

Lecture 21: Mod p irreducibility criterion

Wednesday, May 23, 2018 10:52 AM

We were in the middle of proof of the following result:

Theorem. Suppose $f(x) \in \mathbb{Z}[X]$ is primitive, and p is prime.

Suppose $c_p(f)$ is irreducible in $\mathbb{Z}_p[X]$ and $\deg f = \deg c_p(f)$.

Then $f(x)$ is irreducible in $\mathbb{Q}[X]$.

Pf. Suppose to the contrary that $f(x)$ is not irred. in $\mathbb{Q}[X]$.

Since $c_p(f)$ is irred. in $\mathbb{Z}_p[X]$, $\deg c_p(f) \geq 1$. And so

$\deg f \geq 1$. Hence the contrary assumption implies $\exists g_1, g_2 \in \mathbb{Q}[X]$

s.t. $f(x) = g_1(x)g_2(x)$, and $\deg g_i \geq 1$. Then $\exists a_i \in \mathbb{Q} \setminus \{0\}$,

(1) $a_1 a_2 = 1$ (2) $\bar{g}_i(x) = a_i g_i(x)$ is primitive; and so

$f(x) = \bar{g}_1(x) \bar{g}_2(x)$. Hence $c_p(f) = c_p(\bar{g}_1) c_p(\bar{g}_2)$. (*)

Since $\deg f = \deg c_p(f)$ and $\deg \bar{g}_i \geq \deg c_p(\bar{g}_i)$,

we deduce that $\deg c_p(\bar{g}_i) = \deg \bar{g}_i \geq 1$; and so (*)

implies $c_p(f)$ is reducible in $\mathbb{Z}_p[X]$ which is a contradi. \blacksquare

Ex. (a) $X^4 + X + 1$ is irreducible in $\mathbb{Z}_2[X]$.

(b) $5X^4 + 2X^3 - 2018X^2 + 103X + 109$ is irred. in $\mathbb{Q}[X]$.

Lecture 21: Irreducibility criteria

Wednesday, May 23, 2018 11:08 AM

Solution. (a) $\begin{array}{r|l} x & x^4+x+1 \\ 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 \end{array}$ it has no zero in \mathbb{Z}_2 . So if it is

reducible it should have a factor of deg 2:

$\underbrace{x^2}$, $\underbrace{x^2+1}$, $\underbrace{x^2+x}$, $\underbrace{x^2+x+1}$
has a zero has a zero has a zero ↓
~~X~~ ~~X~~ ~~X~~ let's use long division:

$$\begin{array}{r} x^2+x \\ x^2+x+1 \overline{) x^4+x+1} \\ \underline{x^4+x^3+x^2} \\ x^3+x^2+x+1 \\ \underline{x^3+x^2+x} \\ 1 \end{array}$$

x^2+x+1 is not a factor of x^4+x+1 .

Hence x^4+x+1 has no deg. 2 factor.

And so it is irreducible.

(b) Notice that $c_2(f) = x^4+x+1$ is irreducible in $\mathbb{Z}_2[x]$. And so

by Mod p Irreducibility Criterion f is irreducible in $\mathbb{Q}[x]$. ■

The next criterion is extremely useful, and easy to use.

Eisenstein's irreducibility criterion. Suppose

$f(x) = a_n x^n + \dots + a_1 x + a_0 \in \mathbb{Z}[x]$, p is prime, and

$$p \nmid a_n, p \mid a_{n-1}, p \mid a_{n-2}, \dots, p \mid a_0, p^2 \nmid a_0.$$

Then $f(x)$ is irreducible in $\mathbb{Q}[x]$.

Lecture 21: Eisenstein's irreducibility criterion

Wednesday, May 23, 2018 11:20 AM

To prove Eisenstein's criterion, I use the following result:

Theorem. Suppose F is a field. Then any polynomial in $F[x]$ can be written as a product of irreducible polynomials in a unique way (up to reordering the factors.)

Corollary. Suppose F is a field, $g(x), h(x) \in F[x]$, $c \in F \setminus \{0\}$, and $g(x)h(x) = cx^n$. Then $g(x) = c_1x^{n_1}$ and $h(x) = c_2x^{n_2}$.

Pf. g and h can be written as prod. of irred. . Since the only irred. factor of $g(x)h(x)$ is x , the only irred. factor of $g(x)$ and $h(x)$ can be x ; and claim follows. ■

The following lemma is a weaker result than the above Corollary; but we give an easier argument.

Lemma. Suppose F is a field, $g(x), h(x) \in F[x]$, $c \in F \setminus \{0\}$, and $g(x)h(x) = cx^n$, and $\deg g, \deg h \geq 1$. Then $g(0) = h(0) = 0$.

Pf. Suppose to the contrary that $g(0) \neq 0$. Let

$$g(x) = b_m x^m + \dots + b_1 x + b_0, \quad b_m \neq 0, b_0 \neq 0 \quad \text{and} \quad h(x) = c_k x^k + c_{k-1} x^{k-1} + \dots + c_l x^l$$

$c_k \neq 0, c_l \neq 0.$

Lecture 21: Eisenstein's criterion

Wednesday, May 23, 2018 5:41 PM

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Then } g(x)h(x) &= (b_m x^m + \dots + b_1 x + b_0)(c_k x^k + \dots + c_1 x + c_0) \\ &= b_m c_k x^{m+k} + \underbrace{\dots}_{\text{terms of deg.}} + b_0 c_l x^l \\ &\quad l < \quad \quad \quad < m+k \end{aligned}$$

$$b_m c_k \neq 0, b_0 c_l \neq 0, m > 0 \left. \vphantom{\begin{matrix} b_m c_k \neq 0 \\ b_0 c_l \neq 0 \end{matrix}} \right\} \Rightarrow m+k > l. \\ k \geq l$$

So $g(x)h(x)$ has at least two terms, which contradicts our assumption. \blacksquare

Pf of Eisenstein's criterion. Let $d := \alpha(f)$. Since $p \nmid a_n$, $p \nmid d$.

Let $a'_i := \frac{a_i}{d}$. Then $p \nmid a'_n$, $p \mid a'_i$ if $i < n$, $p^2 \nmid a'_0$.

And $\bar{f}(x) = a'_n x^n + \dots + a'_1 x + a'_0$ is primitive, and $f(x) = \alpha(f) \bar{f}(x)$.

Suppose to the contrary that $f(x)$ is reducible in $\mathbb{Q}[x]$. Hence $\bar{f}(x)$

is reducible in $\mathbb{Q}[x]$. So $\bar{f}(x) = g_1(x)g_2(x)$ for some $g_i(x) \in \mathbb{Q}[x]$

with $\deg g_i \geq 1$. Hence $\exists \bar{g}_i(x) \in \mathbb{Z}[x]$ that are primitive and

$\deg \bar{g}_i = \deg g_i \geq 1$, and $\bar{f}(x) = \bar{g}_1(x)\bar{g}_2(x)$. Hence

$$c_p(\bar{f}) = c_p(\bar{g}_1) c_p(\bar{g}_2) \quad \text{in } \mathbb{Z}_p[x].$$

Lecture 21: Eisenstein's criterion

Wednesday, May 23, 2018 11:37 AM

Since $p \nmid a_n$, $p \mid a_i$ for $i < n$, $c_p(\bar{f}) = c_p(a_n) x^n$. Since $\deg c_p(f)$

is equal to $\deg f$, we deduce $\deg c_p(\bar{g}_i) = \deg \bar{g}_i \geq 1$; and

$c_p(a'_n) x^n = c_p(\bar{g}_1) c_p(\bar{g}_2)$. Hence by the above lemma:

$c_p(\bar{g}_1)(0) = c_p(\bar{g}_2)(0)$; and so $p \mid \bar{g}_1(0)$ and $p \mid \bar{g}_2(0)$. Then

$p^2 \mid \bar{g}_1(0) \bar{g}_2(0) = \bar{f}(0) = a'_0$, which is a contradiction. ■