

## Irreducibles and Unique Factorization

THEOREM 19.1. *Let  $F$  be a field. Then  $f$  is a unit in  $F[x]$  if and only if  $f$  is a non-zero constant polynomial.*

*Proof.* Suppose  $f$  is a unit in  $F[x]$ . Then  $f \neq 0_F$  and there exists  $g \neq 0_F$  in  $F[x]$  such that

$$fg = 1_F \quad .$$

Calculating the degrees both sides of this equation yields

$$\deg(f) + \deg(g) = 0 \quad .$$

Since the degree of any element of  $F[x]$  is always a non-negative integer, we conclude that  $\deg(f) = \deg(g) = 0$ . So  $f$  must be a non-zero constant polynomial.

Conversely, if  $c \in F$  and  $c \neq 0_F$ , then  $c^{-1} \in F \subset F[x]$  exists since  $F$  is a field. So  $c$  is a unit in  $F[x]$ . □

DEFINITION 19.2. *Let  $F$  be a field. A polynomial  $f \in F[x]$  is said to an **associate** of another polynomial  $g \in F[x]$  if*

$$f = cg \quad .$$

*for some nonzero  $c \in F$ .*

*Remark:* Suppose  $p$  is an arbitrary polynomial of degree  $n$ , say

$$p = a_n x^n + a_{n-1} x^{n-1} + \cdots + a_1 x + a_0$$

with  $a_n \neq 0_F$ . Then there is precisely one associate  $g$  of  $p$  that is monic; namely

$$g = a_n^{-1} p \quad .$$

DEFINITION 19.3. *Let  $F$  be a field. A nonconstant polynomial  $p \in F[x]$  is said to be **irreducible** if its only divisors are its associates and the nonzero constants polynomials (the units of  $F[x]$ ). A nonconstant polynomial that is not irreducible is said to be **reducible**.*

The following theorem shows that the irreducible polynomials in  $F[x]$  have essentially the same divisibility properties as the prime numbers in  $\mathbb{Z}$ .

THEOREM 19.4. *Let  $F$  be a field and  $p$  a nonconstant polynomial in  $F[x]$ . Then the following conditions are equivalent:*

- (1)  $p$  is irreducible.
- (2) If  $b$  and  $c$  are any polynomials such that  $p \mid bc$ , then  $p \mid b$  or  $p \mid c$ .
- (3) If  $r$  and  $s$  are any polynomials such that  $p = rs$ , then  $r$  or  $s$  is a nonzero constant polynomial.

*Proof.*

(1)  $\Rightarrow$  (2)

Suppose

$$p = a_n x^n + a_{n-1} x^{n-1} + \cdots + a_1 x + a_0 \quad , \quad a_n \neq 0 \quad ,$$

is irreducible and suppose  $p \mid bc$ . Consider

$$d = \text{GCD}(p, b) \quad .$$

By definition  $d$  is the monic polynomial of highest degree that divides  $p$  and  $b$ . Since  $p$  is irreducible its only divisors of the form  $q = c \in F$ ,  $c \neq 0_F$ , and  $r = cp$ ,  $c \in F$ . The only monic divisors of  $p$  are thus  $1_F$  and  $a_n^{-1}p$ . Thus,

$$d \in \{1_F, a_n^{-1}p\} \quad .$$

If  $d = 1_F$ , then  $p$  and  $b$  are relatively prime and Theorem 4.6 then implies  $p \mid c$ . If  $d = a_n^{-1}p$ , then  $a_n^{-1}p$  divides  $b$  and hence so does  $p$ . Thus, if  $p$  is irreducible and  $p \mid bc$ , then  $p \mid b$  or  $p \mid c$ .

(2)  $\Rightarrow$  (3)

Now assume that  $p$  has the property that if  $p \mid bc$  then  $p \mid b$  or  $p \mid c$ .

If  $p = rs$ , then certainly  $p \mid rs$ . But then by hypothesis,  $p \mid r$  or  $p \mid s$ . However,

$$(1) \quad \deg(p) = \deg(r) + \deg(s)$$

and we must also have

$$(2) \quad \deg(p) \leq \deg(r) \quad \text{or} \quad \deg(p) \leq \deg(s) \quad .$$

But (1) and (2) can not be both be satisfied unless either  $\deg(r) = 0$  or  $\deg(s) = 0$ . Hence either  $r$  or  $s$  must be a nonzero constant polynomial.

(3)  $\Rightarrow$  (1)

Now assume property (3) is true. Let  $q$  be any divisor of  $p$ . Then

$$p = qw$$

for some nonzero  $w \in F[x]$ . Property (3) implies either  $q$  or  $w$  is a nonzero element of  $F$ . Thus, either  $q = c$  or  $p = cq$ . Thus, any divisor of  $p$  is either a nonzero constant polynomial or an associate of  $p$ . Hence,  $p$  is irreducible.  $\square$

**COROLLARY 19.5.** *Let  $F$  be a field and  $p$  an irreducible polynomial in  $F[x]$ . If  $p \mid s_1s_2 \cdots s_k$ , then  $p$  must divide at least one of the polynomials  $s_i$ .*

*Proof.* This is proved by applying Property (2) of Theorem 4.8 repeatedly. If  $p$  divides  $s_1s_2 \cdots s_k = s_1(s_2 \cdots s_k)$  then either  $p$  divides  $s_1$  or  $p$  divides  $s_2 \cdots s_k$ . If the first case holds we are done, if not then  $p \mid s_2(s_3 \cdots s_k)$ , so Property (2) implies either  $p \mid s_2$  or  $p \mid s_3 \cdots s_k$ . If  $p \mid s_2$  we are done; if not  $p \mid s_3(s_4 \cdots s_k)$ . Continuing in this manner, one ends up the statement that either  $p$  divides one of the  $s_i$ ,  $i < k$ , or  $p \mid s_k$ . Hence the conclusion of the Corollary follows.  $\square$

**THEOREM 19.6.** *Let  $F$  be a field. Every nonconstant polynomial is a product of irreducible polynomials in  $F[x]$ . This factorization is unique in the following sense. If*

$$f = p_1 \cdots p_r \quad \text{and} \quad f = q_1 \cdots q_s \quad ,$$

*with each  $p_i$  and each  $q_j$  irreducible, then  $r = s$  and one can rearrange and relabel the factors  $q_i$  so that  $q_i$  is an associate of  $p_i$ ,  $i = 1, 2, \dots, k$ .*

*Proof.*

Existence:

Let  $S$  be the set of all polynomials of degree  $\geq 1$  which are not the product of irreducibles. We want to show that  $S$  is empty. We will use a proof by contradiction.

Suppose  $S$  is non-empty and set

$$R = \{n \in \mathbb{N} \mid n = \deg(f) \text{ for some } f \in S\} \quad .$$

Since  $S$  is non-empty,  $R$  is a non-empty subset of  $\mathbb{N}$  and so by the Well-Ordering Axiom,  $R$  has a least member  $r$ . Let  $p$  be a corresponding element of  $S$ .

Since  $p \in S$ ,  $p$  is not a product of irreducibles; and so it is not itself an irreducible polynomial. Therefore,  $p$  must be divisible by some other nonconstant polynomials,

$$p = qr$$

at least one of which, say  $q$ , is not the product of irreducibles. But then

$$\deg(p) = \deg(q) + \deg(r) \leq \deg(q) + 1 \quad .$$

Since  $q$  is not the product of irreducibles, it belongs to  $S$  and has degree strictly less than  $p$ . But  $p$  was chosen to be an element of least degree in  $S$ . Hence, we have a contradiction, unless  $S$  is empty.

Uniqueness:

Now suppose

$$(5) \quad \begin{aligned} f(x) &= p_1(x)p_2(x) \cdots p_m(x) \\ &= q_1(x)q_2(x) \cdots q_n(x) \end{aligned}$$

with  $p_1(x), \dots, p_m(x)$  and  $q_1(x), \dots, q_n(x)$  all irreducible. We then have

$$(6) \quad q_1(x)q_2(x) \cdots q_n(x) = p_1(x)(p_2(x) \cdots p_m(x)) \quad .$$

Thus,

$$(7) \quad p_1(x) \mid q_1(x) \cdots q_n(x) \quad .$$

By Corollary 4.9,  $p_1(x)$  must divide at least one of the  $q_i(x)$ . By reordering the  $q_i(x)$  we can assume without loss of generality that  $p_1(x) \mid q_1(x)$ . But since  $q_1(x)$  is by hypothesis irreducible its only non-constant divisors are its associates. Thus,

$$(8) \quad q_1(x) = c_1 p_1(x) \quad , \quad \text{for some } c_1 \in F.$$

Substituting (8) into the left hand side of (6) and then dividing both sides by  $p_1(x)$  yields

$$(9) \quad c_1 q_2(x) \cdots q_n(x) = p_2(x)(p_3(x) \cdots p_m(x)) \quad .$$

Applying Corollary 4.9 again, we conclude that  $p_2(x)$  must divide one of the factors  $q_2(x), \dots, q_n(x)$  of the left hand side of (9). By reordering the  $q_i(x)$ , we can assume without loss of generality that  $p_2(x) \mid q_2(x)$ . Since  $q_2(x)$  is irreducible, we must have

$$(10) \quad q_2(x) = c_2 p_2(x) \quad , \quad \text{for some } c_2 \in \mathbb{F}.$$

Substituting (10) into the left hand side of (9) we get

$$c_1 c_2 q_3(x) q_4(x) \cdots q_n(x) = p_3(x) p_4(x) \cdots p_m(x) \quad .$$

We can continue in this manner to peel off irreducible factors from both sides of (10).

If  $m > n$ , then eventually we would reach

$$(11) \quad c_1 c_2 \cdots c_m = p_{m+1}(x) p_{m+2}(x) \cdots p_n(x) \quad .$$

But the left hand side of (11) is just a constant, while the right hand side is a product of non-constant polynomials. This can not happen (there is no way that the degrees of two sides can match). Therefore, we cannot have  $m > n$ .

If  $m < n$ , then eventually we would reach

$$(19.1) \quad c_1 c_2 \cdots c_n q_{n+1}(x) q_{n+2}(x) \cdots q_m(x) = 1_F \quad .$$

This can not occur either, because we cannot have a nonconstant polynomial dividing 1. Thus, we cannot have  $m < n$  either.

Thus,  $m = n$ , and the peeling off procedure leads to

$$\begin{aligned}q_1(x) &= c_1 p_1(x) \\q_2(x) &= c_2 p_2(x) \\&\vdots \\q_m(x) &= c_m p_m(x)\end{aligned}$$

with

$$c_1 c_2 \cdots c_m = 1_F$$

for a suitable reordering of the factors  $q_1(x), \dots, q_m(x)$ . Thus, after a suitable reordering each factor  $q_i(x)$  is an associate of the corresponding factor  $p_i(x)$ .  $\square$