenever $x_1,x_2,x_3\in\mathcal{B}(0,M'-D)$ and $x_4\in\mathcal{S}(0,M'-1)$, then

$$\left|\frac{\lambda_1}{\lambda_5}x_1^2+\frac{\lambda_2}{\lambda_5}x_2^2+\frac{\lambda_3}{\lambda_5}x_3^2\right|<\left|\frac{\lambda_4}{\lambda_5}x_4^2\right|. \tag{2.12}$$

Set $M''=M'-D=M-C-D$. We shall use the inequality

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int\limits_{\mathcal{B}(0,M)}\cdots\int\limits_{\mathcal{B}(0,M)}\chi_{\mathcal{B}(0,1)}(Q(x_1,...,x_5))d\mu(x_5)\cdots d\mu(x_1)\\
&\geq\int\limits_{\mathcal{B}(0,M'')}\int\limits_{\mathcal{B}(0,M'')}\int\limits_{\mathcal{B}(0,M'')}\int\limits_{\mathcal{S}(0,M'-1)}\int\limits_{\mathcal{B}(0,M)}\chi_{\mathcal{B}(0,1)}(Q(x_1,...,x_5))d\mu(x_5)\cdots d\mu(x_1)
\end{aligned} \tag{2.13}$$

and prove that the inner-most integral satisfies

$$\int_{\mathcal{B}(0,M)} \chi_{\mathcal{B}(0,1)}(Q(x_1,...,x_5))d\mu(x_5) \gg q^{-M} \tag{2.14}$$

whenever $x_1, x_2, x_3 \in \mathcal{B}(0, M'')$ and $x_4 \in \mathcal{S}(0, M'-1)$. Then since $\mu(\mathcal{B}(0, M'')) = q^{M-C-D} \gg q^M$ and $\mu(\mathcal{S}(0, M'-1)) = q^{M-C} - q^{M-C-1} \gg q^M$, the desired bound (2.11) follows.

We rewrite the integral in question as

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{\mathcal{B}(0,M)} \chi_{\mathcal{B}(0,1)}(Q(x_1,...,x_5))d\mu(x_5) &= \int_{\mathcal{B}(0,M)} \chi_{\mathcal{B}(0,1)}(\lambda_1 x_1^2 + \cdots \lambda_5 x_5^2)d\mu(x_5)\\ &= \int_{\mathcal{B}(0,M)} \chi_{\mathcal{B}(0,L)}\left(\frac{\lambda_1}{\lambda_5}x_1^2 + \cdots \frac{\lambda_4}{\lambda_5}x_4^2 + x_5^2\right) d\mu(x_5)\\ &= \int_{\mathcal{B}(0,M)} \chi_{\mathcal{B}\left(-\frac{\lambda_1}{\lambda_5}x_1^2 - \cdots - \frac{\lambda_4}{\lambda_5}x_4^2, L\right)}(x_5^2)d\mu(x_5),\end{aligned} \tag{2.15}$$

where $|\lambda_5| = q^{-L}$. Now using inequality (2.12), the degree and leading coefficient of

$$-\frac{\lambda_1}{\lambda_5}x_1^2 - \cdots - \frac{\lambda_4}{\lambda_5}x_4^2$$

are equal to the degree and leading coefficient of

$$-\frac{\lambda_4}{\lambda_5}x_4^2,$$

and by our assumption on $-\lambda_4/\lambda_5$, this degree is even and the leading coefficient is a square of an element in $\mathbb{F}_q^*$. Hence,

$$-\frac{\lambda_1}{\lambda_5}x_1^2 - \cdots - \frac{\lambda_4}{\lambda_5}x_4^2$$

is a square of an element in K_∞^*. Let d be one of its two square roots. Then

$$x_5^2 \in \mathcal{B}\left(-\frac{\lambda_1}{\lambda_5}x_1^2 - \cdots - \frac{\lambda_4}{\lambda_5}x_4^2, L\right) \Leftrightarrow x_5^2 \in \mathcal{B}(d^2, L) \Leftrightarrow |x_5^2 - d^2| < q^L \Leftrightarrow |x_5 - d| < \frac{q^L}{|x_5 + d|}. \tag{2.16}$$

We have

$$|d| = \left|-\frac{\lambda_1}{\lambda_5}x_1^2 - \cdots - \frac{\lambda_4}{\lambda_5}x_4^2\right|^{1/2} = \left|\frac{\lambda_4}{\lambda_5}x_4^2\right|^{1/2} = \left|\frac{\lambda_4}{\lambda_5}\right|^{1/2} q^{M'-1} =: q^{E+M'}$$

if $x_5 \in \mathcal{S}(0, M'-1)$. So if

$$|x_5 - d| < q^{L-(E+M')}$$

and

$$M' > \frac{L}{2} - E,$$

then

$$|x_5 + d| = |(x_5 - d) + 2d| = |2d| = |d| = q^{E+M'},$$

and hence the last inequality in (2.16) is satisfied. We deduce that

$$\int_{\mathcal{B}(0,M)} \chi_{\mathcal{B}(0,1)}(Q(x_1,...,x_5))d\mu(x_5) \geq \int_{\mathcal{B}(d,L-(E+M'))} 1 \; d\mu(x_5) = q^{L-(E+M')}, \tag{2.17}$$

provided that

$$\mathcal{B}(d, L-(E+M')) \subseteq \mathcal{B}(0, M).$$

Since $|d| = q^{E+M'}$, this is ensured if

$$M \geq \max\{E + M' + 1, L - (E + M')\}. \tag{2.18}$$

Now we fix

$$C := \max\{0, E\} + 1 \quad \text{and} \quad M' := M - C.$$

Then (2.18) holds if $M \geq (1 + L - \min\{0, E\})/2 = \max\{(1 - \deg\lambda_5)/2, 1 - (\deg\lambda_4 + \deg\lambda_5)/4\}$. Hence, using (2.17), the desired inequality (2.14) is satisfied, which completes the proof. □

The main contribution to the quantity of our interest in (2.9) is approximated in the following result.

Lemma 11. *Assume that* $\max\{|\lambda_1|,...,|\lambda_5|\} \le 1$. *Then we have*

$$\int_{\mathcal{B}(0,-M)} S(\lambda_1\alpha)\dots S(\lambda_5\alpha)d\mu(\alpha) = \int_{\mathcal{B}(0,1)} I(\lambda_1\alpha)\dots I(\lambda_5\alpha)d\mu(\alpha) + O\left(q^{(5/2+2\gamma)M}\right).$$

Proof. By Lemma 5, we have

$$\int_{\mathcal{B}(0,-M)} S(\lambda_1\alpha)\dots S(\lambda_5\alpha)d\mu(\alpha) = \int_{\mathcal{B}(0,-M)} I(\lambda_1\alpha)\dots I(\lambda_5\alpha)d\mu(\alpha).$$

It remains to show that

$$\int_{\mathcal{B}(0,1)\setminus\mathcal{B}(0,-M)} I(\lambda_1\alpha)\dots I(\lambda_5\alpha)d\mu(\alpha) = O\left(q^{(5/2+2\gamma)M}\right). \tag{2.19}$$

We recall that

$$I(A) = \int\limits_{\mathcal{B}(0,M)} e(Ax^2)d\mu(x) = \int\limits_{\overline{\mathcal{B}}(0,M-1)} e(Ax^2)d\mu(x),$$

where $\overline{\mathcal{B}}(0,n)$ is the closed ball $\{|x| \le q^n : x \in K_\infty\}$. In the following, we use results in [1] to produce an upper bound for this integral. (We note that in [1], we used closed instead of open balls.) Write $A := \beta A_2$, where A_2 is the square of an element in K_∞^* and $\beta = ct^{-\epsilon}$ with $c \in \mathbb{F}_q^*$ and $\epsilon \in \{0,1\}$. Then in [1, section 7], it was shown that

$$I(A) = q^{-\lceil(\deg A)/2\rceil} \int\limits_{\overline{\mathcal{B}}(0,n)} e(\beta y^2)d\mu(y)$$

with $n = M - 1 + \lceil(\deg A)/2\rceil$. Further, [1, Lemma 7.3] with $x = 0$ evaluates the integral on the right-hand side as

$$\int\limits_{\overline{\mathcal{B}}(0,n)} e(\beta y^2)d\mu(y) = \begin{cases} q^{n+1} & \text{if } n \le -1 \\ 1 + \epsilon(s(c)q^{1/2} - 1) & \text{if } n \ge 0, \end{cases}$$

where $s(c) = 1$ if c is a square of an element in $\mathbb{F}_q^*$ and $s(c) = -1$ otherwise. In any case,

$$\int\limits_{\overline{\mathcal{B}}(0,n)} e(\beta y^2)d\mu(y) = O(1).$$

It follows that

$$I(A) \ll q^{-(\deg A)/2} = |A|^{-1/2}.$$

Using this for $A = \lambda_5\alpha$, we deduce that

$$\int_{\mathcal{B}(0,1)\setminus\mathcal{B}(0,-M)} I(\lambda_1\alpha)\dots I(\lambda_5\alpha)d\mu(\alpha) \ll q^{M/2}\int_{\mathcal{B}(0,1)} |I(\lambda_1\alpha)\dots I(\lambda_4\alpha)|d\mu(\alpha).$$

The desired bound (2.19) now follows from

$$|I(\lambda_1\alpha)\dots I(\lambda_4\alpha)| \le \sum_{i=1}^{4} |I(\lambda_i\alpha)|^4$$

and Lemma 8. □

3. Completion of the proof

The completion of the proof is almost literally as in [4]. We now restrict M to a certain sequence of natural numbers. If $\lambda_1/\lambda_2 \in K_\infty \setminus K$, then Lemma 1 implies that there exist infinitely many relatively prime pairs $(a_0, r_0) \in \mathbf{A} \times \mathbf{A}^*$ for which

$$\left|\frac{\lambda_1}{\lambda_2} - \frac{a_0}{r_0}\right| \le \frac{1}{|r_0|^2}. \tag{3.1}$$

Let $\mathcal{S}$ be the infinite sequence consisting of all natural numbers $2\deg r_0$ such that $r_0 \in \mathbf{A}^*$ and there exists $a_0 \in \mathbf{A}$ coprime to r_0 such that the above Diophantine condition (3.1) is satisfied. If $M \in \mathcal{S}$, we therefore have

$$\left|\frac{\lambda_1}{\lambda_2} - \frac{a_0}{r_0}\right| \le q^{-M} \tag{3.2}$$

for a suitable relatively prime pair $(a_0, r_0) \in \mathbf{A} \times \mathbf{A}^*$ with $|r_0| = q^{M/2}$.

Lemma 12. *If $\lambda_1/\lambda_2 \in K_\infty \setminus K$, $M \in \mathcal{S}$ and $q^{-M} \le |\alpha| < 1$, then*

$$\min\left(|S(\lambda_1\alpha)|,\ |S(\lambda_2\alpha)|\right) = O\left(q^{(7/8+\varepsilon)M}\right).$$

Proof. By Lemma 1, there exist $a_1, a_2, r_1, r_2 \in \mathbf{A}$ such that

$$(a_i, r_i) = 1, \quad \deg r_i \le M, \quad |\lambda_1\alpha - a_i/r_i| \le q^{-M}|r_i|^{-1} \quad \text{for } i = 1, 2. \tag{3.3}$$

Suppose that $\rho = 1/8 - \varepsilon > 0$. If $|r_1| \ge q^{2\rho M}$ or $|r_2| \ge q^{2\rho M}$, then the desired result follows from Lemma 6. If $a_1 = 0$ or $a_2 = 0$, then by (3.3), we have $|\alpha| = O(q^{-M})$, and the result follows from Lemma 7 since we also have $|\alpha| \ge q^{-M}$ by assumption in Lemma 12. In the following, we will show that the complementary case when

$$a_1 \ne 0 \text{ and } a_2 \ne 0 \text{ and } |r_1| < q^{2\rho M} \text{ and } |r_2| < q^{2\rho M} \tag{3.4}$$

cannot occur, thereby proving Lemma 12.

Assume we have (3.4). Then we observe that

$$|a_2| = O\left(|r_2\alpha| + q^{-M}\right) = O(q^{2\rho M}). \tag{3.5}$$

Using (3.3), we have

$$\alpha = \lambda_1^{-1}a_1r_1^{-1}(1+\gamma_1) \quad \text{and} \quad \alpha = \lambda_2^{-1}a_2r_2^{-1}(1+\gamma_2)$$

with

$$|\gamma_1|, |\gamma_2| = O(q^{-M}),$$

which implies

$$\frac{a_1r_2}{a_2r_1} = \frac{\lambda_1}{\lambda_2}\cdot\frac{1+\gamma_2}{1+\gamma_1} = \frac{\lambda_1}{\lambda_2}(1+\gamma) = \frac{\lambda_1}{\lambda_2} + \gamma'$$

with

$$|\gamma|, |\gamma'| = O(q^{-M}).$$

Using (3.2), we deduce that

$$\left|\frac{a_1r_2}{a_2r_1} - \frac{a_0}{r_0}\right| = O(q^{-M}).$$

The difference on the left-hand side cannot equal 0 because this would imply $r_0|a_2r_1$ and hence $|r_0| \le |a_2r_1|$, whereas $|r_0| = q^{M/2}$ and $|a_2r_1| = O(q^{4\rho M})$ by (3.4) and (3.5) (recall that $\rho < 1/8$). It follows that

$$\frac{1}{|a_2r_1r_0|} \le \left|\frac{a_1r_2}{a_2r_1} - \frac{a_0}{r_0}\right| = O(q^{-M}).$$

This is impossible as well since $a_2r_1r_0 = O(q^{(4\rho+1/2)M})$ (recall $\rho < 1/8$ again). Hence, the case (3.4) cannot occur. This completes the proof. □

The above lemma allows us to bound the remaining (error) contribution to the quantity in (2.9).

Lemma 13. *If $M \in \mathcal{S}$, then we have*

$$\int_{\mathcal{B}(0,1)\setminus\mathcal{B}(0,-M)} S(\lambda_1\alpha)\dots S(\lambda_5\alpha)d\mu(\alpha) = O\left(q^{M(3-1/8+2\gamma+\varepsilon)}\right).$$

Proof. The integrand is bounded by

$$|S(\lambda_1\alpha)\dots S(\lambda_5\alpha)| \le \min\{|S(\lambda_1\alpha)|, |S(\lambda_2\alpha)|\}\sum_{i=1}^{5}|S(\lambda_i\alpha)|^4.$$

Now the result follows from Lemmas 8 and 12. □

3.1. **Proof of Theorem 2.** We note that we may assume without loss of generality that $\max\{|\lambda_1|, ..., |\lambda_5|\} \le 1$ (otherwise we re-scale suitably). Now combining Lemmas 9, 10, 11 and 13, we obtain

$$\sum_{x_1\in\mathcal{B}(0,M)} \dots \sum_{x_5\in\mathcal{B}(0,M)} \chi_{\mathcal{B}(0,1)}(Q(x_1,\dots,x_5)) \gg P^{3M},$$

thus proving Theorem 2, where we use the fact that $3 - 1/8 + 2\gamma < 3$ if $q > 2^{16}$. Here we note that in the course of the proof, we may re-label $\lambda_1, ..., \lambda_5$ as we wish so that the conditions in Lemmas 10 and 12 are satisfied.

References

[1] S. Baier, R.K. Singh, *The large sieve for square moduli in function fields*, to appear in J. Number Theory, arXiv:1910.05043 (2021).
[2] B.J. Birch; H. Davenport, *On a theorem of Davenport and Heilbronn*, Acta Math. 100, 259–279 (1958).
[3] J. Bourgain; *A quantitative Oppenheim theorem for generic diagonal quadratic forms*, Isr. J. Math. 215, No. 1, 503–512 (2016).
[4] H. Davenport; H. Heilbronn, *On indefinite quadratic forms in five variables*, J. Lond. Math. Soc. 21, 185–193 (1946).
[5] G.A. Margulis, G.A. *Formes quadratriques indéfinies et flots unipotents sur les espaces homogènes*, C. R. Acad. Sci Paris Sér. I Math. 304, No. 10, 249– 253 (1987).
[6] G.A. Margulis, *Oppenheim conjecture*, Fields Medalists lectures, 272–327, World Sci. Ser. 20th Century Math. 5, World Sci. publ. River Edge, NJ, USA, 1997.
[7] A. Mohammadi, *Unipotent flows and isotropic quadratic forms in positive characteristic*, Int. Math. Res. Not., no. 20, 4535–4554 (2011).
[8] M. Rosen, *Number theory in function fields*, Graduate Texts in Mathematics 210. New York, NY: Springer, 358 p. (2002).

Stephan Baier, Ramakrishna Mission Vivekananda Educational and Research Institute, Department of Mathematics, G. T. Road, PO Belur Math, Howrah, West Bengal 711202, India
Email address: stephanbaier2017@gmail.com

Arkaprava Bhandari, Ramakrishna Mission Vivekananda Educational and Research Institute, Department of Mathematics, G. T. Road, PO Belur Math, Howrah, West Bengal 711202, India
Email address: arkapravabhandari@gmail.com