

On the primitive element of finite \mathbb{k} -algebras and applications to commuting matrices

Aristides I. Kechriniotis *

March 18, 2024

Abstract

Let \mathbb{k} be a field of characteristic zero. Using the properties of the ideal of the coordinate Hermite interpolation on an n -dimensional grid [4], we prove that the extension $\mathbb{k} \subset \mathbb{k}[x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n] / (f_1(x_1), \dots, f_n(x_n))$ has a primitive element if and only if at most one of the univariate polynomials f_1, \dots, f_n is inseparable. This result leads to some interesting conclusions regarding the primitive elements of finite \mathbb{k} -algebras. Finally, these results are further used to investigate the Frobenius' question, of whether two commuting matrices A and B can be expressed as polynomials in some matrix C .

1 Introduction

The main result of this note is contained within the following Theorem:

Theorem 1.1 *Let \mathbb{k} be a field of characteristic zero, and I an ideal of $\mathbb{k}[x_1, \dots, x_n]$, $n \geq 2$ generated by the univariate polynomials $f_1 \in \mathbb{k}[x_1], \dots, f_n \in \mathbb{k}[x_n]$. Then the finite \mathbb{k} -algebra $\mathbb{k}[x_1, \dots, x_n] / I$ has a primitive element over \mathbb{k} , if and only if at most one of the polynomials f_1, \dots, f_n is inseparable.*

By Theorem 1.1 we easily get the following, related to the existence of primitive elements of finite \mathbb{k} -algebras, Corollaries :

Corollary 1.2 *Let Δ be a finite \mathbb{k} -algebra. Given $\delta_1, \dots, \delta_n \in \Delta$ such that at most one of their minimal polynomials $\mu_{\delta_1}, \dots, \mu_{\delta_n}$ is inseparable, then the extension $\mathbb{k} \subset \mathbb{k}[\delta_1, \dots, \delta_n]$ has a primitive element.*

Corollary 1.3 *Let Δ be as above. Given $\delta_1, \delta_2 \in \Delta$ such that $\mu_{\delta_1}, \mu_{\delta_2}$ are inseparable, and*

$$\deg \mu_{\delta_1} \deg \mu_{\delta_2} = \dim_{\mathbb{k}} \mathbb{k}[\delta_1, \delta_2], \quad (1.1)$$

then the extension $\mathbb{k} \subset \mathbb{k}[\delta_1, \delta_2]$ has no any primitive element.

*Department of Physics, University of Thessaly, GR-35100 Lamia, Greece. Corresponding author. E-mail: arisk7@gmail.com

Frobenius [1] posed the following question: Can any two commuting matrices A and B over a field \mathbb{k} be expressed as polynomials in some matrix C ?

By considering the following two commuting matrices

$$A = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, B = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad (1.2)$$

he was able to prove that there is no matrix $C \in \mathbb{k}[A, B]$, such that A and B can be expressed as polynomials in C , and posed the following question: Is there some matrix C , such that any pair of commuting matrices A and B over a field \mathbb{k} can be expressed as polynomials in C ?

Shoda [5] has shown that the matrices A and B as given in (1.2) can not be expressed as polynomials in any matrix C . In the example 3.1 in section 3, we also provide a very simple proof that the above 3×3 matrices A and B cannot be written as polynomials in any matrix C .

Two main results related to the Frobenius question can be found in the literature:

1. If A commutes with B , and the minimal polynomial of A is equal to its characteristic polynomial, then B can be expressed as polynomial in A , [2], [3; pp.135-137].
2. If two commuting matrices A and B are both diagonalizable, then A and B can be expressed as polynomials in some matrix C .

In the present paper, using Corollaries 1.2 and 1.3 the following results are obtained:

Let \mathbb{k} be a field of characteristic zero, and two $n \times n$ matrices A and B over the field \mathbb{k} .

Theorem 1.4 *Let $A_1, \dots, A_m, m \geq 2$ be commuting $n \times n$ matrices over \mathbb{k} . If at most one of the matrices A_1, \dots, A_m is not diagonalizable, then all matrices can be expressed as polynomials in some matrix C .*

Theorem 1.4 for $m = 2$ improves the above result 2., and may be formulated as follows: If at least one of the commuting matrices A and B is diagonalizable, then A and B can be expressed as polynomials in some matrix C .

Theorem 1.5 *Let n be any composite number. If the minimal polynomials μ_A and μ_B of the commuting $n \times n$ matrices A and B are both inseparable, and $\deg \mu_A \deg \mu_B = \dim_{\mathbb{k}} \mathbb{k}[A, B]$, then neither A nor B can be expressed as polynomials in some matrix $C \in \mathbb{k}[A, B]$. In addition, if*

$$\deg \mu_A \deg \mu_B = \dim_{\mathbb{k}} \mathbb{k}[A, B] = n, \quad (1.3)$$

then neither A nor B can be expressed as polynomials in some matrix C .

According to Corollary 3.2, we can construct the set of all pairs of commuting and inseparable matrices satisfying (1.3).

2 The primitive element Theorem

Let \mathbb{k} be a field of characteristic zero and $\overline{\mathbb{k}}$ the algebraic closure of \mathbb{k} . For convenience we define the following symbols and notations:

- $\mathbb{N}_0 := \{0, 1, 2, \dots\}$.
- $|A|$ is the cardinality of the set A ;
- $A^n := A \times \dots \times A$,
 n -times
- Given the sets A_1, \dots, A_n , then $\mathbf{A} := A_1 \times \dots \times A_n$. Further any element $(c_1, \dots, c_n) \in \mathbf{A}$ will be denoted by \mathbf{c} .
- $\mathbf{0} := (0, 0, \dots, 0)$, $\mathbf{1} := (1, 1, \dots, 1)$.
- For $\mathbf{a} \in \mathbb{k}^n$, and $\mathbf{m} \in \mathbb{N}_0^n$ we denote $\mathbf{a}^{\mathbf{m}} := \prod_{i=1}^n a_i^{m_i}$.
- In \mathbb{N}_0^n we define the relation " \leq " as follows: $\mathbf{k} \leq \mathbf{m}$ if and only if $k_i \leq m_i$, for every $i = 1, \dots, n$. Clearly (\mathbb{N}_0^n, \leq) is a poset (\mathbb{N}_0^n is partially ordered).
- If $\mathbf{k} \leq \mathbf{m}$ and $\mathbf{k} \neq \mathbf{m}$, then $[\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{m}] := \{\mathbf{l} \in \mathbb{N}_0^n : \mathbf{k} \leq \mathbf{l} \leq \mathbf{m}\} = [k_1, m_1] \times \dots \times [k_n, m_n]$, and is valid $|\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{m}]| = \prod_{i=1}^n (m_i - k_i + 1)$.
- $\partial_i^k := \frac{\partial^k}{\partial x_i^k}$, $\partial^{\mathbf{k}} := \prod_{i=1}^n \partial_i^{k_i}$, $\partial_{\mathbf{a}}^{\mathbf{k}} f(\mathbf{x}) := \partial^{\mathbf{k}} f(\mathbf{x})|_{\mathbf{x}=\mathbf{a}}$.
- Let Δ be a finite \mathbb{k} -algebra. The minimal polynomial of $\delta \in \Delta$ over \mathbb{k} will be denoted by μ_δ , and the number $\max\{\deg \mu_\delta : \delta \in \Delta\}$ will be denoted by $\text{codim}_{\mathbb{k}} \Delta$.

Remark 2.1 *Let Δ be as above. It is easy to verify, that the extension $\mathbb{k} \subset \Delta$ has a primitive element if and only if $\text{codim}_{\mathbb{k}} \Delta = \dim_{\mathbb{k}} \Delta$. This will be used in the proof of Theorem 1.1.*

To prove the main Theorem 1.1 some Lemmas are also required.

Lemma 2.2 *Let A_1, \dots, A_n be finite subsets of $\overline{\mathbb{k}}$ such that $|A_i| > 1$, $i = 1, \dots, n$. Then there exist non zero $c_2, \dots, c_n \in \mathbb{k}$, such that the restriction of $g := x_1 + c_2 x_2 + \dots + c_n x_n \in \mathbb{k}[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ on A is an injective mapping.*

Proof. We define in $\overline{\mathbb{k}}[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ the polynomial

$$f(\mathbf{x}) := \prod_{\substack{\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b} \in \mathbf{A} \\ \mathbf{a} \neq \mathbf{b}}} \sum_{i=1}^n (a_i - b_i) x_i.$$

Clearly f is not identically zero. Suppose $\mathbb{k}^n \cap \text{supp}(f) = \emptyset$. Note that all coefficients of the polynomial f are algebraic over \mathbb{k} . Let M be an extension field of \mathbb{k} , generated from all coefficients of the polynomial f . Then $\mathbb{k} \subset M$ is a

finite extension. Let $\dim_{\mathbb{k}} M = s$. Then the extension $\mathbb{k} \subset M$ has a primitive element $\rho \in M$. Also $1, \rho, \dots, \rho^{s-1}$ are linearly independent over \mathbb{k} . Therefore there are unique polynomials $p_i \in \mathbb{k}[x_1, \dots, x_n]$, $i = 0, 1, \dots, s-1$ such that $f = \sum_{i=0}^{s-1} p_i \rho^i$. From $\mathbb{k}^n \cap \text{supp}(f) = \emptyset$ it follows that $\sum_{i=0}^{s-1} p_i \rho^i = 0$ on \mathbb{k}^n . Therefore all polynomials p_i , $i = 0, 1, \dots, s-1$ are identically zero. Thus we have that $f = 0$. This contradicts to f is not identically zero. Consequently there is at least one $\mathbf{d} = (d_1, \dots, d_n) \in \mathbb{k}^n$, such that $f(\mathbf{d}) \neq 0$. Consider the linear mapping h defined by $h(\mathbf{x}) := \sum_{i=1}^n d_i x_i$. Then from $f(\mathbf{d}) \neq 0$ it follows that

$$\prod_{\substack{\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b} \in \mathbf{A} \\ \mathbf{a} \neq \mathbf{b}}} (h(\mathbf{a}) - h(\mathbf{b})) \neq 0.$$

That means that the restriction of h on \mathbf{A} is an injective mapping. Further, if we assume that $d_i = 0$ for some $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, then h is not an injective mapping on \mathbf{A} . Therefore the following holds: $\prod_{i=1}^n d_i \neq 0$. Thus we have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{card}(d_1^{-1}h(\mathbf{A})) &= \text{card}(h(\mathbf{A})) \\ &= \text{card}(\mathbf{A}). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore $g : \mathbf{A} \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{k}}$, $g(\mathbf{x}) := x_1 + \sum_{i=1}^n c_i x_i$, where $c_i := d_i d_1^{-1}$, is also an injective mapping on \mathbf{A} . \square

Lemma 2.3 *Given the real numbers k_1, \dots, k_n , such that $k_1 \geq 1, \dots, k_n \geq 1$, we have that $\sum_{i=1}^n k_i - (n-1) = \prod_{i=1}^n k_i$ if and only if at most one number of k_1, \dots, k_n is greater than 1.*

Proof. If $n-1$ numbers from k_1, \dots, k_n are equal to 1, without loss of generality we can assume that $k_1 = k \geq 1$, and $k_2 = k_3 = \dots = k_n = 1$. In this case, we have that $\sum_{i=1}^n k_i - (n-1) = k = \prod_{i=1}^n k_i$. Therefore, if at most one number from k_1, \dots, k_n is greater than 1, we have that $\sum_{i=1}^n k_i - (n-1) = \prod_{i=1}^n k_i$. Furthermore, if we suppose that $r > 1$ numbers from k_1, \dots, k_n are greater than 1, without loss of generality we can assume that $k_1 > 1, \dots, k_r > 1$ and $k_{r+1} = k_{r+2} = \dots = k_n = 1$. In this case, we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=1}^n k_i - (n-1) &= \sum_{i=1}^r k_i - r + 1 \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^r (k_i - 1) + 1 \\ &< \prod_{i=1}^r (1 + (k_i - 1)) \\ &= \prod_{i=1}^r k_i = \prod_{i=1}^n k_i, \end{aligned}$$

and consequently $\sum_{i=1}^n k_i - (n-1) \neq \prod_{i=1}^n k_i$. Therefore, at most one number from k_1, \dots, k_n satisfying the condition $\sum_{i=1}^n k_i - (n-1) = \prod_{i=1}^n k_i$ could be greater than 1. Summarizing the above we immediately get the claim of Lemma 2.3. \square

Given the univariate polynomials $f_i \in \mathbb{k}[x_i]$, $i = 1, \dots, n$, we denote by A_i the set of the roots of f_i in the algebraic closure $\overline{\mathbb{k}}$ of \mathbb{k} and by $\nu_i(a)$ the multiplicity of $a \in A_i$. That is $f_i(x_i) = \prod_{a \in A_i} (x_i - a)^{\nu_i(a)}$, $i = 1, \dots, n$.

We denote by I the ideal of $\mathbb{k}[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ generated by f_1, \dots, f_n , and by \overline{I} the ideal of $\overline{\mathbb{k}}[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ generated also by f_1, \dots, f_n .

For any $g \in \mathbb{k}[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ let us denote by \tilde{g} the residue class of g in $\mathbb{k}[x_1, \dots, x_n]/I$, and by \overline{g} the residue class of g in $\overline{\mathbb{k}}[x_1, \dots, x_n]/\overline{I}$.

From [4] we need some results included in the following two Lemmas.

Lemma 2.4 (see [4], Lemma 4.2) *Let $I = (f_1, \dots, f_n)$ be an ideal of $\mathbb{k}[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ generated by the polynomials $f_1 \in \mathbb{k}[x_1], \dots, f_n \in \mathbb{k}[x_n]$. Then*

$$\begin{aligned} \dim_{\mathbb{k}} \mathbb{k}[x_1, \dots, x_n]/I &= \prod_{i=1}^n \deg f_i = \prod_{i=1}^n \sum_{a_i \in A_i} \nu_i(a_i) \\ &= \dim_{\overline{\mathbb{k}}} \overline{\mathbb{k}}[x_1, \dots, x_n]/\overline{I} \overline{\mathbb{k}}[x_1, \dots, x_n]. \end{aligned}$$

Lemma 2.5 (see [4], Corollary 4.4) *$f \in I$ if and only if $\partial_{\mathbf{a}}^{\mathbf{m}} f = 0$ for every $\mathbf{a} \in \mathbf{A}$ and $\mathbf{m} \in [0, \nu(\mathbf{a}) - \mathbf{1}]$, where $\nu(\mathbf{a}) := (\nu_1(a_1), \dots, \nu_n(a_n))$.*

Lemma 2.6 *Given $g \in \mathbb{k}[x_1, \dots, x_n]$, the following expressions are equivalent:*

- 1 *For any $f \in \mathbb{k}[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ there is one $p \in \mathbb{k}[t]$ such that $f = p(g) + I$.*
- 2 *For any $h \in \overline{\mathbb{k}}[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ there is one $q \in \overline{\mathbb{k}}[t]$ such that $h = q(g) + \overline{I}$.*

Proof. Let the first expression be true. Let L be the extension field of \mathbb{k} generated from all coefficients of h . Clearly the algebraic extension $\mathbb{k} \subset L$ is finite. Let $\dim_{\mathbb{k}} L = r$. Then the field extension $\mathbb{k} \subset L$ has a primitive element $\rho \in L$. Thus each coefficient c of h can be written as $c = \sum_{i=0}^{r-1} a_i \rho^i$, where $a_1, \dots, a_{n-1} \in \mathbb{k}$. Therefore h takes the following form:

$$h = \sum_{i=0}^{r-1} f_i \rho^i, \quad (2.1)$$

where $f_i \in \mathbb{k}[x_i] \subset \mathbb{k}[x_1, \dots, x_n]$. From expression 1, there are $p_i \in \mathbb{k}[t]$, such that for every $i = 1, \dots, n$

$$f_i = p_i(g) + I. \quad (2.2)$$

Substituting (2.2) into (2.1) we get the second expression. Let the second expression be true. Then there are $q \in \overline{\mathbb{k}}[t]$, and $h_1, \dots, h_n \in \overline{\mathbb{k}}[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ such that

$$f = q(g) + \sum_{i=1}^n h_i f_i. \quad (2.3)$$

Let M be an extension field of \mathbb{k} generated from all coefficients of q, h_1, \dots, h_n . Then $\mathbb{k} \subset M$ is finite. If $\dim_{\mathbb{k}} M = s$, then $\mathbb{k} \subset M$ has a primitive element $\sigma \in M$. Working in a similar manner as in the first part, (2.3) can be rewritten as:

$$\begin{aligned} f &= q_0(g) + \sum_{i=1}^n h_{i0} f_i + \left(q_1(g) + \sum_{i=1}^n h_{i1} f_i \right) \sigma \\ &+ \dots + \left(q_{s-1}(g) + \sum_{i=1}^n h_{is-1} f_i \right) \sigma^{s-1}, \end{aligned} \quad (2.4)$$

where $q_i \in \mathbb{k}[t]$ for all $i = 1, \dots, n$, and $h_{ij} \in \mathbb{k}[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ for all $i = 0, 1, \dots, n$, $j = 1, \dots, s-1$. Since $q_0(g) + \sum_{i=1}^n h_{i0} f_i - f$, and $q_j(g) + \sum_{i=1}^n q_{ij} f_i \in \mathbb{k}[x_1, \dots, x_n]$, $j = 1, \dots, s-1$, and $\{1, \sigma, \dots, \sigma^{s-1}\}$ is linearly independent over \mathbb{k} , from (2.4) we get that $f = q_0(g) + \sum_{i=1}^n q_{i0} f_i$. That is equivalent to $f = q_0(g) + I$. \square

Lemma 2.7 For any $f \in \overline{\mathbb{k}}[x_1, \dots, x_n]$, we have that

$$F := \prod_{\mathbf{a} \in \mathbf{A}} (f(\mathbf{x}) - f(\mathbf{a}))^{\sum_{i=1}^n \nu_i(a_i) - n + 1} \in \overline{I}.$$

Proof. Fix $\mathbf{a} \in \mathbf{A}$. Taking into account that there are $g_i \in \overline{\mathbb{k}}[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ such that $f(\mathbf{x}) - f(\mathbf{a}) = \sum_{i=1}^n (x_i - a_i) g_i(\mathbf{x})$, F can be written as

$$F = g(\mathbf{x}) \left(\sum_{i=1}^n (x_i - a_i) g_i(\mathbf{x}) \right)^{\sum_{i=1}^n \nu_i(a_i) - n + 1}, \quad (2.5)$$

for some $g \in \overline{\mathbb{k}}[x_1, \dots, x_n]$. Using the multinomial formula on the right-hand side of (2.5) we have,

$$F = \sum_{|\mathbf{i}| = \sum_{i=1}^n \nu_i(a_i) - n + 1} (\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{a})^{\mathbf{i}} h_{\mathbf{i}}(\mathbf{x}),$$

for some $h_{\mathbf{i}} \in \overline{\mathbb{k}}[x_1, \dots, x_n]$. Note that for any $\mathbf{m} \in [\mathbf{0}, \nu(\mathbf{a}) - \mathbf{1}]$ the following is valid: $|\mathbf{m}| \leq \sum_{i=1}^n \nu_i(a_i) - n < \sum_{i=1}^n \nu_i(a_i) - n + 1 = |\mathbf{i}|$. Therefore, for every $\mathbf{m} \in [\mathbf{0}, \nu(\mathbf{a}) - \mathbf{1}]$ and every \mathbf{i} satisfying $|\mathbf{i}| = \sum_{i=1}^n \nu_i(a_i) - n + 1$ there is at least one $j \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ such that $i_j > m_j$. Now applying the Leibniz derivative rule for multivariable functions we get that $\partial_{\mathbf{a}}^{\mathbf{m}} F = 0$, $\mathbf{m} \in [\mathbf{0}, \nu(\mathbf{a}) - \mathbf{1}]$, and by Lemma 2.5, it follows that $F \in \overline{I}$. \square

The main result of this paper can now be proven.

Proof of Theorem 1.1. Let A_1, \dots, A_n be the sets of the zeros of f_1, \dots, f_n respectively, and let $\nu_i(a)$ be the multiplicity of $a \in A_i$. First it will be proved that

$$\text{codim}_{\overline{\mathbb{k}}}(\overline{\mathbb{k}}[x_1, \dots, x_n]/\overline{I}) = \sum_{\mathbf{a} \in \mathbf{A}} \sum_{i=1}^n (\nu_i(a_i) - n + 1): \quad (2.6)$$

Let f be any polynomial in $\overline{\mathbb{k}}[x_1, \dots, x_n]$. Then by Lemma 2.7 follows that $\prod_{\mathbf{a} \in \mathbf{A}} (f(\mathbf{x}) - \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{a}))^{\sum_{i=1}^n \nu_i(a_i) - n + 1} \in \overline{I}$. Therefore

$$\prod_{\mathbf{a} \in \mathbf{A}} (\overline{f(\mathbf{x})} - \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{a}))^{\sum_{i=1}^n \nu_i(a_i) - n + 1} = \overline{0},$$

where $\overline{f(\mathbf{x})} \in \overline{\mathbb{k}}[x_1, \dots, x_n] / \overline{I}$ is the equivalence class of $f(\mathbf{x})$. Therefore, there is a $H \in \overline{\mathbb{k}}[t]$ such that

$$\prod_{\mathbf{a} \in \mathbf{A}} (t - \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{a}))^{\sum_{i=1}^n \nu_i(a_i) - n + 1} = \mu_{\overline{f(\mathbf{x})}}(t) H(t). \quad (2.7)$$

From (2.7) we conclude that $\deg \mu_{\overline{f(\mathbf{x})}} \leq \sum_{\mathbf{a} \in \mathbf{A}} (\sum_{i=1}^n \nu_i(a_i) - n + 1)$, for any $f \in \overline{\mathbb{k}}[x_1, \dots, x_n]$. Therefore we have that

$$\text{codim}_{\overline{\mathbb{k}}}(\overline{\mathbb{k}}[x_1, \dots, x_n] / \overline{I}) \leq \sum_{\mathbf{a} \in \mathbf{A}} \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \nu_i(a_i) - n + 1 \right). \quad (2.8)$$

By Lemma 2.2 follows that there is a polynomial $g = x_1 + c_2 x_2 + \dots + c_n x_n \in \mathbb{k}[x_1, \dots, x_n]$, with non zero $c_2, \dots, c_n \in \mathbb{k}$, such that its restriction on $A_1 \times \dots \times A_n$ is an injective mapping. Then from $\mu_{\overline{g}}(\overline{g}) = 0$ follows that $\mu_{\overline{g}}(g) \in \overline{I}$. Therefore by Lemma 2.5 we obtain that $\partial_{\mathbf{a}}^{\mathbf{m}} \mu_{\overline{g}}(g) = 0$, for all $\mathbf{a} \in \mathbf{A}$, $\mathbf{m} \in [\mathbf{0}, \nu(\mathbf{a}) - \mathbf{1}]$. For the special case of $\mathbf{m} = \mathbf{0}$, it follows that $\mu_{\overline{g}}(g(\mathbf{a})) = 0$ for any $\mathbf{a} \in \mathbf{A}$. Therefore, there is a $h \in \mathbb{k}[t]$ such that

$$\mu_{\overline{g}}(t) = h(t) \prod_{c \in g(\mathbf{A})} (t - c). \quad (2.9)$$

Since the restriction of g to \mathbf{A} is an injective function, we have that $\prod_{c \in g(\mathbf{A})} (t - c) = \prod_{\mathbf{a} \in \mathbf{A}} (t - g(\mathbf{a}))$. Therefore (2.9) becomes

$$\mu_{\overline{g}}(t) = h(t) \prod_{\mathbf{a} \in \mathbf{A}} (t - g(\mathbf{a})). \quad (2.10)$$

From (2.7) and (2.10), it is concluded that for every $\mathbf{a} \in \mathbf{A}$ there is a natural number $m_{\mathbf{a}} \in [1, \sum_{i=1}^n \nu_i(a_i) - n + 1]$ such that

$$\mu_{\overline{g}}(t) = \prod_{\mathbf{a} \in \mathbf{A}} (t - g(\mathbf{a}))^{m_{\mathbf{a}}}. \quad (2.11)$$

Suppose that $m_{\mathbf{a}} < \sum_{i=1}^n \nu_i(a_i) - n + 1$ for some $\mathbf{a} \in \mathbf{A}$, then there exists $\mathbf{m} \in [\mathbf{0}, \nu(\mathbf{a}) - \mathbf{1}]$, such that $m_{\mathbf{a}} = |\mathbf{m}| := m_1 + \dots + m_n$. In this case, using

(2.11) and applying the Leibniz rule for functions of several variables, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
& \partial_{\mathbf{a}}^{\mathbf{m}} \mu_{\bar{g}}(g(\mathbf{x})) \\
&= \partial_{\mathbf{a}}^{\mathbf{m}} \left((g(\mathbf{x}) - g(\mathbf{a}))^{m_{\mathbf{a}}} \prod_{\substack{\mathbf{b} \in \mathbf{A} \\ \mathbf{b} \neq \mathbf{a}}} (g(\mathbf{x}) - g(\mathbf{b}))^{m_{\mathbf{b}}} \right) \\
&= \sum_{\mathbf{r} \in [0, \mathbf{m}]} \binom{\mathbf{m}}{\mathbf{r}} \partial_{\mathbf{a}}^{\mathbf{r}} (g(\mathbf{x}) - g(\mathbf{a}))^{m_{\mathbf{a}}} \partial_{\mathbf{a}}^{\mathbf{m}-\mathbf{r}} \prod_{\substack{\mathbf{b} \in \mathbf{A} \\ \mathbf{b} \neq \mathbf{a}}} (g(\mathbf{x}) - g(\mathbf{b}))^{m_{\mathbf{b}}} \\
&= m_{\mathbf{a}}! c_2^{m_2} \dots c_n^{m_n} \prod_{\substack{\mathbf{b} \in \mathbf{A} \\ \mathbf{b} \neq \mathbf{a}}} (g(\mathbf{a}) - g(\mathbf{b}))^{m_{\mathbf{b}}}.
\end{aligned}$$

Since $g = x_1 + \sum_{i=2}^n c_i x_i$, $c_i \in \mathbb{k} - \{0\}$ is injective on \mathbf{A} , follows that

$$m_{\mathbf{a}}! c_2^{m_2} \dots c_n^{m_n} \prod_{\substack{\mathbf{b} \in \mathbf{A} \\ \mathbf{b} \neq \mathbf{a}}} (g(\mathbf{a}) - g(\mathbf{b}))^{m_{\mathbf{b}}} \neq 0.$$

Therefore $\partial_{\mathbf{a}}^{\mathbf{m}} \mu_{\bar{g}}(g(\mathbf{x})) \neq 0$, implying that $\mu_{\bar{g}}(\bar{g}) \neq \bar{0}$, which is not true. Therefore for all $\mathbf{a} \in \mathbf{A}$ the following is valid

$$m_{\mathbf{a}} = \sum_{i=1}^n \nu_i(a_i) - n + 1. \quad (2.12)$$

From (2.11) and (2.12) we get

$$\mu_{\bar{g}}(t) = \prod_{\mathbf{a} \in \mathbf{A}} (t - g(\mathbf{a}))^{\sum_{i=1}^n \nu_i(a_i) - n + 1},$$

so one has,

$$\deg \mu_{\bar{g}} = \sum_{\mathbf{a} \in \mathbf{A}} \sum_{i=1}^n (\nu_i(a_i) - n + 1).$$

From this and from (2.8) we get (2.6). Now from (2.6), by Remark 2.1 it follows that $\bar{\mathbb{k}}[x_1, \dots, x_n] / \bar{I}$ has a primitive element if and only if

$$\dim_{\bar{\mathbb{k}}} \bar{\mathbb{k}}[x_1, \dots, x_n] / \bar{I} = \sum_{\mathbf{a} \in \mathbf{A}} \sum_{i=1}^n (\nu_i(a_i) - n + 1),$$

which, by Lemma 2.4, can be written equivalently as

$$\prod_{i=1}^n \sum_{a_i \in A_i} \nu_i(a_i) = \sum_{\mathbf{a} \in \mathbf{A}} \sum_{i=1}^n (\nu_i(a_i) - n + 1)$$

or

$$\prod_{i=1}^n \sum_{a_i \in A_i} \nu_i(a_i) = \sum_{\mathbf{a} \in \mathbf{A}} \sum_{i=1}^n \nu_i(a_i) - (n-1) |\mathbf{A}|.$$

Changing order of summation on the right-hand side, the above expression becomes

$$\prod_{i=1}^n \sum_{a_i \in A_i} \nu_i(a) = \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\frac{|\mathbf{A}|}{|A_i|} \sum_{a \in A_i} \nu_i(a) \right) - (n+1)|\mathbf{A}|.$$

Dividing the above formula by $|\mathbf{A}|$, yields

$$\prod_{i=1}^n \frac{\sum_{a_i \in A_i} \nu_i(a)}{|A_i|} = \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\frac{\sum_{a \in A_i} \nu_i(a)}{|A_i|} \right) - (n-1). \quad (2.13)$$

So we came to the conclusion: $\overline{\mathbb{k}}[x_1, \dots, x_n]/\overline{I}$ has a primitive element if and only if (2.13) is valid. Note that $\nu_i(a) \geq 1$, $i = 1, \dots, n$ for every $a \in A_i$. Therefore, for any $i = 1, \dots, n$ we have $k_i := \frac{\sum_{a_i \in A_i} \nu_i(a)}{|A_i|} \geq 1$. Thus by Lemma 2.3 we conclude that (2.13) is valid if and only if at most one of the numbers $\frac{\sum_{a_i \in A_i} \nu_i(a)}{|A_i|}$, $i = 1, \dots, n$ is greater than 1. In other words $\overline{\mathbb{k}}[x_1, \dots, x_n]/\overline{I}$ has a primitive element if and only if at most one of the polynomials f_1, \dots, f_n is inseparable, and in this case \overline{g} is a primitive element of $\overline{\mathbb{k}}[x_1, \dots, x_n]/\overline{I}$, where $g = x_1 + c_2x_2 + \dots + c_nx_n \in \mathbb{k}[x_1, \dots, x_n]$, with non zero c_2, \dots, c_n . Finally by Lemma 2.6 we immediately prove the claim of Theorem 1.1. \square

Proof of Corollary 1.2. Let I be the ideal of $\mathbb{k}[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ generated by $f_1 := \mu_{\delta_1}(x_1), \dots, f_n := \mu_{\delta_n}(x_n)$. Then by Theorem 1.1, $\mathbb{k}[x_1, \dots, x_n]/I$ has a primitive element \overline{g} , for some $g = x_1 + c_2x_2 + \dots + c_nx_n \in \mathbb{k}[x_1, \dots, x_n]$, $\prod_{i=2}^n c_i \neq 0$. Therefore, for every $f \in \mathbb{k}[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ there exist $p \in \mathbb{k}[t]$, and $h_1, \dots, h_n \in \mathbb{k}[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ such that $f = p(g) + h_1f_1 + \dots + h_nf_n$, which by setting $x_1 = \delta_1, \dots, x_n = \delta_n$ becomes $f(\delta_1, \dots, \delta_n) = p(\delta_1 + c_2\delta_2 + \dots + c_n\delta_n)$. \square

Proof of Corollary 1.3. From (1.1) we have that

$$\dim_{\mathbb{k}} \mathbb{k}[\delta_1, \delta_2] = \dim_{\mathbb{k}} \mathbb{k}[x_1, x_2] / (\mu_{\delta_1}(x_1), \mu_{\delta_2}(x_2)).$$

Therefore $\mathbb{k}[\delta_1, \delta_2]$ and $\mathbb{k}[x_1, x_2] / (\mu_{\delta_1}(x_1), \mu_{\delta_2}(x_2))$ are isomorphic. Since $\mu_{\delta_1}, \mu_{\delta_2}$ are both inseparable, by Theorem 1.1 follows that $\mathbb{k}[x_1, x_2] / (\mu_{\delta_1}(x_1), \mu_{\delta_2}(x_2))$ has no primitive element, meaning that $\mathbb{k}[\delta_1, \delta_2]$ has no primitive element. \square

3 The Frobenius problem

Proof of Theorem 1.4. Since a matrix is diagonalizable if and only if its minimal polynomial is separable, the proof follows immediately by Corollary 1.2. \square

Lemma 3.1 *Let A and B be $n \times n$ commuting matrices over a field \mathbb{k} with $\dim_{\mathbb{k}} \mathbb{k}[A, B] = n$. If the extension $\mathbb{k} \subset \mathbb{k}[A, B]$ has no primitive element, then there is no matrix C such that A and B can be expressed as polynomials in C .*

Proof. Suppose there is a $n \times n$ matrix $C \notin \mathbb{k}[A, B]$ such that A and B are polynomials in C . Thus, $\mathbb{k}[A, B] \subseteq \mathbb{k}[C]$, and because by Cayley–Hamilton Theorem is valid $\dim_{\mathbb{k}} \mathbb{k}[C] \leq n$, we conclude that $\mathbb{k}[A, B] = \mathbb{k}[C]$. Therefore $C \in \mathbb{k}[A, B]$ which contradics to $C \notin \mathbb{k}[A, B]$. \square

Example 3.1. Consider the matrices A and B as in (1.1). Because $A^2 = B^2 = AB = BA = 0$, follows that $\mathbb{k}[A, B] = \{rI + sA + tB : r, s, t \in \mathbb{k}\}$, and $\dim_{\mathbb{k}} \mathbb{k}[A, B] = 3$. Further through [1] there is no matrix $C \in \mathbb{k}[A, B]$ such that A and B can be expressed as polynomials in C . Thus by Lemma 3.1 there is no 3×3 matrix C such that A and B can be expressed as polynomials in C .

Proof of Theorem 1.5. From (1.3) by Corollary 1.3 we obtain the first assertion and then by Lemma 3.1 we immediately obtain the second assertion. \square

Corollary 3.2 Given the composite number n and the natural numbers $m, k > 1$ such that $mk = n$. If $f = x^m + a_{m-1}x^{m-1} + \dots + a_0 \in \mathbb{k}[x]$, $g = y^k + b_{k-1}y^{k-1} + \dots + b_0 \in \mathbb{k}[y]$ are both inseparable, then the following two $n \times n$ block matrices $\rho(f)$ and $\rho(g)$ can not be expressed as polynomials of any $n \times n$ matrix C ,

$$\rho(f) = \begin{bmatrix} C(f) & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \dots & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & C(f) & \mathbf{0} & \dots & \mathbf{0} \\ \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\ \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \dots & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \dots & C(f) \end{bmatrix}$$

and

$$\rho(g) = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{I} & \mathbf{0} & \dots & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{I} & \dots & \mathbf{0} \\ \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\ \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \dots & \mathbf{I} \\ -b_0\mathbf{I} & -b_1\mathbf{I} & -b_2\mathbf{I} & \dots & -b_k\mathbf{I} \end{bmatrix},$$

where $\mathbf{0}$ and \mathbf{I} are the zero and unit $m \times m$ matrices, respectively, and $C(f)$ is the companion matrix of the polynomial f given by

$$C(f) = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & \dots & 0 \\ \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\ \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \dots & 1 \\ -a_0 & -a_1 & -a_2 & \dots & -a_m \end{bmatrix}.$$

Further the following holds: Let \mathbf{M} be the set of pairs (f, g) of all inseparable polynomials f and g satisfying the condition $\deg f \deg g = n$. Then the set of all matrix pairs (A, B) satisfying the conditions (1.3) of Theorem 1.5 is given by $\{(S\rho(f)S^{-1}, S\rho(g)S^{-1}) : S \in \text{GL}_n(\mathbb{k}), (f, g) \in \mathbf{M}\}$.

Proof. A basis of $\mathbb{k}[x, y] / (f, g)$ as vector space is

$$B = \{\tilde{x}^i \tilde{y}^j : i = 0, 1, \dots, m-1; j = 0, 1, \dots, k-1\}.$$

By ordering the basis B as follows,

$$B = \{1, \tilde{x}, \dots, \tilde{x}^{m-1}, \tilde{y}, \tilde{x}\tilde{y}, \dots, \tilde{x}^{m-1}\tilde{y}, \dots, \tilde{y}^{k-1}, \tilde{x}\tilde{y}^{k-1}, \dots, \tilde{x}^{m-1}\tilde{y}^{k-1}\}, \quad (3.1)$$

it is easy to verify, that the regular matrix representations of \tilde{x} and \tilde{y} with respect to basis B , as ordered in (3.1), equal to the matrices $\rho(f)$ and $\rho(g)$ respectively. Now the first assertion follows by Theorem 1.5. Finally, the second claim follows directly from the first and we will omit the details. \square

Example 3.2. Let $f = (x-1)^2(x+2) = x^3 - 3x + 2$ and $g = (x+1)^2 = x^2 +$

$$2x + 1, \text{ then by Corollary 3.2 the matrices } \rho(f) = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ -2 & 3 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -2 & 3 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$$

$$\text{and } \rho(g) = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ -1 & 0 & 0 & -2 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 & -2 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 & -2 \end{bmatrix} \text{ can not be expressed as polynomials in any one matrix } C.$$

References

- [1] Frobenius, F. G., Ueber vertauschbare Matrizen, *Sitzungsberichte der Akad. der Wiss. zu Berlin*, 1896. Persistent Link: <http://dx.doi.org/10.3931/e-rara-18867>
- [2] M. Gerstenhaber, On Dominance and Varieties of Commuting Matrices, *Annals of Mathematics*, Vol. 73, No. 2, pp. 324-548, March 1961.
- [3] Horn, R.A, & Johnson, C.R, Matrix Analysis, *Cambridge University Press*, 1985

- [4] Kechriniotis, A. I., Delibasis, K. K., Oikonomou, I. P., & Tsigaridas, G. N. (2023). Classical multivariate Hermite coordinate interpolation on n-dimensional grids, *ArXiv preprint arXiv:2301.01833*.
- [5] K.Shoda, Ueber mit einer matrix vertauschbare matrizen, *Mathematische Zeitschrift*, vol. 29, pp. 696-712, 1929.