

RANDOMNESS OF CHARACTER SUMS MODULO m

YOUNESS LAMZOURI AND ALEXANDRU ZAHARESCU

ABSTRACT. Using a probabilistic model, based on random walks on the additive group $\mathbb{Z}/m\mathbb{Z}$, we prove that the values of certain real character sums are uniformly distributed in residue classes modulo m .

1. INTRODUCTION

A central question in number theory is to gain an understanding of character sums

$$S_\chi(x) = \sum_{n \leq x} \chi(n),$$

where χ is a Dirichlet character modulo q . When $q = p$ is a prime number and $\chi_p = \left(\frac{\cdot}{p}\right)$ is the Legendre symbol modulo p , the character sums $S_p(x) = S_{\chi_p}(x)$ encode information on the distribution of quadratic residues and non-residues modulo p (see for example Davenport and Erdős [5], and Peralta [13]). In particular, bounds for the order of magnitude of $S_p(x)$ lead to results on the size of the least quadratic non-residue modulo p (see the work of Ankeny [2]; Banks, Garaev, Heath-Brown and Shparlinski [3]; Burgess [4]; Graham and Ringrose [6]; Lau and Wu [10]; Linnik [11]; and Montgomery [12]).

Quadratic residues and non-residues appear to occur in a rather random pattern modulo p , which suggests that the values of $\chi_p(n)$ mimic a random variable that takes the values 1 and -1 with equal probability $1/2$. This fact was recently exploited by Granville and Soundararajan [7] while investigating the distribution of the values of Dirichlet L -functions attached to quadratic characters at $s = 1$. Furthermore, a result of Davenport and Erdős [5] shows that short real character sums are indeed random in some sense. More specifically, they established that the values $S_p(n + H) - S_p(n)$ are distributed according to a Gaussian distribution of mean zero and variance H as $H \rightarrow \infty$ in the range $\log H / \log p \rightarrow 0$ when $p \rightarrow \infty$.

In this paper, we investigate a new aspect of the *randomness* of these character sums. To describe our results, we first need some notation. Let $F(X)$ be a square-free

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 11L40; Secondary 11B50, 60G50.

Key words and phrases. Character sums, distribution in residue classes, random walks on finite groups.

The First author is supported by a postdoctoral fellowship from the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada. Research of the second author is supported by the NSF grant DMS-0901621.

polynomial of degree $d_F \geq 1$ over the finite field $\mathbb{F}_p = \mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z}$, and define

$$S_p(F, k) := \sum_{n \leq k} \chi_p(F(n)),$$

for all positive integers $k \leq p$. Moreover, let $\Phi_p(F; m, a)$ be the proportion of positive integers $k \leq p$ for which $S_p(F, k) \equiv a \pmod{m}$; that is

$$\Phi_p(F; m, a) = \frac{1}{p} |\{k \leq p : S_p(F, k) \equiv a \pmod{m}\}|.$$

Since the values $\chi_p(F(n))$ are expected to be randomly distributed, one might guess that $\Phi_p(F; m, a) \sim 1/m$ for all $a \pmod{m}$ as $p \rightarrow \infty$. We show that this is indeed the case in Corollary 1 below, uniformly for all m in the range $m = o((\log p)^{1/4})$ as $p \rightarrow \infty$. Our strategy is to introduce a probabilistic model for the values $S_p(F, k)$ based on random walks. A simple random walk on \mathbb{Z} is a stochastic process $\{S_k\}_{k \geq 1}$ where

$$S_k = X_1 + \cdots + X_k,$$

and $\{X_j\}_{j \geq 1}$ is a sequence of independent random variables taking the values 1 and -1 with equal probability $1/2$ (for further reference see Spitzer [14]). We shall model the values $S_p(F, k) \pmod{m}$ by the stochastic process $\{S_k \pmod{m}\}$ which may be regarded as a simple random walk on the additive group $\mathbb{Z}/m\mathbb{Z}$. To this end we consider the random variable

$$\Phi_{\text{rand}}(N; m, a) := \frac{1}{N} |\{k \leq N : S_k \equiv a \pmod{m}\}|.$$

Here and throughout $\mathbb{E}(Y)$ will denote the expectation of the random variable Y . We first study the probabilistic model and prove

Proposition 1. *Let $m \geq 2$ be a positive integer. Then, for all $N \geq m^2$ we have*

$$\sum_{a=0}^{m-1} \mathbb{E} \left(\left(\Phi_{\text{rand}}(N; m, a) - \frac{1}{m} \right)^2 \right) \ll \frac{m^2}{N}.$$

Appealing to Markov's inequality, we deduce from this result that

$$\Phi_{\text{rand}}(N; m, a) = \frac{1}{m} (1 + o(1))$$

with probability $1 - o(1)$ provided that $N/m^2 \rightarrow \infty$.

Using Proposition 1, we establish an analogous estimate for the second moment of the difference $\Phi_p(F; m, a) - 1/m$ (which may be regarded as the ‘‘variance’’ of $\Phi_p(F; m, a)$).

Theorem 1. *Let p be a large prime number and $F(X) \in \mathbb{F}_p(X)$ be a square-free polynomial of degree $d_F \geq 1$. Then, for any integer $2 \leq m \ll (\log p)^{1/4}$ we have*

$$\sum_{a=0}^{m-1} \left(\Phi_p(F; m, a) - \frac{1}{m} \right)^2 \ll_{d_F} \frac{m^2}{\log p}.$$

As a consequence, we obtain

Corollary 1. *Under the same assumptions of Theorem 1, we have uniformly for all $0 \leq a \leq m - 1$*

$$\Phi_p(F; m, a) = \frac{1}{m} + O_{d_F} \left(\frac{m}{\sqrt{\log p}} \right).$$

Let $R_p(F, k)$ be the number of positive integers $n \leq k$ such that $F(n)$ is a quadratic residue modulo p , and similarly denote by $N_p(F, k)$ the number of $n \leq k$ for which $F(n)$ is a quadratic non-residue mod p . Using a slight variation of our method we also prove that the values $R_p(F, k)$ (and $N_p(F, k)$) are uniformly distributed in residue classes modulo m . In this case, the corresponding probabilistic model involves random walks on the non-negative integers, where each step is 0 or 1 with equal probability. Define

$$\tilde{\Phi}_p(F; m, a) = \frac{1}{p} |\{k \leq p : R_p(F, k) \equiv a \pmod{m}\}|.$$

Then, using a similar result to Proposition 1 in this case (see Proposition 3.3 below) we establish

Theorem 2. *Let p be a large prime number and $F(X) \in \mathbb{F}_p(X)$ be a square-free polynomial of degree $d_F \geq 1$. Then, for any integer $2 \leq m \ll (\log p)^{1/4}$ we have*

$$\sum_{a=0}^{m-1} \left(\tilde{\Phi}_p(F; m, a) - \frac{1}{m} \right)^2 \ll_{d_F} \frac{m^2}{\log p}.$$

A similar result holds replacing $R_p(F, k)$ with $N_p(F, k)$.

An important question in the theory of random walks on finite groups is to investigate how close is the distribution of the k -th step of the walk to the uniform distribution on the corresponding group (see for example Hildebrand [8]). In our case this corresponds to investigating the distribution of $S_k \pmod{m}$. Define

$$\Psi_{\text{rand}}(k; m, a) = \text{Prob}(S_k \equiv a \pmod{m}).$$

Proposition 2. *Let $m \geq 3$ be an odd integer and $0 \leq a \leq m - 1$. Then*

$$\Psi_{\text{rand}}(k; m, a) = \frac{1}{m} + O \left(\exp \left(-\frac{\pi^2 k}{3m^2} \right) \right).$$

This shows that the distribution of S_k is close to the uniform distribution on $\mathbb{Z}/m\mathbb{Z}$ when $m = o(k^{1/2})$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$. Although this result is classical (see for example Theorem 2 of Aldous and Diaconis [1]), we chose to include its proof for the sake of completeness.

We now describe an analogous result that we derive for character sums. Let N be large, and for each prime $p \leq N$, we consider the walk on $\mathbb{Z}/m\mathbb{Z}$ whose i -th step corresponds to the value of $\chi_p(q_i) \pmod{m}$, where q_i is the i -th prime number. One might guess that as p varies over the primes below N , the distribution of the k -th step of this

walk will be close to the uniform distribution in $\mathbb{Z}/m\mathbb{Z}$, as $N, k \rightarrow \infty$ if $m = o(k^{1/2})$. Define

$$S_k(p) = \sum_{j \leq k} \chi_p(q_j),$$

and

$$\Psi_N(k; m, a) = \frac{1}{\pi(N)} |\{p \leq N : S_k(p) \equiv a \pmod{m}\}|.$$

Here and throughout \log_j will denote the j -th iterated logarithm, so that $\log_1 n = \log n$ and $\log_j n = \log(\log_{j-1} n)$ for each $j \geq 2$. We prove

Theorem 3. *Fix $A \geq 1$. Let N be large, and $k \leq A(\log_2 N)/(\log_3 N)$ be a positive integer. Then we have*

$$\Psi_N(k; m, a) = \Psi_{\text{rand}}(k; m, a) + O_A\left(\frac{1}{\log^A N}\right).$$

Hence, using Proposition 2 we deduce

Corollary 2. *Let m be an odd integer such that $3 \leq m \leq k^{1/2}$. Then under the same assumptions of Theorem 3 we have uniformly for all $0 \leq a \leq m-1$ that*

$$\Psi_N(k; m, a) = \frac{1}{m} + O_A\left(\exp\left(-\frac{\pi^2 k}{3m^2}\right) + \frac{1}{\log^A N}\right).$$

We remark that under the assumption of the Generalized Riemann Hypothesis for Dirichlet L -functions, we can improve the range of validity of Theorem 3 to $k \ll (\log N)/(\log_2 N)$.

2. PRELIMINARY LEMMAS

In this section we collect together some preliminary results which will be useful in our subsequent work. Here and throughout we shall use the notation $e_m(x) = \exp\left(\frac{2\pi i x}{m}\right)$. Recall the orthogonal relation

$$(2.1) \quad \frac{1}{m} \sum_{t=0}^{m-1} e_m(tn) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } n \equiv 0 \pmod{m}, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Our first lemma gives the classical bound for incomplete exponential sums over \mathbb{F}_p of the form

$$S_I(P_1, P_2) = \sum_{n \in I} \chi_p(P_1(n)) e_p(P_2(n)),$$

where I is a subinterval of $\{0, 1, \dots, p-1\}$, and $P_1(X), P_2(X) \in \mathbb{F}_p[X]$, such that $P_1(X)$ is a nontrivial square-free polynomial.

Lemma 2.1. *Let $p \geq 3$ be a prime number and $I, P_1(X), P_2(X)$ be as above. Then we have*

$$|S_I(P_1, P_2)| \leq 2D\sqrt{p} \log p,$$

where

$$D = \deg P_1(X) + \deg P_2(X).$$

Proof. First if $I = \{0, \dots, p-1\}$, then $S_I(P_1, P_2) = S(P_1, P_2)$ is a complete sum and the result follows from the classical Weil bound for exponential sums [15]:

$$(2.2) \quad |S(P_1, P_2)| \leq Dp^{1/2}.$$

Now, if I is proper subinterval of $\{0, \dots, p-1\}$, we shall use a standard procedure to express our incomplete sum in terms of complete sums of the same type. Using equation (2.1) we see that

$$S_I(P_1, P_2) = \sum_{n \bmod p} \chi_p(P_1(n)) e_p(P_2(n)) \left(\sum_{m \in I} \frac{1}{p} \sum_{t \bmod p} e_p(t(m-n)) \right).$$

Changing the order of summation and noting that the inner double sum is a product of two sums, one being a geometric progression and the other a complete exponential sum, we obtain

$$(2.3) \quad \begin{aligned} S_I(P_1, P_2) &= \frac{1}{p} \sum_{t \bmod p} \left(\sum_{m \in I} e_p(tm) \right) \left(\sum_{n \bmod p} \chi_p(P_1(n)) e_p(P_2(n) - tn) \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{p} \sum_{t \bmod p} F_I(t) S(P_1, \widetilde{P}_2), \end{aligned}$$

where $\widetilde{P}_2(X) = P_2(X) - tX$ and $F_I(t) = \sum_{m \in I} e_p(tm)$. If $t \equiv 0 \pmod p$ then $F_I(t) = |I|$. Otherwise if $I = \{M+1, \dots, M+N\}$, say, then

$$F_I(t) = \frac{e_p(t(M+1)) - e_p(t(M+N+1))}{1 - e_p(t)}.$$

Here the numerator has absolute value at most 2, while the absolute value of the denominator is $2|\sin(t\pi/p)|$. Hence

$$|F_I(t)| \leq \left| \sin \left(\frac{t\pi}{p} \right) \right|^{-1} \leq \left(2 \left\| \frac{t}{p} \right\| \right)^{-1},$$

where $\|\cdot\|$ stands for the distance to the nearest integer. As a set of representatives modulo p we choose $\{-\frac{p-1}{2}, \dots, \frac{p-1}{2}\}$, so that for $t \neq 0$ in this set we have

$$(2.4) \quad |F_I(t)| \leq \frac{p}{2|t|}.$$

Now, we insert (2.2) and (2.4) in (2.3) to obtain

$$|S_I(P_1, P_2)| \leq \frac{D}{p^{1/2}} \left(|I| + \sum_{1 \leq |t| \leq \frac{p-1}{2}} \frac{p}{2|t|} \right) \leq 2D\sqrt{p} \log p.$$

This completes the proof of the lemma. \square

The following lemma will be later used to prove that the product of distinct shifts of a square-free polynomial cannot be a square in $\mathbb{F}_p(X)$.

Lemma 2.2. *Let $r \geq 2$, and z_1, \dots, z_r , be distinct elements of \mathbb{F}_p . Moreover, let \mathcal{M} be a nonempty finite subset of the algebraic closure $\overline{\mathbb{F}_p}$ of \mathbb{F}_p with $4|\mathcal{M}| < p^{\frac{1}{r}}$. Then there exists a $j \in \{1, \dots, r\}$ such that the translate $\mathcal{M} + z_j$ is not contained in $\cup_{i \neq j} (\mathcal{M} + z_i)$.*

Proof. Suppose that $(z_1, \dots, z_r, \mathcal{M})$ provides a counterexample to the statement of the lemma. Then clearly for any nonzero $t \in \mathbb{F}_p$, $(tz_1, \dots, tz_r, t\mathcal{M})$ is also a counterexample.

We now use Minkowski's theorem on lattice points in a symmetric convex body to find a nonzero integer t such that

$$\begin{cases} |t| & \leq p - 1 \\ \left\| \frac{tz_1}{p} \right\| & \leq (p - 1)^{-\frac{1}{r}} \\ & \vdots \\ \left\| \frac{tz_r}{p} \right\| & \leq (p - 1)^{-\frac{1}{r}} \end{cases}$$

Another way to express this is that there are integers

$$(2.5) \quad \begin{cases} |y_j| & \leq p(p - 1)^{-\frac{1}{r}} \\ y_j & \equiv tz_j \pmod{p} \end{cases}$$

for any $j \in \{1, \dots, r\}$. Thus $(y_1, \dots, y_r, t\mathcal{M})$ provides a counterexample. Now let j_0 be such that

$$|y_{j_0}| = \max_{1 \leq j \leq r} |y_j|.$$

Choose $\alpha \in t\mathcal{M}$ and consider the set $\tilde{\mathcal{M}} = t\mathcal{M} \cap (\alpha + \mathbb{F}_p)$. Then $(y_1, \dots, y_r, \tilde{\mathcal{M}})$ will also be a counterexample.

Note that $\alpha + \mathbb{F}_p$ can be written as a union of $|\mathcal{M}|$ intervals whose endpoints are in $\tilde{\mathcal{M}}$. Let $\{\alpha + a, \alpha + a + 1, \dots, \alpha + b\}$ be the longest of these intervals. Then

$$|b - a| \geq \frac{p}{|\tilde{\mathcal{M}}|} \geq \frac{p}{|\mathcal{M}|}.$$

By this, (2.5) and the hypothesis $4|\mathcal{M}| < p^{\frac{1}{r}}$ we deduce

$$|b - a| > 4p^{1 - \frac{1}{r}} > 2|y_{j_0}|.$$

Now the point is that if $y_{j_0} > 0$ then $\alpha + a + y_{j_0}$ belongs to $\tilde{\mathcal{M}} + y_{j_0}$ but does not belong to $\cup_{i \neq j_0} (\tilde{\mathcal{M}} + y_i)$, while if $y_{j_0} < 0$ then $\alpha + b + y_{j_0}$ belongs to $\tilde{\mathcal{M}} + y_{j_0}$ but does not belong to $\cup_{i \neq j_0} (\tilde{\mathcal{M}} + y_i)$. This completes the proof of the lemma. \square

Using this lemma, we prove the following result

Lemma 2.3. *Let $F(X) \in \mathbb{F}_p(X)$ be a square-free polynomial of degree $d_F \geq 1$. Let b_1, \dots, b_L be distinct elements in \mathbb{F}_p such that $L < (\log p) / \log(4d_F)$. Then, for any*

$a \in \mathbb{F}_p$ the polynomial

$$H(X) = \prod_{j=1}^L F(aX + b_j),$$

is not a square in $\mathbb{F}_p(X)$.

Proof. Let $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_s$ be the roots of $F(X)$ in $\overline{\mathbb{F}_p}$. Since $F(X)$ is square-free then the α_j are distinct and $s = d_F$. Let $\mathcal{M} = \{a^{-1}\alpha_1, \dots, a^{-1}\alpha_s\}$, and write $z_j = -a^{-1}b_j$ for all $1 \leq j \leq L$. Then note that $\mathcal{M} + z_j$ is the set of the roots of $F(ax + b_j)$ in $\overline{\mathbb{F}_p}$. By our hypothesis it follows that $4|\mathcal{M}| < p^{1/L}$. Hence, we infer from Lemma 2.2 that there exists a $j \in \{1, \dots, L\}$ such that at least one of the roots of $F(ax + b_j)$ is distinct from all the roots of $\prod_{l \neq j} F(ax + b_l)$. This shows that $H(X)$ is not a square in $\mathbb{F}_p(X)$ as desired. \square

3. RANDOM WALKS ON THE INTEGERS MODULO m

In this section we shall study the distribution of the random walk $\{S_k \bmod m\}_{k \geq 1}$ and prove Propositions 1 and 2. To this end, we establish the following preliminary lemmas.

Lemma 3.1. *If $m \geq 3$ is an odd integer, then*

$$(3.1) \quad \max_{1 \leq t \leq m-1} \left| \cos \left(\frac{2\pi t}{m} \right) \right| \leq 1 - \frac{\pi^2}{3m^2},$$

and

$$\max_{1 \leq t \leq m-1} |1 + e_m(t)| \leq 2 - \frac{\pi^2}{6m^2}.$$

Proof. We begin by proving the first assertion. If $m \geq 5$ is odd, then

$$\max_{1 \leq t \leq m-1} \left| \cos \left(\frac{2\pi t}{m} \right) \right| = \cos \left(\frac{2\pi}{m} \right).$$

Moreover we know that $\cos(x) \leq 1 - x^2/3$ for $0 \leq x \leq \pi/2$. This yields

$$\max_{1 \leq t \leq m-1} \left| \cos \left(\frac{2\pi t}{m} \right) \right| \leq 1 - \frac{4\pi^2}{3m^2}.$$

Now, when $m = 3$ we have $\max_{1 \leq t \leq 2} |\cos(2\pi t/m)| = \cos(\pi/m) \leq 1 - \pi^2/(3m^2)$. This establishes the first part of the lemma.

Moreover, we have

$$|1 + e_m(t)|^2 = 2 + 2 \cos(2\pi t/m) \leq 4 \left(1 - \frac{\pi^2}{6m^2} \right),$$

which follows from (3.1). Therefore, using that $\sqrt{1-x} \leq 1 - x/2$ for $0 \leq x \leq 1$ we obtain the second assertion of the lemma. \square

Lemma 3.2. *If $m \geq 2$ is an integer, then*

$$\sum_{t=1}^{m-1} \sum_{1 \leq j_1 < j_2 \leq N} \cos\left(\frac{2\pi t}{m}\right)^{j_2-j_1} = O(m^3 N),$$

and

$$\sum_{t=1}^{m-1} \sum_{1 \leq j_1 < j_2 \leq N} \left(\frac{1 + e_m(t)}{2}\right)^{j_2-j_1} = O(m^3 N).$$

Proof. We prove only the first statement, since the proof of the second is similar. For $d \in \{1, \dots, N-1\}$, the number of pairs $1 \leq j_1 < j_2 \leq N$ such that $j_2 - j_1 = d$ equals $N - d$. Therefore, the sum we are seeking to bound equals

$$(3.2) \quad \sum_{t=1}^{m-1} \sum_{d=1}^{N-1} (N-d) \cos\left(\frac{2\pi t}{m}\right)^d.$$

First, when m is odd, Lemma 3.1 implies that the last sum is

$$\leq mN \sum_{d=1}^{N-1} \max_{1 \leq t \leq m-1} \left| \cos\left(\frac{2\pi t}{m}\right) \right|^d \leq \frac{mN}{1 - \max_{1 \leq t \leq m-1} \left| \cos\left(\frac{2\pi t}{m}\right) \right|} \leq \frac{3m^3 N}{\pi^2}.$$

Now, when $m = 2r$ is even, then either $\cos(\pi t/r) = -1$ or $|\cos(\pi t/r)| < 1$. In the latter case the proof of Lemma 3.1 implies that $|\cos(\pi t/r)| \leq 1 - \pi^2/(3r^2)$. Hence, in this case we obtain

$$\sum_{d=1}^{N-1} (N-d) \left| \cos\left(\frac{\pi t}{r}\right) \right|^d \ll m^2 N.$$

On the other hand if $\cos(\pi t/r) = -1$, then our sum become

$$\sum_{d=1}^{N-1} (N-d)(-1)^d \leq 2N.$$

This completes the proof. \square

We begin by proving Proposition 2 first, since its proof is both short and simple.

Proof of Proposition 2. Recall that

$$\Psi_{\text{rand}}(k; m, a) = \text{Prob}(X_1 + \dots + X_k \equiv a \pmod{m}) = \frac{1}{2^k} \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{v}=(v_1, \dots, v_k) \in \{-1, 1\}^k \\ v_1 + \dots + v_k \equiv a \pmod{m}}} 1.$$

Hence, using (2.1) we deduce

$$(3.3) \quad \Psi_{\text{rand}}(k; m, a) = \frac{1}{2^k m} \sum_{\mathbf{v}=(v_1, \dots, v_k) \in \{-1, 1\}^k} \sum_{t=0}^{m-1} e_m\left(t(v_1 + \dots + v_k - a)\right).$$

The contribution of the term $t = 0$ to the above sum equals $1/m$. Moreover, since $\sum_{\alpha \in \{-1, 1\}} e_m(\alpha t) = 2 \cos(2\pi t/m)$, then the contribution of the remaining terms equals

$$\frac{1}{2^k m} \sum_{t=1}^{m-1} e_m(-at) \sum_{\mathbf{v}=(v_1, \dots, v_k) \in \{-1, 1\}^k} e_m\left(t(v_1 + \dots + v_k)\right) = \frac{1}{m} \sum_{t=1}^{m-1} e_m(-at) \cos\left(\frac{2\pi t}{m}\right)^k.$$

Thus, the result follows upon using Lemma 3.1. \square

Proof of Proposition 1. First, note that

$$\Phi_{\text{rand}}(N; m, a) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N Y_j \quad \text{where} \quad Y_j = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } S_j \equiv a \pmod{m} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

On the other hand, if $\mathbf{v} = (v_1, \dots, v_N) \in \{-1, 1\}^N$, then (2.1) yields

$$|\{1 \leq j \leq N : v_1 + \dots + v_j \equiv a \pmod{m}\}| = \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^N \sum_{t=0}^{m-1} e_m\left(t(v_1 + \dots + v_j - a)\right).$$

This implies

(3.4)

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left(\left(\Phi_{\text{rand}}(N; m, a) - \frac{1}{m} \right)^2 \right) &= \frac{1}{2^N} \sum_{\mathbf{v}=(v_1, \dots, v_N) \in \{-1, 1\}^N} \left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{\substack{1 \leq j \leq N \\ v_1 + \dots + v_j \equiv a \pmod{m}}} 1 - \frac{1}{m} \right)^2 \\ &= \frac{1}{2^N (mN)^2} \sum_{\mathbf{v}=(v_1, \dots, v_N) \in \{-1, 1\}^N} \left| \sum_{j=1}^N \sum_{t=0}^{m-1} e_m\left(t(v_1 + \dots + v_j - a)\right) - N \right|^2. \end{aligned}$$

Now, expanding the summand on the RHS of (3.4) we derive

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \sum_{j=1}^N \sum_{t=0}^{m-1} e_m\left(t(v_1 + \dots + v_j - a)\right) - N \right|^2 &= \left| \sum_{j=1}^N \sum_{t=1}^{m-1} e_m\left(t(v_1 + \dots + v_j - a)\right) \right|^2 \\ &= \sum_{1 \leq t_1, t_2 \leq m-1} e_m(a(t_2 - t_1)) \sum_{1 \leq j_1, j_2 \leq N} e_m\left(t_1(v_1 + \dots + v_{j_1}) - t_2(v_1 + \dots + v_{j_2})\right). \end{aligned}$$

Hence, we infer from (2.1) that

(3.5)

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{a=0}^{m-1} \left| \sum_{j=1}^N \sum_{t=0}^{m-1} e_m\left(t(v_1 + \dots + v_j - a)\right) - N \right|^2 \\ &= m \sum_{t=1}^{m-1} \sum_{1 \leq j_1, j_2 \leq N} e_m\left(t((v_1 + \dots + v_{j_1}) - (v_1 + \dots + v_{j_2}))\right) \\ &= m^2 N + m \sum_{t=1}^{m-1} \sum_{1 \leq j_1 < j_2 \leq N} \left(e_m\left(t(v_{j_1+1} + \dots + v_{j_2})\right) + e_m\left(-t(v_{j_1+1} + \dots + v_{j_2})\right) \right). \end{aligned}$$

Inserting this estimate into (3.4), and using that $\sum_{\alpha \in \{-1,1\}} e_m(\alpha t) = 2 \cos(2\pi t/m)$, we obtain

$$\sum_{a=0}^{m-1} \mathbb{E} \left(\left(\Phi_{\text{rand}}(N; m, a) - \frac{1}{m} \right)^2 \right) = \frac{1}{N} + \frac{2}{mN^2} \sum_{t=1}^{m-1} \sum_{1 \leq j_1 < j_2 \leq N} \cos \left(\frac{2\pi t}{m} \right)^{j_2 - j_1}.$$

The result follows upon using Lemma 3.2 to bound the RHS of the last identity. \square

In order to prove Theorem 2 we require an analogous result to Proposition 1 in the case of a random walk on the non-negative integers, where each step is 0 or 1 (rather than -1 or 1). To this end, we take $\{\tilde{X}_j\}_{j \geq 1}$ to be a sequence of independent random variables taking the values 0 and 1 with equal probability $1/2$, and define

$$\tilde{S}_k = \tilde{X}_1 + \cdots + \tilde{X}_k,$$

and

$$\tilde{\Phi}_{\text{rand}}(N; m, a) = \frac{1}{N} |\{1 \leq j \leq N : \tilde{S}_j \equiv a \pmod{m}\}|.$$

Using a similar approach to the proof of Proposition 1 we establish:

Proposition 3.3. *Let $m \geq 2$ be a positive integer. Then, for all $N \geq m^2$ we have*

$$\sum_{a=0}^{m-1} \mathbb{E} \left(\left(\tilde{\Phi}_{\text{rand}}(N; m, a) - \frac{1}{m} \right)^2 \right) \ll \frac{m^2}{N}.$$

Proof. We follow closely the proof of Proposition 1. First, a similar analysis used to derive (3.4) allows us to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} (3.6) \quad & \mathbb{E} \left(\left(\tilde{\Phi}_{\text{rand}}(N; m, a) - \frac{1}{m} \right)^2 \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{2^N (mN)^2} \sum_{\mathbf{v}=(v_1, \dots, v_N) \in \{0,1\}^N} \left| \sum_{j=1}^N \sum_{t=0}^{m-1} e_m \left(t(v_1 + \cdots + v_j - a) \right) - N \right|^2. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, using the identity (3.5) in equation (3.6) we get

$$\begin{aligned} (3.7) \quad & \sum_{a=0}^{m-1} \mathbb{E} \left(\left(\tilde{\Phi}_{\text{rand}}(N; m, a) - \frac{1}{m} \right)^2 \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{N} + \frac{1}{mN^2} \sum_{t=1}^{m-1} \sum_{1 \leq j_1 < j_2 \leq N} \left(\left(\frac{1 + e_m(t)}{2} \right)^{j_2 - j_1} + \left(\frac{1 + e_m(-t)}{2} \right)^{j_2 - j_1} \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{N} + \frac{2}{mN^2} \sum_{t=1}^{m-1} \sum_{1 \leq j_1 < j_2 \leq N} \left(\frac{1 + e_m(t)}{2} \right)^{j_2 - j_1}, \end{aligned}$$

upon noting that

$$\sum_{t=1}^{m-1} \left(\frac{1 + e_m(t)}{2} \right)^d = \sum_{r=1}^{m-1} \left(\frac{1 + e_m(-r)}{2} \right)^d,$$

by making the simple change of variables $r = m - t$. Appealing to Lemma 3.2 completes the proof. \square

4. CHARACTER SUMS WITH POLYNOMIALS: PROOF OF THEOREMS 1 AND 2

We begin by proving the following key proposition which establishes the required link with random walks. Let p be a large prime number and $F(X) \in \mathbb{F}_p(X)$ be a square-free polynomial of degree $d_F \geq 1$ in $\mathbb{F}_p(X)$. Moreover, let $L \leq (\log p)/\log(4d_F)$ be a positive integer, and put $N = \lfloor p/L \rfloor - 1$. Furthermore, for any $\mathbf{v} = (v_1, \dots, v_L) \in \{-1, 1\}^L$ we define

$$(4.1) \quad D_{p,F}(\mathbf{v}, L) = \{0 \leq s \leq N : \chi_p(F(sL + j)) = v_j \text{ for all } 1 \leq j \leq L\}.$$

Proposition 4.1. *Let p , L , and $F(X)$ be as above. Then for any $\mathbf{v} = (v_1, \dots, v_L) \in \{-1, 1\}^L$ we have*

$$|D_{p,F}(\mathbf{v}, L)| = \frac{p}{2^L L} \left(1 + O_{d_F}(p^{-1/10})\right).$$

Proof. Let S be the set of non-negative integers $0 \leq s \leq N$ such that $F(sL + j) \neq 0$ for all $1 \leq j \leq L$. Then $|S| = N + O_{d_F}(1)$. Moreover, note that for $s \in S$ we have

$$(4.2) \quad \frac{1}{2^L} \prod_{j=1}^L (1 + v_j \chi_p(F(sL + j))) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } s \in D_{p,F}(\mathbf{v}, L), \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

This yields

$$|D_{p,F}(\mathbf{v}, L)| = \frac{1}{2^L} \sum_{s=0}^N \prod_{j=1}^L (1 + v_j \chi_p(F(sL + j))) + O_{d_F}(1).$$

Expanding the product on the RHS of the previous estimate, we find that $|D_{p,F}(\mathbf{v}, L)|$ equals

$$(4.3) \quad \begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{2^L} \sum_{s=0}^N \left(1 + \sum_{l=1}^L \sum_{1 \leq i_1 < i_2 < \dots < i_l \leq L} v_{i_1} \cdots v_{i_l} \chi_p(F(sL + i_1) \cdots F(sL + i_l)) \right) + O_{d_F}(1). \\ & = \frac{N}{2^L} + \frac{1}{2^L} \sum_{l=1}^L \sum_{1 \leq i_1 < \dots < i_l \leq L} v_{i_1} \cdots v_{i_l} \sum_{s=0}^N \chi_p(F(sL + i_1) \cdots F(sL + i_l)) + O_{d_F}(1). \end{aligned}$$

Since $F(X)$ is a square-free polynomial, then it follows from Lemma 2.3 that the polynomial $H_{i_1, \dots, i_l}(X) = F(LX + i_1) \cdots F(LX + i_l)$ is not a square in $\mathbb{F}_p(X)$. Therefore, using Lemma 2.1 with $P_1(X) = H_{i_1, \dots, i_l}(X)$, $P_2(X) = 0$ and $I = \{0, \dots, N\}$, we obtain

$$\left| \sum_{s=0}^N \chi_p(F(sL + i_1) \cdots F(sL + i_l)) \right| \leq 2d_F L \sqrt{p} \log p.$$

Inserting this bound in (4.3) we get

$$(4.4) \quad |D_{p,F}(\mathbf{v}, L)| = \frac{p}{2^L L} + O_{d_F}(L\sqrt{p}\log p),$$

which completes the proof. \square

Proof of Theorem 1. Recall that

$$\Phi_p(F; m, a) = \frac{1}{p} |\{1 \leq k \leq p : S_p(F, k) \equiv a \pmod{m}\}|.$$

Let $L = \lceil (\log p) / (\log(4d_F)) \rceil$, and put $N = \lfloor p/L \rfloor - 1$. Moreover, for any $0 \leq s \leq N$, we define

$$M_L(s; m, a) = |\{1 \leq l \leq L : S_p(F, sL + l) \equiv a \pmod{m}\}|.$$

Then, note that

$$(4.5) \quad \left| \Phi_p(F; m, a) - \frac{1}{m} \right| \leq \frac{1}{p} \sum_{s=0}^N \left| M_L(s; m, a) - \frac{L}{m} \right| + O\left(\frac{L}{p}\right).$$

To bound the sum on the RHS of (4.5), we use the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality which gives

$$\left(\sum_{s=0}^N \left| M_L(s; m, a) - \frac{L}{m} \right| \right)^2 \leq (N+1) \sum_{s=0}^N \left(M_L(s; m, a) - \frac{L}{m} \right)^2.$$

Hence, combining this estimate with (4.5), we deduce

$$(4.6) \quad \left(\Phi_p(F; m, a) - \frac{1}{m} \right)^2 \ll \frac{N}{p^2} \sum_{s=0}^N \left(M_L(s; m, a) - \frac{L}{m} \right)^2 + \frac{L^2}{p^2}.$$

On the other hand, since $S_p(sL + l) = S_p(sL) + \sum_{j=1}^l \chi_p(F(sL + j))$, then

$$(4.7) \quad \sum_{a=0}^{m-1} \left(M_L(s; m, a) - \frac{L}{m} \right)^2 = \sum_{b=0}^{m-1} \left(\Delta_L(s; m, b) - \frac{L}{m} \right)^2,$$

where

$$\Delta_L(s; m, b) = |\{1 \leq l \leq L : \sum_{j=1}^l \chi_p(F(sL + j)) \equiv b \pmod{m}\}|.$$

Therefore, upon combining (4.6) and (4.7) we obtain

$$(4.8) \quad \sum_{a=0}^{m-1} \left(\Phi_p(F; m, a) - \frac{1}{m} \right)^2 \ll \frac{N}{p^2} \sum_{a=0}^{m-1} \sum_{s=0}^N \left(\Delta_L(s; m, a) - \frac{L}{m} \right)^2 + \frac{mL^2}{p^2}.$$

Now we evaluate the inner sum on the RHS of the previous inequality. Using (2.1) we get

$$\begin{aligned}
(4.9) \quad \sum_{s=0}^N \left(\Delta_L(s; m, a) - \frac{L}{m} \right)^2 &= \frac{1}{m^2} \sum_{s=0}^N \left| \sum_{l=1}^L \sum_{t=0}^{m-1} e_m \left(t \left(\sum_{1 \leq j \leq l} \chi_p(F(sL + j)) - a \right) \right) - L \right|^2 \\
&= \frac{1}{m^2} \sum_{s=0}^N \left| \sum_{l=1}^L \sum_{t=1}^{m-1} e_m \left(t \left(\sum_{1 \leq j \leq l} \chi_p(F(sL + j)) - a \right) \right) \right|^2 \\
&= \frac{1}{m^2} \sum_{\mathbf{v} \in \{-1, 1\}^L} \left| \sum_{l=1}^L \sum_{t=1}^{m-1} e_m \left(t(v_1 + \cdots + v_l - a) \right) \right|^2 D_{p,F}(\mathbf{v}, L).
\end{aligned}$$

Hence, using Proposition 4.1 along with the identity (3.4) obtained in the random walk setting, we derive

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{s=0}^N \left(\Delta_L(s; m, a) - \frac{L}{m} \right)^2 \\
&= \frac{p}{2^L m^2 L} \sum_{\mathbf{v} \in \{-1, 1\}^L} \left| \sum_{l=1}^L \sum_{t=1}^{m-1} e_m \left(t(v_1 + \cdots + v_l - a) \right) \right|^2 (1 + O_{d_F}(p^{-1/10})) \\
&= pL \mathbb{E} \left(\left(\Phi_{\text{rand}}(L; m, a) - \frac{1}{m} \right)^2 \right) (1 + O_{d_F}(p^{-1/10})).
\end{aligned}$$

Finally, combining this estimate with (4.8) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{a=0}^{m-1} \left(\Phi_p(F; m, a) - \frac{1}{m} \right)^2 &\ll_{d_F} \sum_{a=0}^{m-1} \mathbb{E} \left(\left(\Phi_{\text{rand}}(L; m, a) - \frac{1}{m} \right)^2 \right) + \frac{m(\log p)^2}{p^2} \\
&\ll_{d_F} \frac{m^2}{\log p},
\end{aligned}$$

which follows from Proposition 1. This completes the proof. \square

Proof of Theorem 2. We only prove the result for $R_p(F, k)$, since the proof for $N_p(F, k)$ is similar. Define

$$\delta_F(j) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \chi_p(F(j)) = 1 \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Then, note that

$$R_p(F, k) = \sum_{j=1}^k \delta_F(j).$$

We follow closely the proof of Theorem 1. Let $L = \lceil (\log p) / \log(4d_F) \rceil$, and $N = \lfloor p/L \rfloor - 1$. For any $0 \leq s \leq N$ we define

$$\tilde{\Delta}_L(s; m, b) = |\{1 \leq l \leq L : \sum_{j=1}^l \delta_F(sL + j) \equiv b \pmod{m}\}|.$$

Then, similarly to the estimate (4.8) we obtain

$$(4.10) \quad \sum_{a=0}^{m-1} \left(\tilde{\Phi}_p(F; m, a) - \frac{1}{m} \right)^2 \ll \frac{N}{p^2} \sum_{a=0}^{m-1} \sum_{s=0}^N \left(\tilde{\Delta}_L(s; m, a) - \frac{L}{m} \right)^2 + \frac{m(\log p)^2}{p^2}.$$

Moreover, an analogous approach which leads to the identity (4.9) also gives

$$\sum_{s=0}^N \left(\tilde{\Delta}_F(s; m, a) - \frac{L}{m} \right)^2 = \frac{1}{m^2} \sum_{\mathbf{v} \in \{0,1\}^L} \left| \sum_{l=1}^L \sum_{t=1}^{m-1} e_m \left(t(v_1 + \cdots + v_l - a) \right) \right|^2 \sum_{\substack{0 \leq s \leq N \\ \delta_F(sL+j)=v_j \\ \text{for all } 1 \leq j \leq L}} 1.$$

Remark that if F does not vanish in the interval $[sL+1, sL+L]$ then

$$\delta_F(sL+j) = \frac{1 + \chi_p(F(sL+j))}{2},$$

for all $1 \leq j \leq L$. Hence, writing $\tilde{\mathbf{v}} = (\tilde{v}_1, \dots, \tilde{v}_L)$ with $\tilde{v}_j = 2v_j - 1$, we deduce

$$\sum_{\substack{0 \leq s \leq N \\ \delta_F(sL+j)=v_j \\ \text{for all } 1 \leq j \leq L}} 1 = |D_p(\tilde{\mathbf{v}}, L, F)| + O_{d_F}(1) = \frac{p}{2^L L} \left(1 + O_{d_F}(p^{-1/10}) \right),$$

which follows from Proposition 4.1. Thus, appealing to the identity (3.6) obtained in the random walk setting, we derive

$$\sum_{s=0}^N \left(\tilde{\Delta}_F(s; m, a) - \frac{L}{m} \right)^2 = pL\mathbb{E} \left(\left(\tilde{\Phi}_{\text{rand}}(L; m, a) - \frac{1}{m} \right)^2 \right) (1 + O_{d_F}(p^{-1/10})).$$

Therefore, inserting this estimate in (4.10) and using Proposition 3.3 we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{a=0}^{m-1} \left(\tilde{\Phi}_p(F; m, a) - \frac{1}{m} \right)^2 &\ll_{d_F} \sum_{a=0}^{m-1} \mathbb{E} \left(\left(\tilde{\Phi}_{\text{rand}}(L; m, a) - \frac{1}{m} \right)^2 \right) + \frac{m(\log p)^2}{p^2} \\ &\ll_{d_F} \frac{m^2}{\log p}, \end{aligned}$$

as desired. \square

5. CHARACTER SUMS OF FIXED LENGTH: PROOF OF THEOREM 3

We shall derive Theorem 3 from the following proposition

Proposition 5.1. *Fix $A \geq 1$. Let N be large, and $k \leq A(\log_2 N)/(\log_3 N)$. Then for any $\mathbf{v} = (v_1, \dots, v_k) \in \{-1, 1\}^k$ we have*

$$\frac{1}{\pi(N)} |\{p \leq N : \chi_p(q_j) = v_j \text{ for all } 1 \leq j \leq k\}| = \frac{1}{2^k} \left(1 + O_A \left(\frac{1}{\log^A N} \right) \right).$$

Proof. If $\log N \leq p \leq N$ then

$$\frac{1}{2^k} \prod_{j=1}^k (1 + v_j \chi_p(q_j)) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \chi_p(q_j) = v_j \text{ for all } 1 \leq j \leq k, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Therefore we deduce that the number of primes $p \leq N$ such that $\chi_p(q_j) = v_j$ for all $1 \leq j \leq k$, equals

$$\begin{aligned}
 &= \frac{1}{2^k} \sum_{p \leq N} \prod_{j=1}^k (1 + v_j \chi_p(q_j)) + O(\log N) \\
 (5.1) \quad &= \frac{1}{2^k} \sum_{p \leq N} \left(1 + \sum_{l=1}^k \sum_{1 \leq i_1 < \dots < i_l \leq k} v_{i_1} \cdots v_{i_l} \chi_p(q_{i_1} \cdots q_{i_l}) \right) + O(\log N) \\
 &= \frac{\pi(N)}{2^k} + \frac{1}{2^k} \sum_{l=1}^k \sum_{1 \leq i_1 < \dots < i_l \leq k} v_{i_1} \cdots v_{i_l} \sum_{p \leq N} \left(\frac{q_{i_1} \cdots q_{i_l}}{p} \right) + O(\log N).
 \end{aligned}$$

For $1 \leq i_1 < \dots < i_l \leq k$ we let $Q_{i_1, \dots, i_l} = q_{i_1} \cdots q_{i_l}$. Then it follows from the prime number theorem that $Q_{i_1, \dots, i_l} \leq \prod_{j \leq k} q_j = e^{k \log k(1+o(1))} \leq (\log N)^{A+o(1)}$. On the other hand, quadratic reciprocity implies that $\left(\frac{Q_{i_1, \dots, i_l}}{p} \right)$ is a character of modulus Q_{i_1, \dots, i_l} or $4Q_{i_1, \dots, i_l}$. Therefore, appealing to the Siegel-Walfisz Theorem (see Corollary 5.29 of Iwaniec-Kowalski [9]), we deduce

$$\sum_{p \leq N} \left(\frac{Q_{i_1, \dots, i_l}}{p} \right) \ll_A (Q_{i_1, \dots, i_l})^{1/2} \frac{N}{\log^{2A} N}.$$

Inserting this estimate in (5.1) completes the proof. \square

Proof of Theorem 3. Using (2.1) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
 \Psi_N(k; m, a) &= \frac{1}{\pi(N)} |\{p \leq N : S_k(p) \equiv a \pmod{m}\}| \\
 (5.2) \quad &= \frac{1}{m\pi(N)} \sum_{p \leq N} \sum_{t=0}^{m-1} e_m(t(S_k(p) - a)) \\
 &= \frac{1}{m\pi(N)} \sum_{t=0}^{m-1} \sum_{\mathbf{v} \in \{-1, 1\}^k} e_m\left(t(v_1 + \dots + v_k - a)\right) \sum_{\substack{p \leq N \\ \chi_p(q_j) = v_j \text{ for } 1 \leq j \leq k}} 1
 \end{aligned}$$

Thus, appealing to Proposition 5.1 along with the identity (3.3) obtained in the random walk setting we derive

$$\begin{aligned}
 \Psi_N(k; m, a) &= \frac{1}{2^k m} \sum_{t=0}^{m-1} \sum_{\mathbf{v} \in \{-1, 1\}^k} e_m\left(t(v_1 + \dots + v_k - a)\right) + O_A\left(\frac{1}{\log^A N}\right) \\
 &= \Psi_{\text{rand}}(k; m, a) + O_A\left(\frac{1}{\log^A N}\right),
 \end{aligned}$$

which completes the proof. \square

REFERENCES

- [1] D. Aldous and P. Diaconis, *Shuffling cards and stopping times*, Amer. Math. Monthly 93 (1986), no. 5, 333-348.

- [2] N. C. Ankeny, *The least quadratic non residue*, Ann. of Math. (2) 55, (1952). 65-72.
- [3] W. Banks, M. Z. Garaev, D. R. Heath-Brown and I. E. Shparlinski, *Density of non-residues in Burgess-type intervals and applications*, Bull. Lond. Math. Soc. 40 (2008), 88-96.
- [4] D. A. Burgess, *The distribution of quadratic residues and non-residues*, Mathematika 4 1957 106-112.
- [5] H. Davenport and P. Erdős, *The distribution of quadratic and higher residues*, Publ. Math. Debrecen 2, (1952). 252-265.
- [6] S. W. Graham and C. J. Ringrose, *Lower bounds for least quadratic nonresidues*, Analytic number theory (Allerton Park, IL, 1989), 269-309.
- [7] A. Granville and K. Soundararajan, *The distribution of values of $L(1, \chi_d)$* , Geometric and Funct. Anal. 13 (2003), 992-1028.
- [8] M. Hildebrand, *A survey of results on random walks on finite groups*, Probab. Surv. 2 (2005), 33-63.
- [9] H. Iwaniec and E. Kowalski, *Analytic number theory*, American Mathematical Society Colloquium Publications, 53. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2004.
- [10] Y. K. Lau and J. Wu, *On the least quadratic non-residue*, Int. J. Number Theory 4 (2008), no. 3, 423-435.
- [11] U. V. Linnik, *A remark on the least quadratic non-residue*, C. R. (Doklady) Acad. Sci. URSS (N.S.) 36 (1942) 119-120.
- [12] H. L. Montgomery, *Topics in multiplicative number theory*, Lecture Notes in Mathematics, Vol. 227. Springer-Verlag, Berlin-New York, 1971.
- [13] R. Peralta, *On the distribution of quadratic residues and nonresidues modulo a prime number*, Math. Comp. 58 (1992), no. 197, 433-440.
- [14] F. Spitzer, *Principles of random walks*, Graduate Texts in Mathematics, Vol. 34. Springer-Verlag, New York-Heidelberg, 1976.
- [15] A. Weil, *On some exponential sums*, Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci. U. S. A. 34, (1948). 204-207.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT URBANA-CHAMPAIGN, 273 ALT-GELD HALL, MC-382, 1409 W. GREEN STREET, URBANA, ILLINOIS 61801, USA
E-mail address: lamzouri@math.uiuc.edu

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT URBANA-CHAMPAIGN, 273 ALT-GELD HALL, MC-382, 1409 W. GREEN STREET, URBANA, ILLINOIS 61801, USA
E-mail address: Zaharesu@math.uiuc.edu