

# IRREDUCIBILITY OF A SUM OF POLYNOMIALS DEPENDING ON DISJOINT SETS OF VARIABLES

VIKRAMJEET SINGH CHANDEL AND UMA DAYAL

ABSTRACT. In this article, we give two different sufficient conditions for the irreducibility of a polynomial of more than one variable, over an algebraically closed field, that can be written as a sum of two polynomials which depend on mutually disjoint sets of variables. These conditions are derived from analyzing the Newton polytope of such a polynomial and then applying the ‘Irreducibility criterion’ introduced by Gao.

## 1. INTRODUCTION AND STATEMENT OF RESULTS

In this article, we are interested in finding sufficient conditions that will guarantee that a polynomial in several variables whose coefficients lie in an algebraically closed field  $F$  is irreducible over the field  $F$ . The method that we employ in our investigation is called the ‘Polytope Method’ and is strongly motivated from the work of Gao [3]. Before we outline this method, let us denote by  $\mathbb{R}$  the set of all real numbers.

Given a positive integer  $n \geq 1$ , and a nonempty subset  $A \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ , the *convex hull* of  $A$ , denoted by  $\text{Conv}(A)$ , is the set defined by:

$$\text{Conv}(A) := \left\{ \sum_1^m t_j a_j : t_j \in [0, 1] \text{ with } \sum_1^m t_j = 1 \text{ and } a_j \in A, 1 \leq j \leq m \right\}.$$

A *polytope* in  $\mathbb{R}^n$  is (by definition) the convex hull of finitely many points in  $\mathbb{R}^n$ . A point of a polytope is called a *vertex* if it does not lie in the interior of the convex hull of two distinct points of the polytope. It is a well known fact that a polytope is always the convex hull of its vertices. We refer the reader to either one of the following: [1], [4], [7], [9] for further basic properties of polytope.

There is a very natural way of associating a polytope to a given polynomial. In this article, we shall always consider polynomials in the variables  $z_1, \dots, z_n$  with coefficients in an arbitrary but fixed algebraically closed field  $F$ . The set of all such polynomials will be denoted by  $F[z_1, \dots, z_n]$ . Given a polynomial  $Q = \sum q_{i_1, \dots, i_n} z_1^{i_1} \dots z_n^{i_n}$  belonging to  $F[z_1, \dots, z_n]$ , the support of  $Q$  denoted by  $\text{supp}(Q)$ , is the set defined by

$$\text{supp}(Q) := \left\{ (i_1, \dots, i_n) : q_{i_1, \dots, i_n} \neq 0, i_j \geq 0 \right\}.$$

Here, if we write  $I = (i_1, \dots, i_n)$  then denote  $|I| = \sum_{j=1}^n i_j$  and  $z^I = z_1^{i_1} \dots z_n^{i_n}$ .

---

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification*. Primary: 52B20; Secondary: 13P05.

*Key words and phrases*. multivariable polynomial, irreducibility, convex hull, newton polytope, hyperplane.

Vikramjeet Singh Chandel was supported by an institute postdoctoral fellowship of IIT Bombay while working on this project.

The *Newton polytope* of  $Q$ , denoted by  $\mathbf{N}(Q)$ , is (by definition) the convex hull of  $\text{supp}(Q)$ . This is the association that we alluded to in the beginning of this paragraph.

The term ‘Polytope Method’, as coined in the article [3], has its origin in a paper by Ostrowski [6]. Ostrowski in [6] uses the term ‘Baric Polyhedron’ in place of Newton polytope for a class of more general polynomials called *algebraic polynomials* where the exponents of variables are rational numbers. We also wish to refer the reader to the work done in the articles [2], [5] and [8] where methods based on studying the polytopes have been employed in determining the irreducibility of polynomials.

We begin with a key result in the paper [6, Theorem VI] for polynomials that is at the heart of the ‘Polytope Method’. For this purpose, we need the notion of Minkowski sum of convex sets.

Given convex sets  $A$  and  $B$  in  $\mathbb{R}^n$ , the Minkowski sum of  $A$  and  $B$ , denoted by  $A + B$ , is (by definition) the set  $\{a + b : a \in A, b \in B\}$ . We now state:

**Result 1.1** (Ostrowski, [6]). *Let  $Q \in F[z_1, \dots, z_n]$  be such that  $Q = Q_1 Q_2$  for some  $Q_1, Q_2 \in F[z_1, \dots, z_n]$ . Then  $\mathbf{N}(Q) = \mathbf{N}(Q_1) + \mathbf{N}(Q_2)$ .*

Based on Result 1.1, Gao in [3] gave an irreducibility criterion by introducing the notion of an integrally indecomposable polytope. We shall state this criterion here but we need a few definitions.

A point in  $\mathbb{R}^n$  will be called an *integral point* if all of its coordinates are integers. A polytope will be called an *integral polytope* if all of its vertices are integral points. Further, an integral polytope  $C$  is called *integrally decomposable* if there exist integral polytopes  $A$  and  $B$ , consisting of at least two points each, such that  $C = A + B$ . A polytope that is not integrally decomposable is called an *integrally indecomposable* polytope. Now we present the ‘Irreducibility criterion’ due to Gao.

**Irreducibility criterion.** Let  $Q \in F[z_1, \dots, z_n]$  be a nonconstant polynomial that is not divisible by any of  $z_i$ . If the Newton polytope  $\mathbf{N}(Q)$  of  $Q$  is integrally indecomposable then  $Q$  is irreducible over  $F$ .

Notice that the irreducibility criterion above follows very easily from Result 1.1. Based on this criterion and by constructing integrally indecomposable polytopes, Gao in [3] gave new classes of irreducible polynomials. We present an important result in [3] that characterizes integrally indecomposable prisms but first we define what a prism is. A *prism* is the convex hull of a set in  $\mathbb{R}^n$  consisting of a polytope  $C$ , contained in a hyperplane  $H$ , and a point  $v \in \mathbb{R}^n$  not belonging to the hyperplane  $H$ . The point  $v$  is called the *distinguished vertex* of the prism. Now we present

**Result 1.2** ([3, Theorem 4.2]). *Let  $C$  be an integral polytope in  $\mathbb{R}^n$  contained in some hyperplane  $H$  and let  $v \in \mathbb{R}^n$  be an integral point that is not in  $H$ . Suppose that  $v_1, \dots, v_k$  are all the vertices of  $C$ . Let  $\tilde{C} = \{v\} \cup C$ . Then the prism  $\text{Conv}(\tilde{C})$  is integrally indecomposable if and only if*

$$\gcd(v - v_1, \dots, v - v_k) = 1.$$

Here, and elsewhere in this article, for an integral point  $w$ ,  $\gcd(w)$  shall denote the greatest common divisor of the coordinates of  $w$ . For a finite set of integral points  $w_1, \dots, w_k$ ,  $\gcd(w_1, \dots, w_k)$  will denote the greatest common divisor of the coordinates of  $w_i$ ’s taken together.

Using Result 1.2, Gao constructed many classes of irreducible polynomials that were not known before. A particular class of polynomials for which Gao gave a sufficient condition for irreducibility is the following. Let  $Q \in F[z_1, \dots, z_n], n \geq 2$ , be such that  $Q(z) = Q_1(z_1) + Q_2(z_2, \dots, z_n)$  where  $Q_1$  and  $Q_2$  are nonconstant polynomials. Then  $Q$  is irreducible if  $\gcd(d(Q_1), d(Q_2)) = 1$ , where  $d(Q_j), j = 1, 2$ , denotes the degree of  $Q_j$ . This result motivates the following problem:

- (\*) Let  $n \geq 2$ , and consider a polynomial  $P \in F[z_1, \dots, z_n], n \geq 2$ , such that  $P(z_1, \dots, z_n) = P_1(z_1, \dots, z_\nu) + P_2(z_{\nu+1}, \dots, z_n)$ , where  $P_1, P_2$  are nonconstant polynomials and  $1 \leq \nu \leq n - 1$ . Investigate sufficient conditions under which  $P$  is irreducible over  $F$ .

In the case  $\nu = 1$ , one such condition is given by the above stated result of Gao. By investigating the Newton polytope of a polynomial as stated in (\*), we find out that there is a special integral prism, as in Result 1.2, that is a *face* of the Newton polytope of such a polynomial. This fact enabled us to derive our first criterion which we state here.

**Theorem 1.3.** *Let  $P \in F[z_1, \dots, z_n], n \geq 2$ , and  $\nu$  be such that  $1 \leq \nu \leq n - 1$ . Suppose we can write  $P = P_1 + P_2$  where  $P_1 \in F[z_1, \dots, z_\nu], P_2 \in F[z_{\nu+1}, \dots, z_n]$  are nonconstant polynomials. Let  $d(P_j)$  denote the degree of polynomials  $P_j, j = 1, 2$ . Suppose that  $\gcd(d(P_1), d(P_2)) = 1$ , then  $P$  is irreducible over  $F$ .*

Clearly this result generalizes the result of Gao when  $\nu = 1$ . In Section 2, where we do certain computations regarding the determination of  $\mathbf{N}(P), P$  as in Theorem 1.3, we shall also notice that, under a mild restriction on  $P_j, \mathbf{N}(P_j)$  are faces of  $\mathbf{N}(P)$ . This observation allows us to present our second criterion:

**Proposition 1.4.** *Let  $P \in F[z_1, \dots, z_n], n \geq 2$ . Suppose we can write  $P = P_1 + P_2$  where  $P_1 \in F[z_1, \dots, z_\nu], P_2 \in F[z_{\nu+1}, \dots, z_n]$  are nonconstant polynomials. If for some  $i, 1 \leq i \leq 2$ , we have  $P_i(0) = 0$  such that none of  $z_j$ 's divide  $P_i$  for any  $j$  and  $\mathbf{N}(P_i)$  is integrally indecomposable. Then  $P$  is irreducible over  $F$ .*

The proof of the above proposition is presented in Section 2 while the proof of Theorem 1.3 is presented in Section 3.

## 2. A FEW AUXILIARY RESULTS AND PROOF OF PROPOSITION 1.4

This section is devoted to the study of the Newton polytope  $\mathbf{N}(P)$  of the polynomial  $P$ , where  $P$  is as in the problem (\*). One of the important results of this section is a result which says that under the condition that  $P_j(0) = 0, j = 1, 2, \mathbf{N}(P_j)$  are faces of  $\mathbf{N}(P)$ . This is Proposition 2.3 below. We start with recalling the definition of a face of a general convex set  $C$ .

Let  $H$  be a hyperplane in  $\mathbb{R}^n$ . By its definition there exists a nonzero  $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}^n$  and  $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}$  such that  $H := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : \sum_{j=1}^n \alpha_j x_j = \gamma\}$ . The hyperplane divides  $\mathbb{R}^n$  into the following two half spaces:

$$H^+ := \left\{ x \in \mathbb{R}^n : \sum_1^n \alpha_j x_j - \gamma \geq 0 \right\}, \text{ and } H^- := \left\{ x \in \mathbb{R}^n : \sum_1^n \alpha_j x_j - \gamma \leq 0 \right\}.$$

A *supporting hyperplane* for a convex set  $C$  is a hyperplane  $H$  such that  $H \cap C \neq \emptyset$  and either  $C \subseteq H^+$  or  $C \subseteq H^-$ . A *face* of  $C$  is then a set of the form  $C \cap H$ , where  $H$  is a supporting hyperplane for  $C$ .

We begin with an elementary lemma that describes the convex hull of a union of two sets. This lemma should be there in the literature; we present it here for the sake making the article to be more self contained.

**Lemma 2.1.** *Let  $A, B$  be two nonempty finite sets in  $\mathbb{R}^n$ . Then*

$$\text{Conv}(A \cup B) = \{t\alpha + (1-t)\beta : t \in [0, 1], \alpha \in \text{Conv}(A), \beta \in \text{Conv}(B)\}.$$

*Proof.* Let  $x \in \text{Conv}(A \cup B)$ . Then there exist  $x_i \in A \cup B$  and  $t_i \in [0, 1]$ ,  $1 \leq i \leq l$ , such that  $x = \sum_1^l t_i x_i$  and  $\sum_1^l t_i = 1$ . Consider the following sets

$$I_A(x) = \{i : 1 \leq i \leq l, x_i \in A \setminus B\}, \quad I_B(x) = \{i : 1 \leq i \leq l, x_i \in B\}.$$

Notice that  $I_A(x) \cap I_B(x) = \emptyset$  and  $I_A(x) \cup I_B(x) = \{1, \dots, l\}$ . Therefore, we have  $x = \sum_{i \in I_A(x)} t_i x_i + \sum_{i \in I_B(x)} t_i x_i$ . Assuming that  $\sum_{i \in I_A(x)} t_i \neq 0, 1$ , we write

$$x = \lambda \left( \sum_{i \in I_A(x)} (t_i/\lambda) x_i \right) + \mu \left( \sum_{i \in I_B(x)} (t_i/\mu) x_i \right),$$

where  $\lambda = \sum_{i \in I_A(x)} t_i$ ,  $\mu = \sum_{i \in I_B(x)} t_i$ . Clearly  $\lambda + \mu = 1$ . If we set

$$\alpha = \sum_{i \in I_A(x)} (t_i/\lambda) x_i, \quad \beta = \sum_{i \in I_B(x)} (t_i/\mu) x_i.$$

then  $\alpha \in \text{Conv}(A)$  and  $\beta \in \text{Conv}(B)$ , since  $\sum_{i \in I_A(x)} (t_i/\lambda) = \sum_{i \in I_B(x)} (t_i/\mu) = 1$ . Hence,  $x = \lambda\alpha + (1-\lambda)\beta$ . We also notice if  $\lambda = 0$  or  $\lambda = 1$  then  $x \in \text{Conv}(B)$  or  $x \in \text{Conv}(A)$  respectively. This establishes that  $\text{Conv}(A \cup B) \subseteq \{t\alpha + (1-t)\beta : t \in [0, 1], \alpha \in \text{Conv}(A), \beta \in \text{Conv}(B)\}$ .

To see the converse, let  $x = t\alpha + (1-t)\beta$  for some  $t \in [0, 1]$  and  $\alpha \in \text{Conv}(A), \beta \in \text{Conv}(B)$ . Now there exist  $a_i \in A$ ,  $\lambda_i \in [0, 1]$ ,  $1 \leq i \leq l$  and  $b_j \in B$ ,  $\gamma_j \in [0, 1]$ ,  $1 \leq j \leq m$ , such that

$$\alpha = \sum_1^l \lambda_i a_i, \quad \sum_1^l \lambda_i = 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \beta = \sum_1^m \gamma_j b_j, \quad \sum_1^m \gamma_j = 1$$

Therefore,  $x = \sum_1^l t\lambda_i a_i + \sum_1^m (1-t)\gamma_j b_j$  and  $\sum_1^l t\lambda_i + \sum_1^m (1-t)\gamma_j = 1$ . This proves that  $x \in \text{Conv}(A \cup B)$ .  $\square$

We wish to compute the Newton polytope  $\mathbf{N}(P)$  with  $P$  as in problem (\*). Before we do this in our next lemma, we make the following observations:

- (i) Given a nonconstant polynomial  $Q \in F[z_1, \dots, z_n]$ ,  $Q$  is irreducible if and only if  $\tilde{Q}(z_1, \dots, z_n) := Q(z_1 + a_1, \dots, z_n + a_n)$ , where  $a_i$ 's are any elements of  $F$ , is irreducible.
- (ii) Given a nonconstant polynomial  $Q \in F[z_1, \dots, z_n]$  such that  $Q(0) \neq 0$ , we know there exist  $a_i \in F$ ,  $1 \leq i \leq n$  such that  $Q(a_1, \dots, a_n) = 0$ . Then  $\tilde{Q}(z_1, \dots, z_n) := Q(z_1 + a_1, \dots, z_n + a_n)$  satisfies  $\tilde{Q}(0) = 0$ . Notice that the fact that  $F$  is algebraically closed is crucial here.

Because of (i) and (ii) above, we can assume, without loss of generality, when considering the irreducibility/reducibility of  $P$ , that  $P_1(0) = 0$  and  $P_2(0) = 0$ . Now we compute  $\mathbf{N}(P)$ .

**Lemma 2.2.** *Let  $n \geq 2$  and let  $P \in F[z_1, \dots, z_n]$  be a polynomial such that  $P = P_1 + P_2$  where  $P_1 \in F[z_1, \dots, z_\nu]$  and  $P_2 \in F[z_{\nu+1}, \dots, z_n]$  be such that  $P_1(0) = 0, P_2(0) = 0$ . Then the Newton polytope of  $P$  is given by:*

$$\mathbf{N}(P) = \{t\alpha + (1-t)\beta : t \in [0, 1], \alpha \in \mathbf{N}(P_1), \beta \in \mathbf{N}(P_2)\}.$$

*Proof.* The reader will discern that the above follows from Lemma 2.1, once we establish that  $\text{supp}(P) = \text{supp}(P_1) \cup \text{supp}(P_2)$ . Notice that  $\text{supp}(P) \subseteq \text{supp}(P_1) \cup \text{supp}(P_2)$ .

**Claim.**  $\text{supp}(P_1) \cap \text{supp}(P_2) = \emptyset$ .

To see this let  $\alpha \in \text{supp}(P_1) \cap \text{supp}(P_2)$ . This implies  $\alpha \in \text{supp}(P_1)$  and  $\alpha \in \text{supp}(P_2)$ . We know  $\text{supp}(P_1) \subseteq \{(z_1, z_2, \dots, z_n) \in \mathbb{C}^n : z_{\nu+1} = \dots = z_n = 0\}$  and  $\text{supp}(P_2) \subseteq \{(z_1, z_2, \dots, z_n) \in \mathbb{C}^n : z_1 = \dots = z_\nu = 0\}$  where  $1 \leq \nu \leq n$ . Hence  $\alpha = 0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$ . However, since  $P_1(0) = 0$  and  $P_2(0) = 0$ , this is a contradiction. Thus,  $\text{supp}(P_1) \cap \text{supp}(P_2) = \emptyset$ .

It follows from the claim above that  $\text{supp}(P_1) \cup \text{supp}(P_2) \subseteq \text{supp}(P)$  since none of the monomials in  $P_1$  can cancel out the monomials in  $P_2$  and viceversa. Hence we have  $\text{supp}(P_1) \cup \text{supp}(P_2) = \text{supp}(P)$ . The lemma itself now follows from Lemma 2.1.  $\square$

Now we establish the result that was alluded to in the introduction of this section.

**Proposition 2.3.** *The Newton polytopes  $\mathbf{N}(P_1)$  and  $\mathbf{N}(P_2)$  associated to the polynomials  $P_1$  and  $P_2$ , as in Lemma 2.2, are faces of  $\mathbf{N}(P)$ .*

*Proof.* For every  $j \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ , let us consider

$$H_j := \{(x_1, \dots, x_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n : x_j = 0\} \text{ and } H_j^+ := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : x_j \geq 0\}.$$

Notice that  $\mathbf{N}(P) \subset H_j^+$  for all  $j \in \{1, \dots, n\}$  and  $\mathbf{N}(P) \cap H_j \neq \emptyset$  for every  $j \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ . Hence, from the definition of a face,  $\mathbf{N}(P) \cap H_j$  are faces of  $\mathbf{N}(P)$ .

**Claim.**  $\mathbf{N}(P_1) = \bigcap_{\nu+1}^n (\mathbf{N}(P) \cap H_j)$ .

It is clear that  $\mathbf{N}(P_1) \subseteq \bigcap_{\nu+1}^n (\mathbf{N}(P) \cap H_j)$  since  $\mathbf{N}(P_1) \subset H_j$  for every  $j \in \{\nu+1, \dots, n\}$ . To see the converse, let  $x \in \bigcap_{\nu+1}^n (\mathbf{N}(P) \cap H_j)$  then  $x \in \mathbf{N}(P) \cap H_j$  for every  $j \in \{\nu+1, \dots, n\}$ . This implies that there exist  $t \in [0, 1]$  and  $\alpha \in \mathbf{N}(P_1), \beta \in \mathbf{N}(P_2)$  such that

$$x = t\alpha + (1-t)\beta \text{ and } x_j = 0 \text{ for all } j \geq \nu + 1.$$

If  $t = 1$ , we see that  $x = \alpha \in \mathbf{N}(P_1)$ . So, let us suppose this is not the case, i.e.,  $t \neq 1$ . We have  $x_j = t\alpha_j + (1-t)\beta_j$  and  $\alpha_j = 0$  for every  $j \geq \nu + 1$ . Hence for each  $j \geq \nu + 1$ ,  $x_j = 0$  if and only if  $(1-t)\beta_j = 0$ . This implies that  $\beta = 0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$ , which is a contradiction since  $0 \notin \mathbf{N}(P_2)$ . So  $t = 1$  and  $x \in \mathbf{N}(P_1)$ . Therefore the converse holds true and the claim above is established.

Thus  $\mathbf{N}(P_1)$  is the intersection of finitely many faces of  $\mathbf{N}(P)$ . It is a fact ([1, Lemma 4.5, p.15]) that the intersection of finitely many faces of a convex set is also a face. Therefore,  $\mathbf{N}(P_1)$  is a face of  $\mathbf{N}(P)$ . Arguing in a similar fashion and working with hyperplanes  $H_j$ ,  $1 \leq j \leq \nu$ , we see that  $\mathbf{N}(P_2)$  is also a face of  $\mathbf{N}(P)$ .  $\square$

We shall now present a proof of Proposition 1.4. Before that we need a result that says how faces of a polytope decompose under Minkowski sum. We shall also use this result in Section 3. The reader is referred to [1, Theorem 1.5, p. 105] for a proof of this.

**Result 2.4.** *Let  $A$  and  $B$  be polytopes in  $\mathbb{R}^n$  and suppose  $C = A + B$ . Then every face of  $C$  is a Minkowski sum of unique faces of  $A$  and  $B$ .*

We are now ready to present

*Proof of Proposition 1.4.* We shall assume for simplicity that  $i = 1$  in Proposition 1.4. Let  $(b_{\nu+1}, \dots, b_n)$  be such that if we write

$$\widetilde{P}(z_1, \dots, z_n) := P(z_1, \dots, z_\nu, z_{\nu+1} + b_{\nu+1}, \dots, z_n + b_n) = P_1 + \widetilde{P}_2$$

where  $\widetilde{P}_2(z_1, \dots, z_n) := P_2(z_{\nu+1} + b_{\nu+1}, \dots, z_n + b_n)$ , then  $\widetilde{P}_2(0) = 0$ . Now, suppose  $P$  is reducible over  $F$  then so is  $\widetilde{P}(z_1, \dots, z_n)$ . Let  $Q_1, Q_2$  be two nonconstant polynomials such that  $\widetilde{P} = Q_1 Q_2$ . By Result 1.1 we have

$$\mathbf{N}(\widetilde{P}) = \mathbf{N}(Q_1) + \mathbf{N}(Q_2).$$

By Proposition 2.3, we see that  $\mathbf{N}(P_1)$  is a face of  $\mathbf{N}(\widetilde{P})$ . Hence, Result 2.4 implies that there exist faces  $A_1, B_1$  of polytopes  $\mathbf{N}(Q_1), \mathbf{N}(Q_2)$  respectively such that

$$\mathbf{N}(P_1) = A_1 + B_1. \quad (2.1)$$

**Claim.** Both  $A_1$  and  $B_1$  must contain at least two points.

We begin with the observation that each vertex of  $A_1, B_1$  is a vertex of  $\mathbf{N}(Q_1), \mathbf{N}(Q_2)$  respectively (follows from Result 3.1). We also recall that for a polynomial  $P$ , the vertex set of  $\mathbf{N}(P)$  is a subset of  $\text{supp}(P)$ . Now, suppose  $A_1$  consists of only a single point, i.e.,  $A_1 = \{\alpha = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n) : \alpha \neq \mathbf{0}\}$ , where each  $\alpha_j$  is a positive integer. Then every vertex  $v$  of  $\mathbf{N}(P_1)$  is given by  $v = w + \alpha$ , where  $w$  is a vertex of  $B_1$ . This will imply that  $z^\alpha := z^{\alpha_1} \dots z^{\alpha_n}$  divides  $P_1$  which is a contradiction to our hypothesis. Hence  $A_1$  must contain at least two points. Similarly,  $B_1$  must contain at least two points.

The above claim together with (2.1) implies that  $\mathbf{N}(P_1)$  is integrally decomposable which is a contradiction to our hypothesis. Therefore  $\widetilde{P}$  and consequently  $P$  must be irreducible over  $F$ .  $\square$

### 3. PROOF OF THE MAIN THEOREM

In this section, we shall present the proof of our main theorem. In this direction, let  $P$  be a polynomial in  $F[z_1, \dots, z_n]$  such that  $P = P_1 + P_2$ , where  $P_1 \in F[z_1, \dots, z_\nu]$ ,  $P_2 \in F[z_{\nu+1}, \dots, z_n]$  are nonconstant polynomials with  $P_j(0) = 0$ . We shall first describe certain faces of the Newton polytope of  $P$ . For this purpose we shall need a well known result about the geometry of polytopes. The result is:

**Result 3.1.** *Let  $C$  be a polytope and let  $F_1$  be a face of  $C$ . Suppose  $F_0$  is any face of  $F_1$  then  $F_0$  will be a face of  $C$ .*

The reader is referred to [1, Theorem 1.7, p. 31] for a proof of this result.

We now begin with describing certain faces of  $\mathbf{N}(P)$ . Define:

$$\mathfrak{A}_j := \left\{ v \in \mathbb{R}^n : v \text{ is a vertex of } \mathbf{N}(P_j) \text{ such that } \sum_1^n v_i = d(P_j) \right\}.$$

Here,  $d(P_j)$ ,  $j = 1, 2$ , denotes the degree of  $P_j$ . It is clear that  $\mathfrak{A}_j \neq \emptyset$ ,  $j = 1, 2$ . We also consider the hyperplane defined by:

$$H_0 := \left\{ x \in \mathbb{R}^n : d(P_2) \left( \sum_1^\nu x_i \right) + d(P_1) \left( \sum_1^{n-\nu} x_{\nu+j} \right) = d(P_1)d(P_2) \right\}. \quad (3.1)$$

**Proposition 3.2.** *The convex set  $H_0 \cap \mathbf{N}(\mathbf{P})$  is a face of  $\mathbf{N}(\mathbf{P})$ . Moreover,*

$$H_0 \cap \mathbf{N}(\mathbf{P}) = \left\{ t\alpha + (1-t)\beta : t \in [0, 1], \alpha \in \text{Conv}(\mathfrak{A}_1), \beta \in \text{Conv}(\mathfrak{A}_2) \right\}. \quad (3.2)$$

*Proof.* Let  $L(x) := d(P_2) \left( \sum_1^\nu x_i \right) + d(P_1) \left( \sum_1^{n-\nu} x_{\nu+j} \right)$ . Then if we let  $X = tX_1 + (1-t)X_2$ , where  $X_1 \in \mathbf{N}(\mathbf{P}_1)$ ,  $X_2 \in \mathbf{N}(\mathbf{P}_2)$  and  $t \in [0, 1]$ , then  $L(X) = tL(X_1) + (1-t)L(X_2)$ .

Let  $\{w_1, \dots, w_k\}$  be the set of all vertices of  $\mathbf{N}(\mathbf{P}_1)$ . Then there exist  $s_j \in [0, 1]$ ,  $1 \leq j \leq k$ , and  $\sum_1^k s_j = 1$  such that we have:

$$\begin{aligned} X_1 &= \sum_1^k s_j w_j = \sum_1^k s_j (w_{j1}, \dots, w_{j\nu}, 0, \dots, 0) \\ &= \left( \sum_1^k s_j w_{j1}, \sum_1^k s_j w_{j2}, \dots, \sum_1^k s_j w_{j\nu}, 0, \dots, 0 \right). \end{aligned}$$

Here,  $w_{ji}$  denotes the  $i$ -th coordinate of the vertex  $w_j$ . It follows then that

$$\sum_{i=1}^\nu X_{1i} = \sum_{i=1}^\nu \sum_{j=1}^k s_j w_{ji} = \sum_{j=1}^k s_j \left( \sum_{i=1}^\nu w_{ji} \right). \quad (3.3)$$

For each  $j$ , since  $w_j$  is a vertex of  $\mathbf{N}(\mathbf{P}_1)$ , we have  $\sum_{i=1}^\nu w_{ji} \leq d(P_1)$ . From this and (3.3) we have:

$$\sum_{i=1}^\nu X_{1i} = \sum_{j=1}^k s_j \left( \sum_{i=1}^\nu w_{ji} \right) \leq \sum_{j=1}^k s_j d(P_1) = d(P_1).$$

Hence  $L(X_1) = d(P_2) \sum_{i=1}^\nu X_{1i} \leq d(P_2)d(P_1)$ . This proves that  $\mathbf{N}(\mathbf{P}_1)$  lies in the negative half space determined by  $H_0$ .

The inequality  $L(X_1) \leq d(P_2)d(P_1)$  becomes an equality if and only if

$$\sum_{i=1}^\nu X_{1i} = d(P_1) = \sum_{j=1}^k s_j \left( \sum_{i=1}^\nu w_{ji} \right) = d(P_1). \quad (3.4)$$

Define  $\mathcal{A} := \{j : 1 \leq j \leq k : s_j \neq 0\}$ . Then it follows from (3.4) that for each  $j \in \mathcal{A}$ ,  $w_j \in \mathfrak{A}_1$ .

Therefore, if  $X_1 \in \mathbf{N}(\mathbf{P}_1)$  then  $L(X_1) \leq d(P_1)d(P_2)$ , and this inequality becomes an equality if and only if  $X_1 \in \text{Conv}(\mathfrak{A}_1)$ . Similarly, we shall have that if  $X_2 \in \mathbf{N}(\mathbf{P}_2)$  then  $L(X_2) \leq d(P_1)d(P_2)$  and this inequality becomes an equality if and only if  $X_2 \in \text{Conv}(\mathfrak{A}_2)$ . From these two assertions it follows that  $L(X) \leq d(P_1)d(P_2)$  and this inequality is an equality if and only if  $X_j \in \text{Conv}(\mathfrak{A}_j)$ . This proves that  $H_0 \cap \mathbf{N}(\mathbf{P})$  is a face of  $\mathbf{N}(\mathbf{P})$  and is given by (3.2).  $\square$

Let us consider the following sets:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathfrak{A}_{11} &= \{v \in \mathfrak{A}_1 : v_1 \geq w_1 \text{ for any } w \in \mathfrak{A}_1\}, \text{ and} \\ \mathfrak{A}_{1i} &= \{v \in \mathfrak{A}_{1(i-1)} : v_i \geq w_i \text{ for any } w \in \mathfrak{A}_{1(i-1)}\} \text{ for each } i, 2 \leq i \leq \nu.\end{aligned}$$

Notice that since  $\mathfrak{A}_1$  is nonempty, each of  $\mathfrak{A}_{1i}$  is nonempty. Moreover we have

$$\mathfrak{A}_1 \supseteq \mathfrak{A}_{11} \supseteq \cdots \supseteq \mathfrak{A}_{1\nu}.$$

Notice that  $\mathfrak{A}_{1\nu}$  is a singleton set. This is because if  $X_1, X_2 \in \mathfrak{A}_{1\nu}$  then  $X_{1i} = X_{2i}$  for all  $i$ ,  $1 \leq i \leq \nu - 1$ . Now since  $\sum_1^\nu X_{1i} = \sum_1^\nu X_{2i}$ , we have  $X_{1\nu} = X_{2\nu}$ . Hence  $X_1 = X_2$ .

For each  $i$ ,  $1 \leq i \leq \nu$ , we consider

$$\begin{aligned}C_i &= \left\{t\alpha + (1-t)\beta : t \in [0, 1], \alpha \in \text{Conv}(\mathfrak{A}_{1i}), \beta \in \text{Conv}(\mathfrak{A}_2)\right\} \\ H_i &= \left\{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : d(P_2)x_i + \left(\sum_1^{n-\nu} x_{\nu+j}\right)v_i = v_i d(P_2)\right\}.\end{aligned}$$

Here,  $v_i$  is the  $i$ -th coordinate of any vector  $v \in \mathfrak{A}_{1i}$ . Now we present two very crucial lemmas that we shall need in our proof of the main theorem.

**Lemma 3.3.** *If we let  $C_0 = H_0 \cap \mathbf{N}(P)$  be as in the Proposition 3.2. Then  $C_0 \cap H_1 = C_1$  and  $C_1$  is a face of  $C_0$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $\alpha \in C_0$  then there exist  $X_1 \in \text{Conv}(\mathfrak{A}_1)$ ,  $X_2 \in \text{Conv}(\mathfrak{A}_2)$  such that  $\alpha = tX_1 + (1-t)X_2$ ,  $t \in [0, 1]$ . If we let  $L_1(x) = d(P_2)x_1 + \left(\sum_1^{n-\nu} x_{\nu+j}\right)v_1$ , then  $L_1(\alpha) = tL_1(X_1) + (1-t)L_1(X_2)$ . Now  $L_1(X_1) = d(P_2)X_{11}$  and since  $v_1 \geq w_1$  for any  $w \in \mathfrak{A}_1$ , we see that  $v_1 \geq X_{11}$  with equality when  $X_1$  is a convex combination of vertices belonging to  $\mathfrak{A}_1$  whose first co-ordinate is  $v_1$ .

Clearly  $L_1(X_2) = v_1 d(P_2)$ . Hence we see that  $tL_1(X_1) + (1-t)L_1(X_2) = td(P_2)X_{11} + (1-t)v_1 d(P_2) \leq tv_1 d(P_2) + (1-t)v_1 d(P_2) = v_1 d(P_2)$ . The inequality in here is an equality if and only if  $X_1 \in \text{Conv}(\mathfrak{A}_{11})$ . This establishes the lemma above.  $\square$

Our next lemma concludes that for each  $i$ ,  $1 \leq i \leq \nu - 1$ ,  $C_{i+1}$  is a face of  $C_i$ .

**Lemma 3.4.** *For each  $i$ ,  $1 \leq i \leq \nu - 1$ ,  $C_i \cap H_{i+1}$  is a face of  $C_i$  and is equal to  $C_{i+1}$ , where  $H_{i+1}$  is the hyperplane as defined above.*

*Proof.* For each  $i$ , let us set  $L_{i+1}(x) = d(P_2)x_{i+1} + \left(\sum_1^{n-\nu} x_{\nu+j}\right)v_{i+1}$ . Let  $\alpha \in C_i$  then  $\alpha = tX_1 + (1-t)X_2$  for some  $t \in [0, 1]$  and  $X_1 \in \text{Conv}(\mathfrak{A}_{1i})$ ,  $X_2 \in \text{Conv}(\mathfrak{A}_2)$ . Hence  $L_{i+1}(\alpha) = tL_{i+1}(X_1) + (1-t)L_{i+1}(X_2)$  for every  $i$ .

Notice  $L_{i+1}(X_1) = d(P_2)X_{1(i+1)}$ . Since  $X_1 \in \text{Conv}(\mathfrak{A}_{1i})$ , we see that  $X_{1(i+1)} \leq v_{i+1}$  with equality if and only if  $X_1 \in \text{Conv}(\mathfrak{A}_{1(i+1)})$ . On the other hand  $L_{i+1}(X_2) = v_{i+1}d(P_2)$ . The lemma now follows from similar arguments as in the last paragraph of the proof of the previous lemma.  $\square$

We are now ready to present the proof of our main theorem.



**3.1. Proof of Theorem 1.3.** Observe that without loss of generality we can assume that  $P_j(0) = 0$ ,  $j = 1, 2$ . We notice that, since  $\mathfrak{A}_{1\nu}$  is a singleton set,  $C_\nu$  is a prism with its distinguished vertex being the unique element of  $\mathfrak{A}_{1\nu}$  and its base  $\text{Conv}(\mathfrak{A}_2)$ . From Lemma 3.4, we see that  $C_\nu$  is a face of  $C_{\nu-1}$ . Applying Lemma 3.4 and Result 3.1 iteratively we get that  $C_\nu$  is a face of  $C_1$  which, by Lemma 3.3, is a face of  $C_0$ . Proposition 3.2 says that  $C_0$  is a face of  $\mathbf{N}(\mathbf{P})$ . Again applying Result 3.1, we get that  $C_\nu$  is a face of  $N(P)$ .

Let us denote by  $X_0$  the unique element of  $\mathfrak{A}_{1\nu}$  and let  $X_1$  be any vertex of  $\mathfrak{A}_2$ . Then the segment  $\{tX_0 + (1-t)X_1 : t \in [0, 1]\}$  is an edge of the prism  $C_\nu$ . Since  $C_\nu$  is a face of  $\mathbf{N}(\mathbf{P})$ , using Result 3.1 again, we get that the segment is also an edge of the polytope  $\mathbf{N}(\mathbf{P})$ .

**Claim.** The edge  $\{tX_0 + (1-t)X_1 : t \in [0, 1]\}$  is integrally indecomposable.

To see this, suppose the edge is not integrally indecomposable. Then, by Result 1.2, we get that  $\gcd(X_0 - X_1) = \gcd(X_{01}, \dots, X_{0\nu}, -X_{1(\nu+1)}, \dots, -X_{1n}) = r \neq 1$ . This implies  $r$  divides  $\sum_{i=1}^\nu X_{0i}$  and  $r$  divides  $\sum_{j=1}^{n-\nu} X_{i(\nu+j)}$ . Since  $\sum_{i=1}^\nu X_{0i} = d(P_1)$  and  $\sum_{j=1}^{n-\nu} X_{i(\nu+j)} = d(P_2)$ , we have  $r$  divides  $\gcd(d(P_1), d(P_2))$ . This gives a contradiction. Hence the edge is integrally indecomposable.

Now we claim that  $\mathbf{N}(\mathbf{P})$  is integrally indecomposable. This is because if it is not so then using Result 2.4 we see that the edge as described above will be integrally decomposable. Since none of the  $z_i$ 's divide  $P$ , from the 'Irreducibility criterion'  $P$  is irreducible.  $\square$

**3.2. Examples.** In this subsection, we present a family of irreducible polynomials using the sufficient condition given in this article.

**Example 1.** Let  $P_1 \in F[z_1, z_2]$  be of the form

$$az_1^n + bz_2^m + cz_1^u z_2^v + \sum c_{ij} z_1^i z_2^j$$

where  $a, b, c, n, m \neq 0$  and  $P_2 \in F[z_3, \dots, z_n]$  be any nonconstant polynomial. Suppose that  $un + mv \neq mn$  and  $u + v > \max\{m, n\}$  and  $u + v > \max\{(i + j) : c_{ij} \neq 0\}$ . Notice that  $(u, v)$  will be on the positive side of the line passing through  $(n, 0)$  and  $(0, m)$ , i.e.,  $mu + nv > mn$ . To see this, suppose first that  $n \geq m$ . We know  $u + v > n$ . So,

$$mu + nv \geq m(u + v) > mn.$$

The other case could also be verified easily.

Suppose now for each  $(i, j)$  for which  $c_{ij} \neq 0$ , we have  $mi + nj \geq mn$ ,  $vi - (u - n)j \leq vn$ , and  $uj - (v - m)i \leq mu$ . Then  $\mathbf{N}(\mathbf{P}_1)$  will be a triangle with vertices  $(n, 0)$ ,  $(m, 0)$  and  $(u, v)$ . By Result 1.2 and Proposition 1.4, we see that  $P = P_1 + P_2$  is irreducible if  $\gcd(m, n, u, v) = 1$ .

**Example 2.** Suppose we can rearrange the terms of  $P \in F[z_1, \dots, z_n]$  such that we can write  $P = P_1 + P_2$  where  $P_1$  can be written in the form  $P_1 = Q_1 + Q_2$  where  $Q_1 \in F[z_1]$  is a nonconstant polynomial of degree  $r$  and  $Q_2 \in F[z_2, \dots, z_\nu]$  is a nonconstant polynomial of degree  $m$  such that  $P_1(0) = 0$ . Observe that if  $\gcd(r, m) = 1$  then the method of the proof of Theorem 1.3 implies that  $\mathbf{N}(\mathbf{P}_1)$  is integrally indecomposable polytope. Hence by Proposition 1.4,  $P$  will be irreducible for any nonconstant  $P_2 \in F[z_{\nu+1}, \dots, z_n]$ .

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

A part of this work was carried out at the Indian Institute of Science (IISc), Bangalore where the first author was a research associate. He wishes to thank his thesis adviser Prof. Gautam Bharali for supporting him at this position under his Swarnajayanti Fellowship (Grant No. DST/SJF/MSA-02/2013-14).

## REFERENCES

- [1] G. Ewald, *Combinatorial convexity and algebraic geometry*, Graduate Texts in Mathematics, 168, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1996.
- [2] M. Filaseta, *The irreducibility of all but finitely many Bessel polynomials*, Acta Math. **174**(1995), no. 2, 383-397.
- [3] Shuhong Gao, *Absolute irreducibility of polynomials via Newton polytopes*, J. Algebra **237** (2001), no. 2, 501-520.
- [4] B. Grünbaum, *Convex Polytopes*, Vol. 16 Interscience Publishers John Wiley & Sons, New York, 1967.
- [5] A. Lipkovski, *Newton polyhedra and irreducibility*, Math.Z. **199** (1988), 119-127.
- [6] A. M. Ostrowski, *On multiplication and factorization of polynomials, I. Lexicographic ordering and extreme aggregates of terms*, Aequationes Math. **13** (1975), no. 3, 201-228.
- [7] Rolf Schneider, *Convex bodies: the Brunn-Minkowski theory*, Encyclopedia of Mathematics and its Applications, Vol. 44, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1993.
- [8] C. Shanok, *Convex polyhedra and criteria for irreducibility*, Duke Math. J. **2** (1936), 103-111.
- [9] G. M. Ziegler, *Lectures on polytopes*, Graduate Texts in Mathematics, Vol. 152, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1995.

HARISH-CHANDRA RESEARCH INSTITUTE, PRAYAGRAJ (ALLAHABAD) 211019, INDIA  
Email address: vikramjeetchandel@hri.res.in

Email address: umadayal@stanford.edu