A GENERALIZATION OF GIRSTMAIR'S IRREDUCIBILITY CRITERION

JITENDER SINGH*† AND SANJEEV KUMAR‡

Abstract. Girstmair in [1, Theorem 1] gave a generalization of Murty’s irreducibility criterion (see [2, Theorem 1]). In this article, we further generalize these criteria.

Prime numbers and irreducible polynomials having integer coefficients are intimately connected. This interwinding of primality and irreducibility has been a dominant subject in the development of number theory and geometry. For example, there is a 165 years old open problem profoundly known as Buniakowski’s conjecture (1854) which states that if \( f \in \mathbb{Z}[x] \) is an irreducible polynomial such that the numbers in the set \( f(\mathbb{N}) \) has no common divisor other than 1, then \( f \) takes prime values infinitely often so that sequences of prime numbers could be produced from irreducible polynomials. Conversely if \( f \) takes prime values for infinitely many values of \( n \), then \( f \) must be irreducible. Otherwise if \( f(x) = g(x)h(x) \) where \( g \) and \( h \) are nonconstant polynomials in \( \mathbb{Z}[x] \), then \( f(n) = g(n)h(n) \) with \( f(n) \) prime infinitely often gives either \( g(n) = \pm 1 \) or \( h(n) = \pm 1 \) infinitely often, which is clearly absurd since a polynomial can take \( \pm 1 \) at most finitely many times. Thus, the converse of Buniakowski’s conjecture is true. Here, primality is useful to deduce irreducibility of a polynomial. As a strong converse of Buniakowski’s conjecture, Murty in [2] deduced irreducibility of a polynomial \( f \in \mathbb{Z}[x] \) assuming \( f(n) \) to be prime for sufficiently large \( n \). Here, primality is useful in obtaining irreducibility. Girstmair in [1] generalized Murty’s criterion in the sense that \( f \) is irreducible in \( \mathbb{Z} \) if \( f \) is primitive, and \( f(n) = pd \) for large enough \( n \) where \( p \) is a prime not dividing the natural number \( d \). A polynomial \( f \in \mathbb{Z}[x] \) is said to be primitive if the greatest common divisor of its coefficients is 1. In this article, we further generalize Girstmair’s criterion to the case when a primitive polynomial takes composite value, say \( f(n) = pkd \) for a sufficiently large \( n \) where \( p \) is a prime not dividing \( d \) and \( k \geq 1 \). Let \( f'(x) \) denote the derivative of \( f \) with respect to \( x \). With these notions, we first assert the following:

**Theorem 1.** Let \( f = a_0 + a_1x + \cdots + a_mx^m \in \mathbb{Z}[x] \) be primitive, and let \( H = \max_{0 \leq i \leq m-1} \{|a_i/a_m|\} \). If there exist natural numbers \( n, d, k, \) and a prime \( p \nmid d \) such that \( n \geq H+d+1 \), \( f(n) = \pm pkd \), and for \( k > 1 \), \( p \nmid f'(n) \), then \( f \) is irreducible in \( \mathbb{Z}[x] \).

**Proof of Theorem 1.** Note that the definition of \( H \) implies that each zero \( \theta \) of \( f \) satisfies \( |\theta| < H + 1 \). Now suppose to the contrary that \( f(x) = f_1(x)f_2(x) \), where \( f_1 \) and \( f_2 \) are non-constant polynomials in \( \mathbb{Z}[x] \). Since \( f(n) = f_1(n)f_2(n) = \pm pkd \), one of the factors \( f_1(n) \) and \( f_2(n) \) is divisible by \( p \). So assume without loss of generality that \( p \mid f_2(n) \).
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Consider the case when \( p \nmid f_1(n) \). Then it follows that \( |f_1(n)| \leq d \). Further, if \( \theta_1, \ldots, \theta_{\deg f_1} \) denote the zeros of \( f_1 \) and \( \alpha \neq 0 \) the leading coefficient of \( f_1 \), then we may express \( f_1 \) as

(1) \[ f_1(x) = \alpha(x - \theta_1) \cdots (x - \theta_{\deg f_1}). \]

Note that for each \( i \),

\[ |n - \theta_i| \geq n - |\theta_i| > H + d + 1 - (H + 1) = d. \]

This in view of (1) gives \( |f_1(n)| > d^\deg f_1 \) leading to a contradiction.

Now consider the case when \( p \mid f_1(n) \) so that \( k \geq 2 \). By the product rule of derivatives, we have

\[ f'(n) = f_1'(n)f_2(n) + f_1(n)f_2'(n), \]

where \( p \mid f_1(n) \) and \( p \mid f_2(n) \). Consequently \( p \mid f'(n) \) which contradicts the hypothesis and the theorem follows. \( \square \)

Note that the Theorem in [1] is the special case \( k = 1 \) of the above proved result. It must be pointed out here that there may be quite large \( n \) for which \( f(n) \) is a product of a prime and a small factor, which restricts its application, however for such a polynomial, there may exist a relatively small value of \( n \) for which \( f(n) \) is a prime exponent. For example, in the polynomial

\[ u = 7 + 5x - 16x^2 + 6x^3 + 2x^4 + 7x^5 + x^6 + 6x^7 + 2x^8 + 8x^9 + 4x^{10}, \]

we have

\[ H = 4, u(10) = 48261724457 = 137^5, d = 1, 137 \nmid f'(10) = 47402959485. \]

Thus, in view of Theorem 1, \( u \) is irreducible in \( \mathbb{Z}[x] \) whereas the smallest value of \( n \) for which \( u(n) \) satisfies the Theorem in [1] is \( n = 50 \), where

\[ u(50) = 406332830325710257, \]

a large prime.

Now consider the polynomial

\[ v = 49147 + 49153x + 36864x^3 + 12288x^4 \]

for which \( H < 1, v(5) = 2^{22} \times 3, v'(x) \equiv 1 \mod 2, 5 > H + 1 + 3 \), So, by Theorem 1, \( v \) is irreducible. Here, the smallest value of \( n \), for which Girstmair’s criterion applies is 20 with \( v(20) = 251336023 \times 9 \), where 251336023 is prime.

Proceeding towards our next result, let \( f^{(0)}(x) = f(x) \) and for each natural number \( j \), \( f^{(j)}(x) \) denote the \( j \)-th derivative of \( f \) with respect to \( x \). We now give a generalization of Theorem 1.

**Theorem 2.** Let \( f = a_0 + a_1x + \cdots + a_mx^m \in \mathbb{Z}[x] \) be primitive, and let \( H = \max_{0 \leq i \leq m-1} \{|a_i/a_m|\} \).

If there exist natural numbers \( n, d, k, j \leq m \), and a prime \( p \nmid d \) such that \( n \geq H + d + 1 \),

\[ f(n) = \pm p^kd, \gcd(k, j) = 1, p^k \mid \frac{f^{(i)}(n)}{d^i} \text{ for each } i = 0, \ldots, j - 1, \text{ and for } k > 1, p \nmid \frac{f^{(j)}(n)}{j!}, \]

then \( f \) is irreducible in \( \mathbb{Z}[x] \).

The proof of Theorem 2 rests on the following crucial result of Singh and Kumar [3, Lemma 3].
Lemma 3. Let \( f = a_0 + a_1 x + \cdots + a_m x^m \), \( f_1 \) and \( f_2 \) be nonconstant polynomials in \( \mathbb{Z}[x] \) such that \( f(x) = f_1(x) f_2(x) \). Suppose that there is a prime \( p \) and coprime natural numbers \( k \geq 2 \) and \( j \leq m \) such that \( p^k \mid \gcd(a_0, a_1, \ldots, a_{j-1}) \) and \( p^{k+1} \nmid a_0 \). If \( p \mid f_1(0) \) and \( p \mid f_2(0) \), then \( p \mid a_j \).

Proof of Theorem 2. Let for each \( i = 0, \ldots, m \), \( s_i = \frac{f^{(i)}(n)}{i!} \). Define
\[
g(x) = f(x + n) = s_0 + s_1 x + \cdots + s_m x^m,
\]
in view of which it will be enough to prove that \( g \) is irreducible. Assume to the contrary that \( g(x) = g_1(x) g_2(x) \) where \( g_1 \) and \( g_2 \) are nonconstant polynomials in \( \mathbb{Z}[x] \). Observe that \( g(0) = f(n) = \pm p^k d = g_1(0) g_2(0) \). This shows that \( p \) divides one of the factors \( g_1(0) \) or \( g_2(0) \). Assume without loss of generality that \( p \mid g_2(0) \).

If \( p \mid g_1(0) \), then \( k > 1 \) and \( p \mid g_i(0) \) for each \( i = 1, 2 \), which in view of Lemma 3 applied on \( g \), we get \( p \mid s_j \), which contradicts the hypothesis.

Now consider the case when \( p \nmid g_1(0) \). Then \( |g_1(0)| \leq d \). If \( \theta_1, \ldots, \theta_{\deg g_1} \) are the zeros of \( g_1 \) and \( \alpha \neq 0 \), the leading coefficient of \( g_1 \), we have
\[
g_1(x) = \alpha (x - \theta_1) \cdots (x - \theta_{\deg g_1}).
\]
Since in view of (2), \( f(\theta_i + n) = 0 \) for each \( i \), we must have
\[
|\theta_i| \geq n - |\theta_i + n| > H + d + 1 - (H + 1) = d,
\]
which gives \( |g_1(0)| > d^{\deg g_1} \) leading to a contradiction.
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