

JOURNAL OF NUMBER THEORY 8, 280-281 (1976)

On the Integer Points on Some Special Hyper-elliptic Curves over a Finite Field

P. CHOWLA AND S. CHOWLA

*Department of Mathematics, The Pennsylvania State University,
University Park, Pennsylvania 16802*

Communicated by S. Chowla

Received July 9, 1973

If $\ell_r(p)$ is the least positive integral value of x for which $y^2 \equiv x(x+1) \cdots (x+r-1) \pmod{p}$ has a solution, we conjecture that $\ell_r(p) \leq r^2 - r + 1$ with equality for infinitely many primes p . A proof is sketched for $r = 5$. A further generalization to $y^2 \equiv (x+a_1) \cdots (x+a_r) \pmod{p}$ is suggested, where the a 's are fixed positive integers.

1

Consider the equation

$$y^2 \equiv x(x+1)(x+2) \cdots (x+r-1) \pmod{p} \quad (1)$$

where, on the right, we have a product of r consecutive factors.

We conjecture that when the prime p exceeds a certain limit depending on r alone, (1) always has a solution with

$$1 \leq x \leq B(r),$$

where $B(r)$ depends on r alone and is independent of the prime p .

Moreover, we conjecture that when r is a prime, we may take

$$B(r) = r^2 - r + 1,$$

and that this bound cannot be improved. This means that when r is a prime there exist primes p for which (1) has no solution for $1 \leq x < r^2 - r + 1$ but has a solution for $x = r^2 - r + 1$.

We illustrate the conjecture with a proof for $r = 5$. We wish to show that the congruence

$$y^2 \equiv x(x+1) \cdots (x+4) \pmod{p} \quad (2)$$

always has a solution with $1 \leq x \leq 5^2 - 5 + 1$ for all primes $p > 27$.

280

Consider first the case when all the numbers from 1 to 4 are quadratic residues (*R*, for short), while 5 is a quadratic nonresidue (*N*, for short)

The following scheme or "pattern" is self-evident:

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
<i>R</i>	<i>R</i>	<i>R</i>	<i>R</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>R</i>	<i>R</i>	<i>R</i>	<i>R</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>R</i>	<i>R</i>		
13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26
<i>R</i>	<i>R</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>R</i>	<i>R</i>	<i>R</i>	<i>R</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>R</i>	<i>R</i>	<i>R</i>	<i>R</i>	<i>R</i>	<i>R</i>

Thus (2) has a solution $x = 21$, but has no solution for $1 \leq x \leq 20$. Explanation: We put *R* below 7 because if 7 were an *N*, (2) would already be solved with $x = 3$.

Similarly 11, 13, 17, 19, 23, are *R*'s. It is clear from Dirichlet's theorem that there exists a prime p with the above pattern of *R*'s and *N*'s. For example our prime p can be chosen to be $\equiv 2 \pmod{5}$ for then $(5/p) = (p/5) = (2/5) = -1$. Similarly we can take $p \equiv 9(28)$ for then

$$(7/p) = (p/7) = (9/7) = +1.$$

Since the several congruence conditions imposed on the prime p are easily seen to be compatible, Dirichlet's theorem shows the existence of primes p with the pattern of *R*'s and *N*'s in our example. We consider one more pattern.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
<i>R</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>R</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>R</i>	<i>R</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>R</i>

Thus if 2 and 3 are *N*'s, $x = 5$ solves Eq. (2) (if 5 is an *R*, then $x = 1$, already, will do).

The remaining patterns for $r = 5$ are left as an exercise for the reader.

2

Let a_1, a_2, \dots, a_r be fixed positive integer. We conjecture that the congruence $y^2 \equiv (x + a_1) \cdots (x + a_r) \pmod{p}$ always has a solution with $1 \leq x \leq B(r)$ for all primes $p > C(r)$. Here $B(r)$ and $C(r)$ depend only on the a 's and r , not on p .

Note added in proof (May 18, 1976). The first conjecture is easily proved; the second, if true, may be hard to prove. There is a vast related literature, which will be the subject of another note.