

On an Erdős-type conjecture on $\mathbb{F}_q[x]$

Rongyin Wang¹

¹School of Mathematical Sciences and LPMC, Nankai University,
Tianjin, 300071, China.

Contributing authors: 2112442@mail.nankai.edu.cn;

Abstract

P. Erdős conjectured that on the ring \mathbb{Z} , every system of n congruences covers the ring if and only if it covers any 2^n consecutive integers. This conjecture was proved by R. B. Crittenden and C. L. Vanden Eynden in 1970 by contradiction, then in 2019 P. Balister et. al. proved it again in an easier way. However, it was difficult to generalize P. Balister et. al.'s work to polynomial rings. We generalize Erdős's conjecture on integer covering systems to polynomial rings on finite field, for example, $\mathbb{F}_2[x]$, and proved the theorem: Every system of n cosets of ideals in $\mathbb{F}_q[x]$ covering all polynomials whose degree is less than n covers $\mathbb{F}_q[x]$ ring, by following and generalizing R. B. Crittenden and C. L. Vanden Eynden's method. We also notice the result is not sharp for larger q and small n , and we conjectured the second n in our theorem can be improved to $n/\log_2(q)$.

Keywords: Finite Field, Polynomial Ring, Residue class, Covering System

MSC Classification: 11T06, 11A07

1 Introduction

In 1970, R. B. Crittenden and C. L. Vanden Eynden[1] proved that any system of n congruence classes covering positive integers $1, 2, \dots, 2^n$ covers all integers, which was originally conjectured by P. Erdős[2] in 1962, who first proved a weaker version of this conjecture, replacing 2^n with $C(n)$, where $C(n)$ is a constant determined by n . The constant 2^n here cannot be improved, since one can find n congruences covering any given 2^n consecutive integers with any one given exception among them exactly. In 2019, P. Balister, B. Bollobás, R. Morris, J. Sahasrabudhe and M. Tiba[3] gave a simpler proof of this conjecture also by the proof by contradiction, including constructing polynomials using parameters from the counter-example congruences.

Covering systems for polynomial rings over finite fields has been studied by [4–6]. Our main result of this paper is we prove the generalized version of the Erdős’ conjecture mentioned above to the $\mathbb{F}_q[x]$ setting. We define congruences and covering systems in polynomial rings in a similar manner to those in the integer ring.

Definition 1. *In a polynomial ring $\mathbb{F}_q[x]$ over a finite field \mathbb{F}_q , a residue class (with modulus f and congruent to r) is*

$$\{g \in \mathbb{F}_q[x] : g \equiv r \pmod{f}, \text{ or } f|(g - r).\}$$

Definition 2. *We say a system of congruences or residue classes **covers** a certain polynomial g_0 if g_0 satisfies at least one of the congruences in the system; and the system of congruences covers a certain subset $A \subseteq \mathbb{F}_q[x]$ if for any $g \in A$, g belongs to at least one of the residue classes.*

Besides, in this article we see $\bar{0}$ as a degree-0 polynomial, so when we mention *the first k degree polynomials*, we mean polynomials of degree $k - 1$ or lower.

The main result of our paper is the following theorem.

Theorem 1. *Let $f_1, f_2, \dots, f_n, r_1, r_2, \dots, r_n$ be given polynomials in $\mathbb{F}_2[x]$ satisfying $\deg(r_i) < \deg(f_i)$, for $1 \leq i \leq n$. Suppose there exists some polynomial g satisfying none of the congruences*

$$g \equiv r_i \pmod{f_i}, i = 1, 2, \dots, n$$

Then there is such an g_0 with $\deg(g_0) < n$.

Our proof mainly follows R. B. Crittenden and C. L. Vanden Eynden’s method. The reason we do not follow the simpler proof by P. Balister, et al. is, their proof relies on two key points, to map the elements of the ring to a algebraic closed field preserving divisibility, and to find specific monomials on this field that are linearly independent, which we have encountered difficulties achieving when generalizing their method to the polynomial rings.

More generally, our method can be used on on any finite field \mathbb{F}_q , its polynomial ring $\mathbb{F}_q[x]$ and n congruences covering all polynomials whose degrees are at most $n - 1$ also cover all polynomials (see the Generalized Results part).

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we state a key to our proof, where the theorem holds for sufficiently large n ’s, as well as showing our result on $\mathbb{F}_2[x]$ is sharp.

In Section 3, we state and prove the lemmas we need to show Theorem 2.

In Section 4, we prove Theorem 2, using the adjustment method.

In Section 5, we discuss the case of Theorem 1 where $n \leq 9$.

In Section 6, we generalize our results to $\mathbb{F}_q[x]$.

2 Main Theorem

In order to prove our main theorem, we first prove a result as follows:

Theorem 2. *If the theorem is false, it does not hold for some $n < 10$.*

Remark 1. For any $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $r_0 \in \mathbb{F}_2[x]$ that $\deg(r_0) < n$, note that there exist r_1, r_2, \dots, r_n that

$$\begin{cases} r_0 \equiv r_1 \pmod{x} \\ r_0 \equiv r_2 \pmod{x^2} \\ \dots \\ r_0 \equiv r_n \pmod{x^n} \end{cases}$$

. One can find n congruences, starting by $g \equiv 1 + r_1 \pmod{x}$. There are 4 elements in $\mathbb{F}_2[x]/(x^2)$ and $r_2 \not\equiv 1 + r_1 \pmod{x}$, so there is exactly one r'_2 whose degree is less than 2, $r'_2 \not\equiv r_2 \pmod{x^2}$ and $r'_2 \not\equiv 1 + r_1 \pmod{x}$.

Suppose we have already in this way found $r'_1 (= 1 + r_1), r'_2, \dots, r'_k$. By the way we find them we know $(x) + r'_1, (x^2) + r'_2, \dots, (x^k) + r'_k, (x^{k+1}) + r_{k+1}$ are disjoint sets, hence $(\bar{x}) + \bar{r}'_1, (\bar{x}^2) + \bar{r}'_2, \dots, (\bar{x}^k) + \bar{r}'_k$ and singleton $\{\bar{r}_{k+1}\}$ are disjoint in $\mathbb{F}_2[x]/(x^{k+1})$ (Here \bar{f} means the equivalence class with element f). By counting the number of elements like in the proof of Lemma 2 (see below), we know there is exactly one $r'_{k+1} \in \mathbb{F}_2[x]$, with $\deg(r'_{k+1}) < k+1$, that $(x) + r'_1, (x^2) + r'_2, \dots, (x^k) + r'_k, (x^{k+1}) + r_{k+1}, (x^{k+1}) + r'_{k+1}$ disjoint, $(\bigcup_{i=1}^{k+1} ((x^i) + r'_i)) \cup ((x^{k+1}) + r_{k+1}) = \mathbb{F}_2[x]$. In other words, the set of congruences

$$\begin{cases} g \equiv r'_1 \pmod{x} \\ g \equiv r'_2 \pmod{x^2} \\ \dots \\ g \equiv r'_{k+1} \pmod{x^{k+1}} \end{cases}$$

covers all polynomials of degree k or less but not r_0 . Through inductive definition we obtain a system of congruences

$$\begin{cases} g \equiv r'_1 \pmod{x} \\ g \equiv r'_2 \pmod{x^2} \\ \dots \\ g \equiv r'_n \pmod{x^n} \end{cases}$$

covering all polynomials of degree less than n but exactly not r_0 .

3 Lemmas

Lemma 1. Suppose Theorem 1 is not true. Then for some n there exist congruences $x \equiv r_i \pmod{b_i}, i = 1, 2, \dots, n$ such that the following three conditions hold:

- (1) The set of congruences covers all polynomials of degree $n - 1$ or less but not all polynomials.
- (2) All the $b_i = p_i^s$ irreducible.
- (3) If k of the congruences have the same modulus p , then $k < d$, where $d = \deg(p)$.

Proof. Let n be the smallest integer for which Theorem 1 does not hold. Hence there exist $f_1, f_2, \dots, f_n, r_1, r_2, \dots, r_n$ covering each polynomial with degree less than n , but not all polynomials in $\mathbb{F}_2[x]$ and let α be a polynomial omitted by these congruences. We first show that we can adjust the congruences to make each $f_i(x) = p_i^{\lambda_i}(x)$ consist only one irreducible factor. Suppose $f_i(x) = \prod_{j=1}^J p_j^{\lambda_j}$, all p_j 's irreducible. Then the following congruences

$$\begin{cases} \alpha \equiv r_i \pmod{p_1^{\lambda_1}} \\ \alpha \equiv r_i \pmod{p_2^{\lambda_2}} \\ \dots \\ \alpha \equiv r_i \pmod{p_J^{\lambda_J}} \end{cases}$$

cannot hold all simultaneously. (Otherwise α becomes a solution of $\alpha \equiv r_i \pmod{f_i}$.) i.e. There exist some j that $\alpha \not\equiv r_i \pmod{p_j^{\lambda_j}}$, now replace f_i with $p_j^{\lambda_j}$, we know the new congruences still do not cover α but cover all polynomials of degree $n-1$ or less.

Then we move on to (3). Fix an irreducible polynomial p of degree d , and let α_0 be the remainder of $\alpha \pmod{p}$ there are 3 types of congruences:

$$\begin{cases} g \equiv r_i \pmod{p} \ (\alpha \not\equiv r_i \pmod{p}) \ (a) \\ g \equiv \kappa p + \alpha_0 \pmod{p^\lambda} \ (\lambda > 1) \ (b) \\ g \equiv r'_i \pmod{q} \ (\gcd(p, q) = 1) \ (c) \end{cases}$$

For the last two types of congruences, they cover all degree $n-1$ or less polynomials $a \equiv \alpha \pmod{p}$, but not α . So we rewrite those as

$$g \equiv \kappa_i p + \alpha_0 \pmod{b_i p},$$

where $b_i = p^{\lambda-1}$ for some λ or q for some $(q, p) = 1$, $1 \leq i \leq n-k$. Note that $\deg(\alpha_0) < \deg(p)$, we have an bijection between polynomials of degree $n-1-d$ or less and polynomials of degree $n-1$ or less in the form $\kappa_i p + \alpha_0$. So the $n-k$ congruences $g \equiv \kappa_i \pmod{b_i}$ cover all polynomials degree $n-d-1$ or less but not $\alpha - \alpha_0$. Recall the main theorem holds for $n-k$, so we must have $n-k > n-d$, this is (3).

To (2). by(3) there must be some $g \equiv r_0 \pmod{p}$ not included in any type-(a) congruences and $r_0 \neq \alpha_0$. Let $M = \prod_{(q,p)=1 \text{ in a type-(c) congruence}} q$, so $(M, p) = 1$. Since type-(c) congruences omit some polynomial, they omit at least one residue class $[g_0]$ (if g_0 is omitted, it's obvious $g_0 + M$ is also omitted by all type-(c) congruences.) By CRT, there is a polynomial g' satisfying

$$\begin{cases} g' \equiv r_0 \pmod{p}, \\ g' \equiv g_0 \pmod{M}. \end{cases}$$

If we replace all type-(b) congruences with $g \equiv \alpha_0 \pmod{p}$, the new congruences still cover all polynomials of degree $n - 1$ or less, although they cover α now, they still don't cover g' . So (1) holds still. By discussing the (3) property again, we can see (3) still holds. By repeating similar replacement for other irreducible factors we can assume (2). \square

Lemma 2. *Let S_1, S_2, \dots, S_t be sets of polynomials in $\mathbb{F}_2[x]$ and S_i consists of exactly k_i residue classes mod p_i , where $(p_i, p_j) = 1$ for $i \neq j$, $\deg(p_i) = d_i$. Let n be a positive integer and N be the number of polynomials of degree $n - 1$ or less and not included in any of the S_i 's, and s be any integer $1 \leq s \leq t$. We have*

$$N > 1 + 2^n \left(1 - \prod_{i=1}^s \frac{k_i}{2^{d_i}}\right) \prod_{i=s+1}^t \left(1 - \frac{k_i}{2^{d_i}}\right) - \left(1 + \sum_{i=1}^s k_i\right) \prod_{i=s+1}^t (1 + k_i).$$

Proof. For any set S , let $C(S)$ be its characteristic function. Then we note that $1 - \prod_{i=1}^s C(S) \leq \prod_{i=1}^s (1 - C(S))$. So the characteristic function of the set of polynomials not in any S is:

$$\begin{aligned} C\left(\overline{\bigcup_{i=1}^t S_i}\right) &= C\left(\bigcap_{i=1}^t \overline{S_i}\right) = \prod_{i=1}^t C(\overline{S_i}) = \prod_{i=1}^t (1 - C(S_i)) \\ &= \prod_{i=1}^s (1 - C(S_i)) \prod_{i=s+1}^t (1 - C(S_i)) \geq \left(1 - \sum_{i=1}^s C(S_i)\right) \prod_{i=s+1}^t (1 - C(S_i)) \\ &= 1 - \sum_{i=1}^t C(S_i) + \sum'_{i,j} C(S_i \cap S_j) - \dots \end{aligned}$$

where \sum' indicates that at most one subscript is less or equal than s .

If $d_i \leq n$, There are k_i elements of S_i among the first $d_i - 1$ degree polynomials, and $2^{d-d_i} k_i$ more of degree $d \geq d_i$. So $\sum_{\deg(r) < n} C(S_i)(r) = k_i \left(1 + \sum_{d=d_i}^{n-1} 2^{d-d_i}\right) = 2^{n-d_i} k_i$.

If $d_i > n$, there are at least 0 and at most k_i elements s of S_i among the first n degree polynomials. Or

$$0 \cdot k_i \leq \sum_{\deg(r) < n} C(S_i)(r) < 0 \cdot k_i + k_i.$$

Now we have a unified result that $\sum_{\deg(r) < n} C(S_i)(r) = 2^{n-d_i} k_i + E_i$, where $|E_i| < k_i$.

And according to CRT, there are at most $k_i k_j \dots k_z$ elements of $S_i \cap S_j \cap \dots \cap S_z$ in first $d_i + d_j + \dots + d_z$ degree polynomials, so

$$\sum_{\deg(r) < n} C(S_i \cap S_j \cap \dots \cap S_z)(r) = 2^{n-d_i-d_j-\dots-d_z} k_i k_j \dots k_z + E_{ij\dots z},$$

where $|E_{ij\dots z}| < k_i k_j \dots k_z$, Then

$$\begin{aligned}
N &= \sum_{\deg(r) < n} \overline{C(\bigcup_{i=1}^t S_i)(r)} \geq \sum_{\deg(r) < n} (1 - \sum_{i=1}^t C(S_i) + \sum_{i,j} 'C(S_i \cap S_j) - \dots)(r) \\
&= 2^n - \sum_{i=1}^t 2^{n-d_i} k_i + \sum_{i,j} '2^{n-d_i-d_j} k_i k_j - \dots + E \\
&= 2^n (1 - \sum_{i=1}^s \frac{k_i}{2^{d_i}}) \prod_{i=s+1}^t (1 - \frac{k_i}{2^{d_i}}) + E,
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$|E| < |\sum_{i=1}^t k_i - \sum_{i,j} 'k_i k_j + \dots| = (1 + \sum_{i=1}^s k_i) \prod_{i=s+1}^t (1 + k_i).$$

, which completes the proof. \square

4 Proof of Theorem 2

We continue to prove Theorem 2. By Lemma 2 and without loss of generality let $d_1 \leq d_2 \leq \dots \leq d_t$. It suffices to prove for some s

$$2^n (1 - \sum_{i=s+1}^t \frac{k_i}{2^{d_i}}) \prod_{i=1}^s (1 - \frac{k_i}{2^{d_i}}) \geq (1 + \sum_{i=s+1}^t k_i) \prod_{i=1}^s (1 + k_i) (*).$$

Note the right side (of $(*)$) is $(s+1)$ factors of sum $n+s+1$, let $s = \min(\lceil \frac{n}{3} - 1 \rceil, t-1)$. Then

$$((\text{the right side of } (*))*) \leq (\frac{n+s+1}{s+1})^{s+1} \leq (\frac{n+\frac{n}{3}}{\frac{n}{3}})^{\frac{n}{3}} = 2^{\frac{2n}{3}}.$$

Now we work on the left side of $(*)$. We want to obtain that

$$L \triangleq \text{the left side of } (*) \geq 2^{\frac{2n}{3}}.$$

Consider the first factor, we need the following lemma:

Lemma 3. *Let $N(\leq d)$ be the number of irreducible polynomials in $\mathbb{F}_2[x]$ whose degree is equal or less than d but no less than 2. Then for $d \geq 2$, $N(\leq d) \leq 3 \cdot 2^{d-3}$*

Proof. Note for $d \in \mathbb{N}$ there are $N(d) = \frac{1}{d} \sum_{k|d} \mu(k) 2^{\frac{d}{k}}$ deg- d irreducible polynomials in

$\mathbb{F}_2[x]$. Hence $N(d) \leq \frac{2^d}{d} \leq \frac{3 \cdot 2^d}{16}$ for $d > 5$. For $1 \leq d \leq 5$ one can check the inequality holds, so the lemma is true for all $d \in \mathbb{N}$. \square

By Lemma 3, for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $d_n > \lceil \log_2(\frac{8n}{3}) \rceil$, so $d_n \geq \log_2(\frac{8n}{3})$ and $2^{d_n} \geq \frac{8n}{3}$. This implies

$$1 - \sum_{i=s+1}^t \frac{k_i}{2^{d_i}} \geq 1 - \sum_{i=\lceil \frac{n}{3} \rceil + 1}^t \frac{k_i}{2^{\lceil \frac{n}{3} \rceil}} \geq 1 - \frac{\frac{2n}{3}}{\frac{8}{3} \cdot \frac{n}{3}} = \frac{1}{4}.$$

We use method of adjustment to handle the remaining factors.

i) if there exist p_1, p_2 such that $d_1 = d_2$ and $1 \leq k_1 \leq k_2 < d_2 - 1$, we show that

$$(1 - \frac{k_1}{2^{d_1}})(1 - \frac{k_2}{2^{d_2}}) - (1 - \frac{k_1 - 1}{2^{d_1}})(1 - \frac{k_2 + 1}{2^{d_2}}) = \frac{k_2 - k_1 + 1}{2^{2d_1}} > 0,$$

hence

$$(1 - \frac{k_1}{2^{d_1}})(1 - \frac{k_2}{2^{d_2}}) > (1 - \frac{k_1 - 1}{2^{d_1}})(1 - \frac{k_2 + 1}{2^{d_2}}).$$

On the other hand,

ii) and if there exist p_1, p_2 such that $d_1 < d_2$ and $0 \leq k_1 < d_1 - 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} (1 - \frac{k_1}{2^{d_1}})(1 - \frac{k_2}{2^{d_2}}) - (1 - \frac{k_1 + 1}{2^{d_1}})(1 - \frac{k_2 - 1}{2^{d_2}}) \\ = \frac{2^{d_2} - 2^{d_1} + k_1 - k_2 + 1}{2^{d_1 + d_2}} > \frac{2^{d_2 - 1} - k_2}{2^{d_1 + d_2}} > \frac{2^{d_2 - 1} - d_2}{2^{d_1 + d_2}} > 0, \end{aligned}$$

hence

$$(1 - \frac{k_1}{2^{d_1}})(1 - \frac{k_2}{2^{d_2}}) > (1 - \frac{k_1 + 1}{2^{d_1}})(1 - \frac{k_2 - 1}{2^{d_2}}).$$

According to i) and ii), we can assume the remaining factors "fill" the irreducible moduli in order that from the lowest degree to highest. Note $k_i < d_i$, so

$$\prod_{i=1}^s (1 - \frac{k_i}{2^{d_i}}) \geq (1 - \frac{1}{2^2})(1 - \frac{2}{2^3})(1 - \frac{2}{2^3})^{\lceil \frac{\lceil \frac{n}{3} \rceil - 1 - 3}{2} \rceil + 1} > (1 - \frac{1}{2^2})(1 - \frac{2}{2^3})(1 - \frac{2}{2^3})^{\frac{n-4}{2} + 1}.$$

So for $n \geq 10$,

$$\begin{aligned} 2^n (1 - \sum_{i=s+1}^t \frac{k_i}{2^{d_i}}) \prod_{i=1}^s (1 - \frac{k_i}{2^{d_i}}) &\geq (1 - \frac{1}{4})(1 - \frac{1}{2^2})(1 - \frac{2}{2^3})(1 - \frac{2}{2^3})^{\frac{n-4}{2} + 1} \\ &= 2^{\frac{2n}{3} - 4} \cdot 3^{\frac{n}{6} + 1} > 2^{\frac{2n}{3}} \geq (1 + \sum_{i=s+1}^t k_i) \prod_{i=1}^s (1 + k_i). \end{aligned}$$

That completes the proof.

5 Further results to Theorem 1

It remains to check the theorem for $n < 10$. Since the lemmas always hold, in this part our systems of congruences discussed are always the form mentioned in Lemma 1. We state some facts to help handle these cases. On the one hand, recall that at

most $\lceil 2^{n-d_i} \rceil k_i$ polynomials whose degree is at most $n-1$ in S_i and they most cover $\{f \in \mathbb{F}_2[x] : \deg(f) \leq n-1\}$. So for a system of congruences satisfying Lemma 1, when $n=1$, there are at most 1 constant covered; for $n=2$ at most 2 polynomials of degree at most 1; and for $n=3$ at most $\frac{2^3}{2^2} + 2 = 4$. If $4 \leq n \leq 8$, there are at most $(\frac{1}{4} + \frac{2}{8} + \frac{2}{8} + \frac{3}{16})2^n = \frac{15}{16} \cdot 2^n$ polynomials covered, a contradiction.

For $n=9$, there are at most $(\frac{1}{4} + \frac{2}{8} + \frac{2}{8} + \frac{3}{16} + \frac{1}{16})2^n = 2^n$ polynomials covered. But to make the equality hold, the S_i 's must be disjoint. But according to CRT this is impossible. Contradiction. This completes the proof of Theorem 1.

6 Generalized Results

For a finite field $\mathbb{F}_q[x]$, we consider the similar result on $\mathbb{F}_q[x]$.

Lemma 4. *Let S_1, S_2, \dots, S_t be sets of polynomials in $\mathbb{F}_q[x]$ and S_i consists of exactly k_i residue classes mod p_i , where $(p_i, p_j) = 1$ for $i \neq j$, $\deg(p_i) = d_i$. Let n be a positive integer and N be the number of polynomials of degree $n-C-1$ or less and not included in any of the S_i 's, and s be any integer $1 \leq s \leq t$, here C is a constant. We have*

$$N > 1 + q^{n-C} \left(1 - \sum_{i=1}^s \frac{k_i}{q^{d_i}}\right) \prod_{i=s+1}^t \left(1 - \frac{k_i}{q^{d_i}}\right) - \left(1 + \sum_{i=1}^s k_i\right) \prod_{i=s+1}^t (1 + k_i).$$

Proof of this lemma is similar to that of Lemma 2, by using the inclusion-exclusion principle.

Corollary 1. *Let $f_1, f_2, \dots, f_n, r_1, r_2, \dots, r_n$ be given polynomials in $\mathbb{F}_q[x]$ satisfying $\deg(r_i) < \deg(f_i)$, for $1 \leq i \leq n$. Suppose there exists some polynomial g satisfying none of the congruences*

$$g \equiv r_i \pmod{f_i}, i = 1, 2, \dots, n$$

Then there is such an g_0 with $\deg(g_0) < n$.

Proof. Note in the proof of Lemma 1 we did not use any property specific in $\mathbb{F}_2[x]$ from general $\mathbb{F}_q[x]$, and we can still make the discussion. So,

for $n \geq 10$, the inequality we want to show in proof of Theorem 2 is now

$$q^n \left(1 - \sum_{i=s+1}^t \frac{k_i}{q^{d_i}}\right) \prod_{i=1}^s \left(1 - \frac{k_i}{q^{d_i}}\right) \geq 4^{\frac{n}{3}}.$$

and the method of adjustment still can be applied. note that $N_q(\leq d) \leq \frac{q-1}{2q} q^d$ and $q^{d_n} > \frac{2qn}{q-1}$, where $N_q(\leq d)$ is the number of irreducible polynomials in $\mathbb{F}_q[x]$ whose degree is equal or less than d but no less than 2. Hence

$$q^n \left(1 - \sum_{i=s+1}^t \frac{k_i}{q^{d_i}}\right) \prod_{i=1}^s \left(1 - \frac{k_i}{q^{d_i}}\right) \geq q^{n-1} \prod_{i=1}^s \frac{8}{9}.$$

For $2 \leq n \leq 9$, since

$$\frac{\lceil q^{n-d_i} \rceil k_i}{q^n} \leq \frac{1}{9}$$

And Corollary 1 holds. \square

Remark 2. When $q = 3$ and $n = 2$, by our result, if a system of 2 congruences in $\mathbb{F}_3[x]$ covers all polynomials whose degrees are at most 1, they cover the polynomial ring. But in fact, if a system of 2 congruences covers all polynomials of degree at most 0, they still covers the whole ring. The proof of this is similar to how we handle the case $q = 2$ and $n \leq 9$. For the general case, since a obvious lower bound of the number of polynomials we must cover to confirm the system of n congruences covers the whole ring is 2^n , a lowest degree d where the number of polynomials of degree d or less exceeds 2^n is $\lceil n/\log_2(q) \rceil$.

We conjecture the lower bound can be reached.

Conjecture. Let $f_1, f_2, \dots, f_n, r_1, r_2, \dots, r_n$ be given polynomials in $\mathbb{F}_q[x]$ satisfying $\deg(r_i) < \deg(f_i)$, for $1 \leq i \leq n$. Suppose there exists some polynomial g satisfying none of the congruences

$$g \equiv r_i \pmod{f_i}, i = 1, 2, \dots, n$$

Then there is such an g_0 with $\deg(g_0) < \lceil n/\log_2(q) \rceil$.

References

- [1] Crittenden, R.B., Vanden Eynden, C.L.: Any n arithmetic progressions covering the first 2^n integers cover all integers. Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **24**, 475–481 (1970) <https://doi.org/10.2307/2037391>
- [2] Erdős, P.: Remarks on number theory. IV. Extremal problems in number theory. I. Mat. Lapok **13**, 228–255 (1962)
- [3] Balister, P., Bollobás, B., Morris, R., Sahasrabudhe, J., Tiba, M.: Covering intervals with arithmetic progressions. Acta Math. Hungar. **161**(1), 197–200 (2020) <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10474-019-00980-z>
- [4] Azlin, M.W.: Covering Systems of Polynomial Rings Over Finite Fields. University of Mississippi, Electronic Theses and Dissertations. 39, ??? (2011). <https://egrove.olemiss.edu/etd/39>
- [5] Li, H., Wang, B., Wang, C., Yi, S.: On the Covering Systems of Polynomial Rings Over Finite Fields, Accepted by the Proc. Amer. Math. Soc., 12 pp. . arXiv e-prints, 2308–05378 (2024) <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2308.05378> arXiv:2308.05378 [math.NT]
- [6] Li, H., Wang, B., Wang, C., Yi, S.: On Erdős covering systems in global function fields. arXiv e-prints, 2402–03810 (2024) <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2402.03810> arXiv:2402.03810 [math.NT]



