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It was known to the ancient Greeks that sums of two squares satisfy the composition law

$$
\left(x_{1}^{2}+x_{2}^{2}\right)\left(y_{1}^{2}+y_{2}^{2}\right)=z_{1}^{2}+z_{2}^{2}
$$

with

$$
z_{1}=x_{1} y_{1}+x_{2} y_{2}, z_{2}=x_{1} y_{2}-x_{2} y_{1},
$$

and to Euler in 1770 that sums of four squares satisfy the composition law

$$
\left(x_{1}^{2}+x_{2}^{2}+x_{3}^{2}+x_{4}^{2}\right)\left(y_{1}^{2}+y_{2}^{2}+y_{3}^{2}+y_{4}^{2}\right)=z_{1}^{2}+z_{2}^{2}+z_{3}^{2}+z_{4}^{2}
$$

with

$$
\begin{aligned}
& z_{1}=x_{1} y_{1}+x_{2} y_{2}+x_{3} y_{3}+x_{4} y_{4}, z_{2}=x_{1} y_{2}-x_{2} y_{1}+x_{3} y_{4}-x_{4} y_{3} . \\
& z_{3}=x_{1} y_{3}-x_{2} y_{4}-x_{3} y_{1}+x_{4} y_{2}, z_{4}=x_{1} y_{4}+x_{2} y_{3}-x_{3} y_{2}-x_{4} y_{1} .
\end{aligned}
$$

Degen in 1822 and Cayley in 1845 gave the corresponding identity for eight squares, see for example [ 6, p. 2]. Sums of three squares however cannot possess an analogous composition law as $3=1^{2}+1^{2}+1^{2}, 5=0^{2}+1^{2}+2^{2}$ but $15=3 \cdot 5 \neq x^{2}+y^{2}+z^{2}$ for integers $x, y, z$. Hurwitz proved in 1898 that there is an identity of the type

$$
\left(x_{1}^{2}+\cdots+x_{n}^{2}\right)\left(y_{1}^{2}+\cdots+y_{n}^{2}\right)=z_{1}^{2}+\cdots+z_{n}^{2},
$$

where the $z_{k}$ are bilinear functions of the $x_{i}$ and $y_{i}$, if and only if $n=1,2,4,8$. Dickson [2] gave a detailed, amplified form of Hurwitz's proof in four pages. Rajwade [6] gave an amplified version of Dickson's proof in six pages. A proof using normed algebras is given in [1]. For more on such laws see for example [6].

As $2=1^{2}+1^{2}+2 \cdot 0^{2}, 7=1^{2}+2^{2}+2 \cdot 1^{2}$, and $14=2 \cdot 7 \neq x^{2}+y^{2}+2 z^{2}$ for integers $x, y, z$ there cannot exist a composition law of the type

$$
\left(x_{1}^{2}+x_{2}^{2}+2 x_{3}^{2}\right)\left(y_{1}^{2}+y_{2}^{2}+2 y_{3}^{2}\right)=z_{1}^{2}+z_{2}^{2}+2 z_{3}^{2}
$$

with $z_{1}, z_{2}, z_{3}$ bilinear functions of $x_{1}, x_{2}, x_{3}$ and $y_{1}, y_{2}, y_{3}$ with integer coefficients. However every odd positive integer can always be expressed in the form $x^{2}+y^{2}+2 z^{2}$ for some integers $x, y, z$, see for example [3, Theorem 86, p. 96], [4], [5, Theorem 1].

[^0]Moreover one of $x$ and $y$ is odd and one is even. Thus every positive odd integer is of the form

$$
\left(2 x_{1}+1\right)^{2}+2 x_{2}^{2}+4 x_{3}^{2}
$$

for some integers $x_{1}, x_{2}, x_{3}$. Let $m$ and $n$ be odd positive integers. Then $m n$ is also an odd positive integer and there exist integers $x_{1}, x_{2}, x_{3}, y_{1}, y_{2}, y_{3}, z_{1}, z_{2}$ and $z_{3}$ such that

$$
\begin{aligned}
m & =\left(2 x_{1}+1\right)^{2}+2 x_{2}^{2}+4 x_{3}^{2}, \\
n & =\left(2 y_{1}+1\right)^{2}+2 y_{2}^{2}+4 y_{3}^{2}, \\
m n & =\left(2 z_{1}+1\right)^{2}+2 z_{2}^{2}+4 z_{3}^{2} .
\end{aligned}
$$

Hence

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \left(\left(2 x_{1}+1\right)^{2}+2 x_{2}^{2}+4 x_{3}^{2}\right)\left(\left(2 y_{1}+1\right)^{2}+2 y_{2}^{2}+4 y_{3}^{2}\right) \\
& \quad=\left(2 z_{1}+1\right)^{2}+2 z_{2}^{2}+4 z_{3}^{2} .
\end{aligned}
$$

The question naturally arises: Is this equality a consequence of some underlying composition law for the polynomial $\left(2 x_{1}+1\right)^{2}+2 x_{2}^{2}+4 x_{3}^{2}$ ? In fact it is not, as can be deduced from Hurwitz's theorem. We show this directly from first principles without recourse to Hurwitz's theorem.

Suppose that there exist integers

$$
a_{1}, a_{2}, \ldots, a_{16}, b_{1}, b_{2}, \ldots, b_{16}, c_{1}, c_{2}, \ldots, c_{16}
$$

such that

$$
\begin{align*}
& \left(\left(2 x_{1}+1\right)^{2}+2 x_{2}^{2}+4 x_{3}^{2}\right)\left(\left(2 y_{1}+1\right)^{2}+2 y_{2}^{2}+4 y_{3}^{2}\right)  \tag{I}\\
& \quad=\left(2 z_{1}+1\right)^{2}+2 z_{2}^{2}+4 z_{3}^{2}
\end{align*}
$$

is an identity in $\mathbb{Z}\left[x_{1}, x_{2}, x_{3}, y_{1}, y_{2}, y_{3}\right]$ with

$$
\begin{align*}
z_{1}= & a_{1} x_{1} y_{1}+a_{2} x_{1} y_{2}+a_{3} x_{1} y_{3}+a_{4} x_{2} y_{1}+a_{5} x_{2} y_{2}+a_{6} x_{2} y_{3}  \tag{2}\\
& +a_{7} x_{3} y_{1}+a_{8} x_{3} y_{2}+a_{9} x_{3} y_{3}+a_{10} x_{1}+a_{11} x_{2}+a_{12} x_{3} \\
& +a_{13} y_{1}+a_{14} y_{2}+a_{15} y_{3}+a_{16}, \\
z_{2}= & b_{1} x_{1} y_{1}+b_{2} x_{1} y_{2}+b_{3} x_{1} y_{3}+b_{4} x_{2} y_{1}+b_{5} x_{2} y_{2}+b_{6} x_{2} y_{3}  \tag{3}\\
& +b_{7} x_{3} y_{1}+b_{8} x_{3} y_{2}+b_{9} x_{3} y_{3}+b_{10} x_{1}+b_{11} x_{2}+b_{12} x_{3} \\
& +b_{13} y_{1}+b_{14} y_{2}+b_{15} y_{3}+b_{16}, \\
z_{3}= & c_{1} x_{1} y_{1}+c_{2} x_{1} y_{2}+c_{3} x_{1} y_{3}+c_{4} x_{2} y_{1}+c_{5} x_{2} y_{2}+c_{6} x_{2} y_{3}  \tag{4}\\
& +c_{7} x_{3} y_{1}+c_{8} x_{3} y_{2}+c_{9} x_{3} y_{3}+c_{10} x_{1}+c_{11} x_{2}+c_{12} x_{3} \\
& +c_{13} y_{1}+c_{14} y_{2}+c_{15} y_{3}+c_{16} .
\end{align*}
$$

We equate the coefficients of $y_{3}^{2}, y_{3}, x_{2} y_{3}^{2}, x_{2}^{2}, x_{2}^{2} y_{3}$, and $x_{2}^{2} y_{3}^{2}$ in (1) (with $z_{1}, z_{2}, z_{3}$ given by (2), (3), (4) respectively) to obtain the required contradiction. We have

$$
\left[y_{3}^{2}\right] 4 a_{15}^{2}+2 b_{15}^{2}+4 c_{15}^{2}=4
$$

so

$$
\begin{equation*}
b_{15}=0,\left(a_{15}, c_{15}\right)=( \pm 1,0) \text { or }(0, \pm 1) ; \tag{5}
\end{equation*}
$$

$\left[y_{3}\right] 4 a_{15}\left(2 a_{16}+1\right)+4 b_{15} b_{16}+8 c_{15} c_{16}=0$
so by (5) and division by 4 we have

$$
a_{15}\left(2 a_{16}+1\right)+2 c_{15} c_{16}=0
$$

which forces $a_{15}$ to be even and thus, by (5) again

$$
\begin{align*}
a_{15} & =0, c_{15}= \pm 1  \tag{6}\\
{\left[x_{2} y_{3}^{2}\right] 8 a_{6} a_{15}+4 b_{6} b_{15}+8 c_{6} c_{15} } & =0
\end{align*}
$$

so by (5) and (6)

$$
\begin{equation*}
c_{6}=0 \tag{7}
\end{equation*}
$$

$$
\left[x_{2}^{2}\right] 4 a_{11}^{2}+2 b_{11}^{2}+4 c_{11}^{2}=2
$$

so

$$
\begin{gathered}
a_{11}=c_{11}=0, b_{11}= \pm 1 \\
{\left[x_{2}^{2} y_{3}\right] 8 a_{8} a_{11}+4 b_{6} b_{11}+8 c_{6} c_{11}=0}
\end{gathered}
$$

so by (8)

$$
\begin{equation*}
b_{0}=0 \tag{9}
\end{equation*}
$$

Finally we consider the coefficient of $x_{2}^{2} y_{3}^{2}$ in (1). We have

$$
4 a_{6}^{2}+2 b_{6}^{2}+4 c_{6}^{2}=8
$$

Appealing to (7) and (9) we obtain the required contradiction $a_{6}^{2}=2$.
Panaitopol [5] has shown that the only diagonal ternary quadratic forms $a x^{2}+$ $b y^{2}+c z^{2}(1 \leq a \leq b \leq c)$, which represent every odd positive integer are the forms $x^{2}+y^{2}+2 z^{2}, x^{2}+2 y^{2}+3 z^{2}$, and $x^{2}+2 y^{2}+4 z^{2}$. Our proof shows that the representability of odd integers by $x^{2}+y^{2}+2 z^{2}$ and $x^{2}+2 y^{2}+4 z^{2}$ does not arise from an underlying composition law. We leave it to the reader to show also that $x^{2}+2 y^{2}+3 z^{2}$ does not possess such a composition law.
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