

EXTENDING WEAKLY POLYNOMIAL FUNCTIONS FROM HIGH RANK VARIETIES

DAVID KAZHDAN AND TAMAR ZIEGLER

ABSTRACT. Let k be a field, V a k -vector space and X be a subset of V . A function $f : X \rightarrow k$ is *weakly polynomial* of degree $\leq a$, if the restriction of f on any affine subspace $L \subset X$ is a polynomial of degree $\leq a$. In this paper we consider the case when $X = \mathbb{X}(k)$ where \mathbb{X} is a complete intersection of bounded codimension defined by a high rank polynomials of degrees d , $\text{char}(k) = 0$ or $\text{char}(k) > d$ and either k is algebraically closed, or $k = \mathbb{F}_q, q > ad$. We show that under these assumptions any k -valued weakly polynomial function of degree $\leq a$ on X is a restriction of a polynomial of degree $\leq a$ on V .

Our proof is based on Theorem 1.11 on fibers of polynomial morphisms $P : \mathbb{F}_q^n \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_q^m$ of high rank. This result is of an independent interest. For example it immediately implies a strengthening of the result of [4].

1. INTRODUCTION

Let k be a field. We denote k -algebraic varieties by bold letters such as \mathbb{X} and the sets of k -points of \mathbb{X} by $\mathbb{X}(k)$ or by X . We fix $d, a, c \geq 1$. We always assume that $|k| > ad$, that there exists a root of unity $\beta \in k$ of order $m > 2a$, and that either $\text{char}(k) > d$ or that it is of characteristic 0. A field is *admissible* if it satisfying these conditions.

Definition 1.1. Let V be a k -vector space and $X \subset V$. We say that a function $f : X \rightarrow k$ is *weakly polynomial* of degree $\leq a$ if the restriction $f|_L$ to any affine subspace $L \subset X$ is a polynomial of degree $\leq a$.

Remark 1.2. If $|k| > a$ it suffices to check this on 2-dimensional subspaces (see [12]). Namely a function is *weakly polynomial* of degree $\leq a$ if the restriction $f|_L$ to 2-dimensional affine subspace $L \subset X$ is a polynomial of degree $\leq a$.

One of goals of this paper is to construct classes of hypersurfaces $\mathbb{X} \subset \mathbb{V}$ such that any weakly polynomial function f on X of degree $\leq a$ is a restriction of a polynomial F of degree $\leq a$ on V . The main difficulty is in the case when $a \geq d$ since in this case an extension F of f to V is not unique.

To state our result properly we introduce some definitions:

Definition 1.3. Let $\mathbb{X} \subset \mathbb{V}$ be an algebraic k -subvariety.

The second author is supported by ERC grant ErgComNum 682150.

- (1) $\mathbb{X} \subset \mathbb{V}$ satisfies \star_a^k if any weakly polynomial function of degree $\leq a$ on X is a restriction of a polynomial function of degree $\leq a$ on V .
- (2) A k -subvariety $\mathbb{X} \subset \mathbb{V}$ satisfies \star_a if $\mathbb{X}(l)$ satisfies \star_a^l for any finite extension l/k .
- (3) For any family $\bar{P} = \{P_i\}, 1 \leq i \leq c$ of polynomials on \mathbb{V} we define the subscheme $\mathbb{X}_{\bar{P}} \subset \mathbb{V}$ by the system of equations $\{P_i(v) = 0\}, 1 \leq i \leq c$.

The following example demonstrates the existence of cubic surfaces $\mathbb{X} \subset \mathbb{A}^2$ which do not have the property \star_1^k for any field k .

Example 1.4. Let $V = k^2$, $Q = xy(x - y)$. Then $X = X_0 \cup X_1 \cup X_2$ where $X_0 = \{v \in V | x = 0\}$, $X_1 = \{v \in V | y = 0\}$, $X_2 = \{v \in V | x = y\}$. The function $f : X \rightarrow k$ such that $f(x, 0) = f(0, y) = 0$, $f(x, x) = x$ is weakly linear but one can not extend it to a linear function on V .

Our goal is to prove that high rank hypersurfaces have the property \star_a^k .

Definition 1.5 (Algebraic rank¹). Let $P : V \rightarrow k$ be a polynomial. We define the k -rank $r_k(P)$ as the minimal number r such that $P = \sum_{i=1}^r Q_i R_i$, with Q_i, R_i of k -polynomials of degrees strictly smaller than the degree of P . When k is fixed we write $r(P)$ instead of $r_k(P)$.

Question 1.6. Does there exist a function $R(d, r) \rightarrow \infty$ for $r \rightarrow \infty$ such that $r_{\bar{k}}(P) \geq R(d, r)$ for any polynomial P of degree d and k -rank r , where \bar{k} is the algebraic closure of k ?

Our main result is that high rank hypersurfaces over admissible fields satisfy \star_a^k .

Theorem 1.7. *There exists $r = r(a, d)$ such that for any admissible field k , any k -vector space \mathbb{V} , and any hypersurface $\mathbb{X} \subset \mathbb{V}$ of degree d and rank $\geq r$ satisfies \star_a^k .*

Conjecture 1.8. There exists $r = r(a, d)$ such that for any admissible field k , any k -vector space \mathbb{V} , any hypersurface $\mathbb{X} \subset \mathbb{V}$ of degree d , and rank $\geq r$, the associated hypersurface $\tilde{\mathbb{X}} \subset \mathbb{V}^d$ satisfies $\tilde{\star}_a^k$.

The first step in our proof of Theorem 1.7 is to construct an explicit collection of hypersurfaces \mathbb{X}_n of rank $\sim n$ satisfying \star_a^k for admissible fields k .

Let $\mathbb{W} = \mathbb{A}^d$, let $\mathbb{V}_n = \mathbb{W}^n$, and let $P_n : \mathbb{V}_n \rightarrow \mathbb{A}$ be given by $P_n(w_1, \dots, w_n) = \sum_{i=1}^n \mu(w_i)$, where $\mu : \mathbb{W} \rightarrow \mathbb{A}$ is given by $\mu(x^1, \dots, x^d) := \prod_{j=1}^d x^j$.

Theorem 1.9. (1) $r(P_n) \geq n/d$.

(2) For any admissible field k , the hypersurface $\mathbb{X}_n \subset \mathbb{V}_n$ has the property \star_a .

The second step in our proof of Theorem 1.7 is of an independent interest. To formulate the statement we introduce some definitions.

¹Also known as the Schmidt h -invariant.

Definition 1.10. Let \mathbb{V} be k -vector space.

- (1) We denote by $\mathcal{P}_d(\mathbb{V})$ the k -variety of polynomials of degree $\leq d$ on V .
- (2) For any k -vector space \mathbb{W} we denote by $\text{Hom}_{af}(\mathbb{W}, \mathbb{V})$ the k -variety of affine maps $\phi : \mathbb{W} \rightarrow \mathbb{V}$.
- (3) For any $P \in \mathcal{P}_d(V)$ we denote by $\kappa_P : \text{Hom}_{af}(W, V) \rightarrow \mathcal{P}_d(\mathbb{W})$ the map given by $\phi \rightarrow \phi^*(P)$ ($:= P \circ \phi$).
- (4) A field k has the property c_d if for any $m \geq 2$, there exists $\rho = \rho(m, d)$ such that for any k -vector spaces \mathbb{V}, \mathbb{W} , $\dim(\mathbb{W}) \leq m$, a polynomial $P : \mathbb{V} \rightarrow \mathbb{A}^1$ of degree d and rank $\geq \rho$ the map $\kappa_P(k) : \text{Hom}_{af}(W, V) \rightarrow \mathcal{P}_d(\mathbb{W})$ is onto.
- (5) A field k has the property c_∞ if it has the property c_d for all d .

Theorem 1.11. (1) *Finite fields of characteristic $> d$ have the property c_∞ .*
 (2) *For any algebraically closed fields of either characteristic $> d$ or characteristic 0 and $Q \in \mathcal{P}_d(W)(k)$ the fiber $\kappa_P^{-1}(Q)$ is a variety of dimension $\dim(\text{Hom}_{af}(W, V)) - \dim(\mathcal{P}_d(\mathbb{W}))$.*

Remark 1.12. Theorem 1.11 is first proven for finite fields. We show in Appendix C how to derive the validity Theorem 1.11 for algebraically closed fields from the corresponding statement for finite fields.

The results extend without difficulty to complete intersections $\mathbb{X} \subset \mathbb{V}$ of bounded degree and codimension, and high rank (see Definition 5.1)

Theorem 1.13. *For any $c > 0$, there exists $r = r(a, d, c)$ such that for any admissible field k , any k -vector space \mathbb{V} , and any subvariety $\mathbb{X} \subset \mathbb{V}$ codimension c , degree d and rank $\geq r$ the subset $\mathbb{X} \subset \mathbb{V}$ satisfies \star_a^k .*

Conjecture 1.14. (1) For any $m, d \geq 0$, there exists $\rho = \rho(m, d)$ such that if the rank of a polynomial P is $\geq \rho(m, d)$, then the map κ_P is flat.
 (2) Non-archimedean local fields have the property c_∞ .
 (3) The bound on r depends polynomially on c . This will follow from Conjecture A.4 which is currently known for $d = 2, 3$ [9].

Remark 1.15. From now on the claims in the introduction and in the first three sections of the main body of the paper are stated for the case that \mathbb{X} a hypersurface ($c = 1$). The general case (which is completely analogous) is discussed in Section 5.

The third step in the proof of Theorem 1.7 consists of the following two results. Let $\mathbb{X} \subset \mathbb{V}$ be a hypersurface of degree d , $l : V \rightarrow k$ a non-constant affine function, $\mathbb{X}_b := l^{-1}(b) \cap \mathbb{X}$. We denote by \mathbb{Z} the variety of affine 2-dimensional subspaces $\mathbb{L} \subset \mathbb{X}_1$ and by $\mathbb{Z}^0 \subset \mathbb{Z}$ the constructible subset of planes \mathbb{L} for which there exists an affine 3-dimensional subspace $\mathbb{M} \subset \mathbb{X}$ containing \mathbb{L} and such that $\mathbb{M} \cap \mathbb{X}_0 \neq \emptyset$. Let $\mathbb{Y} := \mathbb{Z} - \mathbb{Z}^0$. We denote by $r(\mathbb{X})$ the rank of the polynomial defining the hypersurface $\mathbb{X}_0 \subset \mathbb{V}_n^0 := l^{-1}(0)$.

The first result states that the subvariety $\mathbb{Y} \subset \mathbb{Z}$ is *small* if $r(\mathbb{X}) \gg 1$.

Claim 1.16. For any $s > 0$, there exists $r = r(d, s)$ such that if $r(\mathbb{X}) > r$ then

- (1) If k is finite and $\text{char}(k) > d$ then $|\mathbb{Y}(k)|/|\mathcal{L}(k)| \leq |k|^{-s}$.
- (2) $\dim(\mathbb{Y}) < \dim(\mathbb{Z}) - s$.

Remark 1.17. We first prove the part (1) using techniques from Additive Combinatorics. The part (2) is then an easy corollary.

The second result demonstrates that one can extend any weakly polynomial function vanishing on X_0 to a polynomial function on X :

Proposition 1.18. *There exists $r = r(d, a)$ such that if $r(X) > r$ and k is an admissible field then*

- (1) *If $k = \mathbb{F}_q$, $q > a$ then any weakly polynomial function on X of degree $\leq a$ vanishing on X_0 is a restriction of a polynomial on V of degree $\leq a$.*
- (2) *If k is an algebraically closed field then any weakly polynomial function on X of degree $\leq a$ vanishing on X_0 is a restriction of a polynomial on V of degree $\leq a$.*

As an immediate corollary we obtain:

Corollary 1.19. *There exists $r = r(d, a)$ such that the following holds for all admissible fields k .*

Let $\mathbb{X} = \{v \in \mathbb{V} | P(v) = 0\} \subset \mathbb{V}$ be a hypersurface of degree $\leq d$ and $\mathbb{W} \subset \mathbb{V}$ an affine subspace such that $\text{rank of } P|_{\mathbb{W}} \geq r$. Then for any weakly polynomial function f on X of degree $\leq a$ such that $f|_{X \cap \mathbb{W}}$ extends to a polynomial on W of degree $\leq a$ there exists an extension F of f to a polynomial on V of degree $\leq a$.

Proof. Choose a flag

$$\mathcal{F} = \{W_0 = W \subset W_1 \cdots \subset W_{\dim(V) - \dim(W)} = V\}, \dim(W_i) = \dim(W) + i,$$

and extend f by induction in i , $1 \leq i \leq \dim(V) - \dim(W)$ to a polynomial F on V . \square

Remark 1.20. The choice of F depends on a choice of flag \mathcal{F} and on choices involved in the inductive arguments.

Theorem 1.7 is an almost immediate corollary of the results stated above:

Proof of Theorem 1.7 assuming Theorems 1.9 and 1.11, and Corollary 1.19. Let \tilde{r} be from Corollary 1.19 and $r = r(a, d) := \rho(\dim(W), d)$ from Theorem 1.11. As follows from Theorem 1.9 hypersurfaces \mathbb{X}_n are of rank $\geq \tilde{r}$ for $n \geq d\tilde{r}$.

Let $\mathbb{X} \subset \mathbb{V}$ be a hypersurface of rank $\geq r$. By Theorem 1.11 there exists a linear map $\phi : \mathbb{W} \rightarrow \mathbb{V}$ such that $\mathbb{X}_n = \{w \in \mathbb{W} | \phi(w) \in \mathbb{X}\}$. Since \mathbb{X}_n satisfies \star_a^k , Corollary 1.19 implies that \mathbb{X} satisfies \star_a^k . \square

Remark 1.21. We believe that the restrictions on the characteristic is not necessary in Theorem 1.7.

Remark 1.22. The case $a < d$ was studied in [15]. The case $a = d = 2$ was studied in [13], and a bilinear version of it was studied in [6], where it was applied as part of a quantitative proof for the inverse theorem for the U_4 -norms over finite fields. We expect the results in this paper to have similar applications to a quantitative proof for the inverse theorem for the higher Gowers uniformity norms, for which at the moment only a non quantitative proof using ergodic theoretic methods exists [2, 17, 18].

We finish the introduction with a different application of Theorem 1.11. We show how to derive the following strengthening of the main Theorem from [4].

Lemma 1.23. *Let k be an algebraically closed field, \mathcal{C} the category of finite-dimensional affine k -vector spaces with morphisms being affine maps, let \mathcal{F}_d be the contravariant endofunctor on \mathcal{C} given by*

$$\mathcal{F}_d(V) = \{\text{Polynomials on } V \text{ of degree } \leq d\},$$

and let $\mathcal{G} \subset \mathcal{F}$ be a proper subfunctor. Then there exists r such that $r(P) \leq r$ for any finite-dimensional k -vector space V and $P \in \mathcal{G}(V)$.

Proof. Let \mathcal{G} be a subfunctor of \mathcal{F}_d such that $r(P), P \in \mathcal{G}(W)$ is not bounded above. We want to show that $\mathcal{G}(W) = \mathcal{F}_d(W)$ for any finite-dimensional k -vector space W .

Let $m = \dim(W)$ and choose a polynomial $P \in \mathcal{G}(V)$ where V where V is a k -vector space V such that $r(P) \geq r(m, d)$ where $r(m, d)$ is as in Theorem 1.11. Then for any polynomial Q on W of degree d there exist an affine map $\phi : W \rightarrow V$ such that $Q = \phi^*(P)$. We see that $\mathcal{G}(W) = \mathcal{F}_d(W)$. \square

Remark 1.24. The paper [4] assumed that $\mathcal{G}(V) \subset \mathcal{P}_d(V)$ are Zariski closed subsets.

2. PROOF OF THEOREM 1.9

Let \mathbb{X}_n be as in Theorem 1.9.

2.1. Rank of \mathbb{X}_n . In this subsection we prove the part 1 of Theorem 1.9.

Proof. We start with the following general result.

Let $\mathbb{V} = \mathbb{A}^N$, let $P : \mathbb{V} \rightarrow \mathbb{A}$ be a homogeneous polynomial of degree d , and let $\mathbb{X} = \mathbb{X}_P := \{v \in \mathbb{V} \mid P(v) = 0\}$. We denote $\mathbb{X}_{sing} \subset \mathbb{X}$ the subvariety of points $x \in \mathbb{X}$ such that $\frac{\partial P}{\partial x_i}(x) = 0, 1 \leq i \leq N$.

Lemma 2.1. *$\text{codim}_{\mathbb{X}}(\mathbb{X}_{sing}) \leq 2dr(P)$ where $r(P)$ is the d -rank of P .*

Proof. By definition we can write P as sum $P = \sum_{i=1}^r \tilde{Q}_i \tilde{R}_i$ where $\deg(\tilde{Q}_i), \deg(\tilde{R}_i) < d, 1 \leq i \leq r$, and $r := r(P)$. Writing \tilde{Q}_i, \tilde{R}_i as sums of homogeneous components we see that $P = \sum_{j=1}^{r(d-1)} Q_j R_j$ where $\deg(Q_j), \deg(R_j)$ are homogeneous polynomials of degrees ≥ 1 .

Let $\mathbb{Y} = \{v \mid P(v) = 0, Q_j(v) = 0, R_j(v) = 0, \}, 1 \leq j \leq r(d-1)$. Since $\{0\} \in \mathbb{Y}$ we see that $\mathbb{Y} \neq \emptyset$. Since $\mathbb{Y} \subset \mathbb{V}$ is defined by $\leq 2r(d-1) + 1$ equations we see that $\text{codim}_{\mathbb{X}}(\mathbb{Y}) \leq rd$.

Since $\mathbb{Y} \subset \mathbb{X}_{\text{sing}}$ we have $\text{codim}_{\mathbb{X}}(\mathbb{X}_{\text{sing}}) \leq 2dr$. \square

Now we show that $r(P_n) \geq n/d$. As follows from Lemma 2.1 it is sufficient to prove that $\text{codim}_{\mathbb{X}}(\mathbb{X}_{\text{sing}}) = 2n$ where $\mathbb{X} = \mathbb{X}_{P_n}$. Let $\mathbb{W}' \subset \mathbb{W}$ be the subvariety of points $\{x^j\}$ such that $x^a = x^b = 0$ for some $a, b, 1 \leq a < b \leq d$. It is clear that $\mathbb{X}_{\text{sing}} = (\mathbb{W}')^n \subset \mathbb{W}^n = \mathbb{V}_n$. Therefore $\text{codim}_{\mathbb{X}}(\mathbb{X}_{\text{sing}}) = n \times \text{codim}_{\mathbb{W}}(\mathbb{W}') = 2n$. \square

2.2. Proof of the part (2) of Theorem 1.9.

Definition 2.2. (1) For any set X we denote by $k[X]$ the space of k -valued functions on X .

(2) For a subset X of a vector space V we denote by $\mathcal{P}_a^w(X) \subset k[X]$ the subspace of weakly polynomial functions of degree $\leq a$.

(3) We denote by $\mathcal{P}_a(X) \subset \mathcal{P}_a^w(X)$ the subspace of functions $f : X \rightarrow k$ which are restrictions of polynomial functions on V of degree $\leq a$.

(4) Let $\mathbb{W} = \mathbb{A}^d$ and μ be the map $\mu : \mathbb{W} \rightarrow \mathbb{A}$ given by

$$\mu(a_1, \dots, a_d) = \prod_{s=1}^d a_s.$$

(5) For any n we define $\mathbb{V}_n := \mathbb{W}^n$ and write elements $v \in \mathbb{V}_n$ in the form

$$v = (w_1, \dots, w_n), \quad 1 \leq i \leq n, \quad w_i \in \mathbb{W}.$$

(6) We denote by $P_n : \mathbb{W}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{A}$ the degree d polynomial

$$P_n(w_1, \dots, w_n) := \sum_{i=1}^n \mu(w_i),$$

and write $\mathbb{X}_n := \mathbb{X}_{P_n} = \{v \in \mathbb{V} : P_n(v) = 0\}$.

We fix n and write X instead of X_n and V instead of V_n . We will use notations from Definition 2.2. The proof is based on the existence of a large group of symmetries of X and the existence of a linear subspace $L \subset V$ of dimension $\dim(V)/d$. Since the field k admissible it contains a fine subgroup $\Delta \subset k^*$ of size $m > ad$.

Under this notation Theorem 1.9 becomes:

Theorem 2.3. *Let k be an admissible field, then $\mathcal{P}_a^w(X) = \mathcal{P}_a(X)$.*

Proof. We start with the following result.

Claim 2.4. Let Q be a polynomial of degree $\leq ad$ on k^N such that $Q|_{\Delta^N} \equiv 0$. Then $Q = 0$.

Proof. The proof is by induction in N . If $N = 1$ then $Q = Q(x)$ is polynomial such that $Q(\delta) = 0$ for $\delta \in \Delta$. Since $|\Delta| > ad$ we see that $Q = 0$.

Assume that the result is know for $N = s - 1$. Let Q be a polynomial of degree $\leq ad$ on k^s such that $Q|_{\Delta^s} \equiv 0$. By induction we see that $Q(\delta, x_2, \dots, x_s) \equiv 0$ for all $\delta \in \Delta$. Then for any x_2, \dots, x_s the polynomial $x \rightarrow Q(x, x_2, \dots, x_s)$ vanishes for all $\delta \in \Delta$. Therefore $Q(x, x_2, \dots, x_s) = 0$ for all $x \in k$. \square

Definition 2.5. (1) $\Gamma := (S_d)^n$. The group Γ acts naturally on X .

(2) $L := \{(c_1, \dots, c_n) \in k^n \mid \sum_{i=1}^n c_i = 0\}$.

(3) $L(m) = (\Delta)^n \cap L \subset k^n$.

(4) For $c \in k$ we write $w(c) := (c, 1, \dots, 1) \in W$.

(5) $\kappa : L \hookrightarrow X \subset L \subset V$ is the linear map given by

$$\kappa(c_1, \dots, c_n) := (w(c_1), \dots, w(c_n)).$$

(6) $T_1 := \{(u_1, \dots, u_d) \in (\Delta)^d \mid \prod_{j=1}^d u_j = 1\}$. Let $T = T_1^n$.

(7) For any $j, j', 1 \leq j \neq j' \leq d$ we denote by $\phi_{j,j'} : \Delta \rightarrow T_1$ the morphism such that $\phi_{j,j'}(u) = (x_l(u)), 1 \leq l \leq d$ where $x_j(u) = u, x_{j'}(u) = u^{-1}$ and $x_l(u) = 1$ for $l \neq j, j'$.

(8) We denote by Θ_1 the group of homomorphisms $\chi : T_1 \rightarrow k^*$.

(9) For $\chi \in \Theta_1, j, j', 1 \leq j \neq j' \leq d$ we define a homomorphism $\chi_{j,j'} : \Delta \rightarrow k^*$ by $\chi_{j,j'} := \chi \circ \phi_{j,j'}$. Since $\Delta \cong \mathbb{Z}/m\mathbb{Z}$ there exists unique $\alpha_{j,j'}(\chi) \in [-m/2, m/2]$ such that $\chi_{j,j'}(u) = u^{\alpha_{j,j'}(\chi)}$ for any $u \in \Delta$.

(10) Denote by $\Theta_1^{adm} = \{\chi \in \Theta_1 : |\alpha_{j,j'}(\chi)| \leq a\}$, and by $\Theta_1^{adm,+} \subset \Theta_1^{adm}$ the subset of χ such that $\alpha_{j,j'} \geq 0$ if $j < j'$.

(11) Denote by $\Theta = (\Theta_1)^n$ the groups of characters $\theta : T \rightarrow k^*$.

(12) Denote by $\Theta^{adm,+} := (\Theta_1^{adm,+})^n$ and by $\Theta^{adm} := (\Theta_1^{adm})^n$.

(13) For any k -vector space R , a representation $\pi : T \rightarrow \text{Aut}(R)$ and $\theta \in \Theta$ we define

$$R^\theta = \{r \in R \mid \pi(t)r = \theta(t)r, t \in T\}.$$

Since $|T|$ is prime to q we have a direct sum decomposition $R = \bigoplus_{\theta \in \Theta} R^\theta$ and on X .

(14) For any function $f : X \rightarrow k, \gamma \in \Gamma$ define a function $h_{\gamma,f} : L \rightarrow k$ by $h_{\gamma,f} := f \circ \kappa_\gamma$.

Claim 2.6. For any $f \in \mathcal{P}_a^w(X), \gamma \in \Gamma$ the function $h_{\gamma,f}$ is a polynomial of degree $\leq a$.

Proof. Since $f \in \mathcal{P}_a^w(X)$ we have $h_{\gamma,f} \in \mathcal{P}_a^w(L)$. Since L is linear space we see that $h_{\gamma,f}$ is a polynomial of degree $\leq a$. \square

Definition 2.7. We denote by $\mathcal{P}_a^{\bar{w}}(X)$ the space of functions f such that $h_{\gamma,f}$ is a polynomial of degree $\leq a$ on L for all $\gamma \in \Gamma$.

Claim 2.8. (1) The subset Θ^{adm} of Θ is Γ -invariant.

- (2) For any $\theta \in \Theta^{adm}$ there exists $\gamma \in \Gamma$ such that $\theta \circ \gamma \in \Theta^{adm,+}$

The group T acts naturally on X and on spaces $\mathcal{P}_a^{\bar{w}}(X)$ and $\mathcal{P}_a(X)$ and we have direct sum decompositions

$$\mathcal{P}_a^{\bar{w}}(X) = \bigoplus_{\theta \in \Theta} \mathcal{P}_a^{\bar{w}}(X)^\theta$$

and

$$\mathcal{P}_a(X) = \bigoplus_{\theta \in \Theta} \mathcal{P}_a(X)^\theta.$$

Therefore to prove Proposition 2.3 it suffices to show that $\mathcal{P}_a^{\bar{w}}(X)^\theta = \mathcal{P}_a(X)^\theta$ for any $\theta \in \Theta$. This will follow from the following statement.

- Proposition 2.9.** (1) *For any function $f : X \rightarrow k$ satisfying the equation $f(tx) = \theta(t)f(x), t \in T, x \in X, \theta \in \Theta$ and such that $h_{\gamma,f}$ are polynomial functions on L of degree $\leq a$ for all $\gamma \in \Gamma$ there exists a polynomial F on V of degree $\leq ad$ such that $f = P|_X$.*
- (2) *Let $f : X \rightarrow k$ be a weakly polynomial of degree $< a$ on X which is a restriction of polynomial function of degree $\leq ad$ on V . Then f is a restriction of polynomial function of degree $\leq a$ on V .*

We start a proof of the first part of Proposition 2.9 with a set of notation. Let $f : X \rightarrow k$ satisfy $f(tx) = \theta(t)f(x), t \in T, x \in X$ and such that $h_{\gamma,f}$ are polynomial functions on L of degree $\leq a$ for all $\gamma \in \Gamma$.

- Definition 2.10.** (1) We write $h, h_\gamma : L \rightarrow k$ instead of $h_{Id,f}$ and $h_{\gamma,f}$.
- (2) $W^0 := \{w = (x_1, \dots, x_d) | x_i \in \Delta \text{ for } i \geq 2\} \subset W$.
- (3) $X^0 := (W^0)^n \cap X$.
- (4) $W_\gamma^0 := \gamma(W^0), \gamma \in \Gamma$.
- (5) Let $\nu : V \rightarrow k^n$ be the map $\nu(w_1, \dots, w_n) = (\mu(w_1), \dots, \mu(w_n))$. It is clear that the restriction of ν on X defines a map $\nu : X \rightarrow L$.

We start with some observations:

- Claim 2.11.** (1) For any $x \in X^0, 1 \leq i \leq n$ there exist unique $t(x) \in T$ such that $x = t(x)\kappa(\nu(x))$.
- (2) $f(x) = \theta(t(x))f(\kappa(\nu(x)))$ for any $x \in X^0$.
- (3) For any $\gamma \in \Gamma, l \in L$ we have $\nu(\gamma(l)) = l$.

Lemma 2.12. *We have $\mathcal{P}_a^{\bar{w}}(X)^\theta = \{0\}$ for any $\theta \notin \Theta^{adm}$.*

Proof. Assume that if $\theta \notin \Theta^{adm}$. Then there exist $i, j, j', 1 \leq i \leq n, 1 \leq j, j' \leq d$ such that $\alpha_{j,j'}(\chi_i) \geq a$. Choose $s \in S_d$ be such $s(j) = 1, s(j') = 2$ and denote by $\tilde{s} \in \Gamma$ the image of s under the imbedding $S_d \hookrightarrow \Gamma$ as the i -factor. After the replacement $f \rightarrow f \circ \tilde{s}, \theta \rightarrow \theta \circ s$ we may assume that $\alpha_{1,2}(\chi_i) > a$.

The functions $h := \kappa^*(f)$ and $h_s := \kappa_s^*(f)$ are weakly polynomial functions of degrees $\leq a$ on the linear space L . Therefore h and h_s are polynomial functions of degrees $\leq a$.

Let $\phi := \zeta_i \circ \phi_{1,2} : \Delta \rightarrow T$. Then $\kappa_s(l) = \phi(l_i)\kappa(l)$, $l = (l_1, \dots, l_n) \in L$. Therefore for any $l \in L$ such that $l_i \in \Delta$ we have $h_s(l) = l_i^{\alpha_{1,2}(\chi_i)} h(l)$. Since $\alpha_{1,2}(\chi_i) > a$ and $\alpha_{1,2}(\chi_i) \leq m/2$ this is only possible if $h = 0$. \square

Corollary 2.13. *As follows from Claim 2.8 it is sufficient to prove Proposition 2.9 for $\theta \in \Theta^{adm,+}$.*

Since $L \subset k^n$ is a linear subspace we can choose a polynomial F_h on V of degree $\leq a$ extending h . One way to define F_h is the composition $h \circ \pi$ where $\pi : k^n \rightarrow L$ is a linear projection.

Remark 2.14. Since the map $\mathcal{P}_a(X)^\theta \rightarrow \mathcal{P}_a(L), F \rightarrow F|_L$ is a choice of an extension of f to $F \in \mathcal{P}_a(X)^\theta$ is determined by a choice of an extension of h to a polynomial F_h on k^n .

Definition 2.15. $P : V \rightarrow k$ be the polynomial given by

$$P(v) = \prod_{i=1}^n \prod_{j=1}^d (x_i^j)^{\alpha^{1,j}(\chi_i)} F_h(\nu(v)), \quad v = (x_i^j)$$

Lemma 2.16. $\deg(P) \leq ad$.

Proof. Let $b = \deg(h)$. It is sufficient to show that for any sequence $\bar{e} = \{e(i)\}$, $e(i) \in [1, d]$, $1 \leq i \leq n$ we have $\sum_{i=1}^n \alpha^{1,e(i)}(\chi_i) + b \leq a$.

Suppose there exists \bar{e} such $\gamma \in \Gamma$ such that $\sum_{i=1}^n \alpha^{1,e(i)}(\chi_i) + b > a$. Since $\theta \in \Theta_n^{adm}$ there exists a subset I of $[1, n]$ such that $a < \sum_{i \in I} \alpha^{1,e(i)}(\chi_i) + b \leq 2a$.

Let $\gamma \in \Gamma$, $\gamma = \{\sigma_i\}$, $\sigma_i \in S_d$ such that $e(i) = \sigma_i(1)$ for $i \in I$ and $\sigma_i = Id$ if $i \notin I$. Consider $h_\gamma := \kappa_\gamma^*(f)$. On one hand it is a polynomial of degree $\leq a$ on L . On the other $h_\gamma(l) = h(l) \prod_{i \in I} l_i^{\alpha^{1,e(i)}(\chi_i)}$. The inequalities $a < \sum_{i \in I} \alpha^{1,e(i)}(\chi_i) + b \leq 2a$ imply that $h \equiv 0$. \square

By construction $P|_L \equiv f|_L$. Let $\bar{f} := f - P$. Then \bar{f} is weakly polynomial function of degree $\leq ad$ vanishing on L and $\bar{f}(tx) = \theta(t)f(x)$ for $t \in T$, $x \in X$. By Claim 2.11 we see that $\bar{f}|_{X^0} \equiv 0$. We will show that $\bar{f} \equiv 0$. We start with the following observation.

Remark 2.17. Since \bar{f} is a weakly polynomial function of degree $\leq ad$ and $q > ad$ we know that $\bar{f}|_{\mathcal{L}} \equiv 0$ for any line $\mathcal{L} \subset X$ such that \bar{f} vanishes on more than ad points on \mathcal{L} .

Let $Y := \bigcup_{\gamma \in \Gamma} \gamma(X_0)$.

Lemma 2.18. $\bar{f}|_Y \equiv 0$

Proof. Since $\gamma(X^0) = TL_\gamma$ it is sufficient to show that $\bar{f}|_{L_\gamma} \equiv 0$ for all $\gamma \in \Gamma$. Let $h_\gamma : L \rightarrow k$ be given by $h_\gamma(l) = \bar{f}(\gamma(l))$. We have to show that $h_\gamma \equiv 0$. Since h_γ is a polynomial of degree $\leq ad$ it follows from Claim 2.4 that it is sufficient to show that the restriction of h_γ on $L(m)$ vanishes. But for any $l \in L(m)$ we have $\gamma(l) = tl'$, $t \in T_n$, $l' \in L$. Since $\bar{f}(tx) = \theta(t)f(x)$ we see that $h_\gamma(l) = 0$. \square

Let $W_1 \subset W$ be the subset of (x_1, \dots, x_d) for which there exists $j_0, 1 \leq j_1 \leq d$ such that $x_j \in \Delta$, for $j \neq j_1$.

Let $W_2 \subset W$ be the subset of (x_1, \dots, x_d) for which there exists $j_1 \neq j_2, 1 \leq j_1, j_2 \leq d$ such that $x_j \in \Delta$, for $j \neq j_1, j_2$. Define $Y_2^1 = W_2 \times (W_1)^{n-1}$.

Claim 2.19. $\bar{f}|_{Y_2^1} \equiv 0$.

Proof. Fix $x = (x_i^j) \in Y_2^1$. By definition after a replacement of x by $\gamma tx, t \in T, \gamma \in \Gamma$ we can assume that $x_1^j = 1$ for $j \geq 3$, and $x_i^j = 1$ for $j \geq 2$.

Consider the subset

$$M = \{(y_i^j) \in X | y_1^2 = x_1^2, y_1^j = 1, j \geq 3, y_i^j = 1, j \geq 2\}$$

A point in M corresponds to $\{y_i^1\}_{i=1}^n$ such that $y_1^1 x_1^2 + \sum_{i=2}^n y_i^1 = 0$. So M is a linear subspace in X . Let $N := \{y_i^j \in M | y_1^1 \in \Delta\}$.

Consider the restriction h_M of f on M . Since f is a weakly polynomial function of degree $\leq ad$ and M is vector space we see that h_M is a polynomial function of degree $\leq ad$ on M . Since $N \subset Y$ we see that $h_{M|N} = 0$. It follows now from Claim 2.4 that $h_M = 0$. So $\bar{f}(x) = h_M(x) = 0$. \square

Repeating the same arguments we see that $\bar{f} = 0$.

We proved the first part Proposition 2.9. The second part follows from the following general result.

Lemma 2.20. *Let $\mathbb{Z} \subset \mathbb{V}$ be a homogeneous k -subvariety of degree $d, f : Z \rightarrow k$ a polynomial function of degree ad which is a weakly polynomial function on Z of degree $\leq a$. Then it is a restriction of polynomial function on $V(k)$ of degree $\leq a$.*

Lemma 2.20 follows inductively from the following claim

Claim 2.21. Let $f : Z \rightarrow k$ be a polynomial function of degree $\leq a$ which is weakly polynomial of degree $< a$ and $a < q$. Then f is polynomial of degree $< a$.

Proof. We can write f as a sum $f = Q + f'$ where $\deg(f') < a$ and Q is homogeneous of degree a . Since f is weakly polynomial of degree $< a$ the function h is also weakly polynomial of degree $< a$. It is sufficient to show that $h \equiv 0$.

Choose $x \in X$ and consider the function g on $k, g(t) = h(tx)$. Since X is homogeneous $tx \in X$. Since Q is homogeneous of degree a we have $g(t) = ct^a$. On the other hand, since Q is weakly polynomial of degree $< a$ we see that g is a polynomial of degree $< a$. Since $a < q$ we see that $g \equiv 0$. So $Q(x) = g(1) = 0$. \square

This completes the proof of Theorem 2.3. \square

3. PROOF OF THEOREM 1.11.

We use notation of Definition 1.10. So for any k -vector field $\mathbb{V}, P \in \mathcal{P}_d(\mathbb{V})$ we consider the map $\kappa_P : \text{Hom}_{af}(W, V) \rightarrow \mathcal{P}_d(W)$. The first part of following result implies that finite fields k of characteristic $> d$ have the property c_d .

Proposition 3.1. *For any $m \geq 0$ there exists $r = r(m, d)$ such that the following holds. For any finite field k of characteristic $> d$, any polynomial $P \in \mathcal{P}_d(\mathbb{V})$ of rank $\geq r$ and any $R \in \mathcal{P}_d(\mathbb{A}^m)$ the fiber $Z_Q := \kappa_P^{-1}$ is large. That is*

- (1) $Z_Q(k) \neq \emptyset$.
- (2) Let k_l/k be the extension of degree l , then

$$\lim_{l \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log_q(|\kappa_P^{-1}(Q)(k_l)|)}{l} = \dim(\text{Hom}_{af}(W, V)) - \dim(\mathcal{P}_d(W)).$$

Remark 3.2. (1) It is clear that Proposition shows that k satisfies the first condition of the property c_d . We show in Appendix C that it also implies the k satisfies the second condition.

- (2) A similar proof to the one below gives the more general result: For any $m \geq 0$ there exists $r = r(m, d, d')$ such that for any finite field k of characteristic $> dd'$, any polynomial $P \in k[V_n]$ of degree d and of d -rank $\geq r$ and any polynomial $R \in k[x_1, \dots, x_m]$ of degree $\leq dd'$ there exists a degree d' map $\phi : \mathbb{A}^m \rightarrow V_n$ such that $R = \phi^*(P)$.

Proof. Let $P : V = k^n \rightarrow k$ be a polynomial. Denote by W the space linear maps $w : k^m \rightarrow k^n$. Consider the polynomial Q on $W \times k^m$ ded by

$$Q(w, x) = P(w(x)) = \sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda} c_\lambda(w) x^\lambda,$$

where Λ is the set of ordered tuples (j_1, \dots, j_m) with $j_i \geq 0$ and $\sum_{i=1}^m j_i \leq d$.

Lemma 3.3. *If $p > d$ and $\text{rank}(P) > r$ then $\{c_\lambda(w)\}_{\lambda \in \Lambda}$ is of rank $\geq r$.*

Proof. We begin with the argument for the case $d = 2$. We are given $P(t) = \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq n} a_{ij} t_i t_j + \sum_{1 \leq i \leq n} a_i t_i + a$ of rank r . Note that for any linear form $l(t) = \sum_{i=1}^n c_i t_i$ we have that $P(t) + l(t)$ is of rank $\geq r$.

We can write

$$\begin{aligned} P(w(x)) &= \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq n} a_{ij} (w^i(x) + s_i)(w^j(x) + s_j) + \sum_{1 \leq i \leq n} a_i (w^i(x) + s_i) + a \\ &= \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq n} a_{ij} \sum_{k, l=1}^m w_k^i w_l^j x_k x_l + \sum_{1 \leq i \leq n} a_i \sum_{k=1}^m w_k^i x_k \\ &+ \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq n} \sum_{k=1}^m a_{ij} (s_i w_k^j + s_j w_k^i) x_k + \sum_{1 \leq i \leq j \leq n} a_{ij} s_i s_j + \sum_{1 \leq i \leq n} a_i s_i + a \end{aligned}$$

Which we can write as

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{1 \leq k < l \leq m} \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq n} a_{ij}(w_k^i w_l^j + w_l^i w_k^j) x_k x_l + \sum_{1 \leq l \leq m} \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq n} a_{ij} w_l^i w_l^j x_l^2 \\ & + \sum_{k=1}^m \left[\sum_{1 \leq i \leq n} a_i w_k^i + \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq n} a_{ij}(s_i w_k^j + s_j w_k^i) \right] x_k + \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq n} a_{ij} s_i s_j + \sum_{1 \leq i \leq n} a_i s_i + a \end{aligned}$$

We want to show that the collection

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\{ \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq n} a_{ij}(w_k^i w_l^j + w_l^i w_k^j) + \sum_{1 \leq i \leq n} a_i w_k^i \right\}_{1 \leq k < l \leq m} \cup \left\{ \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq n} a_{ij}(s_i w_k^j + s_j w_k^i) \right\}_{1 \leq k \leq m} \\ & \cup \left\{ \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq n} a_{ij} s_i s_j + \sum_{1 \leq i \leq n} a_i s_i \right\} \cup \left\{ \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq n} a_{ij} w_l^i w_l^j \right\}_{1 \leq l \leq m} \end{aligned}$$

is of rank $\geq r$. Namely, we need to show that if $B = (b_{kl}), (c_k), (d_k)$ is not 0 then

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{1 \leq k < l \leq m} b_{kl} \left[\sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq n} a_{ij}(w_k^i w_l^j + w_l^i w_k^j) \right] + \sum_{1 \leq l \leq m} b_{ll} \left[\sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq n} a_{ij} w_l^i w_l^j \right] \\ & + \sum_{1 \leq k \leq m} c_k \left[\sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq n} a_{ij}(s_i w_k^j + s_j w_k^i) \right] + \sum_{1 \leq k \leq m} d_k \left[\sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq n} a_{ij} s_i s_j + \sum_{1 \leq i \leq n} a_i s_i \right] \end{aligned}$$

is or rank $\geq r$. Suppose $b_{11} \neq 0$. Then we can write the above as

$$b_{11}P(w_1) + l_{w_2, \dots, w_m}(w_1)$$

where $w_j = (w_j^1, \dots, w_j^n)$, and l_{w_2, \dots, w_m} is linear in w_1 , so as a polynomial in w_1 this is of rank $\geq r$ and thus also of rank $\geq r$ as a polynomial in w . Similarly in the case where $b_{ll} \neq 0$, for some $1 \leq l \leq m$.

Suppose $b_{12} \neq 0$. We can write the above as

$$(*) \quad b_{12}Q(w_1, w_2) + l_{w_3, \dots, w_m}(w_1, w_2)$$

where $Q : V^2 \rightarrow k$, and $Q(t, t) = 2P(t)$, and $l_{w_3, \dots, w_m} : V^2 \rightarrow k$ is linear. Thus restricted to the subspace in W where $w_1 = w_2$ we get that $(*)$ is of rank $\geq r$ and thus of rank $\geq r$ on W . Similarly if $b_{kl} \neq 0$ for some $k < l$. Similar analysis for c_k or d_k not zero.

For $d > 2$ the argument is similar: We carry it out in the case P is homogeneous; the non homogeneous case is similar. We are given $P(t) = \sum_{I \in \mathcal{I}} a_I t_I$ of rank r , where \mathcal{I} is the set of ordered tuples (i_1, \dots, i_d) with $1 \leq i_1 \leq \dots \leq i_d \leq n$, and $t_I = t_{i_1} \dots t_{i_d}$.

Note that for any polynomial $R(t)$ of degree $< d$ we have that $P(t) + R(t)$ is also of rank $> r$.

We can write

$$P(w(x)) = \sum_{I \in \mathcal{I}} a_I w^I(x) = \sum_{I \in \mathcal{I}} a_I \sum_{l_1, \dots, l_d=1}^m w_{l_1}^{i_1} \dots w_{l_d}^{i_d} x_{l_1} \dots x_{l_d}$$

For $1 \leq l_1 \leq \dots \leq l_d \leq m$ the term $x_{l_1} \dots x_{l_d}$ has as coefficient

$$\sum_{I \in \mathcal{I}_{l_1, \dots, l_d}} a_I w_{l_1}^{i_1} \dots w_{l_d}^{i_d}$$

where $\mathcal{I}_{l_1, \dots, l_d}$ is the set of permutations of l_1, \dots, l_d . We wish to show that the set of the collection

$$\left\{ \sum_{I \in \mathcal{I}_{l_1, \dots, l_d}} a_I w_{l_1}^{i_1} \dots w_{l_d}^{i_d} \right\}_{\mathcal{I}_{l_1, \dots, l_d}}$$

is of rank $\geq r$. Namely we need to show that if $B = (b_{\mathcal{I}_{l_1, \dots, l_d}})$ is not 0 then

$$\sum_{\mathcal{I}_{l_1, \dots, l_d}} b_{\mathcal{I}_{l_1, \dots, l_d}} \sum_{I \in \mathcal{I}_{l_1, \dots, l_d}} a_I w_{l_1}^{i_1} \dots w_{l_d}^{i_d}$$

is of rank $\geq r$. Suppose $b_{\mathcal{I}_{l_1, \dots, l_d}} \neq 0$. Then restricted to the subspace $w_{l_1} = \dots = w_{l_d}$ we can write the above as

$$b_{\mathcal{I}_{l_1, \dots, l_d}} |\mathcal{I}_{l_1, \dots, l_d}| P(w_{l_1}) + R(w)$$

where $w_j = (w_j^1, \dots, w_j^n)$, and $R(w)$ is of lower degree in w_{l_1} , so as a polynomial in w_{l_1} this is of rank $\geq r$ and thus also of rank $\geq r$ as a polynomial in w . \square

Lemma 3.4. *There exists $r = r(d, m)$ such that for $P : k^n \rightarrow k$ is of rank $> r$ the map $f : W \rightarrow k^{|\Lambda|}$ given by $w \rightarrow \{c_\lambda(w)\}_{\lambda \in \Lambda}$ is surjective.*

Proof. We need to solve the system of equations $c_\lambda(w) = b_\lambda$ for any $b \in k^\Lambda$. The number of solutions is given by

$$q^{-|\Lambda|} \sum_{\alpha \in k^\Lambda} e_q \left(\sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda} a_\lambda (c_\lambda(w) - b_\lambda) \right).$$

Let $s = 2|\Lambda| \leq d^m$. By Proposition A.3 there exists $r = r(d, m)$ such that each term other than the term corresponding to $\alpha = 0$ is at most q^{-s} , so that the total contribution from these terms is at most $q^{-|\Lambda|}$. \square

This completes the proof of Proposition 3.1 and the first part of Theorem 1.11. We show in Appendix C how to deduce the second part of Theorem 1.11 from the second part of Proposition 3.1. \square

4. PROOF OF PROPOSITION 1.18

A key tool in our proof of this Proposition is a testing result from [15] which roughly says that any weakly polynomial function of degree a that is "almost" weakly polynomial of degree $< a$, namely it is a polynomial of degree $< a$ on almost all affine subspaces, is weakly polynomial of degree $< a$. This does not require high rank. We use high rank to show that almost any isotropic line is contained in an isotropic plane that not contained in $l^{-1}\{0\}$.

Proof of Claim 1.18. Let V be a vector space and $l : V \rightarrow k$ be a non-constant affine function. For any subset I of k we denote $\mathbb{W}_I = \{v \in \mathbb{V} \mid l(v) \in I\}$ so that $\mathbb{W}_b = \mathbb{W}_{\{b\}}$, for $b \in k$. For a hypersurface $\mathbb{X} \in \mathbb{V}$ we write $\mathbb{X}_I = \mathbb{X} \cap \mathbb{W}_I$.

Lemma 4.1. *For any finite subset $S \subset k$, any a weakly polynomial function f of degree a on X such that $f|_{X_S} \equiv 0$, and any $b \in k$ there exists a polynomial Q of degree $\leq a$ on V such that $Q|_{X_S} \equiv 0$ and $(Q - f)|_{X_b} \equiv 0$.*

Proof. We start with the following result.

Claim 4.2. Under the assumptions of Lemma 4.1 the restriction $f|_{X_b}$ is a weakly polynomial function of degree $\leq a - |S|$.

Proof. Since $|k| > a$ it suffices to show that for any plane $L \subset X_b$ the restriction $f|_L$ is a polynomial of degree $\leq a - |S|$.

As follows from Proposition B.2, there is a constant $A = A(d, a)$ such that it suffices to check the restriction $f|_L$ on q^{-A} -almost any affine plane $L \subset X_b$ is a polynomial of degree $\leq a - 1$.

As follows from Proposition B.3 for any $s > 0$ there is an $r = r(d, s)$ such that if X is of rank $> r$ then for q^{-s} -almost any affine plane $L \subset X_b$ there exists an affine 3-dim subspace $M \subset X$ containing L and such that $M \cap W_0 \neq \emptyset$. Then $M \cap X_t \neq \emptyset$ for any $t \in k$. Since f is a weakly polynomial function of degree a its restriction to M is a polynomial R of degree $\leq a$. Since the restriction of R to $l^{-1}(S) \cap M \equiv 0$ we see that $R = R' \prod_{s \in S} (l - s)$. Since $l|_L \equiv b$ we see that the restriction $f|_L$ is equal to R' which is a polynomial of degree $\leq a - |S|$. \square

Now we show that this Claim implies Lemma 4.1. Indeed, assume that $f|_{X_b}$ is a weakly polynomial function of degree $\leq a - |S|$. It follows from the inductive assumption on a that there exists a polynomial Q' of degree $\leq a - |S|$ on V such that $f|_{X_b} = Q'|_{X_b}$. Let $Q := \frac{Q' \prod_{s \in S} (l - s)}{\prod_{s \in S} (b - s)}$. Then $(f - Q)|_{X_{S \cup \{b\}}} \equiv 0$. \square

This completes the proof the Claim 1.18. \square

To formulate a useful variant of Corollary 1.19 we introduce some notations. Recall the definitions of $\mathcal{P}_a^w(X)$, $\mathcal{P}_a(X)$ from Definition 2.2

Definition 4.3. (1) We denote by $\overline{\mathcal{P}}_a(X)$ the quotient $\mathcal{P}_a^w(X)/\mathcal{P}_a(X)$.
(2) For an imbedding $\phi : V' \hookrightarrow V$ we define $X_\phi := \{v' \in V' \mid \phi(v') \in X\}$. The map ϕ defines an imbedding $X_\phi \rightarrow X$ which we also denote by ϕ .
(3) We denote by $\phi^* : k[X] \rightarrow k[X_\phi]$ the map $f \rightarrow f \circ \phi$.
(4) We denote by

$$\overline{\phi} : \overline{\mathcal{P}}_a(X) \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{P}}_a(X_\phi)$$

the linear map induced by ϕ^* .

Corollary 4.4. *Let $a > 0$, and let k be a field with $a < q$. There exists $\rho = \rho(d, a)$ such that for any hypersurface $X = \{v \in V \mid P(v) = 0\} \subset V$ of degree $\leq d$, any affine imbedding $\phi : W \hookrightarrow V$ such that rank of $P|_W \geq \rho$ the restriction map $\bar{\phi} : \bar{\mathcal{P}}_a(X) \rightarrow \bar{\mathcal{P}}_a(X \cap W)$ is an imbedding.*

5. COMPLETE INTERSECTIONS OF BOUNDED CODIMENSION

The arguments in the paper are written in the case when \mathbb{X} is hypersurface. Most of our results extend easily to the case when \mathbb{X} is a complete intersection of bounded codimension.

Definition 5.1 (Algebraic rank of a variety). (1) Given a collection $\bar{P} \in \mathcal{P}_{\bar{d}}(\mathbb{V})$ of polynomials we define $\mathbb{X}_{\bar{P}} = \{v \in \mathbb{V} \mid P_s(v) = 0, 1 \leq s \leq c\}$.
 (2) A collection $\bar{P} = \{P_i\}$ of polynomials is *admissible* if $\mathbb{X}_{\bar{P}} \subset \mathbb{V}$ is a complete intersection (that is $\dim(\mathbb{X}_{\bar{P}}) = \dim(\mathbb{V}) - c$).
 (3) In the case when all polynomials P_i are of the same degree we define $r(\bar{P})$ as the minimal rank of a non trivial k -linear combination of P_s .
 (4) If $\bar{P} = \bigcup_j \bar{P}_j$ where P_j is a collection of polynomials of degree d_j we say that $r(\mathbb{X}_{\bar{P}}) > r$ if for all j , $r(\bar{P}_j) > r$.

Let $P_{n,d} : \mathbb{V}_n \rightarrow \mathbb{A}$ be polynomials as in Theorem 1.9 and $\mathbb{X}_{n,d} = \mathbb{X}_{P_{n,d}}$. For any $\bar{d} = (d_1, \dots, d_c)$ we define $\bar{P}_{n,\bar{d}} \in \mathcal{P}_{\bar{d}}(\mathbb{V}^c) = \{P_{l,d_l \circ p_l}\}$, $1 \leq l \leq c$ where $p_l : \mathbb{V}_n^c \rightarrow \mathbb{V}$ is the projection on the l -component. It is clear that $\mathbb{X}_{\bar{P}} = \prod_{l=1}^c \mathbb{X}_{n,d_l}$.

Theorem 5.2. (1) $r(\bar{P}_{n,\bar{d}}) \geq n/d$, where $d := \max_l d_l$.
 (2) For any admissible field k , the complete intersection $\mathbb{X}_{n,\bar{d}} \subset \mathbb{V}_n^c$ has the property \star_a .

Proof. The proof of the part (1) is completely analogous to the proof of the part (1) of Theorem 1.9. The proof of the second part is also parallel to proof of the part (2) of Theorem 1.9 which is based on on the analysis of the restriction of weakly polynomial functions to the subspace $L \subset \mathbb{X}_n$ and the decomposition of the space $k[\mathbb{X}_n(k)]$ under the action of the torus T . In the proof of Theorem 5.2 we use the restriction weakly polynomial functions to the subspace $L^c \subset \mathbb{X}_{n,\bar{d}}$ and the action of the torus T^c on the space $k[\mathbb{X}_{n,\bar{d}}(k)]$. \square

One checks that the formulations and proofs of Claim 1.16 and of Proposition 1.18 are naturally extended to complete intersections of bounded codimension.

The following is the counterpart of Proposition 3.1. We can consider $\mathcal{P}_{\bar{d}}$ as a contravariant autofunctor on the category Vect_{af} of finite-dimensional k -affine vector spaces where to an affine map $f : W \rightarrow V$ we associate the map

$$f^* : \mathcal{P}_{\bar{d}}(V) \rightarrow \mathcal{P}_{\bar{d}}(W), \quad f^*(\{P_s\}) = \{P_s \circ f\}.$$

Proposition 5.3. *For any $m \geq 1$ There exists $r = r(\bar{d}, m)$ such that for any $\bar{P} \in \mathcal{P}_{\bar{d}}(V)$, $\bar{Q} \in \mathcal{P}_{\bar{d}}(U)$, with $r(\bar{P}) \geq r$, and $\dim(U) \leq m$ there exists $f \in \text{Hom}_{\text{Vect}_{af}}(U, V)$ such that $\bar{Q} = f^*(\bar{P})$.*

Proof. Consider the polynomials R_s , $1 \leq s \leq c$ on $W \times k^m$ defined by

$$R_s(w, x) = P_s(w(x)) = \sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda_s} c_\lambda^s(w) x^\lambda,$$

where Λ_s is the set of ordered tuples (j_1, \dots, j_m) with $j_i \geq 0$ and $\sum_{i=1}^m j_i \leq d_s$.

Lemma 5.4. *If $p > d$ and $\text{rank}(\bar{P}) > r$ then $\{c_\lambda^s(w)\}_{1 \leq s \leq c, \lambda \in \Lambda}$ is of rank $> r$.*

Proof. We are given $P_s(t) = \sum_{I \in \mathcal{I}_s} a_I^s t_I$, $1 \leq s \leq c$, of rank r , where \mathcal{I}_s is the set of ordered tuples (i_1, \dots, i_{d_s}) with $1 \leq i_1 \leq \dots \leq i_{d_s} \leq n$, and $t_I = t_{i_1} \dots t_{i_{d_s}}$.

Note that for any polynomials $l_s(t)$ of degrees $< d_s$ we have that $\{P_s(t) + l_s(t)\}$ is also of rank $> r$.

We can write

$$P_s(w(x)) = \sum_{I \in \mathcal{I}_s} a_I^s w^I(x) = \sum_{I \in \mathcal{I}} a_I^s \sum_{l_1, \dots, l_{d_s}=1}^m w_{l_1}^{i_1} \dots w_{l_{d_s}}^{i_{d_s}} x_{l_1} \dots x_{l_{d_s}}$$

For $1 \leq l_1 \leq \dots \leq l_{d_s} \leq m$ the term $x_{l_1} \dots x_{l_{d_s}}$ has as coefficient

$$\sum_{I \in \mathcal{I}_{l_1, \dots, l_{d_s}}} a_I^s w_{l_1}^{i_1} \dots w_{l_{d_s}}^{i_{d_s}},$$

where $\mathcal{I}_{l_1, \dots, l_{d_s}}$ is the set of permutations of l_1, \dots, l_{d_s} . We wish to show that the collection

$$\left\{ \sum_{I \in \mathcal{I}_{l_1, \dots, l_{d_s}}} a_I^s w_{l_1}^{i_1} \dots w_{l_{d_s}}^{i_{d_s}} \right\}_{1 \leq s \leq c, \mathcal{I}_{l_1, \dots, l_{d_s}}}$$

is of rank $> r$. Write $[1, c] = \bigcup_{f=2}^d C_f$ where $C_f = \{s : d_s = f\}$.

We need to show that for any $f = 2, \dots, c$ if $B = (b_{\mathcal{I}_{l_1, \dots, l_{d_s}}})_{s \in C_f, \mathcal{I}_{l_1, \dots, l_{d_s}}}$ is not 0, then

$$\sum_{s \in C_f} \sum_{\mathcal{I}_{l_1, \dots, l_{d_s}}} b_{\mathcal{I}_{l_1, \dots, l_{d_s}}} \sum_{I \in \mathcal{I}_{l_1, \dots, l_{d_s}}} a_I^s w_{l_1}^{i_1} \dots w_{l_{d_s}}^{i_{d_s}}$$

is of rank $> r$. Suppose $(b_{\mathcal{I}_{l_1, \dots, l_{d_s}}})_{s \in C_f} \neq \bar{0}$. Then restricted to the subspace $w_{l_1} = \dots = w_{l_{d_s}}$ we can write the above as

$$\sum_{s \in C_f} b_{\mathcal{I}_{l_1, \dots, l_{d_s}}} |\mathcal{I}_{l_1, \dots, l_{d_s}}| P_s(w_{l_1}) + R(w)$$

where $w_j = (w_j^1, \dots, w_j^n)$, and $R(w)$ is of lower degree in w_{l_1} , so as a polynomial in w_{l_1} this is of rank $> r$ and thus also of rank $> r$ as a polynomial in w . \square

Lemma 5.5. *There exists $r = r(d, c, m)$ such that for $\bar{P} : k^n \rightarrow k^c$ is of rank $> r$ the map $f : W \rightarrow \prod_s k^{|\Lambda_s|}$ given by $w \rightarrow \{c_\lambda(w)\}_{s, \lambda \in \Lambda_s}$ is surjective.*

Proof. Same proof as the corresponding Lemma 3.4 for hypersurfaces. \square

This completes the proof of Lemma 5.4 and therefore Proposition 5.3. \square

Finally, Proposition 1.18 for complete intersections is proved in the exact same way.

APPENDIX A. COUNTING TOOLS

The main property of high rank varieties is that it is easy to estimate the number of points on various important varieties. The main counting tool comes from the relation between the bias of exponential sums and algebraic rank.

Let k be a finite field, $\text{char}(k) = p$, $|k| = q$. Let V a vector space over k . We denote $e_q(x) = e^{2\pi i\psi(x)/p}$ where $\psi : k \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_p$ is the trace function. Let $P : V \rightarrow k$ be a polynomial of degree d . We denote by $(h_1, \dots, h_d)_P$ the multilinear form

$$(h_1, \dots, h_d)_P = \sum_{\omega \in \{0,1\}^d} -1^{|\omega|} P(x + \omega \cdot \bar{h}); \quad |\omega| = \sum_{i=1}^d \omega_i.$$

We denote by $\mathbb{E}_{x \in S} f(x)$ the average $|S|^{-1} \sum_{x \in S} f(x)$.

Definition A.1 (Gowers norms [5]). For a function $g : V \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ we define the norm $\|g\|_{U_d}$ by

$$\|g\|_{U_d}^{2^d} = \mathbb{E}_{x, v_1, \dots, v_d \in V} \prod_{\omega \in \{0,1\}^d} g^\omega(x + \omega \cdot \bar{v}),$$

where $g^\omega = g$ if $|\omega|$ is even and $g^\omega = \bar{g}$ otherwise.

Definition A.2 (Analytic rank). The analytic rank of a polynomial $P : V \rightarrow k$ of degree d is defined by $\text{arank}(P) = -\log_q \|e_q(P)\|_{U_d}$.

The following Proposition relating bias and rank was proved in increasing generality in [7, 11, 3]. The most general version can be found at the survey [8] (Theorem 8.0.1):

Proposition A.3 (Bias-rank). *Let $s, d > 0$. There exists $r = r(s, k, d)$ such that for any finite field k of size $q = p^l$, any vector space V over k , any polynomial $P : V \rightarrow k$ of degree d . If P is of rank $> r$ then*

$$|\mathbb{E}_{v \in V} e_q(P(v))| < q^{-s}.$$

In the case when $p > d$, the bound on r is uniform in k .

Conjecture A.4. For $p > d$ we have $r = s^{-O_d(1)}$. The conjecture is known for $d = 2, 3$ ([9]).

Remark A.5. When $p > d$ then one can recover P from $(h_1, \dots, h_d)_P$ so that if the rank of $(h_1, \dots, h_d)_P$ is $< r$ of then so is the rank of P .

For multilinear functions; in particular for $(h_1, \dots, h_d)_P$, the converse is also true:

Proposition A.6 ([16]). *Let $r, d > 0$. For any finite field k of size $q = p^l$, $p > d$, any vector space V over k , any polynomial $P : V \rightarrow k$ of degree d , if*

$$\|e_q(P)\|_{U_d}^{2^d} = |\mathbb{E}_{h_1, \dots, h_d} e_q(h_1, \dots, h_d)_P| < q^{-r}$$

for some polynomial, then P is of rank $> r$.

Remark A.7. If P is of degree d and $p > d$ then $(h, \dots, h)_P = P(h)/d!$ so that if P is of rank $> r$ then also $(h_1, \dots, h_d)_P$ is of rank $> r$ as a polynomial on V^d .

Lemma A.8. *For any R of degree $< d$ we have*

$$|\mathbb{E}_{h_1, \dots, h_d} e_q((h_1, \dots, h_d)_P + R(h_1, \dots, h_d))| \leq |\mathbb{E}_{h_1, \dots, h_d} e_q((h_1, \dots, h_d)_P)|$$

Lemma A.9. *Let $P : V \rightarrow k$ be a polynomial of degree d and rank R , and let $W \subset V$ be a subspace of codimension s . Then the rank of $P|_W$ is $\geq R - s$.*

Lemma A.10. *Let $s > 0$, $\bar{d} = (d_1, \dots, d_c)$, k a finite field. There exists $r = r(\bar{d}, s, k)$ such that for any $\bar{P} = \{P_1, \dots, P_c\}$, $P_i : V \rightarrow k$ with $\deg(P_i) \leq d_i$, $|X_{\bar{P}}| = q^{\dim(V)-c}(1 + q^{-s})$. In the case when $p > \max_i d_i$, the bound on r is uniform in k .*

Proof. The number of points on X is given by

$$q^{-c} \sum_{\bar{a} \in k^c} \sum_{x \in V} e_q\left(\sum_{i=1}^c a_i P_i(x)\right).$$

By Proposition A.3 for any $s > 0$ we can choose r so that for any $\bar{a} \neq 0$ we have

$$\left| \sum_{x \in V} e_q\left(\sum_{i=1}^c a_i P_i(x)\right) \right| < q^{-s} |V|.$$

□

APPENDIX B. ALMOST-SURE RESULTS

In [12] (Theorem 1) the following description of degree $< m$ polynomials is given:

Proposition B.1. *Let $P : V \rightarrow k$. Then P is a polynomial of degree $\leq a$ if and only if the restriction of P to any affine subspace of dimension $l = \lceil \frac{a+1}{q-q/p} \rceil$ is a polynomial of degree $< m$.*

Note that when $a < q$ then $l \leq 2$.

In [12] the above criterion is used for polynomial testing over general finite fields. In [15] (Corollary 1.14) it is shown how the arguments in [12] can be adapted to polynomial testing within a subvariety variety $X \subset V$ (high rank is not required).

Theorem B.2 (Subspace splining on X). *For any $a, d, L > 0$ there exists an $A = A(d, L, a) > 0$ such that the following holds. Let $X \subset V(k)$ be a complete intersection of degree d , codimension L . Then any weakly polynomial function f of degree a such that the restriction of f to q^{-A} -a.e l -dimensional affine subspace, $l = \lceil \frac{a}{q-q/p} \rceil$ is a polynomial of degree $< a$ is weakly polynomial of degree $< a$.*

Let the notation be as in Section 4.

Proposition B.3. *Fix $\bar{d} = \{d_i\}$ and $s > 0$. Let $d := \max_i d_i$. There exists $r = r(\bar{d}, s)$ such that for any finite field k with $\text{char}(k) > d$, a k -vector space \mathbb{V} and $\bar{P} \in \mathcal{P}_{\bar{d}}(\mathbb{V})$ of rank $> r$ the following holds.*

- (1) *For any $b \in k$ and q^{-s} -almost any affine line $L \subset X_b$ there exists an affine plane $M \subset X$ containing L such that $M \cap X_0 \neq \emptyset$.*
- (2) *For q^{-s} -almost any affine plane $M \subset X_b$ there exists an affine 3-dim subspace $N \subset X$ containing M such that $N \cap X_0 \neq \emptyset$.*

Proof. We prove the result for hypersurfaces, the proof for complete intersections in analogous.

We will prove (1); the proof of (2) is similar.

Let $k = \mathbb{F}_q$. We fix d and define $d' = \min(d+1, q)$. Let $M_0 = \{a_0, \dots, a_d\} \subset k$ be a subset of d' distinct points.

Claim B.4. Let $Q(x)$ be a polynomial of degree $\leq d$ such that $Q|_{M_0} \equiv 0$. Then $Q(a) = 0$ for all $a \in k$.

Proof. If $q \geq d+1$ the Claim follows from the formula for the Vandermonde determinant. On the other hand if $d \geq q$ then there is nothing to prove. \square

From now on we assume that $q \geq d+1$. For any $0 \leq i \leq d$ we define a subset S_i of k^2 by

$$S_i = \{(a_i, a_j), 0 \leq j \leq i\}$$

Let $T = \bigcup_{0 \leq i \leq d} S_i$.

Claim B.5. Let $Q(x, y)$ be a polynomial of degree $\leq d$ such that $Q|_T \equiv 0$. Then $Q = 0$.

Proof. We prove the claim by induction in d . Let $Q = \sum_{a,b} q_{a,b} x^a y^b$, $a+b \leq d$. The restriction of Q on the line $\{x=0\}$ is equal to $Q^0(y) = \sum_{b \leq d} q_{0,b} y^b$. Since $Q^0|_{S_d} \equiv 0$ we see that $Q^0 = 0$. So $Q(x, y) = xQ'(x, y)$. By the inductive assumption we have $Q' = 0$ \square

We will assume from now on that $a_0 = 0$. Denote $I(d) = \{(i, j) : 1 \leq i \leq d, 1 \leq j \leq i\}$, and $m = |I(d)|$.

An affine line in X_b is parametrized as $x+ty$, $t \in k$, with

$$(*) \quad Q(x+ty) = 0, l(x) = b, l(y) = 0.$$

Let Y be the set of (x, y) satisfying $(*)$.

We need to show that almost every $(x, y) \in Y$ we can find z with

$$(**) \quad Q(x + ty + sz) = 0, \quad l(z) = -b, \quad s, t \in k$$

or alternatively

$$Q(x + ty + sz) = 0, \quad l(x + ty + sz) = (1 - s)b, \quad s, t \in k$$

We can reduce this system to

$$Q(x + a_i y + a_j z) = 0, \quad l(x + a_i y + a_j z) = (1 - a_j)b, \quad (i, j) \in I(d)$$

Fix $(x, y) \in Y$ and estimate the number of solutions:

$$(*) \quad q^{-2m} \sum_z \sum_{a, c \in k^m} e_q \left(\sum a_{ij} Q(x + a_i y + a_j z) + c_{ij} (l(x + a_i y + a_j z) + (a_j - 1)b) \right)$$

Suppose $a = (a_{ij}) = 0$, but $c = (c_{ij}) \neq 0$, and recall that $l(x) = b, l(y) = 0$. We have

$$\sum_z e_q \left(\sum_{ij} c_{ij} (l(x + a_i y + a_j z) + (a_j - 1)b) \right) = \sum_z e_q \left(\sum_{ij} c_{ij} (a_j l(z) + a_j b) \right)$$

Now if $\sum_{ij} c_{ij} a_j l(z) \neq 0$ then the sum is 0. Otherwise also $\sum_{i,j} c_{ij} a_j b = 0$ so that the sum is $|V|$.

Now suppose $a \neq 0$. Say $a_{i_0 j_0} \neq 0$. We estimate

$$(1) \quad \mathbb{E}_{x,y \in V} |\mathbb{E}_z e_q \left(\sum a_{ij} Q(x + a_i y + a_j z) + c_{ij} (l(x + a_i y + a_j z) + (a_j - 1)b) \right)|^2$$

Lemma B.6.

$$\mathbb{E}_{x,y,z,z'} \prod_{(i,j) \in I(d)} f_{i,j}(x + a_i y + a_j z) \bar{f}_{i,j}(x + a_i y + a_j z + a_j z') \leq \|f_{i_0 j_0}\|_{U_d}$$

Proof. Without loss of generality $a_1 = 1$ (make a change of variable $y \rightarrow a_1^{-1}y, z \rightarrow a_1^{-1}z$). We prove this by induction on d . When $d = 1$ we have $x + y + z, x + y + z'$, and the claim is obvious. Assume $d > 1$. We can write the average as

$$\mathbb{E}_{x,y,z,z'} \prod_{(i,j) \in I(d-1)} f_{i,j}(x + a_i y + a_j z) \bar{f}_{i,j}(x + a_i y + a_j z + a_j z') \prod_{1 \leq j \leq d} f_{d,j}(x + a_d y + a_j z) \bar{f}_{d,j}(x + a_d y + a_j z + a_j z').$$

Shifting x by $a_d y$ we get

$$\mathbb{E}_{x,y,z,z'} \prod_{(i,j) \in I(d-1)} f_{i,j}(x + (a_i - a_d)y + a_j z) \bar{f}_{i,j}(x + (a_i - a_d)y + a_j z + a_j z') \prod_{1 \leq j \leq d} f_{d,j}(x + a_j z) \bar{f}_{d,j}(x + a_j z + a_j z')$$

Applying the Cauchy-Schwartz inequality we get

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}_{x,y,y',z,z'} \prod_{(i,j) \in I(d-1)} f_{i,j}(x + (a_i - a_d)y + a_j z) \bar{f}_{i,j}(x + (a_i - a_d)y + a_j z + a_j z') \\ & \prod_{(i,j) \in I(d-1)} f_{i,j}(x + (a_i - a_d)y + (a_i - a_d)y' + a_j z) \\ & \bar{f}_{i,j}(x + (a_i - a_d)y + (a_i - a_d)y' + a_j z + a_j z')^{1/2} \end{aligned}$$

Shifting x by $a_d y$ and rearranging we get

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}_{x,y,y',z,z'} \prod_{(i,j) \in I(d-1)} f_{i,j}(x + a_i y + a_j z) \bar{f}_{i,j}(x + a_i y + (a_i - a_d)y' + a_j z) \\ & \prod_{(i,j) \in I(d-1)} \bar{f}_{i,j}(x + a_i y + a_j z + a_j z') f_{i,j}(x + a_i y + (a_i - a_d)y' + a_j z + a_j z')^{1/2} \end{aligned}$$

Now if we denote

$$g_{i,j,y'}(x) = f_{i,j}(x) \bar{f}_{i,j}(x + y' + (a_i - a_d)y'').$$

then by the induction hypothesis we get that the above is bounded by

$$[\mathbb{E}_{y'} \|f_{i,j}(x) \bar{f}_{i,j}(x + y' + (a_i - a_d)y'')\|_{U_{d-1}}]^{1/2} \leq \|f_{i,j}(x)\|_{U_d}.$$

for any $(i,j) \in I(d-1)$.

We do a similar computation for $(i,j) \in I(d) \setminus \{I(d-1), (d,1)\}$, splitting

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{x,y,z,z'} & \prod_{(i,j) \in I(d-1)} f_{i+1,j+1}(x + a_{i+1}y + a_{j+1}z) \bar{f}_{i+1,j+1}(x + a_{i+1}y + a_{j+1}z + a_{j+1}z') \\ & \prod_{1 \leq j \leq d} f_{j,1}(x + a_j z) \bar{f}_{j,1}(x + a_j z + a_j z') \end{aligned}$$

The only term left uncovered is $f_{d,1}$, so we split

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{x,y,z,z'} & \prod_{(i,j) \in I(d-1)} f_{i+1,j}(x + a_{i+1}y + a_j z) \bar{f}_{i+1,j}(x + a_{i+1}y + a_j z + a_j z') \\ & \prod_{1 \leq i \leq d} f_{i,i}(x + a_i y + a_i z) \bar{f}_{i,i}(x + a_i y + a_i z + a_i z'). \end{aligned}$$

We make the change of variable $z \rightarrow z - y$ to get

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{x,y,z,z'} & \prod_{(i,j) \in I(d-1)} f_{i+1,j}(x + a_{i+1}y + a_j(z - y)) \bar{f}_{i+1,j}(x + a_{i+1}y + a_j(z - y) + a_j z') \\ & \prod_{1 \leq i \leq d} f_{i,i}(x + a_i z) \bar{f}_{i,i}(x + a_i z + a_i z'). \end{aligned}$$

□

By the Lemma B.6 we obtain that (1) is bounded by $\|e_q(\sum a_{i_0 j_0} Q + c_{i_0 j_0} l)\|_{U_d}$. By Propositions A.3, A.8 for there exists $r = r(s)$ such that if Q is of rank $> r$ then $\|e_q(\sum a_{i_0 j_0} Q + c_{i_0 j_0} l)\|_{U_d} < q^{-s}$. It follows that we can choose r so that for q^{-s} almost all $x, y \in Y$ the contribution to $(*)$ from all (a, c) with $a \neq 0$ is bounded by $|V|q^{-4m}$. \square

APPENDIX C. THE CASE OF ALGEBRAICALLY CLOSE FIELDS

We prove Theorem 1.11 for algebraically closed fields.

We fix m, d . We provide a proof for the case when $c = 1$; the general case is completely analogous. As proven in Section 3, there exists $r = r(m, d)$ such that for any finite field k of characteristic $> d$, a k -vector space \mathbb{V} and a polynomial $P \in \mathcal{P}_d(\mathbb{V})$ of rank $\geq r$ the map $\kappa_P(k)$ is surjective.

We first show the surjectivity of $\kappa_P(k)$ for polynomials $P \in \mathcal{P}_d(\mathbb{V})(k)$ of rank $\geq r$.

We fix $\mathbb{V} = \mathbb{A}^n$ and consider $\mathcal{P}_d(\mathbb{V})$ as a scheme defined over \mathbb{Z} . Let T be the set of sequences $(a_i, b_i), 1 \leq i \leq r$ such that $0 \leq a_i, b_i < d$ and $a_i + b_i \leq d$. For any $t = \{(a_i, b_i)\} \in T$ we denote by $\nu_t : \bigoplus_{i=1}^r \mathcal{P}_{a_i}(\mathbb{V}) \otimes \mathcal{P}_{b_i}(\mathbb{V})$ the linear map given by

$$\nu_t(\{Q_i \otimes R_i\}) = \sum_{i=1}^r Q_i R_i$$

Let $\mathbb{Y} \subset \mathcal{P}_d(\mathbb{V})$ be constructible subset which is the complement of unions of $\nu_t, t \in T$ and $\mathbb{Y}(k) \subset \mathcal{P}_d(\mathbb{V})(k)$ consists polynomials P of rank $> r$ for any algebraically closed field k .

Let $\mathbb{R} \subset \mathbb{Y}$ be the subscheme of polynomials P such that the map κ_P is not surjective.

Claim C.1. $\mathbb{R}(\bar{\mathbb{F}}_p) = \emptyset$ for any $p > d$.

Proof. Assume that $\mathbb{R}(\bar{\mathbb{F}}_p) \neq \emptyset$. Then $\mathbb{R}(k) \neq \emptyset$ for some finite extension k of \mathbb{F}_p . So there exists a polynomial $P \in \mathcal{P}_d(k^n)$ of \bar{k} -rank $> r$ such that the map $\kappa_P(\bar{k})$ is not surjective. So there exist a finite extension l of k and $Q \in \mathcal{P}_d(k^n)$ which is not in the image of $\kappa_P(\bar{k})$. Then of course it is not in the image of $\kappa_P(\bar{k})$. On the other hand $r_l(P) \geq r_{\bar{k}}(P)$. So by Theorem 1.11 we see that $Q \in \text{Im}(\kappa_P(l))$. \square

Corollary C.2. (1) *The map $\kappa_P(k)$ is surjective for any algebraically closed field k of characteristic $> d$ and a polynomial $P \in \mathcal{P}_d(\mathbb{V})$ of ranks $> r$.*

(2) *The map $\kappa_P(k)$ is surjective for any algebraically closed field k of characteristic 0 and a polynomial $P \in \mathcal{P}_d(\mathbb{V})$ of ranks $> r$.*

Proof. The part (1) follows from the completeness of the theory ACF_p of algebraically closed fields of a fixed characteristic p .

To prove the part (2) one chooses a non-trivial ultrafilter \mathcal{U} on the set of prime and considers the \mathcal{U} -ultraproduct of theories ACF_p . Let l be the \mathcal{U} -ultraproduct of fields $\bar{\mathbb{F}}_p$. As follows Claim C.1 and Theorem of Los the map $\kappa_P(l)$ is surjective for

any polynomial $P \in \mathcal{P}_d(\mathbb{W})$ of ranks $> r$. Since the theory ACF_p of algebraically closed fields of characteristic 0 is complete the Corollary is proved. \square

Let $\mathbb{T} \subset \mathbb{Y}$ be the subscheme of polynomials P such that there exists $Q \in \mathcal{P}_d(\mathbb{A}^m)$ such that $\dim(\kappa_P^{-1}(Q)) \neq \dim(\text{Hom}_{af}(W, V)) - \dim(\mathcal{P}_d(\mathbb{W}))$. Theorem 1.11 says that $\mathbb{T} = \emptyset$. The same arguments as before show that it is sufficient to prove that

$$\dim(\kappa_P^{-1}(Q)) = \dim(\text{Hom}_{af}(W, V)) - \dim(\mathcal{P}_d(\mathbb{W}))$$

for all finite fields $k = \mathbb{F}_q$ of characteristic $> d$ and $Q \in \mathcal{P}_d(\mathbb{A}^m)(k)$. But it follows from the results of Weil that

$$\dim(\kappa_P^{-1}(Q)) = \lim_{l \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log_q(|\kappa_P^{-1}(Q)(k_l)|)}{l}$$

where k_l/k is the extension of degree l . Now the equality

$$\dim(\kappa_P^{-1}(Q)) = \dim(\text{Hom}_{af}(W, V)) - \dim(\mathcal{P}_d(\mathbb{W}))$$

follows from Proposition 3.1 (2).

REFERENCES

- [1] Alon, N., Kaufman, T., Krivelevich, M., Litsyn, S., Ron, D. *Testing Low-Degree Polynomials over GF(2)*. Approximation, Randomization, and Combinatorial Optimization. Algorithms and Techniques 188-199.
- [2] Bergelson, V.; Tao, T.; Ziegler, T. *An inverse theorem for the uniformity seminorms associated with the action of \mathbb{F}^∞* . Geom. Funct. Anal. 19 (2010), no. 6, 1539-1596.
- [3] Bhowmick A., Lovett S. *Bias vs structure of polynomials in large fields, and applications in effective algebraic geometry and coding theory*. arXiv:1506.02047
- [4] Bik, A.; Draisma, J.; Eggermont, R. *Polynomials and tensors of bounded strength*. Preprint available Arxiv 1805.01816
- [5] Gowers, T. *A new proof of Szemerédi's theorem*. Geom. Funct. Anal. 11, (2001) 465-588.
- [6] Gowers, W. T.; Milićević, L. *A quantitative proof for the U^4 norm over finite fields*. Arxiv 1712.00241
- [7] Green, B., Tao, T. *The distribution of polynomials over finite fields, with applications to the Gowers norms*. Contrib. Discrete Math. 4 (2009), no. 2, 1-36.
- [8] Hatami, H, Hatami, P. Lovett, S *Higher order Fourier analysis and applications*. Available at <http://cseweb.ucsd.edu/slovett/files/survey-higher-order-fourier.pdf>.
- [9] Haramaty , E.; Shpilka, A. *On the structure of cubic and quartic polynomials*, STOC 2010.
- [10] Jutla, C.S.; Patthak, A.C. ; Rudra, A. ; Zuckerman, D. *Testing low-degree polynomials over prime fields*. Random Structures and Algorithms Volume 35, Issue 2, 2009, Pages 163-193.
- [11] Kaufman, T., Lovett, S. *Worst case to average case reductions for polynomials*. Proc. 49th Annual IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (2008),166-175.
- [12] Kaufman, T., Ron, D. *Testing polynomials over general fields*. SIAM J. on Comput., 36(3): 779-802, 2006.
- [13] Kazhdan, D., Ziegler, T. *Extending linear and quadratic functions from high rank varieties*. arXiv:1712.01335
- [14] Kazhdan, D., Ziegler, T. *On ranks of polynomials*. Algebr Represent Theory (2018).
- [15] Kazhdan, D., Ziegler, T. *Polynomials as splines*. arXiv:1712.09047.

- [16] Kazhdan, D., Ziegler, T. Approximate cohomology. *Sel. Math. New Ser.* (2018) 24: 499.
- [17] Tao, T., Ziegler, T. *The inverse conjecture for the Gowers norm over finite fields via the correspondence principle* *Analysis & PDE* Vol. 3 (2010), No. 1, 1-20.
- [18] Tao, T.; Ziegler, T. *The inverse conjecture for the Gowers norm over finite fields in low characteristic*, *Ann. Comb.* 16 (1) (2012) 121-188.

EINSTEIN INSTITUTE OF MATHEMATICS, EDMOND J. SAFRA CAMPUS, GIVAAT RAM THE
HEBREW UNIVERSITY OF JERUSALEM, JERUSALEM, 91904, ISRAEL
E-mail address: david.kazhdan@mail.huji.ac.il

EINSTEIN INSTITUTE OF MATHEMATICS, EDMOND J. SAFRA CAMPUS, GIVAAT RAM THE
HEBREW UNIVERSITY OF JERUSALEM, JERUSALEM, 91904, ISRAEL
E-mail address: tamarz@math.huji.ac.il