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Abstract. In this paper, we find a formula for the number of \( r \)-walks on NEPS of arbitrary graphs in any basis. We apply this formula to find the number of elements of a commutative ring that can be represented as a sum of \( r \) units. We then also obtain the number of solutions \((x_i)_{i=1}^r\) with \( x_i \neq 0 \) to the diagonal equation \( x_1^k + \cdots + x_r^k = b \) over a finite field \( \mathbb{F}_{p^m} \), obtaining an identity for generalized Jacobi sums.

1. Introduction

Given a set \( B \subseteq \{0, 1\}^n \) and graphs \( G_1, \ldots, G_n \), the NEPS (non-complete extended psu) of these graphs with respect to the basis \( B \) is the graph \( G = \text{NEPS}(G_1, \ldots, G_n; B) \), whose vertex set is the cartesian product of the vertex sets of the individual graphs, \( V(G) = V(G_1) \times \cdots \times V(G_n) \) and two vertices \((x_1, \ldots, x_n), (y_1, \ldots, y_n) \in V(G)\) are adjacent in \( G \), if and only if there exists some \( n \)-tuple \((\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_n) \in B\) such that \( x_i = y_i \), whenever \( \alpha_i = 0 \), or \( x_i, y_i \) are distinct and adjacent in \( G_i \), whenever \( \alpha_i = 1 \).

The NEPS operation generalizes a number of known graph products, all of which have in common that the vertex set of the resulting graph is the cartesian product of the input vertex sets. For instance, \( \text{NEPS}(G_1, \ldots, G_n; \{(1, \ldots, 1)\}) = G_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes G_n \) is the Kronecker product of the \( G_i \)'s; \( \text{NEPS}(G_1, \ldots, G_n; \{e_1, \ldots, e_n\}) = G_1 + \cdots + G_n \) (where \( e_i \) is the vector which only 1 in the position \( i \)) is the sum of the graphs \( G_i \); \( \text{NEPS}(G_1, G_2; \{(1, 1), (1, 0), (0, 1)\}) = G_1 \boxtimes G_2 \) is the strong product of \( G_1, G_2 \). We refer to \([5]\) or \([6]\) for the history of the notion of NEPS.

Outline and results. The main goal of this paper is to find a closed formula for the number of walks in NEPS of complete graphs. This is useful because there are some very well-known families of graphs which are NEPS. We focus on the family of unitary Cayley graphs over abelian rings and generalized Paley graphs, because the number of walks in these cases give information of two different kind of problems: the first case is related to the representation of an element of a ring as a sum of units of the ring, and the second one is related to the number of solution of diagonal equation over finite fields.

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we give some basic definitions and find a closed formula for the number of \( r \)-walks in NEPS in terms of the number of walks of its factors by using essentially the properties of Kronecker products of matrices.
and well-known facts about the power of matrices and the number of walks between two vertices.

In Section 3 we apply this formula to some special cases. On the first hand we apply this formula for the Kronecker product of complete graphs which correspond to the NEPS($K_{n_1}, \ldots, K_{n_r}; \{(1, \ldots, 1)\}$) and by using the fact that every unitary Cayley graphs in commutative rings without nilpotent elements can be constructed in this way (see [4]) we derive a formula for the number of representation of an element of the given ring as a $r$-sum of units in the ring. On the other hand, we apply this formula for the case of the cartesian product of the same complete graph which is NEPS($K_n, \ldots, K_n; B$) with $B$ the canonical basis. In this case, this graph the well-known Hamming graph. In [7], the authors characterize those generalized Paley graphs which are Hamming graph. Using this, we find the $r$-walks between two vertices in generalized Paley graphs. This allows us to find a relation between generalized Jacobi sums and other kind of combinatorial sums since every $r$-walk between the vertix $0$ and $\alpha$ in the generalized Paley graph is the same to having a solution $(x_1, \ldots, x_r) \in (\mathbb{F}^*_{p^n})^r$ of the diagonal equation $x_1^k + \cdots + x_r^k = \alpha$.

2. Number of walks in NEPS

Given a graph $G$ and $v_i, v_j$ vertices of $G$, we denote by $w_G(r, v_i, v_j)$ the number of walks of length $r$ from $v_i$ to $v_j$ in $G$. By convention, $w_G(0, v_i, v_j) = 0$ or $1$ if $v_i \neq v_j$ or $v_i = v_j$, respectively. It is well-known that if $A(G)$ is the adjacency matrix of a graph $G$, then

$$w_G(r, v_i, v_j) = (A(G)^r)_{i,j}$$

labeling the vertices in an appropriate way.

The adjacency matrix of NEPS($G_1, \ldots, G_n; B$) can be calculated in terms of the adjacency matrices of the graphs $G_1, \ldots, G_n$. More precisely, if $G = \text{NEPS}(G_1, \ldots, G_n; B)$ and the graphs $G_1, \ldots, G_n$ have adjacency matrices $A_1, \ldots, A_n$, then the adjacency matrix of $G$ is given by

$$A = \sum_{\alpha \in B} A_1^{\alpha_1} \otimes \cdots \otimes A_n^{\alpha_n},$$

where $\otimes$ denotes the Kronecker matrix product and $\alpha = (\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_n)$ (see [5]).

**Theorem 2.1.** If $G = \text{NEPS}(G_1, \ldots, G_n; B)$ and if $v_i, v_j \in V(G)$ then

$$w_G(r, v_i, v_j) = \sum_{(\beta_1, \ldots, \beta_r) \in B^r} \prod_{t=1}^n w_{G_t}(\beta_{1t} + \cdots + \beta_{rt}, \pi_t(v_i), \pi_t(v_j)),$$

where $\pi_t$ denotes the projection of $V(G)$ in $V(G_t)$ and $\beta_\ell = (\beta_{1\ell}, \beta_{2\ell}, \ldots, \beta_{n\ell}) \in B$ for all $\ell = 1, \ldots, r$.

**Proof.** Recall that the Kronecker product has the property

$$(A \otimes B)(C \otimes D) = AC \otimes BD.$$

Thus, by (2.2) if $A, A_1, \ldots, A_n$ are the adjacency matrices of $G, G_1, \ldots, G_n$, respectively, then

$$A^r = \left(\sum_{\alpha \in B} A_1^{\alpha_1} \otimes \cdots \otimes A_n^{\alpha_n}\right)^r = \sum_{(\beta_1, \ldots, \beta_r) \in B^r} A_1^{\beta_{11} + \cdots + \beta_{1r}} \otimes \cdots \otimes A_n^{\beta_{n1} + \cdots + \beta_{nr}},$$
where \( \beta_t = (\beta_{t1}, \beta_{t2}, \ldots, \beta_{tn}) \in \mathcal{B} \) for all \( t = 1, \ldots, r \) and thus
\[
(2.4) \quad (A^r)_{ij} = \sum_{(\beta_1, \ldots, \beta_r) \in \mathcal{B}^r} (A_1^{\beta_{t1} + \cdots + \beta_{t1}} \otimes \cdots \otimes A_n^{\beta_{tn} + \cdots + \beta_{tn}})_{ij}.
\]
Taking into account that \( A \) is constructed with the lexicographic order for the vertices of \( G \) which represent the ordered \( n \)-tuples of vertices of \( G_1, \ldots, G_n \) (see [5]). Denote by \( o_t(i) \) the label of \( \pi_t(v_i) \) in \( G_t \) for \( t = 1, \ldots, n \). By definition of Kronecker product we have
\[
(A_1^{\beta_{t1} + \cdots + \beta_{t1}} \otimes \cdots \otimes A_n^{\beta_{tn} + \cdots + \beta_{tn}})_{ij} = \prod_{t=1}^n (A_t^{\beta_{t1} + \cdots + \beta_{t1}})_{o_t(i), o_t(j)}
\]
and, by (2.1)
\[
(A_t^{\beta_{t1} + \cdots + \beta_{rt}})_{o_t(i), o_t(j)} = w_{G_t}(\beta_{1t} + \cdots + \beta_{rt}, \pi_t(v_i), \pi_t(v_j)).
\]
Therefore, by (2.1) and (2.4), we obtain the desired formula.

As a consequence we obtain a formula for the number of walks in NEPS of complete graphs.

**Corollary 2.2.** Let \( G = \text{NEPS}(K_{m_1}, \ldots, K_{m_n}; \mathcal{B}) \). If \( v_i, v_j \in V(G) \) then
\[
(2.5) \quad w_G(r, v_i, v_j) = \sum_{(\beta_1, \ldots, \beta_r) \in \mathcal{B}^r} \prod_{t=1}^n a_t(v_i, v_j),
\]
where
\[
\begin{align*}
 a_t(v_i, v_j) = \frac{m_t-1}{m_t}((m_t-1)^{\beta_{1t} + \cdots + \beta_{rt}} - (-1)^{\beta_{1t} + \cdots + \beta_{rt}}), & \quad \text{if } \pi_t(v_i) = \pi_t(v_j), \\
\frac{1}{m_t}((m_t-1)^{\beta_{1t} + \cdots + \beta_{rt}} - (-1)^{\beta_{1t} + \cdots + \beta_{rt}}), & \quad \text{if } \pi_t(v_i) \neq \pi_t(v_j).
\end{align*}
\]
**Proof.** It is enough to find \( w_{K_m}(r, w_i, w_j) \), where \( K_m \) is the complete graph with \( m \) vertices. It is well known that
\[
w_{K_m}(r, w_i, w_j) = \begin{cases} \frac{m}{m}((m-1)^{r-1} - (-1)^{r-1}), & \text{if } w_i = w_j, \\ \frac{1}{m}((m-1)^r - (-1)^r), & \text{if } w_i \neq w_j. \end{cases}
\]
Thus, the result follows from Theorem 2.1.

**Example 2.3.** Let \( K_3 \) and \( K_4 \) be the complete graphs of 3 and 4 vertices respectively and let \( G_1 = \text{NEPS}(K_3 \times K_4; \mathcal{B}_1) \) and \( G_2 = \text{NEPS}(K_3 \times K_4; \mathcal{B}_2) \) with \( \mathcal{B}_1 = \{(1, 1)\} \) and \( \mathcal{B}_2 = \{(1, 0), (0, 1)\} \).

Clearly, \( \mathcal{B}_1^r \) contains the element \( \beta = (\beta_1, \ldots, \beta_r) \) such that \( \beta_i = \beta_j = (1, 1) \) for all \( i, j \in \{1, \ldots, r\} \), i.e. we have that \( \beta_{1t} + \cdots + \beta_{rt} = r \) for \( t = 1, 2 \). On the other hand, \( \mathcal{B}_2^r \) contains all the elements \( \beta = (\beta_1, \ldots, \beta_r) \) such that \( \beta_{1t} + \cdots + \beta_{rt} = \ell_t \) for \( t = 1, 2 \) and \( \ell_t \)'s satisfying \( \ell_1 + \ell_2 = r \). By Corollary 2.2 we have that
\[
w_{G_1}(r, v, v) = \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)(2^r-1)(3^{r-1}) = \frac{6^{r-1}+(-1)^r(2^{r-1}+3^{r-1})+1}{2},
\]
\[
w_{G_2}(r, v, v) = \sum_{\ell=0}^r \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)(2^\ell-1)(3^{\ell-1}) = \frac{6^{r-\ell-1}+(-1)^\ell(2^{r-\ell-1}+3^{r-\ell-1})+1}{2}
\]
for any vertex \( v \in V(G) \).
3. Kronecker product and sums of units

There are a lot of graphs that can be constructed by the NEPS of complete graphs. For instance, every unitary Cayley graph and every integral circulant graph is a NEPS of some $K_{m,n}$. Even more, the class of all graphs that can be formed from some $K_{m,n}$ by means of a NEPS operation is a nicely structured subclass of integral Cayley graphs (not necessarily circulant). In [8], the authors showed that the class of $gcd$-graphs are NEPS of complete graphs and reciprocally, all NEPS of complete graphs is a $gcd$-graph.

If $G$ is the NEPS with basis $B = \{(1, \ldots, 1)\}$ of $G_1, \ldots, G_n$, then $G = G_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes G_n$ is the Kronecker product of the $G_i$’s. By Theorem 2.1 we have that

$$w_G(r, v_i, v_j) = \prod_{t=1}^{n} w_{G_t}(r, \pi_t(v_i), \pi_t(v_j)),$$

where $\pi_t$ denote the projection of $V(G)$ on $V(G_t)$.

Given $R$ a commutative ring with 1, the unitary Cayley graph $G_R = Cay(R, R^*)$ is the graph with vertex set $R$ and where two elements $x, y$ in $R$ are neighbors in $G_R$ if and only if $x - y$ is an unit of $R$. Since $R$ is a commutative ring, $R = R_1 \times \cdots \times R_n$ is a product of local rings $R_i$ with $|R_i| = p_i^{r_i}$, moreover $R^* = R_1^* \times \cdots \times R_n^*$ (see [2]). If $R$ is reduced, i.e. without nilpotent elements, the rings $R_i$ are finite fields for all $t = 1, \ldots, n$, thus $G_R$ is the Kronecker product of the complete graphs $K_{p_i^{r_t}}$ for $t = 1, \ldots, n$ (see [1]). In this case, by Theorem 2.1 we obtain that

$$w_{G_R}(r, v_i, v_j) = \prod_{t=1}^{n} a_t(v_i, v_j),$$

where

$$a_t(v_i, v_j) = \begin{cases} \frac{p_i^{r_t}-1}{p_i^{r_t}}((p_i^{r_t}-1)^{r_t-1} - (-1)^{r_t-1}) & \text{if } \pi_t(v_i) = \pi_t(v_j), \\ \frac{1}{p_t^{r_t}}((p_t^{r_t}-1)^{r_t} - (-1)^{r_t}) & \text{if } \pi_t(v_i) \neq \pi_t(v_j). \end{cases}$$

In the case of $R$ is not reduced, we can take the reduced ring $R_{red} = R/N$, where $N$ is the nilradical of $R$ (the set of nilpotents elements of $R$). The authors in [1] show that, if $R$ is a finite commutative ring, then $G_{R_{red}} simeq (G_R)_{red}$. In general, if $\Gamma$ is a given graph, $\Gamma_{red}$ denotes the graph having as vertex set the equivalence classes of the relation

$$x \sim y \iff N(x) = N(y)$$

where $N(x)$ denotes the number of neighbors of $x$ and $[x] \cap [y]$ induces a complete bipartite graph in $\Gamma$. The graph $\Gamma_{red}$ is called the reduced graph of $\Gamma$. By proceeding in the same way as in the case of $\mathbb{Z}_n$ (see [4]), we obtain that

$$w_{G_R}(r, v_i, v_j) = \frac{|S|}{|X|} w_{G_{R_{red}}}(r, p(v_i), p(v_j))$$

where $p : R \to R_{red}$ is the quotient map.

Notice that if $a, b \in R$, then a $r$-walk from $a$ to $b$ in $G_{R}$ gives $x_1, \ldots, x_r \in R^*$ such that

$$a + x_1 + \cdots + x_r = b.$$

Reciprocally, any solution $(x_1, \ldots, x_r)$ of (3.2) with $x_1, \ldots, x_r \in R^*$ defines a $r$-walk from $a$ to $b$. Thus,

$$w_{G_R}(r, a, b) = \#\{(x_1, \ldots, x_r) \in (R^*)^r : a + x_1 + \cdots + x_r = b\}.$$
Therefore, we have obtained a formula for the representation of any element of $R$ as an ordered sum of $r$ units of $R$.

4. GP-graphs and diagonal equation over finite fields

Let $\mathcal{B} = \{e_1, \ldots, e_n\}$, where $e_i$ is the $n$-tuple with $1$ in the position $i$ and zeros in the remaining positions. If $G$ is the NEPS of the graphs $G_1, \ldots, G_n$ with basis $\mathcal{B}$, then $G = G_1 + \cdots + G_n$ is the sum of $G_t$ (cartesian product of graph). In this case we have the following result.

**Proposition 4.1.** Let $G = G_1 + \cdots + G_n$. Then, we have that

$$w_G(r, v_i, v_j) = \sum_{r_1 + \cdots + r_n = r} \frac{r!}{r_1! \cdots r_n!} \prod_{t=1}^{n} w_{G_t}(r_t, \pi_t(v_i), \pi_t(v_j)),$$

where $\pi_t$ denote the projection of $V(G)$ over $V(G_t)$.

**Proof.** Let $r$ be a non-negative integer. By Theorem 2.1 we have that

(4.1) $$w_G(r, v_i, v_j) = \sum_{(\beta_1, \ldots, \beta_r) \in \mathcal{B}^r} \prod_{t=1}^{n} w_{G_t}(\beta_{t+1}, \pi_t(v_i), \pi_t(v_j)),$$

where $\mathcal{B} = \{e_1, \ldots, e_n\}$. Notice that if $(\beta_1, \ldots, \beta_r) \in \mathcal{B}^r$, then

$$\beta_1 + \cdots + \beta_r = (r_1, r_2, \ldots, r_n) \in (\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0})^n \quad \text{with} \quad r_1 + r_2 + \cdots + r_n = r.$$ 

Moreover, there exist a number $\frac{r!}{r_1! \cdots r_n!}$ of $r$-tuples $(\beta_1, \ldots, \beta_r)$’s with $\beta_1 + \cdots + \beta_r = (r_1, r_2, \ldots, r_n)$. Therefore we set (4.1) as we wanted. \hfill \Box

Recall that the Hamming graph $H(n, q)$ is the graph with vertex set all the $n$-tuples with entries from a set $\Delta$ of size $q$, and two $n$-tuples are neighbors if and only if they differ in exactly one entry. It is known that $H(n, q)$ is the $n$-sum of the complete graph $K_q$. Therefore, we have that

(4.2) $$w_{H(n, q)}(r, v_i, v_j) = \sum_{r_1 + \cdots + r_n = r} \frac{r!}{r_1! \cdots r_n!} \prod_{t=1}^{n} a_t(v_i, v_j),$$

where $r_t \geq 0$ for all $t = 1, \ldots, n$ and

(4.3) $$a_t(v_i, v_j) = \begin{cases} \frac{q-1}{q}((q-1)^{r_t-1} - (-1)^{r_t-1}) & \text{if } \pi_t(v_i) = \pi_t(v_j), \\ \frac{1}{q}((q-1)^{r_t} - (-1)^{r_t}) & \text{if } \pi_t(v_i) \neq \pi_t(v_j). \end{cases}$$

Let $p$ be a prime and let $m, k$ be positive integers such that $k \mid p^m - 1$. The generalized Paley graph is the Cayley graph

(4.4) $$\Gamma(k, p^m) = \text{Cay}(\mathbb{F}_{p^m}, R_k) \quad \text{where} \quad R_k = \{x^k : x \in \mathbb{F}_{p^m}^\ast\},$$

i.e. $\Gamma(k, p^m)$ is the graph with set of vertex $\mathbb{F}_{p^m}$ and two vertices $x, y \in \mathbb{F}_{p^m}$ are neighbors if and only if the difference $y - x \in R_k$. In general $\Gamma(k, p^m)$ is a directed graph, but if $R_k$ is symmetric ($R_k = -R_k$), then $\Gamma(k, p^m)$ is a simple graph.

Notice that if $\omega$ is a primitive element of $\mathbb{F}_{p^m}$, then $R_k = \langle \omega^k \rangle$, this implies that $\Gamma(k, p^m)$ is a $(\frac{p^m-1}{k})$-regular graph.
We assume that \( u = \frac{p^m - 1}{k} \) is a primitive divisor of \( p^m - 1 \) (i.e. \( u \) does not divide \( p^h - 1 \) for any \( h < m \)) and \( u \) even if \( p \) is odd. The first condition is equivalent to \( \Gamma(k, p^m) \) being a connected graph and the second one is equivalent to \( \Gamma(k, p^m) \) being a simple graph if \( p \) is odd. Notice that if \( p = 2 \) then \( \Gamma(k, p^m) \) is a simple graph (without using this condition).

In [7], the authors characterized all generalized Paley graphs which are Hamming graphs. More precisely, they showed that \( \Gamma(k, p^m) \) is a Hamming graph if and only if \( u = b(p^a - 1) \) for some divisor \( b > 1 \) such that \( m = ab \).

Also if \( \omega \) is a primitive element of \( \mathbb{F}_{p^m} \), then the set \( \{1, \omega^k, \omega^{2k}, \ldots, \omega^{(b-1)k}\} \) is a basis of \( \mathbb{F}_{p^m} \) as \( \mathbb{F}_{p^a} \)-vector space, then

\[
x = \sum_{i=0}^{b-1} c_i \omega^{ik} \mapsto [x] = (c_0, c_1, \ldots, c_{b-1}) \in (\mathbb{F}_{p^a})^b
\]

and hence we have the isomorphism (see [7])

\[
(4.5) \quad \Gamma(k, p^m) \cong H(b, p^a).
\]

In this case, we have the following result.

**Proposition 4.2.** Let \( p \) be a prime and let \( m, k \) be positive integers such that \( k \mid p^m - 1 \) and \( 2k \mid p^m - 1 \) if \( p \) is odd. If \( u = \frac{p^m - 1}{k} = b(p^a - 1) \) with \( b > 1 \) and \( m = ab \), then

\[
(4.6) \quad w_{\Gamma(k, p^m)}(r, x, y) = w_{H(b, p^a)}(r, [x], [y]) = \sum_{r_1 + \cdots + r_b = r} \frac{r!}{r_1! \cdots r_b!} \prod_{i=1}^{b} a_i(x, y),
\]

where \( r_i \geq 0 \) for all \( i = 1, \ldots, b \) and

\[a_i(x, y) = \begin{cases} \frac{p^a - 1}{p^a}((p^a - 1)^{r_i} - (-1)^{r_i - 1}) & \text{if } [x]_i = [y]_i, \\ \frac{1}{p^a}((p^a - 1)^{r_i} - (-1)^{r_i}) & \text{if } [x]_i \neq [y]_i, \end{cases}\]

where \([x]_i\) denotes the \( i \)-th coordinate of the vector \([x] \in (\mathbb{F}_{p^a})^b\), respect to the \( \mathbb{F}_{p^a} \)-base \( \{1, \omega^k, \omega^{2k}, \ldots, \omega^{(b-1)k}\} \).

As a direct consequence we obtain the following.

**Corollary 4.3.** Under the same hypothesis as before, the number \( N \) of solutions \((x_1, \ldots, x_r)\) in \((\mathbb{F}_{p^m}^*)^r\) to the diagonal equation \( x_1^k + \cdots + x_r^k = \alpha \) satisfies

\[
(4.7) \quad N = \sum_{r_1 + \cdots + r_b = r} \frac{r!}{r_1! \cdots r_b!} \prod_{i=1}^{b} a_i(\alpha),
\]

where \( r_i \geq 0 \) for all \( i = 1, \ldots, b \) and

\[a_i(\alpha) = \begin{cases} \frac{p^a - 1}{p^a}((p^a - 1)^{r_i} - (-1)^{r_i - 1}) & \text{if } [\alpha]_i = 0, \\ \frac{1}{p^a}((p^a - 1)^{r_i} - (-1)^{r_i}) & \text{if } [\alpha]_i \neq 0. \end{cases}\]

**Proof.** If \( x, y \in \mathbb{F}_{p^m} \), then an \( r \)-walk from \( x \) to \( y \) in \( \Gamma(k, p^m) \) gives \( x_1, \ldots, x_r \in \mathbb{F}_{p^m}^* \) such that

\[
(4.8) \quad x + x_1^k + \cdots + x_r^k = y.
\]
Reciprocally, any solution \((x_1, \ldots, x_k)\) of (4.8) defines an \(r\)-walk from \(x\) to \(y\). Thus

\[
\omega_{(k,p^m)}(r, x, y) = \#\{(x_1, \ldots, x_k) \in (\mathbb{F}_{p^m})^r : x + x^k_1 + \cdots + x^k_r = y\},
\]

and by taking \(x = 0\) and \(y = \alpha\) we obtain (4.7).

\[\square\]

**Jacobi sums.** It is known that the number of solutions of diagonal equations over finite fields can be found by generalized Jacobi sums (see [3]). The last corollary allows us to find an identity between these Jacobi sums and the combinatorial sums related to the number of walks. If \(\chi_1, \ldots, \chi_r\) are multiplicative characters of \(\mathbb{F}_{p^m}\) \((r > 1)\), the generalized Jacobi sum is defined by

\[
J(\chi_1, \ldots, \chi_r) = \sum_{x_1 + \cdots + x_r = 1} \chi_1(x_1) \cdots \chi_r(x_r).
\]

**Theorem 4.4.** Let \(p\) be a prime and let \(m, k\) be positive integers such that \(k \mid p^m - 1\) and \(2k \mid p^m - 1\) if \(p\) is odd. If \(u = \frac{p^m - 1}{k} = b(p^a - 1)\) with \(b > 1\) and \(m = ab\), then

\[
\sum_{\ell=1}^{r} \sum_{r_1 + \cdots + r_\ell = \ell} \frac{r!}{r_1! \cdots r_\ell!} \prod_{i=1}^{b} \left( \frac{p^a - 1}{p^a} - \frac{1}{(p^a - 1)^{r_i-1} + (-1)^{r_i-1}} \right) = p^{m(r-1)} - (p^m - 1) \sum_{k_1, \ldots, k_r} J(\chi^{j_1}, \ldots, \chi^{j_r}),
\]

where \(\chi\) is a multiplicative character of \(\mathbb{F}_{p^m}\) of order \(k\) and \(0 \leq j_i \leq k - 1\) for all \(i = 1, \ldots, r\).

**Proof.** Let \(N\) be the number of solutions \((x_1, \ldots, x_r) \in (\mathbb{F}_{p^m})^r\) to the diagonal equation \(x^k_1 + \cdots + x^k_r = 0\). Notice that

\[
N = \sum_{\ell=1}^{r} \binom{r}{\ell} \omega_{(k,p^m)}(\ell, 0, 0),
\]

since \(\omega_{(k,p^m)}(\ell, 0, 0)\) is exactly the number of solutions \((x_1, \ldots, x_\ell) \in (\mathbb{F}_{p^m})^\ell\) to the equation \(x^k_1 + \cdots + x^k_\ell = 0\). On the other hand, from the theory of Jacobi sums, it is known that in general if \(M\) denotes the number of solutions \((x_1, \ldots, x_r) \in (\mathbb{F}_{p^m})^r\) to the diagonal equation

\[
\alpha_1 x^{k_1}_1 + \cdots + \alpha_r x^{k_r}_r = 0,
\]

where \(\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_r \in \mathbb{F}_{p^m}\) and \(k_1, \ldots, k_r\) are positive integers, then

\[
M = p^{m(r-1)} - (p^m - 1) \sum_{(j_1, \ldots, j_r) \in D} \prod_{i=1}^{r} \chi_i(\alpha_i) J(\chi^{j_1}_i, \ldots, \chi^{j_r}_i),
\]

where \(\chi_i\)'s are multiplicative characters of \(\mathbb{F}_{p^m}\) of order \(d_i = (k_i, p^m - 1)\) for \(i = 1, \ldots, r\) and \(D\) is the set

\[
D = \{(j_1, \ldots, j_r) \in \mathbb{Z}^r : 0 \leq j_i \leq d_i - 1, \chi^{j_1}_1 \cdots \chi^{j_r}_r \text{ is trivial}\}.
\]

In our case \(\alpha_i = 1, d_i = k_i = k\) and thus \(\chi_i = \chi\) is a character of order \(k\) for all \(i = 1, \ldots, r\). Notice that in this case we have \(\prod_{i=1}^{r} \chi_i(\alpha_i) = \chi^r(1) = 1\) and therefore

\[
N = p^{m(r-1)} - (p^m - 1) \sum_{k_1, \ldots, k_r} J(\chi^{j_1}, \ldots, \chi^{j_r}),
\]
where $\chi$ is a character of $\mathbb{F}_{p^m}$ of order $k$ and $0 \leq j_i \leq k - 1$. The identity follows from (4.9) and Corollary 4.3.
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