

SEPARATING SYMMETRIC POLYNOMIALS OVER FINITE FIELDS

ARTEM LOPATIN, PEDRO ANTONIO MUNIZ MARTINS, AND LAEL VIANA LIMA

ABSTRACT. The set $S(n)$ of all elementary symmetric polynomials in n variables is a minimal generating set for the algebra of symmetric polynomials in n variables, but over a finite field \mathbb{F}_q the set $S(n)$ is not a minimal separating set for symmetric polynomials in general. We determined when $S(n)$ is a minimal separating set for the algebra of symmetric polynomials having the least possible number of elements.

Keywords: Finite field, symmetric group, symmetric polynomials, invariant theory, separating invariants.

2020 MSC: 13A50; 12E20.

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. Symmetric polynomials. Assume that \mathbb{F} is an arbitrary field (finite or infinite) and denote by \mathbb{F}_q the finite field of order q with the characteristic $p = \text{char } \mathbb{F}_q$.

Consider an n -dimensional vector space V over a field \mathbb{F} with a fixed basis, where $n \geq 2$. For $v \in V$ let v_i denote the i^{th} -coordinate with respect to this basis of V . The symmetric group \mathcal{S}_n acts on V by permutations of the coordinates with respect to the fixed basis of V . Namely, for $\sigma \in \mathcal{S}_n$ and $v = (v_1, \dots, v_n) \in V$ we have $\sigma \cdot v = (v_{\sigma^{-1}(1)}, \dots, v_{\sigma^{-1}(n)})$. The coordinate ring $\mathbb{F}[V] = \mathbb{F}[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ of V is isomorphic to the symmetric algebra $S(V^*)$ over the dual space V^* with the dual basis x_1, \dots, x_n to the fixed basis of V . The group \mathcal{S}_n acts on the set $\{x_1, \dots, x_n\}$ by $\sigma \cdot x_i = x_{\sigma(i)}$ and this action is extended to the action of \mathcal{S}_n on $\mathbb{F}[V]$. The algebra of \mathcal{S}_n -invariants $\mathbb{F}[V]^{\mathcal{S}_n} = \{f \in \mathbb{F}[V] \mid \sigma \cdot f = f \text{ for all } \sigma \in \mathcal{S}_n\}$ is the algebra of symmetric polynomials. It is well-known that the algebra $\mathbb{F}[V]^{\mathcal{S}_n}$ is minimally (with respect to inclusion) generated by the set

$$S(n) = \{s_t(x_1, \dots, x_n) \mid 1 \leq t \leq n\}$$

of all elementary symmetric polynomials $s_t(x_1, \dots, x_n) = \sum_{1 \leq i_1 < \dots < i_t \leq n} x_{i_1} \cdots x_{i_t}$.

Any element f of $\mathbb{F}[V]$ can be considered as a function $f : V \rightarrow \mathbb{F}$. Obviously, any $f \in \mathbb{F}[V]^{\mathcal{S}_n}$ has a constant value over every \mathcal{S}_n -orbit on V . Given a subset S of $\mathbb{F}[V]^{\mathcal{S}_n}$, we say that elements u, v of V are separated by S if exists an invariant $f \in S$ with $f(u) \neq f(v)$. If $u, v \in V$ are separated by $\mathbb{F}[V]^{\mathcal{S}_n}$, then we simply say that they are separated. A subset $S \subset \mathbb{F}[V]^{\mathcal{S}_n}$ is called separating if for any u, v from V that are separated we have that they are separated by S . We say that a separating set is minimal if it is minimal w.r.t. inclusion. Obviously, any generating set is also separating. Minimal separating sets for different actions of groups were constructed in [2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12].

Acknowledgments. The first author was supported by FAPESP 2021/01690-7. We are grateful for this support.

In case of an algebraically closed field \mathbb{F} as well as in case of $\mathbb{F} = \mathbb{R}$ the set $S(n)$ is a minimal separating set for $\mathbb{F}[V]^{S_n}$ having the least possible number of elements. On the other hand, over a finite field a minimal separating set for the algebra of symmetric polynomials is not known in general. For every $n \in \mathbb{N}$ denote

$$[n]_q = \{jp^k \mid 1 \leq j < q, k \in \mathbb{N}_0, jp^k \leq n\} \text{ and}$$

$$S_q(n) = \{s_t(x_1, \dots, x_n) \mid t \in [n]_q\},$$

where $\mathbb{N}_0 = \mathbb{N} \sqcup \{0\}$. In 1964 Aberth [1] established that $S_p(n)$ is a separating set for $\mathbb{F}_p[V]^{S_n}$ for a prime p . In [7] it was proven that the set $S_2(n)$ is a minimal separating set for $\mathbb{F}_2[V]^{S_n}$ having the least possible number of elements. Recently, Domokos and Miklósi [4] extended the result of Aberth to the case of an arbitrary finite field. Namely, they proved that $S_q(n)$ is a separating set for $\mathbb{F}_q[V]^{S_n}$. Nevertheless, the set $S(n)$ is a minimal separating set for $\mathbb{F}_q[V]^{S_n}$ in some cases.

1.2. Results. In Theorem 3.1 and Corollary 3.3 we prove that $S(n)$ is a minimal separating set for $\mathbb{F}_q[V]^{S_n}$ having the least possible number of elements if and only if $n \leq \chi_q$, where χ_q is defined by formula (9). The explicit values of χ_q for $q \leq 10^4$ are given in Remark 3.4. Since $\chi_q \geq \lfloor \ln(\ln q) \rfloor$ by Theorem 3.6, for every $n \geq 2$ there exists q such that $S(n)$ is a minimal separating set for $\mathbb{F}_q[V]^{S_n}$ having the least possible number of elements (see Corollary 3.8). In Proposition 2.3 we determine when the separating set $S_3(n)$ for $\mathbb{F}_3[V]^{S_n}$ have the least possible number of elements.

1.3. Auxiliaries. By [7, Theorem 1.1] the least possible number of elements of a separating set for $\mathbb{F}_q[V]^{S_n}$ is

$$\gamma = \gamma_q(n) = \left\lceil \log_q \frac{(n+q-1) \cdot \dots \cdot (n+1)}{(q-1)!} \right\rceil \quad (1)$$

Consider some properties of the floor and the ceiling functions. Obviously, for $x \in \mathbb{R}$ and $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ we have $\lfloor x+n \rfloor = \lfloor x \rfloor + n$, $\lceil x+n \rceil = \lceil x \rceil + n$, $\text{frac}(x+n) = \text{frac}(x)$, and $-\lfloor x \rfloor = \lceil -x \rceil$, where $\text{frac}(x)$ stands for the fractional part of x , i.e., $x = \lfloor x \rfloor + \text{frac}(x)$.

Remark 1.1. For $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$ with $b \notin \mathbb{Z}$ we have

(a)

$$\lfloor 2a \rfloor = \begin{cases} 2\lfloor a \rfloor + 1 & \text{if } \text{frac}(a) \geq 1/2 \\ 2\lfloor a \rfloor & \text{if } \text{frac}(a) < 1/2 \end{cases} ;$$

(b)

$$\lfloor a-b \rfloor = \begin{cases} \lfloor a \rfloor + \lfloor -b \rfloor + 1 & \text{if } \text{frac}(a) \geq \text{frac}(b) \\ \lfloor a \rfloor + \lfloor -b \rfloor & \text{if } \text{frac}(a) < \text{frac}(b) \end{cases} .$$

Proof. Part (a) follows from $\lfloor 2a \rfloor = \lfloor 2\lfloor a \rfloor + 2\text{frac}(a) \rfloor = 2\lfloor a \rfloor + \lfloor 2\text{frac}(a) \rfloor$. Similarly, part (b) follows from $\lfloor a-b \rfloor = \lfloor a \rfloor - \lfloor b \rfloor + \lfloor \text{frac}(a) - \text{frac}(b) \rfloor$ and $-\lfloor b \rfloor = \lfloor -b \rfloor + 1$. \square

2. THE CASE OF \mathbb{F}_3

For short, we denote

$$a_r = 3^{\frac{r}{2}} \text{ and } b_r = \frac{-3 + \sqrt{8 \cdot 3^r + 1}}{2}$$

for $r \in \mathbb{N}_0$. Note that

$$a_r < b_r < a_{r+1} \text{ for all } r \geq 3. \quad (2)$$

Lemma 2.1. *For every $n \geq 1$ we have*

$$2[\log_3 n] = [2 \log_3 n] + \alpha,$$

where

- $\alpha = 0$, if $n \in [a_{2r}, a_{2r+1})$ for some $r \in \mathbb{N}_0$;
- $\alpha = -1$, if $n \in [a_{2r+1}, a_{2r+2})$ for some $r \in \mathbb{N}_0$.

Proof. By part (a) of Remark 1.1, the statement of the lemma follows from the following claim:

$$\text{frac}(\log_3 n) < \frac{1}{2} \text{ if and only if } n \in [a_{2r}, a_{2r+1}) \text{ for some } r \in \mathbb{N}_0. \quad (3)$$

Note $\text{frac}(\log_3 n) = 0$ if and only if $n = a_{2r}$ for some $r \in \mathbb{N}_0$. Since $\log_3 n$ is a strictly increasing function, then $\text{frac}(\log_3 n)$ is also strictly increasing on every interval $[a_{2r}, a_{2r+2})$ with $r \in \mathbb{N}_0$. The equality $\text{frac}(\log_3 a_{2r+1}) = 1/2$ for every $r \in \mathbb{N}_0$ concludes the proof of claim (3). \square

Lemma 2.2. *Assume that $n \geq 6$. Then for $f_1(x) = \log_3 x^2$, $f_2(x) = \log_3 \frac{(x+1)(x+2)}{2}$, and $f_3(x) = \log_3 \frac{2}{1 + \frac{2}{x} + \frac{2}{x^2}}$ we have*

$$[f_1(n)] + [-f_2(n)] = [f_3(n)] + \beta,$$

where

- $\beta = 0$, if $n \in [a_r, b_r)$ for some $r \in \mathbb{N}$;
- $\beta = -1$, if $n \in [b_r, a_{r+1})$ for some $r \in \mathbb{N}$.

Proof. Since $n \geq 6$, we have $a_3 < n$. Hence, $a_r < b_r < a_{r+1}$ in case $n \in [a_r, a_{r+1})$ by (2). It is easy to see that $f_2(n) \notin \mathbb{Z}$, since in case $(n+1)(n+2) = 2 \cdot 3^k$ for some $k \in \mathbb{N}$ we obtain a contradiction.

We assume that x lies in $\mathbb{R}_+ = (0, +\infty)$. Since $f_1(x) - f_2(x) = f_3(x)$ and $f_2(n) \notin \mathbb{Z}$, part (b) of Remark 1.1 implies that the statement of the lemma follows from the next claims:

$$\text{frac}(f_1(x)) < \text{frac}(f_2(x)), \text{ if } x \in [a_r, b_r) \text{ for some } r \geq 3, \quad (4)$$

$$\text{frac}(f_1(x)) \geq \text{frac}(f_2(x)), \text{ if } x \in [b_r, a_{r+1}) \text{ for some } r \geq 3. \quad (5)$$

We have $\text{frac}(f_1(x)) = 0$ if and only if $x = a_r$ for some $r \in \mathbb{N}_0$. Similarly, $\text{frac}(f_2(x)) = 0$ if and only if $x = b_r$ for some $r \in \mathbb{N}_0$. Since $f_1(x)$ and $f_2(x)$ are strictly increasing, then $\text{frac}(f_1(x))$ and $\text{frac}(f_2(x))$ are also strictly increasing on intervals $[a_r, a_{r+1})$ and $[b_r, b_{r+1})$, respectively, where $r \in \mathbb{N}_0$.

Since $f_1'(x) > f_2'(x)$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}_+$ and $\text{frac}(f_1(b_r)) > \text{frac}(f_2(b_r))$, we obtain claim (5).

Assume that $\text{frac}(f_1(x)) \geq \text{frac}(f_2(x))$ for some $x \in [a_r, b_r)$ with $r \geq 3$. Then there exists $x_0 \in [a_r, b_r)$ with $\text{frac}(f_1(x_0)) = \text{frac}(f_2(x_0))$. Since f_1 increases faster

than f_2 , we have $\text{frac}(f_1(x)) > \text{frac}(f_2(x))$ for all $x \in [x_0, b_r)$. Then the equality $\lim_{x \rightarrow b_r^-} \text{frac}(f_2(x)) = 1$ implies that $\lim_{x \rightarrow b_r^-} \text{frac}(f_1(x)) = 1$, i.e., $\text{frac}(f_1(b_r)) = 0$; a contradiction to equalities (2). Hence claim (4) is proven. \square

Proposition 2.3. *Assume that $\Delta = \#S_3(n) - \gamma_3(n)$ is the difference between the number of elements of the separating set $S_3(n)$ for $\mathbb{F}_3[V]^{S_n}$ and the least possible number of elements of a separating set for $\mathbb{F}_3[V]^{S_n}$. Then*

- $\Delta = 0$ in case $2 \leq n \leq 8$;
-

$$\Delta = \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if } n \in [b_{2r}, 2a_{2r}) \cup [b_{2r+1}, a_{2r+2}) \text{ for some } r \in \mathbb{N} \\ 1, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

in case $n \geq 9$.

Proof. It is easy to see that $\#S_3(n) = 2 \lfloor \log_3 n \rfloor + \delta$, where

- $\delta = 1$ in case $n \in [a_{2r}, 2a_{2r})$ for some $r \in \mathbb{N}_0$;
- $\delta = 2$ in case $n \in [2a_{2r}, a_{2r+2})$ for some $r \in \mathbb{N}_0$.

Since $\gamma_3(n) = \left\lceil \log_3 \frac{(n+2)(n+1)}{2} \right\rceil$ by formula (1), we obtain

$$\Delta = 2 \lfloor \log_3 n \rfloor + \delta - \left\lceil \log_3 \frac{(n+2)(n+1)}{2} \right\rceil.$$

For $2 \leq n \leq 8$ by straightforward calculations we can see that $\Delta = 0$. Assume $n \geq 9$. Then $a_4 \leq n$ and inequalities (2) imply that

$$a_{2r} < b_{2r} < a_{2r+1} < 2a_{2r} < b_{2r+1} < a_{2r+2}$$

in case $n \in [a_{2r}, a_{2r+2})$ for some $r \in \mathbb{N}$. Note that here we have $r \geq 2$.

Using the properties of ceiling functions and Lemma 2.1, we obtain

$$\Delta = \lfloor 2 \log_3 n \rfloor + \left\lfloor -\log_3 \frac{(n+2)(n+1)}{2} \right\rfloor + \alpha + \delta.$$

Hence, Lemma 2.2 together with the fact that $\left\lfloor \log_3 \frac{2}{1 + \frac{3}{n} + \frac{2}{n^2}} \right\rfloor = 0$ in case $n \geq 4$ imply

$$\Delta = \alpha + \beta + \delta.$$

We complete the proof by case by case consideration. Namely,

- for $n \in [a_{2r}, b_{2r})$ we have $\alpha + \beta + \delta = 0 + 0 + 1 = 1$;
- for $n \in [b_{2r}, a_{2r+1})$ we have $\alpha + \beta + \delta = 0 - 1 + 1 = 0$;
- for $n \in [a_{2r+1}, 2a_{2r})$ we have $\alpha + \beta + \delta = -1 + 0 + 1 = 0$;
- for $n \in [2a_{2r}, b_{2r+1})$ we have $\alpha + \beta + \delta = -1 + 0 + 2 = 1$;
- for $n \in [b_{2r+1}, a_{2r+2})$ we have $\alpha + \beta + \delta = -1 - 1 + 2 = 0$.

\square

3. THE GENERAL CASE

Theorem 3.1. *The set $S(n)$ is a minimal separating set for $\mathbb{F}_q[V]^{S_n}$ having the least possible number of elements if and only if $n < x_0$, where $x_0 = x_0(q) \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 1}$ is a unique solution of the following equation*

$$q^{x-1} = (x+1) \binom{x}{2} + 1 \cdot \dots \cdot \left(\frac{x}{q-1} + 1 \right)$$

over $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 1} = [1, +\infty)$. Moreover,

- $x_0 > 1$;
- $x_0 < q$ in case $q > 3$.

Proof. Since $\#S(n) = n$ and $\gamma = \gamma_q(n) = \left\lceil \log_q \frac{(n+q-1) \cdot \dots \cdot (n+1)}{(q-1)!} \right\rceil$ is the least possible number of elements of a separating set for $\mathbb{F}_q[V]^{S_n}$ by formula (1), using the properties of the floor and ceiling functions we obtain

$$\#S(n) - \gamma = \left\lfloor \log_q \frac{(q-1)! \cdot q^n}{(n+q-1) \cdot \dots \cdot (n+1)} \right\rfloor.$$

Hence,

$$\#S(n) = \gamma \text{ if and only if } \frac{(q-1)! \cdot q^n}{(n+q-1) \cdot \dots \cdot (n+1)} < q. \quad (6)$$

Therefore,

$$\#S(n) = \gamma \text{ if and only if } q^{n-1} < (n+1) \binom{n}{2} + 1 \cdot \dots \cdot \left(\frac{n}{q-1} + 1 \right).$$

Applying \ln to both sides, we obtain that

$$\#S(n) = \gamma \text{ if and only if } f_1(n) < f_2(n),$$

where $f_1(x) = (x-1) \ln q$ and $f_2(x) = \sum_{i=1}^{q-1} \ln \left(\frac{x}{i} + 1 \right)$.

Assume $x \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 1}$. Since $f_1'(x) = \ln q$ and $f_2'(x) = \sum_{i=1}^{q-1} \frac{1}{x+i}$, we obtain

$$f_1'(x) > f_2'(x), \quad (7)$$

where we use inequality $f_2'(1) \geq f_2'(x)$ and the well-known upper bound on a partial sum $f_2'(1)$ of the harmonic series. Functions $f_1(x)$ and $f_2(x)$ are strictly increasing over $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 1}$ and $f_1(1) < f_2(1)$. We claim that

$$f_1(a) > f_2(a) \text{ for some } a > 1 \quad (8)$$

To prove the claim, we consider the following three cases.

- If $q = 2$, then $f_2(x) = \ln(x+1)$ and $f_1(4) > f_2(4)$.
- If $q = 3$, then $f_2(x) = \ln(1+x) + \ln(1+x/2)$ and $f_1(4) > f_2(4)$.
- Assume $q > 3$. Then $f_1(q) = \ln q^2 + (q-3) \ln q$ and $f_2(q) = \ln \frac{(q+1)(q+2)}{2} + \sum_{i=3}^{q-1} \ln \left(\frac{q}{i} + 1 \right)$. Since $q^2 > (q+1)(q+2)/2$ and $q > (q+i)/i$ for $i \geq 3$, we obtain that $f_1(q) > f_2(q)$.

Claim (8) together with inequality $f_1(1) < f_2(1)$ imply that $f_1(x_0) = f_2(x_0)$ for some $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 1}$ with $1 < x_0 < a$. Inequality (7) implies that $x_0 = x_0(q)$ is a unique solution of equation $f_1(x) = f_2(x)$ over $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 1}$. Moreover, we can see that for $x \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 1}$ we have $f_1(x) < f_2(x)$ if and only if $x < x_0$. Obviously, x_0 is also a unique solution of the equation

$$q^{x-1} = (x+1)\left(\frac{x}{2}+1\right) \cdot \dots \cdot \left(\frac{x}{q-1}+1\right)$$

over $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 1}$.

In case $q > 3$ we have $f_1(q) > f_2(q)$ and $a = q$; hence $x_0 < q$. The required is proven. \square

Let us remark that the following lemma which is an easy corollary of [7, Theorem 1.1] describes when $S(n)$ is a minimal separating set having the least possible number of elements, but for our purposes we need more explicit condition on n .

Lemma 3.2. *The set $S(n)$ is a minimal separating set for $\mathbb{F}_q[V]^{S_n}$ having the least possible number of elements if and only if*

$$q^{n-1} < \binom{n+q-1}{n}.$$

Proof. It follows from equivalence (6). \square

Given $x_0 = x_0(q)$ from the formulation of Theorem 3.1, define $\chi_q \in \mathbb{N}$ as follows:

$$\chi_q = \begin{cases} x_0 - 1, & \text{if } x_0 \in \mathbb{N} \\ \lfloor x_0 \rfloor, & \text{if } x_0 \notin \mathbb{N} \end{cases} \quad (9)$$

Note that χ_q is defined for an arbitrary integer $q \geq 2$, not only for a power of a prime. Theorem 3.1 implies the following corollary.

Corollary 3.3. *The set $S(n)$ is a minimal separating set for $\mathbb{F}_q[V]^{S_n}$ having the least possible number of elements if and only if $n \leq \chi_q$. Moreover,*

$$1 \leq \chi_q < q \text{ in case } q > 3.$$

Remark 3.4. By straightforward calculations by means of computer we can see that

- $\chi_2 = 2$;
- $\chi_q = 3$ for $3 \leq q \leq 17$;
- $\chi_q = 4$ for $18 \leq q \leq 109$;
- $\chi_q = 5$ for $110 \leq q \leq 704$;
- $\chi_q = 6$ for $705 \leq q \leq 5018$;
- $\chi_q = 7$ for $5019 \leq q \leq 10^4$.

To prove the low estimation on χ_q from Theorem 3.6 (see below) we need the following technical lemma.

Lemma 3.5. *For every $q \geq e^{e^2}$ we have*

$$\ln q - (2 \ln(\ln q) + 1) \ln(\ln(\ln q)) > 0.$$

Proof. Assume $x \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq e}$. Then for

$$h(x) = x - (2 \ln x + 1) \ln(\ln x).$$

we have

$$h'(x) = \frac{w(x)}{x \ln x}, \quad \text{where } w(x) = x \ln x - 2 \ln x - 2 \ln(\ln x) \ln x - 1.$$

Since

$$w'(x) = \frac{(x \ln x - 2 \ln(\ln x)) + (x - 4)}{x} > 0,$$

for all $x \geq e^2$ and $w(e^2) = 2e^2 - 4 \ln 2 - 5 > 0$, we obtain that $w(x) > 0$ for all $x \geq e^2$. Therefore, $h'(x) > 0$ for all $x \geq e^2$. Hence, the inequality $h(e^2) = e^2 - 5 \ln 2 > 0$ implies that $h(x) > 0$ for all $x \geq e^2$. In particular, $h(\ln q) > 0$ for all $q \geq e^{e^2}$. The required statement is proven. \square

Theorem 3.6. *We have $\chi_q \geq \lfloor \ln(\ln q) \rfloor$.*

Proof. If $q < e^{e^2}$, then $\lfloor \ln(\ln q) \rfloor \leq 1 \leq \chi_q$, and the required statement is proven.

Assume that $q \geq e^{e^2}$. Define $f(x) = q^{x-1}$, $g(x) = \frac{(x+1) \cdots (x+q-1)}{(q-1)!}$ for $x \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 1}$. Recall that $x_0 = x_0(q)$ from definition (9) of χ_q is the unique solution of the equation $f(x) = g(x)$ over $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 1}$ and $1 = f(1) < g(1) = q$. Hence, to prove the theorem is sufficient to show that

$$f(b) < g(b) \tag{10}$$

for $b = \lfloor \ln(\ln q) \rfloor \geq 2$, since inequality (10) implies that $b < x_0$. Inequality (10) is equivalent to the inequality $\ln(f(b)) < \ln(g(b))$.

For short, define $a = b + q - 1 \geq q + 1$. Then

$$g(b) = \binom{a}{q-1} \quad \text{and} \quad \ln g(b) = \ln a! - \ln b! - \ln(q-1)!$$

Using well-known inequalities

$$\sqrt{2\pi k} \left(\frac{k}{e}\right)^k < k! < 2\sqrt{\pi k} \left(\frac{k}{e}\right)^k \quad \text{for all } k \geq 1,$$

we obtain that

$$\ln g(b) > a \ln(a) - \left(q - \frac{1}{2}\right) \ln(q-1) + \frac{1}{2} \left(\ln(a) - 2b \ln(b) - \ln(b) \right) - \frac{1}{2} \ln(8\pi). \tag{11}$$

By the definition of b , we have $2 \leq b \leq \ln(\ln q)$. Therefore,

$$\ln(a) - 2b \ln(b) - \ln(b) \geq \ln(q) - (2 \ln(\ln q) + 1) \ln(\ln(\ln q)) > 0$$

by Lemma 3.5. Thus inequality (11) implies that

$$\ln g(b) > a \ln(a) - \left(q - \frac{1}{2}\right) \ln(q-1) - \frac{1}{2} \ln(8\pi).$$

Applying inequality $a \geq q + 1$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \ln g(b) &> (q+b-1) \ln(q+1) - \left(q - \frac{1}{2}\right) \ln(q-1) - \frac{1}{2} \ln(8\pi) = \\ &(b-1) \ln(q+1) + \left(q - \frac{1}{2}\right) \left(\ln(q+1) - \ln(q-1) \right) + \frac{1}{2} \left(\ln(q+1) - \ln(8\pi) \right) > \\ &(b-1) \ln q = \ln f(b). \end{aligned}$$

The required statement is proven. \square

Corollary 3.7. *We have $\lim_{q \rightarrow \infty} \chi_q = +\infty$.*

Corollary 3.8. *For every $n \geq 2$ there exists q such that $S(n)$ is a minimal separating set for $\mathbb{F}_q[V]^{S_n}$ having the least possible number of elements.*

REFERENCES

- [1] O. Aberth, *The elementary functions in a finite field of prime order*, Illinois J. Math. **8** (1964), 132–138.
- [2] F.B. Cavalcante, A. Lopatin, *Separating invariants of three nilpotent 3×3 matrices*, Linear Algebra Appl. **607** (2020), 9–28.
- [3] M. Domokos, *Characteristic free description of semi-invariants of 2×2 matrices*, J. Pure Appl. Algebra **224** (2020), no. 5, 106220. Addendum: J. Pure Appl. Algebra **224** (2020), no. 6, 106270.
- [4] M. Domokos, B. Miklósi, *Symmetric polynomials over finite fields*, Finite Fields and Their Applications **89** (2023), 102224.
- [5] R.J.S. Ferreira, A. Lopatin, *Minimal generating and separating sets for $O(3)$ -invariants of several matrices*, Operators and Matrices **17** (2023), no. 3, 639–651.
- [6] I. Kaygorodov, A. Lopatin, Yu. Popov, *Separating invariants for 2×2 matrices*, Linear Algebra and its Applications **559** (2018), 114–124.
- [7] G. Kemper, A. Lopatin, F. Reimers, *Separating invariants over finite fields*, Journal of Pure and Applied Algebra **226** (2022), 106904.
- [8] A. Lopatin, F. Reimers, *Separating invariants for multisymmetric polynomials*, Proceedings of Amer. Math. Soc. **149** (2021), 497–508.
- [9] A. Lopatin, A.N. Zubkov, *Separating G_2 -invariants of several octonions*, Algebra Number Theory **18** (2024), no. 12, 2157–2177.
- [10] A. Lopatin, *Separating invariants of several nilpotent 2×2 matrices over finite fields*, to appear in International Journal of Algebra and Computation, arXiv: 2310.00477.
- [11] A. Lopatin, P.A. Muniz Martins, *Separating invariants for two-dimensional orthogonal groups over finite fields*, Linear Algebra Applications, **692** (2024), 71–83.
- [12] F. Reimers, *Separating invariants for two copies of the natural S_n -action*, Communications in Algebra **48** (2020), 1584–1590.

ARTEM LOPATIN, UNIVERSIDADE ESTADUAL DE CAMPINAS (UNICAMP), 651 SERGIO BUARQUE DE HOLANDA, 13083-859 CAMPINAS, SP, BRAZIL

Email address: artem_lopatin@yahoo.com (Artem Lopatin)

PEDRO ANTONIO MUNIZ MARTINS, UNIVERSIDADE ESTADUAL DE CAMPINAS (UNICAMP), 651 SERGIO BUARQUE DE HOLANDA, 13083-859 CAMPINAS, SP, BRAZIL

Email address: p242894@dac.unicamp.br (Pedro Antonio Muniz Martins)

LAEL VIANA LIMA, UNIVERSIDADE ESTADUAL DE CAMPINAS (UNICAMP), 651 SERGIO BUARQUE DE HOLANDA, 13083-859 CAMPINAS, SP, BRAZIL

Email address: 1176809@dac.unicamp.br (Lael Viana Lima)