

MATH 542 NUMBER THEORY
 Problems to Think About #5
 CH. 5, #1-7

Russell Jahn

(1)

Let us call:

$$\alpha : (a, b, c) \rightarrow (c, -b, a) \text{ for } f \in (1) \text{ or } (3)$$

$$\beta : (a, b, c) \rightarrow (a, b + 2ka, ak^2 + bk + c) \text{ for } f \in (2) \text{ or } (5) \text{ where } k = \left\lfloor \left\lfloor \frac{a-b}{2a} \right\rfloor \right\rfloor$$

$$\gamma : (a, b, c) \rightarrow (a, b - 2ka, ak^2 - bk + c) \text{ for } f \in (4) \text{ or } (7) \text{ where } k = \left\lfloor \left\lfloor \frac{a+b}{2a} \right\rfloor \right\rfloor$$

$$\delta : (a, b, c) \rightarrow (a, b + 2a, a + b + c) = (a, a, c) \text{ for } f \in (6)$$

First, we need to show that each is unimodular: Recall $F = \begin{pmatrix} a & b/2 \\ b/2 & c \end{pmatrix}$

$$(\alpha) \text{ Let } U_\alpha = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ -1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \Rightarrow \det U_\alpha = 1 \text{ and } U_\alpha^T F U_\alpha = \begin{pmatrix} c & -b/2 \\ -b/2 & a \end{pmatrix}$$

$$(\beta) \text{ Let } U_\beta = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & k \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \Rightarrow \det U_\beta = 1 \text{ and } U_\beta^T F U_\beta = \begin{pmatrix} a & 1/2(b + 2ka) \\ 1/2(b + 2ka) & ak^2 + bk + c \end{pmatrix}$$

$$(\gamma) \text{ Let } U_\gamma = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & -k \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \Rightarrow \det U_\gamma = 1 \text{ and } U_\gamma^T F U_\gamma = \begin{pmatrix} a & 1/2(b - 2ka) \\ 1/2(b - 2ka) & ak^2 - bk + c \end{pmatrix}$$

$$(\delta) \text{ Let } U_\delta = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \Rightarrow \det U_\delta = 1 \text{ and } U_\delta^T F U_\delta = \begin{pmatrix} a & 1/2(b + 2a) \\ 1/2(b + 2a) & a + b + c \end{pmatrix}$$

\therefore Each is unimodular.

Let the transformed BQF be $Ax^2 + Bxy + Cy^2$.

$$f \in (6) \quad (a < c, b = -a) \xrightarrow{\delta} A < C, B = A \Rightarrow \text{reduced.}$$

$$f \in (3) \quad (a = c, -a \leq b < 0) \xrightarrow{\alpha} A = C, 0 < B \leq A \Rightarrow \text{reduced.}$$

$$f \in (1) \quad (a > c) \xrightarrow{\alpha} A < C \begin{cases} -A < B \leq A \Rightarrow \text{reduced} \\ B = -A \xrightarrow{\delta} A < C, B = A \Rightarrow \text{reduced} \\ |B| > A \text{ (need to go to } \beta \text{ or } \gamma) \end{cases}$$

$$\text{In } (\beta), k = \left\lfloor \left\lfloor \frac{a-b}{2a} \right\rfloor \right\rfloor \Rightarrow \frac{a-b}{2a} - 1 \leq k < \frac{a-b}{2a} \Rightarrow -a \leq b + 2ka < a$$

So, $a \rightarrow A, -A \leq B < A$.

$$\text{In } (\gamma), k = \left\lfloor \left\lfloor \frac{a+b}{2a} \right\rfloor \right\rfloor \Rightarrow \frac{a+b}{2a} - 1 \leq k < \frac{a+b}{2a} \Rightarrow -a < b - 2ka \leq a$$

So, $a \rightarrow A, -A < B \leq A$.

We will demonstrate $f \in (2)$ ($a = c, b < -a$) ($f \in (5)$ with (β) and $f \in (4)$ or (7) with (γ) are entirely analogous).

$$f \in (2) (a = c, b < -a) \xrightarrow{\beta} \left\{ \begin{array}{l} A < C, -A < B < A \Rightarrow \text{reduced} \\ A < C, B = -A \xrightarrow{\delta} A < C, B = A \Rightarrow \text{reduced} \\ A = C, 0 \leq B < A \Rightarrow \text{reduced} \\ A = C, -A \leq B < 0 \xrightarrow{\alpha} A = C, 0 < B \leq A \Rightarrow \text{reduced} \\ A > C, -A \leq B < A \xrightarrow{\alpha} A < C \left\{ \begin{array}{l} -A < B \leq A \Rightarrow \text{reduced} \\ B = -A \xrightarrow{\delta} A < C, B = A \Rightarrow \text{reduced} \\ \text{otherwise, } |B| > A \text{ and we are back} \\ \text{to apply } \beta \text{ or } \gamma \end{array} \right. \end{array} \right.$$

Each time we get to a possible $A > C$ (and then apply α), if not reduced we end up with $A < C, |B| > A$, but now A is strictly less than its predecessor. Also, $0 \leq |B| \leq A$ after each application of β or γ . Therefore, if f not already reduced, $|B|$ will eventually equal 0 after a finite number of steps, in which case f is either reduced or reduced after one more application of α .

Therefore, f gets reduced after a finite number of steps in all cases.

(2)-(7) mathematica programs attached

(7)

$$p \equiv 1 \pmod{4}$$

Just to summarize the theory of infinite descent for two squares, which is very similar to the case of four squares but simpler:

Since $\left(\frac{-1}{p}\right) = 1, \exists x \in [0, p-1] \ni x^2 \equiv -1 \pmod{p}$.

$\therefore \exists m \ni mp = x^2 + 1$. Furthermore, $m \in [1, p-1]$ as in four square case. Find an m (by brute force).

The rest is identical to the case of four squares, but we do not have to worry about pairing up like parity addends when m is even, since m even implies both addends are odd or both are even.