

MORE ON THE NUMBER OF DISTINCT VALUES OF A CLASS OF FUNCTIONS

ROBERT S. COULTER AND STEVEN SENGER

Dedicated to the memory of Pancho (1968–2019)

ABSTRACT. In a previous article, the authors determined the first (and at the time of writing, the only) non-trivial upper bound for the cardinality of the image set for several classes of functions, including planar functions. Here, we show that the upper bound cannot be tight for planar functions over \mathbb{F}_q , with the possible exception of $q = 343$. We further show that if such an exceptional planar function exists, then it implies the existence of a projective plane of order 18. This follows from more general results, which apply to wider classes of functions.

1. INTRODUCTION AND HISTORY

Throughout, G_q is an arbitrary abelian group of order q written additively with identity 0. In order to avoid some trivialities, we assume $q > 5$ for all that follows. We use G_q^* to denote the nonzero elements of the group. We will also have cause to discuss finite fields, which we denote by \mathbb{F}_q with $q = p^n$, p a prime and $n \in \mathbb{N}$. When G_q is elementary abelian, we will associate it with the additive group of the field \mathbb{F}_q without comment.

For $f : G_q \rightarrow G_q$, we define the following terms.

- $V(f)$ is the cardinality of the image set of f . That is, $V(f) = \#\{f(x) : x \in G_q\}$.
- f is a *permutation* on G_q if $V(f) = q$. When dealing with a finite field, we talk of a *permutation polynomial (PP)* over \mathbb{F}_q , as any function over \mathbb{F}_q can be represented by a polynomial in $\mathbb{F}_q[X]$.
- For any $a \in G_q^*$, the *differential operator of f in the direction of a* (or simply non-trivial differential operator) is the function $\Delta_{f,a}$ defined by $\Delta_{f,a} : x \mapsto f(x+a) - f(x)$.
- f is *planar* if every non-trivial differential operator of f is a permutation on G_q .
- For any integer $k \geq 2$, and any function F on set S , we define $N_k(f)$ to be the number of equivalent k -tuples,

$$N_k(f) = \#\{(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_k) : f(x_1) = f(x_2) = \dots = f(x_k)\}.$$

The expected value of $N_2(f)$ for $f \in \mathbb{F}_q[X]$ was shown to be $q - 1$ in [7]. This is true in a more general sense. Given any function $f : A \rightarrow B$, where $\#A = \#B = q$, there are $\binom{q}{k}k!$ different k -tuples, (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_k) . The probability that $f(x_i) = f(x_j)$ for all relevant i and j is easily seen to be $q^{-(k-1)}$. This gives that the expected value of $N_k(f)$ is $\binom{q}{k} \frac{k!}{q^{k-1}}$.

There are several classes of functions we will be particularly focussed on in this paper. We follow the notation previously established in [7]. A function f over G_q is said to belong to class $C_3(G_q)$ if all of its non-trivial differential operators, $\Delta_{f,a}$ with $a \in G_q^*$, have unique zeros. A function f over G_q is said to belong to class $C_4(G_q)$ if $N_2(f) = q - 1$. Class C_3 is a proper subclass of class C_4 , and the class of all planar functions over G_q is a proper subclass of class C_3 . These inclusions were shown in [7].

There has been much interest in bounding the size of the image sets of planar functions, which we address in a later section. In [7], the authors provided bounds on the image sets of functions in terms of N_k . In particular, for functions in the class C_4 , we obtained

$$\frac{q+1}{2} \leq V(f) \leq q - \frac{2(q-1)}{1 + \sqrt{4q-3}}. \quad (1)$$

While many functions in C_3 are known to attain the lower bound, there are no known examples that meet the upper bound. Indeed we have always suspected that the bound is not tight. As we noted in [7], for the upper

The authors gratefully acknowledge a bequest from the Estate of Francisco Javier "Pancho" Sayas, which partially supported this research.

bound to be achieved $(q - 1)/2$ needs to be a triangular number, so that $u(u - 1) = q - 1$ for some integer u . Moreover, there are u elements $x_1, \dots, x_u \in G_q$ for which $f(x_i) = f(x_j)$, with f injective on $G_q \setminus \{x_i\}$. This was recently re-visited for planar functions specifically as part of a more wide-ranging paper of Kölsch and Polujan, see [14], Proposition 6.1. We shall be focused on this structure and show that no function in $C_3(G_q)$ attains the upper bound for many choices of q .

Theorem 1. *The following statements hold:*

- (i) *Any function in $C_3(G_q)$ that meets the upper bound given in (1) must describe a projective plane of order k , where $k^2 + k + 1 = q$.*
- (ii) *If $q = y^n$, for natural numbers $y, n > 1$ and $q \neq 343$, then there is no function in $C_3(G_q)$ that meets the upper bound of (1).*
- (iii) *If $q = 343$, then any function in $C_3(G_{343})$ that meets the upper bound must describe a projective plane of order 18.*

As a consequence of this result, we revisit our upper bound and give the following improvement.

Theorem 2. *If $q = y^n$, for natural numbers $y, n > 1$, and $q \neq 343$, then any function $f \in C_3(G_q)$ satisfies*

$$\frac{q+1}{2} \leq V(f) \leq q - \frac{1 + \sqrt{4q - 11}}{2}. \quad (2)$$

We note, in passing, that if $f \in C_3(G_{343})$ does not meet the upper bound given by (1), then the upper bound given in (2) holds. More specifically, we get the following as a corollary.

Corollary 3. *The bounds in (2) hold for any planar function over $F_q[X]$, where $q \neq 343$.*

2. MOTIVATION

Planar functions were introduced by Dembowski and Ostrom [8] in 1968 to construct projective planes with specific automorphism groups, but have been studied more recently in relation to cryptographic functions as they offer the best resistance over fields of odd characteristic against differential cryptanalysis when used in a substitution box. Ding and Yuan [9] also used them to disprove a long-standing conjecture concerning skew Hadamard difference sets. A well-known conjecture in the area is the Dembowski-Ostrom (DO) conjecture, which states that all planar functions over \mathbb{F}_q are necessarily equivalent to one of the form

$$\sum a_{ij} X^{p^i + p^j}.$$

Here, equivalence is defined as follows: $f, h \in \mathbb{F}_q[X]$ are equivalent if there exist three linear operators L, M, N , with L, M nonsingular, and a constant $c \in \mathbb{F}_q$, satisfying

$$L(f(X)) \equiv h(M(X)) + N(X) + c \pmod{(X^q - X)}.$$

The conjecture was proved to be correct over prime fields nearly simultaneously in three independent papers by Gluck [10], Hiramane [11], and Rónyai and Szönyi [25]. Thus, over prime fields, the only planar functions are precisely the quadratics, and these form a single equivalence class. The conjecture is false over fields of characteristic 3. This was shown by Coulter and Matthews [6], who provided an infinite class of counterexamples, the smallest being X^{14} over \mathbb{F}_{3^4} . However, the conjecture remains open for characteristics larger than 3, and also for fields of order p^2 and p^3 . If the DO conjecture is true for fields of order p^2 and p^3 , then all planar functions have been classified in those cases also. Specifically, they must be equivalent to X^2 over \mathbb{F}_{p^2} , and to either X^2 or X^{p+1} over \mathbb{F}_{p^3} . These classifications follow from a combination of results from Knuth [13], Menichetti [18], and Coulter and Henderson [5].

With regard to their cryptographic applications it would be preferable to have planar functions which are also PPs. This is, however, impossible. This is easily seen from the fact every differential operator needs to have a zero. The question of just how far a planar function is from being a PP was the motivation behind [7], producing the upper bound in (1).

3. CORRESPONDENCE BETWEEN THE UPPER BOUND AND A PROJECTIVE PLANE OF ORDER $u - 1$

While our primary motivation in studying the upper bound was to improve it, we now establish a second, somewhat surprising reason one might be interested in the upper bound. Recall that, a subset $D \subset G_q$ of cardinality k forms a (q, k, λ) -difference set, or (q, k, λ) -DS, if for every $g \in G_q^*$, there exists precisely λ pairs $(x, y) \in D \times D$ satisfying $g = x - y$. The special case where $\lambda = 1$ is known as a *simple or planar* DS. In particular, any $(k^2 + k + 1, k + 1, 1)$ -DS is equivalent to a projective plane of order k . We refer the reader to Jungnickel and Schmidt [12] or van Lint and Wilson [16] for further information regarding difference sets.

Let $f \in C_3(G_q)$ meet the upper bound in (1) and let α be the unique image that occurs u times. Now let $S = \{x_i\}$ be the set of pre-images of α . Since $f \in C_3(G_q)$, each difference operator has exactly one zero. More specifically, for each shift $a \neq 0$, we have precisely one solution to $f(x + a) = f(x)$ where $x + a, x \in S$. Consequently, for every $a \in G_q^*$, there exists a unique pair (x_i, x_j) satisfying $x_i - x_j = a$. Thus, S forms a $(q, u, 1)$ -DS. Now set $k = u - 1$. Then $q = u^2 - u + 1 = k^2 + k + 1$, so that S is in fact a $(k^2 + k + 1, k + 1, 1)$ -DS. This proves Theorem 1 (i).

Note that since a planar function over G_q is equivalent to a specific type of projective plane of order q , we see that one reaching the upper bound is actually associated with two distinct projective planes of order q and $u - 1$, with $u - 1$ dividing $q - 1$.

4. SHOWING THE UPPER BOUND IS NIGH IMPOSSIBLE

As can be seen in the previous section, for a function in $C_3(G_q)$ to attain the upper bound in (1), there needs to exist an integer x satisfying $x^2 + x + 1 = q$. This equation will be the focus of this section.

Proposition 4. *Let $q = y^n$, for natural numbers y and n , with $y > 1$. If $f \in C_3(G_q)$ meets the upper bound in (1), then n is odd and any odd prime p dividing y satisfies $p \equiv 1 \pmod{6}$.*

Proof. Note that since f attains the upper bound from (1), there must exist a $u \in \mathbb{N}$ satisfying $u(u - 1) = q - 1$.

To prove n must be odd, by way of contradiction, suppose $n = 2t$ for some natural number t . Then $u(u - 1) = (y^t - 1)(y^t + 1)$. This means there exist $a, b \in \mathbb{N}$, where $a(a + 1) = b(b + 2)$. This implies that $b < a < a + 1 < b + 2$, so that $a, a + 1$ are two integers lying strictly between b and $b + 2$, a contradiction.

Next, assume p is an odd prime dividing y . As $u^2 - u + 1 - q = 0$, working modulo p , we find the discriminant of the resulting quadratic in u is -3 . For there to be a solution, the discriminant must be a square mod p . Using well-known results on the Legendre symbol, this forces $p \equiv 1 \pmod{6}$. \square

We restrict our attention to the case where $q = y^n$, for natural numbers $y, n > 1$. Proposition 4 reduces our problem to determining non-trivial integer solutions (x, y, n) to the equation

$$x^2 + x + 1 = y^n \quad (3)$$

with $n \geq 3$ odd. (Clearly we always have the trivial solution $(0, 1, n)$.) The conditions on the prime divisors of y will serve as motivation for a secondary discussion which we will come to in due course.

There are a number of remarkable histories connected to this problem. In 1916, Thue [28] proved that for fixed integers a, b, c, d, n with $ad(b^2 - 4ac) \neq 0$ and $n \geq 3$, the equation

$$ax^2 + bx + c = dy^n \quad (4)$$

has only a finite number of non-trivial integer solutions in (x, y) . Soon after, Nagell [20] showed that Equation 3 has only trivial solutions unless n is a power of 3, which though dealing with a more restricted setting than Thue, goes much further in that this deals with all $n \geq 3$ at once. Indeed, Nagell's result shows there are only finitely many non-trivial solutions to (3), since his result effectively reduces the problem to finding solutions for $n = 3$ only and Thue's result does the rest.

The $n = 3$ case can be dealt with through standard modern techniques from abstract algebra, along with some more number theory stemming from Thue. Suppose we have a solution to Equation 3. Then the discriminant must be an integer, and so we see that a solution to (3) is equivalent to a non-trivial integer solution to the equation

$$z^2 + 3 = 4y^3. \quad (5)$$

Set $\sigma = \sqrt{-3}$ and $\omega = (1 + \sigma)/2$. Note that ω is a primitive 6th root of unity and $\omega^2 = \omega - 1$. We now work in the UFD $\mathbb{Z}(\omega)$, where the only units are powers of ω . Recall that in $\mathbb{Z}(\omega)$ all elements take the form $a + b\sigma$, with $a, b \in \mathbb{Z}(\frac{1}{2})$ and $2(b - a)$ even. Further, $N(a + b\sigma) = a^2 + 3b^2$ acts as a multiplicative Euclidean norm on $\mathbb{Z}(\omega)$. Suppose we have a solution to (5). Clearly $z = 2t + 1$ for some integer t . Then

$$\begin{aligned} y^3 &= \frac{1}{4}(z + \sigma)(z - \sigma) \\ &= \left(\frac{2t + 1 + \sigma}{2}\right)\left(\frac{2t + 1 - \sigma}{2}\right) \\ &= (t + \omega)(t + 1 - \omega) = \alpha\beta. \end{aligned}$$

Since we have a Euclidean norm, we can talk of greatest common divisors. Let $d \in \gcd(\alpha, \beta)$. Now $\alpha + \beta = 2t + 1 = z$, while $\alpha - \beta = 2\omega - 1 = \sigma$. It is easily observed that σ is a prime in $\mathbb{Z}(\omega)$ as $N(\sigma) = 3$. Since d divides both $\alpha + \beta$ and $\alpha - \beta$, ignoring units d is either a unit or σ . If σ divides x , then $3|z^2$, implying $3|z$. Now working with (5) modulo 9 we find $y^3 \equiv 3 \pmod{9}$, which is impossible. Thus d is a unit, and since $\alpha\beta$ is a cube, we must have that both α and β are cubes also. Thus $t + \omega = \omega^k(a + b\omega)^3$ for some $a, b \in \mathbb{Z}$ and with $k \in \{0, 1, 2\}$. Focusing on the coefficient of ω in the expansion we arrive at one of three possibilities based on k :

$$\begin{aligned} k = 0 : & 1 = 3a^2b + ab^2 = ab(3a + b) \\ k = 1 : & 1 = a^3 + 3a^2b - b^3 \\ k = 2 : & 1 = a^3 - 3ab^2 - b^3 \end{aligned}$$

Clearly there is no solution to the $k = 0$ case, while the latter two equations are equivalent, in that (a, b) is a solution to the $k = 1$ case if and only if $(-b, -a)$ is a solution to the $k = 2$ case. We deal with the $k = 2$ case. In 1933, Skolem [26] gave an effective method for solving cubic Diophantine equations with positive discriminant (which this equation has) and specifically referenced the equation for $k = 2$, conjecturing that his methods would solve it completely. While he did not carry out this work, Ljunggren did in 1943 [17]. He showed that the only solutions are given by $(a, b) \in \{(1, 0), (0, -1), (-1, 1), (1, -3), (-3, 2), (2, 1)\}$. These pairs produce just two solutions for Equation 5, namely $z = 1$ and $z = 37$. Translating to the original equation (3), we find the only non-trivial solution is given by $(x, y, n) = (18, 7, 3)$.

It should be mentioned that the equations for $k = 1$ and $k = 2$ involve irreducible homogeneous functions in a, b . Thue [27] showed in 1909 that for any irreducible homogeneous polynomial $f \in \mathbb{Z}[X, Y]$ of degree at least 3, and any integer c , there are only finitely many integer solutions to the equation $f(x, y) = c$. Such an equation is often nowadays referred to as a Thue-type equation. A modern treatment of the $k = 1$ or $k = 2$ equation would not rely on the methods outlined by Skolem and employed by Ljunggren, as there are now much more effective computational methods for solving such equations, see Bilu and Hanrot [1] for example. The Magma algebra package [2], using the methods of Bilu and Hanrot, almost instantly yields the same solution set for the $k = 2$ equation as that determined by Ljunggren.

From the above we conclude that any function in $C_3(G_q)$ with $q = y^n$, where $y, n > 1$, meeting the upper bound in (1) would necessarily require $q = 343$ and imply the existence of a projective plane of order 18 by Theorem 1 (i). We note the famous Bruck-Ryser Theorem [3] does not eliminate this possibility, as 18 is obviously the sum of two squares. This completes the proof of Theorem 1.

For the field \mathbb{F}_{7^3} , the only known classes of planar functions are those equivalent to X^2 or X^8 and if the DO conjecture is true for cubic fields, then these must be the only ones. Every planar function equivalent to X^2 must have an image set of cardinality $(q + 1)/2 = 172$. Using the Magma algebra package again, an exhaustive check of all polynomials $f \in \mathbb{F}_{343}[X]$ that are equivalent to X^8 shows

$$172 \leq V(f) \leq 224 < 325 = q - \frac{2(q-1)}{1 + \sqrt{4q-3}}.$$

This leads to the following corollary to Theorem 1.

Corollary 5. *Any planar function over \mathbb{F}_{343} that meets the upper bound in (1) must be a counterexample to the DO conjecture.*

Before ending this discussion, we make some further comments regarding the general problem involving the discriminant. There is an immense amount of literature dealing with Diophantine problems such as

$$x^2 + 3 = 4y^n.$$

The result of Thue [28] concerning (4) mentioned above is one of the more important general ones, but many more results concerning variations of this equation have been produced since (and before!) Thue's result. Among a host of restricted settings, the equation

$$Ax^2 + B = \lambda y^n, \tag{6}$$

with $\gcd(y, AB) = 1$ has received much attention. Catalan [4] famously conjectured in 1844 that the only non-trivial consecutive perfect powers of natural numbers are 8 and 9. Put another way, the only solution to the equation $x^m - y^n = 1$, with $x, y, m, n > 1$, is given by $(x, y, m, n) = (3, 2, 2, 3)$. Just 6 years later, Lebesgue [15] showed the equation $x^2 + 1 = y^n$ had no integral solutions with $x, y, n > 1$. (Catalan's full conjecture was proved only in 2004, in a now celebrated paper by Mihăilescu [19].) Much later, Nagell gave several in-depth treatments of the $A = 1$ case of (6), see [21, 23]. Nagell also proved in [22] a conjecture of Ramanujan [24] from 1913 that there were only five triangular Mersenne numbers, or equivalently, that the only integer solutions (x, n) to $x^2 + 7 = 2^n$ were given by $(x, n) \in \{(1, 1), (3, 2), (5, 3), (11, 5), (181, 13)\}$. Equations and generalisations of the form of Equation 6 are now often called Lebesgue-Ramanujan-Nagell equations (or some variant) because of this history.

5. IMPROVING THE UPPER BOUND

The upper bound in (1) could only possibly be attained if there is a unique element with multiple pre-images, and the other elements of the image each have a unique pre-image. However, Theorem 1 precludes this possibility for functions $f \in C_3(G_q)$, where $q \neq 343$. While this immediately makes the inequality strict, we can get a quantitative gain by going back through the proof of (1). This proof, given in full detail in [7], requires only that $f \in C_4(G_q)$.

Consider the equivalence relation on the domain of f , where $x \sim_f x'$ if $f(x) = f(x')$. Notice that for an equivalence class of size u , there will be $u(u - 1)$ ordered pairs (x, x') with $x \neq x'$ and $x \sim_f x'$. As the number of equivalent pairs is $q - 1$, independent of our choice of $f \in C_4(G_q)$, and equivalence classes can only use numbers of the form $u(u - 1)$, we know $V(f)$ only has a certain number of possible values.

We now define a helpful notion used to bound the size of an image set. Given an equivalence relation \sim , and an equivalent pair, (x, x') , where $x \neq x'$, $x \sim x'$, and x is the first element in exactly $k - 1$ equivalent pairs, then x must belong to an equivalence class of size k . We define the *cost* of this pair with respect to \sim to be $\text{cost}_\sim(x, x') = 1/k$. For ease of notation, we define $\text{cost}_\sim(x, x) = 0$. The *total cost* of the relation \sim is defined to be

$$\text{cost}(\sim) = \sum_{x \sim x'} \text{cost}_\sim(x, x').$$

We use $\|\sim\|$ to denote the number of equivalent ordered pairs of distinct elements, which we call the *size* of the equivalence relation. Note that by definition, this will always be an even number. Given $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we define the *triangular floor* of n , denoted by $\lfloor n \rfloor_\Delta$ to be the largest natural number t satisfying $t(t - 1) \leq n$, that is,

$$\lfloor n \rfloor_\Delta = \max\{t \in \mathbb{N} : t(t - 1) \leq n\}.$$

Proposition 6. *Any equivalence relation \sim having $\|\sim\| = n$ on a set A with minimal total cost must have an equivalence class of size $\lfloor n \rfloor_\Delta$.*

Proof. Set $t = \lfloor n \rfloor_\Delta$ and let $d = n - t(t - 1)$. Consider $\text{cost}(\sim)$ assuming \sim has an equivalence class of size t . Now suppose \approx is a different equivalence relation on A with $\|\approx\| = n$, having no class of size t . As \sim has an equivalence class of size t , then the combined cost of all equivalences in that class is $t - 1$, as there are $t(t - 1)$ equivalences of distinct elements, and all have cost $1/t$. Each of the remaining d related ordered pairs of distinct elements must be in smaller equivalence classes, and therefore have cost at least $1/(t - 1)$. This shows

$$\text{cost}(\sim) \leq (t - 1) + \frac{d}{t - 1}.$$

On the other hand, as \approx does not have an equivalence class of size t , then every equivalence of distinct elements costs at least $1/(t-1)$, showing

$$\text{cost}(\approx) \geq \frac{n}{t-1} = \frac{t(t-1) + d}{t-1} = t + \frac{d}{t-1}.$$

Comparing these estimates proves the claim. \square

The following result makes the relationship between the $V(f)$ and total cost explicit.

Proposition 7. *Given a function $f : A \rightarrow B$, with A finite, define an equivalence relation on A by $x \sim_f x'$ iff $f(x) = f(x')$. We have*

$$V(f) = \#A - \text{cost}(\sim_f).$$

Proof. For each equivalence class of size k , there are exactly $k(k-1)$ equivalent pairs of distinct elements, each with cost $1/k$. This means that the total cost of equivalent pairs whose elements belong to an equivalence class of size k is $k-1$. For any set of k elements of the domain that are mapped to the same element in the image of f , we are losing $k-1$ potentially distinct elements of the image set. Now, summing the cost over all equivalent pairs gives precisely how many potential image set elements were lost in total. \square

In light of this result, to maximize $V(f)$ given a number of total equivalences, one need merely minimize the total cost. Our next result quantifies the most efficient method of distributing of images to maximize the size of $V(f)$ given the number of equivalent pairs of distinct elements.

We now apply Proposition 6 to get the following theorem, which describes the minimal possible cost for any equivalence relation on a finite set. The main idea is that greedily using up as many equivalences as we can at any given step in the process will yield the minimal total cost. The key observation is that once an equivalence class of maximal size is fixed, we can restrict our consideration to the sub-equivalence relation (in the Cartesian product sense) and reapply Proposition 6. Modifying the larger classes will only increase the cost, so we can move on to smaller equivalence classes.

Theorem 8. *Given any finite set A , the total cost of any equivalence relation \sim on A with $\|\sim\| = n$ is minimized when the non-singleton equivalence classes E_j , with sizes non-increasing in j , and where*

$$\#E_j = \left\lfloor n - \sum_{i < j} \#E_i(\#E_i - 1) \right\rfloor_{\Delta}.$$

In such cases, $\text{cost}(\sim) = \sum_j (\#E_j - 1)$.

Proof. Given a fixed n , Proposition 6 guarantees that if \sim has minimal total cost, then the largest equivalence class must have size $\#E_1 = \lfloor n \rfloor_{\Delta}$. This will account for $\#E_1(\#E_1 - 1)$ equivalences of ordered pairs of distinct elements, altogether contributing $\#E_1 - 1$ to the total cost. This leaves us with $n_1 = n - \#E_1(\#E_1 - 1)$ remaining equivalences of ordered pairs of distinct elements. We can again appeal to Proposition 6 applied to any equivalence relation on the set $A \setminus E_1$ to get that the remaining portion of the total cost is minimized when the next largest equivalence class has size $\#E_2 = \lfloor n_1 \rfloor_{\Delta}$. To generate the rest of the E_j , we repeatedly apply Proposition 6 to the remaining portions of A . As the set A is finite, this process will eventually terminate. \square

In general, this sum is minimized when all of the equivalent pairs are between elements from the same equivalence class. This agrees with the putative sharpness example where $q = 343$.

To prove Theorem 2, set $q = y^n$, for natural numbers $y, n > 1$, and $q \neq 343$. By Theorem 1, any function $f \in C_3(G_q)$, cannot attain the upper bound in 1. By Proposition 6, there must be at least two equivalence classes that are not singletons. Theorem 8 tells us we will minimize cost by maximizing the largest equivalence class we are allowed. To this end, we must therefore have a maximally efficient large equivalence class, and one more non-singleton equivalence class of size exactly two. This can only happen if there is an integer t , so that $t(t-1) + 2(2-1) = q-1$. In this case, $q-3 = t(t-1)$. Solving for t gives us one real possibility,

$$t = \frac{1 + \sqrt{4q - 11}}{2}.$$

Then any such f would have one element with t pre-images, another element with 2 pre-images, and be injective elsewhere. This would give

$$V(f) \leq q - (t - 1) - (2 - 1) = q - t,$$

proving Theorem 2.

Finally, to prove Corollary 3, let f be a planar function over \mathbb{F}_q . The results of Section 4 show that the only case not yet handled is when $q = p$, a prime. Recall from the Section 2 that planar functions over prime fields have been completely classified. Any such function must be a quadratic. We can always write $f(X) = aX^2 + bX + c$ as $a(X + d)^2 + c'$, so that $V(f) = (q + 1)/2$.

REFERENCES

1. Y. Bilu and G. Hanrot, *Solving Thue equations of high degree*, J. Number Th. **60** (1996), 373–392.
2. W. Bosma, J. Cannon, and C. Playoust, *The Magma algebra system I: The user language*, J. Symbolic Comput. **24** (1997), 235–265.
3. R.H. Bruck and H.J. Ryser, *The nonexistence of certain finite projective planes*, Canad. J. Math. **1** (1949), 88–93.
4. E. Catalan, *Note extreante d'une lettre adressée à l'éditeur*, J. Reine Angew. Math. **27** (1844), 192.
5. R.S. Coulter and M. Henderson, *Commutative presemifields and semifields*, Adv. Math. **217** (2008), 282–304.
6. R.S. Coulter and R.W. Matthews, *Planar functions and planes of Lenz-Barlotti class II*, Des. Codes Cryptogr. **10** (1997), 167–184.
7. R.S. Coulter and S. Senger, *On the number of distinct values of a class of functions with finite domain*, Ann. Comb. **18** (2014), 233–243.
8. P. Dembowski and T.G. Ostrom, *Planes of order n with collineation groups of order n^2* , Math. Z. **103** (1968), 239–258.
9. C. Ding and J. Yuan, *A family of skew Hadamard difference sets*, J. Combin. Theory Ser. A **113** (2006), 1526–1535.
10. D. Gluck, *Affine planes and permutation polynomials*, Coding Theory and Design Theory, part II (Design Theory), The IMA Volumes in Mathematics and its Applications, vol. 21, Springer-Verlag, 1990, pp. 99–100.
11. Y. Hiramine, *A conjecture on affine planes of prime order*, J. Combin. Theory Ser. A **52** (1989), 44–50.
12. D. Jungnickel and B. Schmidt, *Difference sets: an update*, Geometry, combinatorial designs and related structures (Spetses, 1996), London Math. Soc. Lecture Note Ser., vol. 245, Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 1997, pp. 89–112.
13. D.E. Knuth, *Finite semifields and projective planes*, J. Algebra **2** (1965), 182–217.
14. L. Kölsch and A. Polujan, *Value distributions of perfect nonlinear functions*, Combinatorica **44** (2024), 231–268.
15. V.A. Lebesgue, *Sur l'impossibilité, en nombres entiers, de l'équation $x^m = y^2 + 1$* , Nouv. Ann. de Math. **97** (1850), 178–181.
16. J.H. van Lint and R.M. Wilson, *A Course in Combinatorics*, 2nd ed., Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2001.
17. W. Ljunggren, *Einige Bemerkungen über die Darstellung ganzer Zahlen durch binäre kubische Formen mit positiver Diskriminante*, Acta Math. **75** (1943), 1–21.
18. G. Menichetti, *On a Kaplansky conjecture concerning three-dimensional division algebras over a finite field*, J. Algebra **47** (1977), 400–410.
19. P. Mihălescu, *Primary cyclotomic units and a proof of Catalan's conjecture*, J. Reine Angew. Math. **572** (2004), 167–195.
20. T. Nagell, *Des équations indéterminées $x^2 + x + 1 = y^n$ et $x^2 + x + 1 = 3y^n$* , Norsk Mat. Forenings Skr. **1** (1921), 14 pp.
21. ———, *Sur l'impossibilité de quelques équations à deux indéterminées*, Norsk Mat. Tidsskr. **13** (1923), 65–82.
22. ———, *Løsning til oppgave nr 2, 1943, s.29*, Norsk Mat. Forenings Skr. **30** (1948), 62–64.
23. ———, *Contributions to the theory of a category of Diophantine equations of the second degree with two unknowns*, Nova Acta Regiae soc. Sci. Upsaliensis **16** (1954), 1–38.
24. S. Ramanujan, *Question 464*, J. Indian Math. Soc. **5** (1913), 120.
25. L. Rónyai and T. Szőnyi, *Planar functions over finite fields*, Combinatorica **9** (1989), 315–320.
26. Th. Skolem, *Einige Sätze über gewisse Reihentwicklungen und exponentiale Beziehungen mut Anwendung auf diophantische Gleichungen*, Oslo Vid. akad. Skrifter I (1933), no. 6, 61 pp.
27. A. Thue, *Über Annäherungswerte algebraischer Zahlen*, J. Reine Angew. Math. **135** (1909), 284–305.
28. ———, *Über die Unlösbarkeit der Gleichungen $ax^2 + bx + c = dy^n$ in grossen ganzen Zahlen x and y* , Arch. Math. og Naturvideskab Kristiania **34** (1916), 1–6.

(R.S. Coulter) DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES, UNIVERSITY OF DELAWARE, NEWARK, DE 19716, UNITED STATES OF AMERICA.

(S. Senger) DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, MISSOURI STATE UNIVERSITY, MO 65897, UNITED STATES OF AMERICA.

Email address, R.S. Coulter: coulter@udel.edu

Email address, S. Senger: stevensenger@missouristate.edu