

Critical Point Criteria and Dynamically Monogenic Polynomials

JOACHIM KÖNIG, HANSON SMITH, AND ZACK WOLSKE

ABSTRACT. Let K be a number field with ring of integers \mathcal{O}_K , and let $f(x) \in \mathcal{O}_K[x]$ be a monic, irreducible polynomial. We establish necessary and sufficient conditions in terms of the critical points of $f(x)$ for the iterates of $f(x)$ to be monogenic polynomials. More generally, we give necessary and sufficient conditions for the backwards orbits of elements of \mathcal{O}_K under $f(x)$ to be monogenerators. We apply our criteria to construct novel examples of dynamically monogenic polynomials, yielding infinite towers of monogenic number fields with the backward orbit of one monogenerator giving a monogenerator at the next level.

1. INTRODUCTION AND MAIN RESULT

Let K be a number field with ring of integers \mathcal{O}_K . We say K is *monogenic* if there exists some α in \mathcal{O}_K so that $\mathcal{O}_K = \mathbb{Z}[\alpha]$. In other words, K is monogenic if there exists some algebraic integer α such that the powers of α form a power integral basis $\{1, \alpha, \alpha^2, \dots, \alpha^{n-1}\}$ for \mathcal{O}_K . In this case, we say that α is a *monogenerator*, and we call the minimal polynomial of α a *monogenic polynomial*. More generally, if L is an extension of K , we say that L is *monogenic over K* if there exists an $\alpha \in \mathcal{O}_L$ such that $\mathcal{O}_L = \mathcal{O}_K[\alpha]$.

Questions regarding monogenicity* are both theoretically and historically fundamental to algebraic number theory. Especially with the recent growth of arithmetic dynamics, it is natural to study the monogenicity of iterates of polynomials.

In this work, we present succinct necessary and sufficient criteria for when the backward orbits of an algebraic integer under a monic, integral polynomial are monogenerators. More informally and less generally, we answer the question of when all iterates of a polynomial are monogenic.

Before stating these criteria, we need a few definitions. Let K be a number field and let α be integral and algebraic over K . If \mathfrak{p} is a prime ideal of \mathcal{O}_K , write $\mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{p}}$ to indicate \mathcal{O}_K adjoined the inverse of every element not in \mathfrak{p} . Let L denote $K(\alpha)$. We say that $\mathcal{O}_K[\alpha]$ is *\mathfrak{p} -maximal* if $\mathcal{O}_K[\alpha] \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_K} \mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{p}} = \mathcal{O}_L \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_K} \mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{p}}$. When $K = \mathbb{Q}$, it is equivalent to require that $\mathfrak{p} = p$ does not divide the index $[\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{Q}(\alpha)} : \mathbb{Z}[\alpha]]$. If $\mathcal{O}_K[\alpha]$ is \mathfrak{p} -maximal for each prime \mathfrak{p} , then $\mathcal{O}_K[\alpha] = \mathcal{O}_L$ and α is a monogenerator. As usual, given a polynomial $f(x)$, we let $f^n(x)$ denote the n -fold composition. Finally, for a prime \mathfrak{p} of \mathcal{O}_K , we let $v_{\mathfrak{p}} : K \rightarrow \mathbb{Z} \cup \{\infty\}$ denote the \mathfrak{p} -adic valuation. We are now able to state the main result:

2020 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 11R04, 11R21, 37P05.

Key words and phrases. Monogenic, Power integral basis, Arithmetic dynamics, Post Critically Finite (PCF).

*Also called ‘monogeneity’ or ‘monogenity’ in addition to some other less common terms.

Theorem 1.1 (The Critical Point Criteria for Monogenicity). *Let K be a number field. Fix $N > 0$. Suppose $f(x) \in \mathcal{O}_K[x]$ has a leading coefficient that is a unit, and let $a \in \mathcal{O}_K$ be such that $f^n(x) - a$ is irreducible over $K[x]$ for $1 \leq n \leq N$. Let \mathfrak{p} be a prime of \mathcal{O}_K .*

1. *If \mathfrak{p} is a non-vanishing prime (i.e., $f'(x) \not\equiv 0 \pmod{\mathfrak{p}}$), then let M be an extension of K where $f'(x)$ splits. Let \mathfrak{P} be a prime of \mathcal{O}_M above \mathfrak{p} with ramification index $e(\mathfrak{P} | \mathfrak{p})$.*

The polynomial $f^n(x) - a$ is \mathfrak{p} -maximal for each $1 \leq n \leq N$ if and only if for each critical point θ whose reduction is well-defined modulo $\mathfrak{p}\mathcal{O}_M$ and each $1 \leq n \leq N$, one has $v_{\mathfrak{P}}(f^n(\theta) - a) \leq e(\mathfrak{P} | \mathfrak{p})$.

2. *If \mathfrak{p} is a vanishing prime (i.e., $f'(x) \equiv 0 \pmod{\mathfrak{p}}$), then we have $f(x) - a \equiv g(x)^p \pmod{\mathfrak{p}}$ for some $g(x) \in \mathcal{O}_K[x]$. Let L be an extension of K where $g(x)$ splits. Let \mathfrak{P} be a prime of \mathcal{O}_L above \mathfrak{p} with ramification index $e(\mathfrak{P} | \mathfrak{p})$.*

The polynomial $f^n(x) - a$ is \mathfrak{p} -maximal for all $1 \leq n \leq N$ if and only if for every root τ of $g(x)$ in \mathcal{O}_L , one has $v_{\mathfrak{P}}(f(\tau) - a) \leq e(\mathfrak{P} | \mathfrak{p})$.

Applications of Theorem 1.1 become particularly striking in cases where (for $f(x)$ and a suitably chosen) it can be applied simultaneously for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, since in this case one obtains the simultaneous monogenicity of the polynomials $f^n(x) - a$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Such a pair $(f(x), a)$ is called a *dynamically monogenic pair* (cf. Definition 2.10). Investigating such pairs connects the topic of monogenicity with the quickly expanding field of arithmetic dynamics, a central problem of which is the study of arithmetic and Galois-theoretic properties of the backwards orbits $\cup_{j \in \mathbb{N}} f^{-j}(\{a\})$ of a value a under a polynomial $f(x)$.

Theorem 1.1 and the applications herein generalize and subsume several previous results on simultaneous monogenicity of $f^n(x) - a$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ for various $f(x)$ and a . This work was inspired by an effort to generalize [Smi23] and [SW24] (and hence generalize [Cas22] and [Li22]). Theorem 1.1 can be seen as a generalization of other recent work including [SSL24] (which focuses on $f(x) = x^m - a$) and [Jon21] (which considers specific families such as $f(x) = (x - a)^m + a$). [Gas14] made an earlier connection between monogenicity and dynamics by giving conditions to guarantee the monogenicity of $T_\ell^n(x) - a$ when $T_\ell(x)$ is the Chebyshev polynomial of degree ℓ and $T_\ell^n(x) - a$ is irreducible. By applying Theorem 1.1 and some additional work on irreducibility, we obtain Theorem 4.5 which gives necessary and sufficient conditions for the dynamical monogenicity of $(T_\ell(x), a)$ with no irreducibility assumption. From another point of view, results on the monogenicity of radical polynomials can be readily generalized by taking a dynamical perspective and considering backward orbits under the power map $f(x) = x^d$. Thus the main result of [Smi21] (and hence of [Gas17]) can be readily obtained from Theorem 1.1.

The generality of Theorem 1.1 also demonstrates some of the difficulties in identifying dynamically monogenic pairs $(f(x), a)$. Firstly, controlling \mathfrak{p} -adic valuations of infinitely many values simultaneously, as often required in Condition 1, is very difficult, and unconditional

positive results should often be expected to be out of reach. However, it may happen that the set of these values is actually a finite set. This occurs precisely when the polynomial $f(x)$ is post-critically finite. We therefore dedicate special attention to such polynomials in our applications in Section 4, notably extending previous results on specific PCF polynomials such as $f(x) = x^d$ and $T_\ell(x)$, as mentioned above. Moreover, the application of Theorem 1.1 for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ requires a simultaneous irreducibility assumption for all polynomials $f^n(x) - a$. In many cases, proving this property is considered a difficult problem in arithmetic dynamics, and many previous studies have resorted to accepting it as a black-box assumption. A key observation of Sections 3 and 4 is that, in several important key cases, this property follows from the combination of Conditions 1 and 2 (cf. Theorems 4.1 and 4.5) or can be guaranteed for “many” values a (cf. the example given by Theorem 4.11).

2. A CRITICAL POINT CRITERION

We begin with a criterion for monogenicity of a polynomial that is due to Uchida [Uch77]. See [VV21] for a comparison to other criteria for monogenicity.

Theorem 2.1 (Uchida’s Criterion). *Let R be a Dedekind ring. Let α be an element of some integral domain which contains R , and let α be integral over R . Then $R[\alpha]$ is a Dedekind ring if and only if the defining polynomial $f(x)$ of α is not contained in \mathfrak{m}^2 for any maximal ideal \mathfrak{m} of the polynomial ring $R[x]$.*

Notice that if $R = \mathbb{Z}$, then $\mathfrak{m} = (p, \phi(x))$ for some integral prime p and some $\phi(x) \in \mathbb{Z}[x]$ with $\overline{\phi(x)} \in \mathbb{F}_p[x]$ irreducible. Thus $\mathfrak{m}^2 = (p^2, p\phi(x), \phi(x)^2)$. We can rephrase Uchida’s criterion to require that $f(x) \neq \phi(x)^2g(x) + p\phi(x)h(x) + p^2j(x)$ for any p and $\phi(x)$ as above and any $g(x), h(x), j(x) \in \mathbb{Z}[x]$.

Remark 2.2. Uchida’s criterion is generally amicable towards localization. Indeed, let K be the field of fractions of a Dedekind domain R . We will be most interested in the case where K is a number field and $R = \mathcal{O}_K$, the ring of integers of K , or R is \mathcal{O}_K localized at a prime ideal. Let α be integral and algebraic over R . If \mathfrak{p} is a prime ideal of R , write $R_{\mathfrak{p}}$ to indicate R localized at \mathfrak{p} . (By *localized*, we mean that we adjoin the inverse of every element not in \mathfrak{p} .) When R is \mathcal{O}_K , then we will simply write $\mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{p}}$. Let S be the integral closure of $R[\alpha]$. We say that $R[\alpha]$ is \mathfrak{p} -maximal if $R[\alpha] \otimes_R R_{\mathfrak{p}} = S \otimes_R R_{\mathfrak{p}}$. When $R = \mathbb{Z}$, it is equivalent to require that $\mathfrak{p} = p$ does not divide $[\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{Q}(\alpha)} : \mathbb{Z}[\alpha]]$. Uchida [Uch77, Lemma] proves that if \mathfrak{m} is a maximal ideal of $R[x]$ and \mathfrak{m} contains an integral polynomial, then \mathfrak{m} is of the form $(\mathfrak{p}, \phi(x))$ for some maximal ideal \mathfrak{p} of R and some $\phi(x) \in R[x]$ that is irreducible modulo \mathfrak{p} . Let $f(x)$ be the minimal polynomial of α over R (or, equivalently, over $R_{\mathfrak{p}}$), and let $\pi_{\mathfrak{p}}$ be a generator of \mathfrak{p} in $R_{\mathfrak{p}}$. Now, $R[\alpha]$ is \mathfrak{p} -maximal if $f(x)$ is not contained in the square of any maximal ideal of $R_{\mathfrak{p}}[x]$. That is, if $f(x) \notin (\pi_{\mathfrak{p}}, \phi(x))^2$ for any $\phi(x)$ that is irreducible in

$R/\mathfrak{p}[x]$. Expanding, we see that $f(x)$ is \mathfrak{p} -maximal if $f(x) \neq \phi(x)^2g(x) + \pi_{\mathfrak{p}}\phi(x)h(x) + \pi_{\mathfrak{p}}^2j(x)$ for any $g(x), h(x), j(x) \in R_{\mathfrak{p}}[x]$.

Let $k_{\mathfrak{p}}$ be the residue field of R at \mathfrak{p} . Since $f(x)$ and $f'(x)$ share a factor $\phi(x)$ if and only if $\phi(x)$ is a repeated factor of $f(x)$, we have the following restatement of Uchida's Criterion.

Theorem 2.3 (Restatement of Uchida's Criterion). *Let $f(x) \in R[x]$ be an irreducible polynomial with leading coefficient a unit, and let α be a root. If $f'(x) \not\equiv 0 \pmod{\mathfrak{p}}$, then the ring $R[\alpha]$ is \mathfrak{p} -maximal if and only if for every factor $\overline{\phi(x)}$ of $f'(x)$ in $k_{\mathfrak{p}}[x]$ there is a lift $\phi(x) \in R_{\mathfrak{p}}[x]$ such that $\phi(x) \nmid f(x)$ in $R_{\mathfrak{p}}/\pi_{\mathfrak{p}}^2[x]$. If $f'(x) \equiv 0 \pmod{\mathfrak{p}}$, then $R[\alpha]$ is \mathfrak{p} -maximal if and only if for every factor $\overline{\phi(x)}$ of $f(x)$ in $k_{\mathfrak{p}}[x]$ there is a lift $\phi(x) \in R_{\mathfrak{p}}[x]$ such that $\phi(x) \nmid f(x)$ in $R_{\mathfrak{p}}/\pi_{\mathfrak{p}}^2[x]$.*

Remark 2.4. Letting $R = \mathbb{Z}$ for the sake of being explicit, note that we cannot simply require that $f(x)$ and $f'(x)$ do not share a factor in $\mathbb{Z}/p^2\mathbb{Z}[x]$. If $f(x) = \phi(x)^2g(x) + p\phi(x)h(x) + p^2j(x)$, then we compute that

$$f'(x) = 2\phi(x)\phi'(x)g(x) + \phi(x)^2g'(x) + p\phi'(x)h(x) + p\phi(x)h'(x) + p^2j'(x).$$

We see that the monomial $p\phi'(x)h(x)$ may prevent $f'(x)$ and $f(x)$ from sharing $\phi(x)$ as a factor modulo p^2 .

Henceforth, we will focus on the case where R is \mathcal{O}_K , the ring of integers of a number field K or $\mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{p}}$, the localization of \mathcal{O}_K at a prime ideal \mathfrak{p} . From Remark 2.2, we see that in investigating the \mathfrak{p} -maximality of $\mathcal{O}_K[\alpha]$ it is equivalent to investigate the \mathfrak{p} -maximality of $\mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{p}}[\alpha]$ (equivalently, the integral-closedness since \mathfrak{p} is the unique maximal ideal of $\mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{p}}[\alpha]$). In what follows, our exposition centers on \mathcal{O}_K , though the equivalent statements hold for $\mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{p}}$. We will use this in later sections when we consider the \mathfrak{p} -maximality of polynomials that are $\mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{p}}$ -integral but not \mathcal{O}_K -integral. If M is an extension of K and \mathfrak{P} is a prime of M above \mathfrak{p} , we let $e(\mathfrak{P} | \mathfrak{p})$ denote the ramification index of \mathfrak{P} over \mathfrak{p} . We note that if $v_{\mathfrak{P}}$ is the \mathfrak{P} -adic valuation, then $v_{\mathfrak{P}}(\pi_{\mathfrak{p}}) = e(\mathfrak{P} | \mathfrak{p})$ for any uniformizer $\pi_{\mathfrak{p}}$ of $\mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{p}}$.

Note that $f'(x) \equiv 0 \pmod{\mathfrak{p}}$ if and only if $f(x) = g(x)^p$, where p is the characteristic of $k_{\mathfrak{p}}$ and $g(x)$ is a polynomial in $k_{\mathfrak{p}}[x]$. As we can see, every element of $\overline{k_{\mathfrak{p}}}$ is a critical point and every root of $f(x)$ is a multiple root. We call such a prime \mathfrak{p} a *vanishing prime* for $f(x)$.

On the other hand, suppose $f'(x) \not\equiv 0 \pmod{\mathfrak{p}}$. In this case, we say \mathfrak{p} is a *non-vanishing prime*. Let M be an extension of K where $f'(x)$ splits, and let \mathfrak{P} be a prime of \mathcal{O}_M above \mathfrak{p} . Letting $\theta \in M$ be a root of $f'(x)$, if $\theta \pmod{\mathfrak{P}}$ is well-defined, then θ reduces to a root of $f'(x)$ in $k_{\mathfrak{P}}$, an extension of $k_{\mathfrak{p}}$. In this case, we see that $f(\theta) \equiv 0 \pmod{\mathfrak{P}}$ if and only if the minimal polynomial of θ over $k_{\mathfrak{p}}[x]$ is a repeated factor of $f(x)$ in $k_{\mathfrak{p}}[x]$. However, if $\theta \pmod{\mathfrak{p}}$ is not well-defined, then $\deg f(x) \in \mathfrak{p}$. Comparing to the factorization of $f'(x)$ in $M[x]$ shows that θ does not correspond to a repeated factor of $f(x)$ in $k_{\mathfrak{p}}[x]$.

For the purpose of dynamics, we would like to work with critical points. Thus, M will be an extension of K where $f'(x)$ splits completely. We have made the choice to work with M and L for ease of exposition, though we could instead take separate lifts of the relevant irreducible factors of $f'(x)$ and $f(x)$. Indeed, Theorem 2.3 tells us that $f(x)$ is \mathfrak{p} -maximal if and only if $\phi(x) \nmid f(x)$ in $\mathcal{O}_K/\mathfrak{p}^2[x]$ for each lift of each irreducible factor of $f'(x)$ in $k_{\mathfrak{p}}[x]$. The following lemma relates the factors of $f'(x)$ in $k_{\mathfrak{p}}[x]$ to critical points of $f(x)$ in M .

Lemma 2.5 (Factors, Critical Points, and Valuations). *Suppose $f'(x) \not\equiv 0 \pmod{\mathfrak{p}}$, and let M be an extension of K where $f'(x)$ splits completely. Let \mathfrak{P} be a prime of \mathcal{O}_M above \mathfrak{p} . A lift $\phi(x) \in \mathcal{O}_K[x]$ of an irreducible factor of $f'(x)$ in $k_{\mathfrak{p}}[x]$ divides $f(x)$ in $\mathcal{O}_K/\mathfrak{p}^2[x]$ if and only if $v_{\mathfrak{P}}(f(\theta)) > e(\mathfrak{P} | \mathfrak{p})$ for some θ in M that is well-defined modulo $\mathfrak{p}\mathcal{O}_M$ and a root of $f'(x)$.*

Proof. Write $f'(x) \equiv \phi(x)^m r(x) \pmod{\mathfrak{p}}$ for some $m > 0$ and $r(x) \in \mathcal{O}_K[x]$ with $\phi(x)$ and $r(x)$ relatively prime in $k_{\mathfrak{p}}[x]$. Since $\phi(x)$ divides $f(x)$ in $k_{\mathfrak{p}}[x]$, we can write $f(x) \equiv \phi(x)^{m+1}g(x) \pmod{\mathfrak{p}}$ for some $g(x) \in \mathcal{O}_K$. From our hypothesis, we have $f(x) = \phi(x)^{m+1}g(x) + b\phi(x)h(x) + cj(x)$ with $g(x), h(x), j(x) \in \mathcal{O}_K[x]$, $b \in \mathfrak{p}$, and $c \in \mathfrak{p}^2$. Let $\theta \in M$ be a critical point that reduces to a root of $\phi(x)$ modulo \mathfrak{P} . Such a θ exists since $f'(x)$ factors completely over M and $\phi(x)$ divides $f'(x)$ in $k_{\mathfrak{p}}[x]$. The equation $0 = f'(\theta) \equiv \phi(\theta)^m r(\theta) \pmod{\mathfrak{p}}$ implies that $v_{\mathfrak{P}}(\phi(\theta)^m r(\theta)) \geq e(\mathfrak{P} | \mathfrak{p})$. Since $\phi(x)$ and $r(x)$ are relatively prime in $k_{\mathfrak{p}}[x]$ and hence $k_{\mathfrak{P}}[x]$ and since $v_{\mathfrak{P}}(\phi(\theta)) > 0$, we have $v_{\mathfrak{P}}(r(\theta)) = 0$ and $v_{\mathfrak{P}}(\phi(\theta)^m) \geq e(\mathfrak{P} | \mathfrak{p})$.

We evaluate,

$$f(\theta) = \phi(\theta)^{m+1}g(\theta) + b\phi(\theta)h(\theta) + cj(\theta)$$

Analyzing each term, we see that $v_{\mathfrak{P}}(f(\theta)) > e(\mathfrak{P} | \mathfrak{p})$.

For the converse, let $\theta \in M$ be a critical point such that $v_{\mathfrak{P}}(f(\theta)) > e(\mathfrak{P} | \mathfrak{p})$. We see that $f(\theta) \equiv 0 \pmod{\mathfrak{P}}$. Since $k_{\mathfrak{P}} = \mathcal{O}_M/\mathfrak{P}$ is an extension of $k_{\mathfrak{p}}$ and since θ is a root of $f'(x)$ in $k_{\mathfrak{P}}$, we see that $\gcd(f(x), f'(x)) \neq 1$ in $k_{\mathfrak{p}}[x]$. Thus some irreducible factor $\overline{\phi(x)}$ of $f'(x)$ divides $f(x)$ in $k_{\mathfrak{p}}[x]$. Let $\phi(x)$ be a lift to $\mathcal{O}_K[x]$. We have $\phi(\theta) \equiv 0 \pmod{\mathfrak{p}\mathcal{O}_M}$, and from the relationship between $f(x)$ and $f'(x)$, we can write $f(x) \equiv \phi(x)^2g(x) \pmod{\mathfrak{p}}$ for some $g(x) \in \mathcal{O}_K[x]$.

We see that $f(x) = \phi(x)^2g(x) + bh(x)$ in $\mathcal{O}_K[x]$ for some $b \in \mathfrak{p}$ and some $h(x) \in \mathcal{O}_K[x]$. We evaluate at θ and note $v_{\mathfrak{P}}(f(\theta)) > e(\mathfrak{P} | \mathfrak{p})$. Since $\phi(x)^2g(x) \in \mathfrak{p}^2\mathcal{O}_M$, we have $v_{\mathfrak{P}}(bh(\theta)) > e(\mathfrak{P} | \mathfrak{p})$. Thus either $b \in \mathfrak{p}^2$ or $v_{\mathfrak{P}}(h(\theta)) > 0$. In the former case, our desired result is clear. In the latter case, we note $\gcd(h(x), \phi(x)) \neq 1$ in $k_{\mathfrak{P}}[x]$ and hence in $k_{\mathfrak{p}}[x]$ as above. Thus, $h(x) = \phi(x)j(x) + c\ell(x)$ with $c \in \mathfrak{p}\mathcal{O}_K$. Therefore,

$$f(x) = \phi(x)^2g(x) + bh(x) = \phi(x)^2g(x) + b(\phi(x)j(x) + c\ell(x)),$$

and we have our result. \square

When \mathfrak{p} is a vanishing prime, we have $f(x) \equiv g(x)^p \pmod{\mathfrak{p}}$ for some $g(x) \in \mathcal{O}_K[x]$. The next lemma connects roots of $g(x)$ to factors of $f(x)$.

Lemma 2.6 (Vanishing Primes and Roots). *Let \mathfrak{p} be a vanishing prime of residue characteristic p , so $f(x) \equiv g(x)^p \pmod{\mathfrak{p}}$ for some $g(x) \in \mathcal{O}_K[x]$. Let L be an extension of K where $g(x)$ splits, and let \mathfrak{P} be a prime of L above \mathfrak{p} . Then there is a lift $\phi(x)$ of a repeated irreducible factor of $f(x)$ in $k_{\mathfrak{p}}[x]$ that divides $f(x)$ in $\mathcal{O}_K/\mathfrak{p}^2[x]$ if and only if $v_{\mathfrak{P}}(f(\tau)) > e(\mathfrak{P} | \mathfrak{p})$, where $\tau \in \mathcal{O}_L$ is a root of $g(x)$.*

Proof. Since $\phi(x)$ is irreducible in $k_{\mathfrak{p}}[x]$ and since $f(x) \equiv g(x)^p \pmod{\mathfrak{p}}$, we see that $\phi(x)$ divides $g(x)$ in $k_{\mathfrak{p}}[x]$. Thus, we can write $g(x) \equiv \phi(x)^m r(x) \pmod{\mathfrak{p}}$ with $\gcd(\phi(x), r(x)) = 1$ in $k_{\mathfrak{p}}[x]$. Since $g(x)$ splits in L , we see there is an algebraic integer τ that is a root of $g(x)$ and such that $\phi(\tau) \equiv 0 \pmod{\mathfrak{P}}$. We have $0 = g(\tau) \equiv \phi(\tau)^m r(\tau) \pmod{\mathfrak{p}\mathcal{O}_L}$. Since $\gcd(\phi(x), r(x)) = 1$ and since $v_{\mathfrak{P}}(\phi(\tau)) > 0$, we see $v_{\mathfrak{P}}(r(\tau)) = 0$ and $v_{\mathfrak{P}}(\phi(\tau)^m) \geq e(\mathfrak{P} | \mathfrak{p})$.

Since $\phi(x)$ divides $f(x)$ modulo \mathfrak{p}^2 and since $f(x) \equiv g(x)^p \pmod{\mathfrak{p}}$, we have $f(x) = (\phi(x)^m r(x))^p + bh(x)$ with $b \in \mathfrak{p}$ and either $b \in \mathfrak{p}^2$ or $\phi(x)$ dividing $h(x)$ modulo \mathfrak{p}^2 . Evaluating at τ and noting $v_{\mathfrak{P}}(\phi(\tau)^m) \geq e(\mathfrak{P} | \mathfrak{p})$, we have our desired result.

For the converse, let $\tau \in L$ be a root of $g(x)$ such that $v_{\mathfrak{P}}(f(\tau)) > e(\mathfrak{P} | \mathfrak{p})$. Let $\phi(x)$ be an irreducible factor of $g(x)$ in $\mathcal{O}_K[x]$ such that $\phi(\tau) \equiv 0 \pmod{\mathfrak{P}}$. (Note that we can assume that the number of irreducible factors of $g(x)$ in $k_{\mathfrak{p}}[x]$ is equal to that in $\mathcal{O}_K[x]$.) By hypothesis, $f(x) = g(x)^p + bh(x)$ with $b \in \mathfrak{p}$ and $h(x) \in \mathcal{O}_K[x]$. Evaluating at τ , we see that $v_{\mathfrak{P}}(bh(\tau)) > e(\mathfrak{P} | \mathfrak{p})$. Thus either $b \in \mathfrak{p}^2$ or $\gcd(\phi(x), h(x)) > 1$ in $k_{\mathfrak{p}}[x]$. In either case we have our result. \square

The lemmas above yield a rephrasing of Uchida's criterion in terms of critical points.

Theorem 2.7 (Uchida's Critical Point Criterion). *Let $f(x) \in \mathcal{O}_K[x]$ be an irreducible polynomial with leading coefficient a unit, and let α be a root. Let M be an extension of K where $f'(x)$ splits. For $\mathfrak{p} \subset \mathcal{O}_K$ a non-vanishing prime ($f'(x) \not\equiv 0 \pmod{\mathfrak{p}}$), let \mathfrak{P} be a prime of \mathcal{O}_M above \mathfrak{p} . Then $\mathcal{O}_K[\alpha]$ is \mathfrak{p} -maximal if and only if $v_{\mathfrak{P}}(f(\theta)) \leq e(\mathfrak{P} | \mathfrak{p})$ for each critical point θ for which the reduction modulo $\mathfrak{p}\mathcal{O}_M$ is defined.*

If \mathfrak{p} is a vanishing prime, then we can write $f(x) \equiv g(x)^p \pmod{\mathfrak{p}}$ for some $g(x) \in \mathcal{O}_K[x]$. Let L be an extension of K where $g(x)$ splits, and let \mathfrak{P} be a prime of \mathcal{O}_L above \mathfrak{p} . In this case, the ring $\mathcal{O}_K[\alpha]$ is \mathfrak{p} -maximal if and only if for any $\tau \in \mathcal{O}_L$ such that $g(\tau) = 0$, one has $v_{\mathfrak{P}}(f(\tau)) \leq e(\mathfrak{P} | \mathfrak{p})$.

Proof. Combining Lemmas 2.5 and 2.6 with Theorem 2.3, we have the result. \square

The restatement of Uchida's result in Theorem 2.7 lends itself to studying the monogenicity of iterates of polynomials. Moreover, since changing the constant coefficient does not change the critical points, it is not difficult to accommodate the backward orbits of points of \mathcal{O}_K other than 0. The following is our main theorem.

Theorem 1.1 (The Critical Point Criteria for Monogenicity). *Let K be a number field. Fix $N > 0$. Suppose $f(x) \in \mathcal{O}_K[x]$ has a leading coefficient that is a unit, and let $a \in \mathcal{O}_K$ be such that $f^n(x) - a$ is irreducible over $K[x]$ for $1 \leq n \leq N$. Let \mathfrak{p} be a prime of \mathcal{O}_K .*

1. *If \mathfrak{p} is a non-vanishing prime (i.e., $f'(x) \not\equiv 0 \pmod{\mathfrak{p}}$), then let M be an extension of K where $f'(x)$ splits. Let \mathfrak{P} be a prime of \mathcal{O}_M above \mathfrak{p} . The polynomial $f^n(x) - a$ is \mathfrak{p} -maximal for each $1 \leq n \leq N$ if and only if for each critical point θ whose reduction is well-defined modulo $\mathfrak{p}\mathcal{O}_M$ and each $1 \leq n \leq N$, one has $v_{\mathfrak{P}}(f^n(\theta) - a) \leq e(\mathfrak{P} | \mathfrak{p})$.*
2. *If \mathfrak{p} is a vanishing prime (i.e., $f'(x) \equiv 0 \pmod{\mathfrak{p}}$), then we have $f(x) - a \equiv g(x)^p \pmod{\mathfrak{p}}$ for some $g(x) \in \mathcal{O}_K[x]$. Let L be an extension of K where $g(x)$ splits. Let \mathfrak{P} be a prime of \mathcal{O}_L above \mathfrak{p} . The polynomial $f^n(x) - a$ is \mathfrak{p} -maximal for all $1 \leq n \leq N$ if and only if for every root τ of $g(x)$ in \mathcal{O}_L , one has $v_{\mathfrak{P}}(f(\tau) - a) \leq e(\mathfrak{P} | \mathfrak{p})$.*

Proof. First, we focus on the non-vanishing primes. Let \mathfrak{p} be a prime of K and suppose $f'(x) \not\equiv 0 \pmod{\mathfrak{p}}$. Proceeding by induction, the \mathfrak{p} -maximality of $f(x) - a$ follows from Theorem 2.7. Now, let $n < N$ and suppose we have the \mathfrak{p} -maximality of $f^r(x) - a$ for all $0 < r \leq n$. We would like to show that $f^{n+1}(x) - a$ is \mathfrak{p} -maximal. Consider

$$(2.1) \quad \frac{d}{dx} \left(f^{n+1}(x) - a \right) = f'(f^n(x)) f'(f^{n-1}(x)) \cdots f'(x).$$

We will take an extension of M' of M containing all the roots of $\frac{d}{dx}(f^{n+1}(x) - a)$. Let \mathcal{P} be a prime of M' above \mathfrak{P} . It suffices to show that no root γ of $\frac{d}{dx}(f^{n+1}(x) - a)$ whose reduction at \mathcal{P} is well-defined satisfies $v_{\mathcal{P}}(f^{n+1}(\gamma) - a) > e(\mathcal{P} | \mathfrak{p})$.

For a contradiction, suppose γ is a root of $f'(f^s(x))$ in M' , with $0 \leq s \leq n$, such that $v_{\mathcal{P}}(f^{n+1}(\gamma) - a) > e(\mathcal{P} | \mathfrak{p})$. Now, $f^s(\gamma)$ is a root of $f'(x)$ in M . We see

$$v_{\mathcal{P}}(f^{n+1}(\gamma) - a) = e(\mathcal{P} | \mathfrak{P}) v_{\mathfrak{P}}(f^{n+1-s}(f^s(\gamma)) - a) \text{ and } e(\mathcal{P} | \mathfrak{p}) = e(\mathcal{P} | \mathfrak{P}) e(\mathfrak{P} | \mathfrak{p}).$$

Thus $v_{\mathfrak{P}}(f^{n+1-s}(f^s(\gamma)) - a) > e(\mathfrak{P} | \mathfrak{p})$. This contradicts our hypothesis. Since this argument accounts for each term appearing on the right hand side of (2.1), we conclude that no root γ of $\frac{d}{dx} f^{n+1}(x)$ in M' satisfies $v_{\mathcal{P}}(f^{n+1}(\gamma) - a) > e(\mathcal{P} | \mathfrak{p})$. Theorem 2.7 and induction yield the result.

Now we turn to the vanishing primes. Suppose $f'(x) \equiv 0 \pmod{\mathfrak{p}}$, so $f(x) - a \equiv g(x)^p \pmod{\mathfrak{p}}$ for some $g(x) \in \mathcal{O}_K[x]$. Let L and \mathfrak{P} be as in the theorem statement. Here we do not need induction. For the monogenicity of $f^n(x) - a$, Theorem 2.7 shows it is necessary that $v_{\mathfrak{P}}(f(\tau) - a) \leq e(\mathfrak{P} | \mathfrak{p})$ for each root τ of $g(x)$. Suppose this is the case and consider $f^n(x) - a$ with $1 \leq n \leq N$. Since $f'(x) \equiv 0 \pmod{\mathfrak{p}}$, we compute

$$\frac{d}{dx} \left(f^n(x) - a \right) = f'(f^{n-1}(x)) f'(f^{n-2}(x)) \cdots f'(x) \equiv 0 \pmod{\mathfrak{p}}.$$

Thus \mathfrak{p} is a vanishing prime for $f^n(x) - a$, and $f^n(x) - a \equiv g(f^{n-1}(x))^p \pmod{\mathfrak{p}}$. Let L' be an extension of L where $g(f^{n-1}(x))$ splits completely and let \mathcal{P} be a prime of L' above \mathfrak{P} .

Theorem 2.7 shows that $f^n(x) - a$ is \mathfrak{p} -maximal if and only if for any $\tau' \in L'$ that is a root of $g(f^{n-1}(x))$, one has $v_{\mathcal{P}}(f^n(\tau') - a) \leq e(\mathcal{P} | \mathfrak{p})$. If τ' is a root of $g(f^{n-1}(x))$ in L' , then $f^{n-1}(\tau')$ is a root of $g(x)$ in L . We have $v_{\mathcal{P}}(f^n(\tau') - a) = e(\mathcal{P} | \mathfrak{P})v_{\mathfrak{P}}(f(f^{n-1}(\tau')) - a)$ and $e(\mathcal{P} | \mathfrak{p}) = e(\mathcal{P} | \mathfrak{P})e(\mathfrak{P} | \mathfrak{p})$, so $v_{\mathfrak{P}}(f(f^{n-1}(\tau')) - a) > e(\mathfrak{P} | \mathfrak{p})$. This is a contradiction. We conclude that $v_{\mathcal{P}}(f^n(\tau') - a) \leq e(\mathcal{P} | \mathfrak{p})$ and $f^n(x) - a$ is \mathfrak{p} maximal for all $1 \leq n \leq N$. \square

Remark 2.8. a) Note that irreducibility is not necessarily automatic from Conditions 1 and 2 of Theorem 1.1. In general, the assumption of irreducibility cannot be dropped. An example is $f(x) = (x^2 - 2)(x^2 - 3)$, with $K = \mathbb{Q}$, $a = 0$, $N = 1$. The mod 2 roots 0 and 1 evaluate to 2 mod 4. Hence Condition 2 holds for the only vanishing prime 2. The critical values are 6 and $-1/4$. These have squarefree numerators, meaning that Condition 1 holds for all non-vanishing primes.

b) Note that Theorem 1.1 gives necessary and sufficient conditions for iterates of any monic polynomial $f(x) \in \mathcal{O}_K[x]$ to be monogenic. However, even when a polynomial fails to be monogenic, the field generated by a root may be monogenic. For a simple example consider $f(x) = x^2$ and let $a \in \mathbb{Z}^{>1}$. We see that $f^n(x) + a^{2^n} = x^{2^n} + a^{2^n}$ is not monogenic. It fails to be p -maximal at all primes dividing a . However, $f^n(x) + a^{2^n}$ generates the same field as $x^{2^n} + 1$, and the 2-power cyclotomic fields are monogenic with monogenerator $\zeta_{2^{n+1}}$. Indeed Theorem 1.1 gives a short proof: Each odd prime p is a non-vanishing prime, and $v_p(0 + 1) = 0$. The prime 2 is a vanishing prime, and $v_2(1^2 + 1) = 1$.

For many of the examples we work with we do not need the field extensions M/K and L/K in Theorem 1.1. The following corollary captures this simplified situation.

Corollary 2.9. *With the hypotheses as in Theorem 1.1, suppose that f has K -rational critical values, i.e., $f(\theta_i) \in K$ for each critical point θ_i of f . Suppose further that for each vanishing prime \mathfrak{p} one has $f(x) - a \equiv g(x)^p \pmod{\mathfrak{p}}$ where $g(x) \in \mathcal{O}_K[x]$ and for each root τ_j of $g(x)$ it holds that $f(\tau_j) \in \mathcal{O}_K$. Then, $f^n(x) - a$ is monogenic for all $n \leq N$ if and only if both of the following conditions hold:*

1. *(Non-Vanishing Primes) If $f'(x) \not\equiv 0 \pmod{\mathfrak{p}}$, then $v_{\mathfrak{p}}(f^n(\theta_i) - a) \leq 1$ for each i and each $n \leq N$.*
2. *(Vanishing Primes) If $f'(x) \equiv 0 \pmod{\mathfrak{p}}$, then $v_{\mathfrak{p}}(f(\tau_j) - a) \leq 1$ for each j .*

Proof. For the non-vanishing primes we take $M = K(\theta_1, \dots, \theta_r)$ and let \mathfrak{P} be a prime of M above \mathfrak{p} . Since $f(\theta_i) \in \mathcal{O}_K$, we have $v_{\mathfrak{P}}(f^n(\theta_i) - a) \leq e(\mathfrak{P} | \mathfrak{p})$ if and only if $v_{\mathfrak{p}}(f^n(\theta_i) - a) \leq 1$. Note that a critical point θ_i that is not well-defined modulo \mathfrak{p} necessarily has a negative \mathfrak{p} -adic valuation, so $v_{\mathfrak{p}}(f^n(\theta_i) - a) \leq 1$. Condition 1 follows from Theorem 1.1.

For the vanishing primes, we take $L = K(\tau_1, \dots, \tau_s)$ and let \mathfrak{P} be a prime of L above \mathfrak{p} . Since $f(\tau_j) \in \mathcal{O}_K$, we have $v_{\mathfrak{P}}(f(\tau_j) - a) \leq e(\mathfrak{P} | \mathfrak{p})$ if and only if $v_{\mathfrak{p}}(f(\tau_j) - a) \leq 1$. Condition 2 follows from Theorem 1.1. \square

Definition 2.10. We say that a polynomial $f(x) \in \mathcal{O}_K[x]$ is *dynamically monogenic* if $f^n(x)$ is monogenic for each $n \geq 1$. More generally, we say that a pair $f(x) \in \mathcal{O}_K[x]$ and $a \in \mathcal{O}_K$ is a *dynamically monogenic pair* if $f^n(x) - a$ is a monogenic polynomial for each $n \geq 1$. For example, classical results show that for every prime p , the pair (x^p, ζ_p) is a dynamically monogenic pair over $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta_p)$. Note that some authors use the term *dynamically stable* (cf. [Jon21]).

In a related vein, we call a polynomial $f(x)$ (resp., a pair $(f(x), a)$) *dynamically irreducible* if $f^n(x)$ (resp., $f^n(x) - a$) is irreducible for all $n \geq 1$. This is also called *stability* in the literature. Notice that dynamical irreducibility is implied by dynamical monogenicity.

Remark 2.11. A polynomial is called *post-critically finite* (PCF, for short) if the forward orbits of each of its critical points are finite. Theorem 1.1 points toward how dynamical monogenicity relates to post-critically finite polynomials. Suppose all iterates of a monic PCF polynomial $f(x) \in \mathcal{O}_K[x]$ are irreducible. Then, there are only finitely many conditions to check in order to see whether $f(x)$ is dynamically monogenic, or whether $(f(x), a)$ is a dynamically monogenic pair.

Generally, if $f^n(x)$ is monogenic, then $f^k(x)$ is monogenic for all $k \leq n$. In fact, Proposition 3.4 of [SW24] shows that $f^n(x)$ is monogenic if and only if $f^k(x)$ is monogenic for all $k \leq n$. If $f(x)$ is PCF and dynamically irreducible, then let l be the maximum length of a critical orbit. Theorem 2.7 in conjunction with [SW24, Proposition 3.4] shows that if $f^l(x)$ is monogenic, then $f^n(x)$ is monogenic for all $n > 1$. Thus, if $f(x)$ is dynamically irreducible, then $f(x)$ is PCF if and only if there exists some $l \geq 1$ such that (from the perspective of Theorem 1.1) the conditions for the monogenicity of $f^l(x)$ imply the monogenicity of $f^n(x)$ for all $n \geq 1$.

If, conversely, $f(x) \in \mathbb{Z}[x]$ is not PCF, then it is known that for any critical point θ with infinite forward orbit and any a which is not a postcritical point of $f(x)$, there are infinitely many primes \mathfrak{p} with $v_{\mathfrak{p}}(f^n(\theta) - a) \geq 1$ for at least one $n \in \mathbb{N}$ (see, e.g., [BIJ⁺15, Lemma12] for a somewhat stronger assertion). In the context of Uchida's theorem, this means that the squarefreeness conditions of Corollary 2.9, which need to be verified in order to show monogenicity for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ simultaneously, will necessarily involve infinitely many primes.

3. RESULTS ON DYNAMICAL IRREDUCIBILITY

The following is a statement on when and how often the conditions for dynamical monogenicity obtained in the previous section can be fulfilled. It asserts that, for a PCF polynomial fulfilling certain extra assumptions (notably concerning dynamical irreducibility and K -rationality of the critical values), the conditions can be fulfilled as long as there are no local obstructions.

Lemma 3.1. *Let K be a number field, and $f(x) \in \mathcal{O}_K[x]$ a PCF polynomial whose leading coefficient is a unit and all of whose critical values are K -rational. Let $\Omega \subset K$ be the (finite)*

union of forward orbits of the critical points of $f(x)$. Assume that $(f(x), a)$ is dynamically irreducible for all $a \in \mathcal{O}_K$ outside of a set of relative density zero (with respect to norm). Then the following are equivalent:

1. Both of the following hold:
 - i. (Non-Vanishing Primes) For every prime ideal \mathfrak{p} of \mathcal{O}_K with $f'(x) \not\equiv 0 \pmod{\mathfrak{p}}$, there exists at least one residue class modulo \mathfrak{p}^2 containing no element of Ω .[†]
 - ii. (Vanishing Primes) For every prime ideal \mathfrak{p} of \mathcal{O}_K with $f'(x) \equiv 0 \pmod{\mathfrak{p}}$, there exists at least one value $a \in \mathcal{O}_K$ such that $f(x) - a$ is \mathfrak{p} -maximal.[‡]
2. There exists a positive density subset (with respect to norm) of values $a \in \mathcal{O}_K$ such that $(f(x), a)$ is dynamically monogenic over K .

Proof. The implication $2 \Rightarrow 1$ follows directly from Theorem 1.1, so we assume 1

For every prime ideal \mathfrak{p} of \mathcal{O}_K , let $\Omega_{\mathfrak{p}}$ be the set of all mod- \mathfrak{p}^2 reductions of elements of Ω (excluding those for which the reduction is not defined). It follows by a standard Chinese remainder argument, that the proportion of $a \in \mathcal{O}_K$ such that $(f(x), a)$ fulfills the conclusion of Theorem 1.1 is bounded below by

$$\prod_{\mathfrak{p} \text{ vanishing}} \frac{1}{N(\mathfrak{p})^2} \cdot \prod_{\mathfrak{p} \text{ non-vanishing}} \left(1 - \frac{|\Omega_{\mathfrak{p}}|}{N(\mathfrak{p})^2}\right).$$

Here, the factor $\prod_{\mathfrak{p}} \frac{1}{N(\mathfrak{p})^2}$ is due to the fact that Condition 2 of Theorem 1.1 only depends on the mod- \mathfrak{p}^2 residue class of a . This factor is positive since there are only finitely many vanishing primes. Furthermore, by Assumption i, we have $|\Omega_{\mathfrak{p}}| \leq \min\{|\Omega|, N(\mathfrak{p})^2 - 1\}$ for all non-vanishing primes \mathfrak{p} . From this, it follows that $\prod_{\mathfrak{p}} \left(1 - \frac{|\Omega_{\mathfrak{p}}|}{N(\mathfrak{p})^2}\right)$ is bounded below by a positive constant factor (arising from the finitely many primes \mathfrak{p} with $N(\mathfrak{p})^2 - 1 < |\Omega|$) times $\prod_{\mathfrak{p}} \left(1 - \frac{|\Omega|}{N(\mathfrak{p})^2}\right)$, the latter product obviously being bounded away from zero. In total, the proportion of $a \in \mathcal{O}_K$ such that $(f(x), a)$ fulfills the conclusion of Theorem 1.1 is bounded away from 0. \square

The assumption in Lemma 3.1 of $(f(x), a)$ being dynamically irreducible for “most” $a \in \mathcal{O}_K$ is not automatic but can nevertheless be guaranteed in certain key cases. We collect some results ensuring this property.

Lemma 3.2. *Let K be a number field, p a prime number, and $f(x) = (f_1 \circ \dots \circ f_r)(x) \in K[x]$ be a PCF polynomial such that each $f_i(x) \in K[x]$ is linearly related to x^p , i.e., $f_i(x) = (\lambda_i \circ x^p \circ \mu_i)(x)$ with suitable linear polynomials $\lambda_i(x), \mu_i(x) \in K[x]$. Then there exists $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that, for all $a \in K$ with $\text{Gal}(f^{n_0}(x) - a/K) \cong \text{Gal}(f^{n_0}(x) - t/K(t))$, the pair $(f(x), a)$ is dynamically irreducible.*

[†]Note that this condition is automatically fulfilled if $|\Omega| \leq 3$.

[‡]See Theorem 1.1 Condition 2 for the verification of this property.

Proof. For any field $K \subset F \subset \overline{K}$, let $\text{Mon}_{f,F} := \text{Gal}(f(x) - t/F(t))$ denote the monodromy group of $f(x)$ over F . It is well-known that $\text{Mon}_{f,F}$ embeds as a permutation group into the iterated wreath product $\text{Mon}_{f_r,F} \circ \cdots \circ \text{Mon}_{f_1,F}$. Furthermore, for $F = K(\zeta_p)$ the p -th cyclotomic field, one clearly has $\text{Mon}_{f_i,F} \cong C_p$, so that in particular $\text{Mon}_{f,F} \leq C_p \wr \cdots \wr C_p$ is a p -group. The assertion is now a straightforward consequence of [BGJT23, Theorem 1.3]. \square

Remark 3.3. Note that the assumption on the Galois group of $f^{n_0}(x) - a$ is fulfilled for all but a density zero set of integral values $a \in \mathcal{O}_K$, by a sufficiently strong version of Hilbert's irreducibility theorem, see, e.g., [Coh79, Theorem 1].

The following lemma collects a number of relatively well-known statements on the dynamics of Eisenstein polynomials. It is also useful in ensuring dynamical irreducibility, and eventually dynamical monogenicity.

Lemma 3.4. *Let K be a number field and \mathfrak{p} a prime of K . If a polynomial $f(x) \in K[x]$ is \mathfrak{p} -Eisenstein, then it is \mathfrak{p} -maximal. Moreover, the extension generated by $f(x)$ is totally ramified at \mathfrak{p} . Conversely, if an extension L/K is totally ramified at \mathfrak{p} , then L/K is generated by a polynomial that is \mathfrak{p} -Eisenstein. Finally, if $f(x)$ is \mathfrak{p} -Eisenstein and has degree greater than 1, then $f^n(x)$ is \mathfrak{p} -Eisenstein for all $n \geq 1$.*

We include a brief proof for completeness.

Proof. For the first claim, suppose $f(x)$ has degree d . Note that $f(x) \equiv x^d \pmod{\mathfrak{p}}$. However, x does not divide $f(x)$ modulo \mathfrak{p}^2 . Thus $f(x)$ is \mathfrak{p} -maximal. Alternatively, one can use the Montes algorithm/Ore's theorem to see that the principal x -polygon is one-sided with slope $-\frac{1}{d}$. This also shows that \mathfrak{p} has ramification index d . The fact that iterates of a \mathfrak{p} -Eisenstein polynomial are \mathfrak{p} -Eisenstein is implied by Lemma 2.3 of [Odo85], though a direct proof via analysis of the valuations of the coefficients of $f^n(x)$ is possible.

To see that an extension totally ramified over \mathfrak{p} is given by a \mathfrak{p} -Eisenstein polynomial, suppose we are in that setup, and let \mathfrak{P} denote the unique prime of \mathcal{O}_L above \mathfrak{p} . Let $\pi_{\mathfrak{P}} \in \mathcal{O}_L$ be an element with \mathfrak{P} -adic valuation 1. We see that $K(\pi_{\mathfrak{P}}) = L$. Moreover, the minimal polynomial of $\pi_{\mathfrak{P}}$ over K is \mathfrak{p} -Eisenstein. This can be generalized a good deal; the interested reader should consult Proposition 12 in §6 of Chapter III of [Ser79]. \square

Combining Lemma 3.4 with Theorem 1.1, we obtain a sufficient criterion for monogenicity of the *fields* generated by roots of polynomials $f^n(x) - a$, for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. First, we need a lemma that classifies when units are monogenerators.

Lemma 3.5. *Let R be a Dedekind domain, and let α be a root of an irreducible polynomial $f(x) = c_n x^n + c_{n-1} x^{n-1} + \cdots + c_1 x + c_0 \in R[x]$ with $c_n \in R^\times$. Let K be the field of fractions of R , and let $L = K(\alpha)$. Write \mathcal{O}_L for the ring of elements of L which are integral over R . The following are equivalent:*

- (1) $\alpha \in \mathcal{O}_L^\times$.
- (2) $c_0 \in R^\times$.
- (3) $\alpha^{-1} \in R[\alpha]$.
- (4) $R[\alpha] = R[\alpha^{-1}]$.

Proof. For (1) \implies (2), note that if $\alpha \in \mathcal{O}_L^\times$, then there exists $\alpha^{-1} \in \mathcal{O}_L^\times$ so that $\alpha \cdot \alpha^{-1} = 1$. Taking norms we have $\text{Norm}_{L/K}(\alpha) \text{Norm}_{L/K}(\alpha^{-1}) = 1$. Thus $c_0 \in R^\times$. \checkmark

For (2) \implies (3), we have $c_n \alpha^n + \dots + c_1 \alpha + c_0 = 0$, so

$$1 = -c_0^{-1} c_n \alpha^n - \dots - c_0^{-1} c_1 \alpha. \text{ Thus } \alpha^{-1} = -c_0^{-1} c_n \alpha^{n-1} - \dots - c_0^{-1} c_1. \checkmark$$

For (3) \implies (4), we have $\alpha^{-1} = b_{n-1} \alpha^{n-1} + \dots + b_1 \alpha + b_0$ for some $b_i \in R$. Multiplying by α^{1-n} and subtracting, we obtain

$$\alpha^{-n} - b_0 \alpha^{1-n} - b_1 \alpha^{2-n} - \dots - b_{n-3} \alpha^{-2} - b_{n-2} \alpha^{-1} - b_{n-1} = 0$$

Since α^{-1} is a unit and since it generates the same extension field as α , we see that $x^n - b_0 x^{n-1} - \dots - b_{n-2} x - b_{n-1}$ is the minimal polynomial. (1) \implies (2) shows that $b_{n-1} \in R^\times$. Thus

$$b_{n-1}^{-1} \alpha^{1-n} - b_{n-1}^{-1} b_0 \alpha^{2-n} - b_{n-1}^{-1} b_1 \alpha^{3-n} - \dots - b_{n-1}^{-1} b_{n-3} \alpha^{-1} - b_{n-1}^{-1} b_{n-2} = \alpha$$

is an R -linear expression of α in powers of α^{-1} . Hence $R[\alpha] = R[\alpha^{-1}]$. \checkmark

Finally, (4) \implies (1) is clear since $R[\alpha] = R[\alpha^{-1}] \subset \mathcal{O}_L$. \checkmark □

Theorem 3.6. *Let K be a number field. Assume that $f(x) \in \mathcal{O}_K[x]$ is PCF with leading coefficient a unit, and assume that there exists some $\gamma \in \mathcal{O}_K$ which is periodic under $f(x)$. Given a non-unit $b \in \mathcal{O}_K$, let $K \subset K_1 \subset K_2 \subset \dots$ be a chain of fields such that K_n is generated over K by a root of $f^n(x) - \frac{1+b\gamma}{b}$. For any non-vanishing prime $\mathfrak{p} \subset \mathcal{O}_K$ of $f(x)$, let \mathfrak{P} denote a prime extending \mathfrak{p} in the splitting field of $f'(x)$. For any vanishing prime \mathfrak{p} of $f(x)$ not dividing b , fix $g(x) \in K[x]$ such that $f(x) - \frac{1+b\gamma}{b} \equiv g(x)^p \pmod{\mathfrak{p}}$ (with p the residue characteristic of \mathfrak{p}), and let \mathfrak{P} denote a prime extending \mathfrak{p} in the splitting field of $g(x)$. Assume that all of the following are fulfilled:*

- i.* $v_{\mathfrak{p}}(b) \leq 1$ for all primes \mathfrak{p} of \mathcal{O}_K .
- ii.* For every critical point θ of $f(x)$, every $k \in \mathbb{N}$, and every prime \mathfrak{p} of \mathcal{O}_K not dividing b which is a non-vanishing prime for $f(x)$, one has $v_{\mathfrak{P}}(1 + (\gamma - f^k(\theta))b) \leq e(\mathfrak{P} | \mathfrak{p})$.
- iii.* For every prime \mathfrak{p} of \mathcal{O}_K not dividing b which is a vanishing prime for $f(x)$, and for any root τ of $g(x)$, one has $v_{\mathfrak{P}}(f(\tau) - \frac{1+b\gamma}{b}) \leq e(\mathfrak{P} | \mathfrak{p})$.

Then K_n is monogenic over K for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

Proof. For $n \in \mathbb{N}$, let α_n be a root of $f^n(x) - \frac{1+b\gamma}{b}$, let $c_n \in \mathcal{O}_K$ be such that $f^n(c_n) = \gamma$ (note that such c_n exists due to γ being periodic), and let $\beta_n := \frac{1}{\alpha_n - c_n}$. In particular, β_n is a root of the polynomial $h_n(x) := (-bf^n(\frac{1}{x} + c_n) + 1 + b\gamma) \cdot x^{\deg(f)^n}$ (i.e., the reciprocal of the

polynomial $-bf^n(x + c_n) + 1 + b\gamma$. We will show that, under the conditions of the theorem, $\mathcal{O}_{K_n} = \mathcal{O}_K[\beta_n]$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

First, we make sure that $h_n(x)$ is indeed monic. This amounts to verifying that the constant coefficient of $-bf^n(x + c_n) + 1 + b\gamma$ equals 1, which follows directly from the fact that $f^n(c_n) = \gamma$. Next, since the leading coefficient of $f(x)$ is a unit and $v_{\mathfrak{p}}(b) \leq 1$, we see that $h_n(x)$ is a \mathfrak{p} -Eisenstein polynomial, and hence \mathfrak{p} -maximal for all primes $\mathfrak{p} \mid b$ by Lemma 3.4. Since b is a non-unit, there is at least one such prime \mathfrak{p} with $v_{\mathfrak{p}}(b) = 1$. In particular, $h_n(x)$ is irreducible.

Next, pick a prime \mathfrak{p} not dividing b which is a non-vanishing prime for $f(x)$, and consider the polynomial $g_n(x) := f^n(x + c_n) - \frac{1+b\gamma}{b} \in \mathcal{O}_{K_{\mathfrak{p}}}[x]$. Note that $g_n(x) = \widehat{f}^n(x) - \widehat{a}$, where $\widehat{f}(x) := (x - c_n) \circ f \circ (x + c_n)$ and $\widehat{a} := \frac{1+b\gamma}{b} - c_n$. The critical points of $\widehat{f}(x)$ are exactly the values $\widehat{\theta} := \theta - c_n$, where θ runs through the critical points of $f(x)$. In particular, if \mathfrak{p} is not a vanishing prime of $f(x)$, then Assumption ii guarantees that, for every critical point θ of $f(x)$ and every $k \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$v_{\mathfrak{p}}\left(f^k(\widehat{\theta}) - \widehat{a}\right) = v_{\mathfrak{p}}\left(f^k(\theta) - \frac{1+b\gamma}{b}\right) = v_{\mathfrak{p}}\left(-\frac{1}{b}\left(1 + (\gamma - f^k(\theta))b\right)\right) \leq e(\mathfrak{P} \mid \mathfrak{p}).$$

Thus Condition 1 of Theorem 1.1 applied with the pair $(\widehat{f}, \widehat{a})$ [§] shows that $g_n(x)$ is \mathfrak{p} -maximal.

Since $g_n(x)$ has constant coefficient $f^n(c_n) - \frac{1+b\gamma}{b} = -\frac{1}{b}$, which is a unit in $\mathcal{O}_{K_{\mathfrak{p}}}$, it follows from Lemma 3.5 that $\mathfrak{p} \nmid [\mathcal{O}_{K_n} : \mathcal{O}_K[\beta_n]]$.

Similarly, if \mathfrak{p} is a vanishing prime not dividing b , then, due to Assumption iii, it follows from Theorem 1.1 that $g_n(x) \in \mathcal{O}_{K_{\mathfrak{p}}}[x]$ is \mathfrak{p} -maximal, and hence again $\mathfrak{p} \nmid [\mathcal{O}_{K_n} : \mathcal{O}_K[\beta_n]]$.

In total, $\mathcal{O}_K[\beta_n]$ is \mathfrak{p} -maximal for *all* primes \mathfrak{p} , i.e., β_n is a monogenerator of \mathcal{O}_{K_n} over \mathcal{O}_K . \square

4. APPLICATIONS TO SPECIFIC FAMILIES OF POLYNOMIALS

4.1. Unicritical polynomials. Arguably the most obvious family of PCF polynomials is given by the monomials x^d (which are unicritical and critically fixed). Investigation of dynamical monogenicity for pairs (x^d, a) has been carried out in [Jon21] (e.g., Corollary 1). Here, we generalize this widely to unicritical PCF polynomials $f(x) = ux^d + b$. Our key observation is that, for polynomials of this shape, dynamical irreducibility follows automatically from the two conditions of Corollary 2.9 and thus does not have to be assumed additionally.

Theorem 4.1. *Let K be a number field, $f(x) = ux^d + b \in \mathcal{O}_K[x]$ where u is a unit, and $a \in \mathcal{O}_K$. Then $(f(x), a)$ is dynamically monogenic (and in particular, dynamically irreducible) if and only if both of the following hold:*

1. For each $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and each prime \mathfrak{p} of \mathcal{O}_K not dividing d , one has $v_{\mathfrak{p}}(f^n(0) - a) \leq 1$.

[§]Technically, since $\widehat{a} \notin \mathcal{O}_K$, we apply Theorem 1.1 with \mathcal{O}_K replaced by its localization at \mathfrak{p} , but see the remarks in Section 2 justifying this.

2. For each prime \mathfrak{p} of \mathcal{O}_K of residue characteristic p dividing d , the ratio $\frac{a-b}{u}$ is not congruent to any p -th power modulo \mathfrak{p}^2 .

Proof. Note that Condition 1 amounts to Condition 1 of Corollary 2.9, since 0 is the unique critical point of $f(x)$. Moreover, Condition 2 is equivalent to Condition 2 of the same corollary due to the following: for $\mathfrak{p}|d$ of residue characteristic p and any $v, c \in \mathcal{O}_K$ such that $v^p \equiv u \pmod{\mathfrak{p}}$ and $c^p \equiv a - b \pmod{\mathfrak{p}}$, we have $f(x) - a \equiv (vx^{d/p} - c)^p \pmod{\mathfrak{p}}$. Choose any root θ of $vx^{d/p} - c$ in an extension of K . Condition 2 of Corollary 2.9 then implies that $f(\theta) - a = u(\frac{c}{v})^p + b - a \not\equiv 0 \pmod{\mathfrak{p}^2}$, so in particular $\frac{a-b}{u}$ is not congruent modulo \mathfrak{p}^2 to the p -th power of $\frac{c}{v}$. But on the other hand, the mod- \mathfrak{p} residue class of elements $\gamma \in \mathcal{O}_K$ such that $\gamma^p \equiv \frac{a-b}{u} \pmod{\mathfrak{p}}$ is unique, and must be the one of $\frac{c}{v}$ by definition. This shows the claimed equivalence.

Since we have verified that our Conditions 1 and 2 amount to those of Corollary 2.9, we are left with showing that the two conditions here imply that $f^n(x) - a$ is irreducible for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. We will show this inductively. Let α_n denote a root of $f^n(x) - a$ and set $K_n = K(\alpha_n)$. For the base case $n = 1$, note that by the so-called Vahlen-Capelli Theorem (see [Tur98, Theorem 3.1]), $f(x) - a$ being reducible implies either $\frac{a-b}{u}$ being a p -th power in \mathcal{O}_K for some prime divisor p of d , or $(-4) \cdot \frac{b-a}{u}$ being a 4-th power (the latter case being relevant only for $p = 2$). In the former case, $\frac{a-b}{u}$ would have to be a p -th power modulo \mathfrak{p}^2 , which was excluded by Condition 2. In the latter case, we may as well assume that \mathfrak{p}^2 divides 2, since if $v_{\mathfrak{p}}(2) = 1$, then $(-4) \cdot \frac{b-a}{u}$ being a 4-th power implies that its \mathfrak{p} -adic valuation is a positive multiple of 4. Thus $v_{\mathfrak{p}}(\frac{b-a}{u}) \geq 2$, and we have a contradiction. However, assuming \mathfrak{p}^2 divides 2 implies that -1 is a square modulo \mathfrak{p}^2 . Thus $(-4) \cdot \frac{b-a}{u}$ being a 4-th power implies $\frac{b-a}{u}$ is a square modulo \mathfrak{p}^2 , again a contradiction. This concludes the proof of the base case $n = 1$.

Assume now inductively that $f^n(x) - a$ is irreducible. Then it is also monogenic over K by Corollary 2.9, i.e., $\mathcal{O}_{K_n}[\alpha_n] = \mathcal{O}_{K_n}$. To verify that $f^{n+1}(x) - a$ is irreducible, it suffices to show that $f(x) - \alpha_n$ is irreducible over \mathcal{O}_{K_n} . Set $\beta_n = \frac{\alpha_n - b}{u}$. Clearly $f(x) - \alpha_n$ is reducible if and only if $x^d - \beta_n$ is. By the Vahlen-Capelli lemma, this can only happen if there exists some prime divisor p of d such that β_n or $-\beta_n$ (the latter being needed only in the case that $p = 2 \mid d$) is a p -th power in $\mathcal{O}_{K_n} = \mathcal{O}_K[\alpha_n] = \mathcal{O}_K[x]/(f^n(x) - a)$. The latter implies the existence of a polynomial $g(x) \in \mathcal{O}_K[x]$ such that $g(x)^p \equiv \pm(x - b)/u \pmod{(f^n(x) - a)}$. But consider this congruence over the residue field $k_{\mathfrak{p}}$ of \mathfrak{p} , for a prime \mathfrak{p} of \mathcal{O}_K extending the rational prime p . Then both $g(x)^p$ and $f^n(x) - a$ become polynomials in x^p , and hence so does the remainder after division of one of them by the other. But clearly this is not the case for the degree-1 remainder $\pm(x - b)/u$. This contradiction concludes the proof. \square

Applying Theorem 4.1, we obtain a particularly nice result for the family of unicritical polynomials $f(x) = 1 - x^d \in \mathbb{Z}[x]$. Note that the iterated extensions defined by $f^n(x) - a$ behave quite differently from those defined by $x^{d^n} - a$; in particular, the Galois group of

the former is in general far from cyclic even after adjoining roots of unity, meaning that the theorem below yields many monogenic extensions with “interesting” Galois groups.

Theorem 4.2. *Let $d \geq 2$ be an integer, $f(x) = 1 - x^d$ and $a \in \mathbb{Z}$. Then the following are equivalent:*

1. $(f(x), a)$ is dynamically monogenic.
2. $f^2(x) - a$ is monogenic.
3. Both of the following hold:
 - i. a and $1 - a$ are both squarefree,
 - ii. $(1 - a)^{p-1} \not\equiv 1 \pmod{p^2}$ for all prime divisors p of d .

In particular, the set of values $a \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $(f(x), a)$ is dynamically monogenic has positive density

$$\frac{\varphi(d)}{d} \cdot \prod_{\substack{\ell \text{ prime} \\ \ell \nmid d}} \left(1 - \frac{2}{\ell^2}\right).$$

Proof. Note that $f(x) = 1 - x^d$ is a unicritical PCF polynomial with critical orbit $\{0, 1\}$ of length 2. From Theorem 4.1, dynamical monogenicity of $(f(x), a)$ is equivalent to the following two conditions being fulfilled for all primes p :

- A. If p is a non-vanishing prime for $f(x)$ (i.e., a prime not dividing d), then p^2 does not divide any of the integers a and $1 - a$.
- B. If p is a vanishing prime, then $1 - a$ is not a p -th power modulo p^2 .

Note that B implies the following:

- C. Neither a nor $1 - a$ is divisible by p^2 .

Hence, dynamical monogenicity is equivalent to all Conditions A, B, and C being fulfilled. But A and C together are equivalent to Condition 3i. On the other hand, note that the non-zero p -th powers in $\mathbb{Z}/p^2\mathbb{Z}$ are exactly the p -th powers which are coprime to p , i.e., the elements of $(\mathbb{Z}/p^2\mathbb{Z})^\times \cong C_{p(p-1)}$ whose multiplicative order divides $p - 1$. Hence B and C together are equivalent to 3ii

In total, we have obtained that the dynamical monogenicity of $(f(x), a)$ is equivalent to a fulfilling both Conditions 3i and 3ii of the theorem. On the other hand, Conditions 3i and 3ii are exactly the conditions obtained from setting $N = 2$ in Corollary 2.9, whence 2 implies 3. The implication $1 \Rightarrow 2$ is trivial.

Lastly, the density assertion follows by a Chinese remainder argument as in the proof of Lemma 3.1. Explicitly, we notice that Condition 3i excludes exactly two residue classes modulo ℓ^2 for all primes ℓ not dividing d . Whereas, for primes $p \mid d$, $1 - a$ satisfies 3ii in $p(p - 1)$ of the possible $p^2 - 1$ nonzero residue classes modulo p^2 , and 3i additionally excludes only $1 - a \equiv 0 \pmod{p^2}$. Thus, a total of exactly $p(p - 1)$ out of p^2 residue classes are allowed. \square

For pairs $(f(x), a)$ with $f(x) = 1 - x^d$ and a not necessarily integral, we can use Theorem 3.6 to obtain results on dynamic monogenicity for the fields generated by roots of $f^n(x) - a$ (rather than monogenicity of the polynomials themselves).

Concretely, we have the following:

Theorem 4.3. *Let $d \in \mathbb{N}$ and $b \in \mathbb{N}$ be positive integers such that all of the following hold:*

- i. b and $b - 1$ are squarefree.*
- ii. For all primes p which divide d , but not b , one has $(1 - 1/b)^{p-1} \not\equiv 1 \pmod{p^2}$.*

Let $f(x) = 1 - x^d$, and write K_n for an extension of \mathbb{Q} generated by a root of $f^n(x) - 1/b$. Then K_n is monogenic for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

Proof. This follows from Theorem 3.6 via using the periodic point $\gamma = 0$. We only need to verify that Assumptions **i** and **ii** here imply Assumptions **i**, **ii**, and **iii** of Theorem 3.6. Indeed, since the set of postcritical points of $f(x)$ is $\{0, 1\}$, the squarefreeness of b and of $b - 1$ amounts to Conditions **i** and **ii** of Theorem 3.6, respectively. Further, Condition **ii** here amounts to Condition **iii** of Theorem 3.6, as explained in the proof of Theorem 4.2. \square

Unicritical PCF polynomials defined over \mathbb{Q} only produce critical orbits with fixed points or 2-cycles, cf. [AMT20, Theorems 2.1 and 2.3]. In order to construct critical orbits containing an n -cycle, we find quadratic polynomials $h(x) = x^2 + \alpha_n$, where α_n is defined by $h^n(\alpha_n) = 0$ and $h^k(\alpha_n) \neq 0$ for $0 \leq k < n$. The fields of definition for α_n are given by the Gleason polynomials for order n , and α_n is a Misiurewicz point of period $(1, n)$. (See [Buf18],[Gok19],[HT15] for additional exposition.)

Example 4.4. Let $K = \mathbb{Q}[\theta]$ be the number field defined by $\theta^3 - \theta^2 + 1 = 0$ (note that $\mathcal{O}_K = \mathbb{Z}[\theta]$), and let $f(x) = x^2 + \theta - 1$. Then $f(x)$ is PCF, since $f(0) = \theta - 1$, $f(\theta - 1) = \theta^2 - \theta$, and $f(\theta^2 - \theta) = 0$, and hence has a 3-cycle as its critical orbit.

Let $a \in \mathcal{O}_K$ such that $\{a, a - \theta + 1, a - \theta^2 + \theta\}$ are squarefree, and that $a \not\equiv \theta - 1 \pmod{2}$. Note that 2 is inert in \mathcal{O}_K , and is the only vanishing prime. Then by Theorem 4.1, $(f(x), a)$ is dynamically monogenic over K .

4.2. Chebyshev polynomials. In this section, we determine all dynamically monogenic pairs $(T_d(x), a)$ where $a \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $T_d(x)$ is the (normalized) degree d Chebyshev polynomial, thereby generalizing [Gas14, Theorem 1.2] which deals with the case where d is prime, and characterize those pairs which generate totally real fields. Using the notation and results from [Sil07], the normalized Chebyshev polynomials $T_d(x) \in \mathbb{Z}[x]$ have the following properties:

- (1) They satisfy the recurrence $T_{d+1}(x) = xT_d(x) - T_{d-1}(x)$, with $T_0(x) = 2$, $T_1(x) = x$.
- (2) They are monic.
- (3) They commute: $T_d(T_e(x)) = T_{de}(x) = T_e(T_d(x))$. Note, composition gives $T_d^n(x) = T_{d^n}(x)$, so iterates of Chebyshev polynomials are also Chebyshev polynomials.

- (4) Their derivatives are $T'_d(x) = dU_{d-1}(x)$, where $U_{d+1}(x) = xU_d(x) - U_{d-1}(x)$ with $U_{-1} = 0$ and $U_0(x) = 1$. The $U_i(x)$ are the normalized Chebyshev polynomials of the second kind. Together $T_d(x)$ and $U_{d-1}(x)$ satisfy the quadratic relation

$$T_d(x)^2 = 4 + (x^2 - 4)U_{d-1}(x)^2.$$

Using this last relation, we see the $T_d(x)$ are PCF. Indeed, if $U_{d-1}(\alpha) = 0$, then $T_d(\alpha) = \pm 2$, and $T_d(\pm 2)^2 = 4$. Using the recurrence, we have $T_d(2) = 2$, $T_d(-2) = (-1)^d 2$. Further, the roots of $T_d(x)$ and $U_d(x)$ are real, belong to the interval $[-2, 2]$, and are simple. They are given, respectively, by

$$2 \cos\left(\frac{(2k-1)\pi}{2d}\right) = \zeta_{2d}^{2k-1} + \zeta_{2d}^{1-2k} \quad \text{and} \quad 2 \cos\left(\frac{k\pi}{d+1}\right) = \zeta_{d+1}^k + \zeta_{d+1}^{-k},$$

where $1 \leq k \leq d$, and ζ_n is a primitive n -th root of unity. The main result of this section is the following.

Theorem 4.5. *Let $d \geq 2$, and let $T_d(x)$ be the normalized Chebyshev polynomial of degree d . Then for $a \in \mathbb{Z}$, the pair $(T_d(x), a)$ is dynamically monogenic if and only if all of the following hold.*

- i.* For all primes p not dividing d , one has $a \not\equiv \pm 2 \pmod{p^2}$.
- ii.* For all primes $p|d$, one has $T_p(a) \not\equiv a \pmod{p^2}$.

We prove Theorem 4.5 by first assuming a pair is dynamically irreducible and applying the main theorem, then showing that the conditions required for the pair to be dynamically monogenic are sufficient to imply they are dynamically irreducible.

Lemma 4.6. *Let $d \geq 2$ and $a \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $(T_d(x), a)$ is dynamically irreducible. Then $(T_d(x), a)$ is dynamically monogenic if and only if*

- for all primes p not dividing d , one has $a \not\equiv \pm 2 \pmod{p^2}$, and
- for all primes $p|d$, $T_p(a) \not\equiv a \pmod{p^2}$.

Proof. Suppose first that p is a prime not dividing d . Then $T'_d(x) = dU_{d-1}(x)$ is not identically 0 in \mathbb{F}_p , so p is a non-vanishing prime. The PCF properties of $T_d(x)$ show that $T_d^n(\theta) \in \{-2, 2\}$ for any critical point θ , so we can apply Corollary 2.9 for the non-vanishing primes. Thus $T_d^n(x) - a$ is p -maximal if and only if p^2 does not divide $-2 - a$ or $2 - a$.

Next, suppose p is a prime dividing d . We have $T'_d(x) \equiv 0 \pmod{p}$, so p is a vanishing prime. Let $v_p(d) = k$, and note $T_{p^k}(x) \equiv x^{p^k} \pmod{p}$. Let $e = d/p^k$, so $T_d(x) = T_p^k(T_e(x))$. In particular

$$T_d(x) - a \equiv T_e(x)^{p^k} - a \equiv (T_e(x) - a)^{p^k} \pmod{p}.$$

To apply Corollary 2.9, we need to consider $T_d(\tau) - a$, where $\tau \in \overline{\mathbb{Q}}$ is a root of $T_e(x) - a$. More precisely, $T_d(x) - a$ is p -maximal if and only if $T_d(\tau) - a = T_p^k(a) - a \in \mathbb{Z}$ is not divisible by p^2 . We reduce to $T_p(a)$ by applying Proposition 3.4 of [Gas14]: for p an odd prime,

$$T_p(b) \equiv T_p(c) \pmod{p^2} \iff b \equiv c \pmod{p}$$

with $b = T_{p^{k-1}}(a)$ and $c = a$. The extension to $p = 2$ is immediate from $T_2(x) = x^2 - 2$. \square

Remark 4.7. As seen in the above proof, the condition $T_p(a) \not\equiv a \pmod{p^2}$ is in fact equivalent to a not being in the image of $T_p(x)$ modulo p^2 , which leaves a total of $p^2 - p$ residue classes modulo p^2 . In particular, Theorem 4.5 then implies that the set of $a \in \mathbb{Z}$ with $(T_d(x), a)$ dynamically monogenic is of density

$$\begin{cases} \frac{\varphi(d)}{d} \cdot \prod_{\ell} (1 - \frac{2}{\ell^2}) & \text{if } d \text{ is even} \\ \frac{\varphi(d)}{d} \cdot \frac{3}{4} \prod_{\ell \neq 2} (1 - \frac{2}{\ell^2}) & \text{if } d \text{ is odd} \end{cases}$$

where in both cases the product is over primes ℓ not dividing d .

To obtain Theorem 4.5, it remains to prove that the dynamical irreducibility assumption made in Lemma 4.6 follows from Condition ii of Theorem 4.5. Note this generalizes [Gas14] even in the prime degree case.

Lemma 4.8. *Assume that $a \in \mathbb{Z}$ is such that $T_p(a) \not\equiv a \pmod{p^2}$ for all primes $p|d$. Then $(T_d(x), a)$ is dynamically irreducible.*

Proof. Since $T_d^n(x) = T_{d^n}(x)$, it suffices to deduce irreducibility of $T_d(x) - a$ for any d . By the main theorem of [Tur98], the latter is equivalent to a not being a rational value of any polynomial $T_p(x)$ for any prime p dividing d . Further, in the case that $4|d$ there is the additional requirement that a is not of the form $-4c^4 + 8c^2 - 2$ with $c \in \mathbb{Q}$. (This latter condition is equivalent to the irreducibility of $T_4(x) - a$.) As already noted, the condition $T_p(a) \not\equiv a \pmod{p^2}$ is equivalent to a not being a value of $T_p(x)$ modulo p^2 , which implies in particular that $T_p(x) - a$ has no rational root for any $p|d$. Furthermore, in the case where $2|d$, we have the requirement $a \not\equiv 2, 3 \pmod{4}$, which in particular prevents the shape $a = -4c^4 + 8c^2 - 2$. This concludes the proof. \square

We conclude this section with considerations about totally real monogenic extensions.

Theorem 4.9. *Let $d \geq 3$ and $a \in \mathbb{Z}$. The polynomial $T_d(x) - a$ generates a totally real monogenic field if and only if one of the following holds:*

1. $a = 1$ and $d = 2^b 3^c$ with $b, c \geq 0$;
2. $a = -1$ and $d = 3^c$ with $c \geq 1$;
3. $a = 0$ and $d = 2^b$ with $b \geq 2$.

Proof. Since $d \geq 3$, the critical values of $T_d(x)$ are exactly ± 2 . It is well-known that all of the roots of $T_d(x)$ are real, and since the number of real roots of $T_d(x) - a$ can only change as a passes a critical value, it follows that the splitting field of $T_d(x) \pm 1$ is real as well. On the other hand, a polynomial $f(x) - a$ of degree ≥ 3 can never have all of its roots real as $a \rightarrow \pm\infty$. Thus $T_d(x) - a$ cannot generate a totally real field for $|a| > 2$. Moreover, $T_d(x) - a$ is reducible for $a = \pm 2$ a critical value. This leaves only the values $a \in \{-1, 0, 1\}$.

The polynomial $T_d(x)$ is odd when d is odd, hence $T_d(0) = 0$. This means that $T_d(x)$ is reducible for any odd integer $d \geq 3$, and thus also for any d with at least one odd prime factor, due to the relation $T_d(T_e(x)) = T_{de}(x)$.

Moreover, if $d \equiv \pm 1 \pmod{6}$, then $T_d(1) = 1$, since the recurrence $T_{d+1}(x) = xT_d(x) - T_{d-1}(x)$ has period 6 when $x = 1$. Again, since $T_d(x)$ is odd when d is odd, one also gets $T_d(-1) = -1$. This means that if $p > 3$ is prime, the polynomials $T_p(x) - a$ are also reducible for $a = \pm 1$, and hence, so are the polynomials $T_d(x) - a$ for any d divisible by at least one prime $p > 3$. Lastly, $T_2(x) + 1 = x^2 - 1$ is reducible, and thus, so is $T_d(x) + 1$ for every even integer d . This leaves the values $(d, a) = (2^b 3^c, 1)$ for $b, c \geq 0$ arbitrary, $(d, a) = (3^b, -1)$, and $(d, a) = (2^b, 0)$.

For Cases 1 and 2, monogenicity follows from Theorem 4.5 since $T_2(x) = x^2 - 2$ maps 1 to -1 , and $T_3(x) = x^3 - 3x$ maps 1 to -2 and -1 to 2. Finally, for Case 3, monogenicity follows since $T_2(x) = x^2 - 2$ does not fix 0 modulo 4. \square

Note that the polynomials $T_d(x) - a$ in Theorem 4.9 all generate abelian extensions of \mathbb{Q} ; indeed, as a special case of [AP20, Theorem 13], the dynamical Galois group $\text{Gal}(T_{d^\infty}(x) - a/\mathbb{Q})$ is abelian exactly for $a \in \{-2, -1, 0, 1, 2\}$. A wider variety of totally real monogenic fields (in particular, nonabelian ones) can be obtained via resorting to non-integral specialization values:

Theorem 4.10. *Let d be an integer and $b < -1$ a negative integer such that all of the following are fulfilled:*

- i. b and $1 + 4b$ are squarefree.*
- ii. For all prime divisors p of d which do not divide b , one has $T_p(2 + \frac{1}{b}) \not\equiv 2 + \frac{1}{b} \pmod{p^2}$.*

Then the field generated over \mathbb{Q} by a root of $T_d(x) - (2 + \frac{1}{b})$ is monogenic and totally real.

Proof. Monogenicity is a straightforward consequence of Theorem 3.6 with $\gamma = 2$ (which is a fixed point of $T_d(x)$), upon noting again that the postcritical points of $T_d(x)$ are exactly ± 2 and that Condition ii here is the translation of Condition iii in Theorem 3.6, as already shown in the proof of Theorem 4.5. That the field is totally real is immediate from $|2 + \frac{1}{b}| < 2$ (due to b being negative), as noted in the proof of Theorem 4.9. \square

4.3. PCF compositions of several polynomials. We describe a family of PCF polynomials arising as compositions of two different polynomials in a “non-trivial” way. In particular, this family is of a different shape than any of the families considered in the previous sections. These polynomials are defined over cyclotomic fields and can be constructed to have any number of critical points. Let d be a positive integer, write ζ for a primitive d -th root of unity, and μ for a primitive $(2d - 1)$ -th root of unity if d is odd, or a primitive $(4d - 2)$ -th

root if d is even. Let $K = \mathbb{Q}(\mu)$. Then

$$f(x) = x^{2d} + 2\mu x^d = x^d(x^d + 2\mu) = (x^2 + 2\mu x) \circ x^d \quad \text{with} \quad f'(x) = 2dx^{d-1}(x^d + \mu)$$

has $d + 1$ critical points: 0 and $(-1)^d \mu^2 \zeta^k$ for each $0 \leq k < d$. Each non-zero critical point is mapped by $f(x)$ to $-\mu^2$, which is fixed by $f(x)$, and 0 is mapped to 0. For each prime p dividing $2d$ and each $a \in \mathcal{O}_K$, μ is a p -th power in \mathcal{O}_K because $(p, 2d - 1) = 1$, and we have

$$f(x) - a \equiv \left(x^{\frac{2d}{p}} + 2\mu^{\frac{1}{p}} x^{\frac{d}{p}} - a \right)^p \pmod{p}.$$

When $d = 2^k$, this becomes a power of a linear polynomial in $\mathcal{O}_K[x]$, so we can apply Lemma 3.2 to find values of a where $(f(x), a)$ is dynamically irreducible, and Corollary 2.9 to restrict to those that are dynamically monogenic.

Theorem 4.11. *For $k \geq 1$, let $d = 2^k$, μ a primitive $(4d - 2)$ -th root of unity, $K = \mathbb{Q}(\mu)$ and $f(x) = x^{2d} + 2\mu x^d$. Then the following hold.*

1. *The set of all $a \in \mathcal{O}_K$ such that $(f(x), a)$ is dynamically irreducible, (a) and $(a + \mu^2)$ are squarefree, and $f(a) - a$ is not divisible by \mathfrak{p}^2 for any prime ideal \mathfrak{p} above 2, is a positive density subset of \mathcal{O}_K .*
2. *For all $a \in \mathcal{O}_K$ with the above properties, $(f(x), a)$ is dynamically monogenic over K .*

Proof. Since $f(x)$ is a composition of quadratic polynomials, it follows from Lemma 3.2 and Remark 3.3 that $(f(x), a)$ is dynamically irreducible for all but a density zero set of values $a \in \mathcal{O}_K$. To apply Corollary 2.9 and Lemma 3.1, note that we have the prime ideals above 2 in \mathcal{O}_K as vanishing primes and all other primes as non-vanishing primes. The PCF properties of $f(x)$ and the squarefree conditions on (a) and $(a + \mu^2)$ ensure that the non-vanishing primes condition holds, and here clearly Condition i of Lemma 3.1 holds (with $|\Omega| = 2$).

Shifting to the vanishing primes, the primes above 2, the field K is also the $(2^{k+1} - 1)$ -th cyclotomic field, so (2) factors into $\phi(2^{k+1} - 1)/(k + 1)$ distinct prime ideals, each with inertia degree $k + 1$. Let \mathfrak{p} be one such prime. The assumption that $f(a) - a$ is not divisible by \mathfrak{p}^2 is precisely what the vanishing prime condition of Corollary 2.9 requires. In order for Condition ii of Lemma 3.1 to hold, it suffices to find one value $a \in \mathcal{O}_K$ for which $f(a) - a$ has this property. But note that, if \mathfrak{p} divides (a) and (a) is squarefree, then $f(a) - a$ is not divisible by \mathfrak{p}^2 , since $v_{\mathfrak{p}}(f(a)) = 2^k + 1$ and $v_{\mathfrak{p}}(a) = 1$. Hence the assumption holds if \mathfrak{p} strictly divides a . In particular, $a = 2$ works for all such \mathfrak{p} .

It thus follows from Lemma 3.1 that a positive density of values $a \in \mathcal{O}_K$ fulfill all the conditions in 1 and hence render $(f(x), a)$ dynamically monogenic. \square

Question 4.12. Is dynamical irreducibility in fact implied by the remaining assumptions of Theorem 4.11? We are not aware of a counterexample, although our criteria (such as

Theorem 4.1) are not applicable to compositions of arbitrary quadratic polynomials, as shown by the example in Remark 2.8 a).

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors are especially grateful to Sebastian Bozlee for the insightful suggestion that Uchida’s criterion could be used to create a general connection between critical points and monogenicity.

REFERENCES

- [AMT20] Jacqueline Anderson, Michelle Manes, and Bella Tobin. Cubic post-critically finite polynomials defined over \mathbb{Q} . *Open Book Series*, 4(1):23–38, December 2020. [10.2140/obs.2020.4.23](https://doi.org/10.2140/obs.2020.4.23). Cited on page 16.
- [AP20] Jesse Andrews and Clayton Petsche. Abelian extensions in dynamical Galois theory. *Algebra and Number Theory*, 14(7):1981 – 1999, 2020. doi.org/10.2140/ant.2020.14.1981. Cited on page 19.
- [BGJT23] Robert L. Benedetto, Dragos Ghioca, Jamie Juul, and Thomas J. Tucker. Specializations of iterated Galois groups of PCF rational functions, 2023. arxiv.org/abs/2309.00840. Cited on page 11.
- [BIJ⁺15] Andrew Bridy, Patrick Ingram, Rafe Jones, Jamie Juul, Alon Levy, Michelle Manes, Simon Rubinstein-Salzedo, and Joseph Silverman. Finite ramification for preimage fields of postcritically finite morphisms. *Mathematical Research Letters*, 24, 10 2015. doi.org/10.4310/mrl.2017.v24.n6.a3. Cited on page 9.
- [Buf18] Xavier Buff. On postcritically finite unicritical polynomials. *New York J. Math.*, 24:1111–1122, 2018. nyjm.albany.edu/j/2018/24-54p.pdf. Cited on page 16.
- [Cas22] Marianela Castillo. A dynamical characterization for monogeneity at every level of some infinite 2-towers. *Canad. Math. Bull.*, 65(3):806–814, 2022. doi.org/10.4153/S0008439521000874. Cited on page 2.
- [Coh79] Stephen D. Cohen. The distribution of the Galois groups of integral polynomials. *Illinois Journal of Mathematics*, 23(1):135–152, 1979. doi.org/10.1112/plms/s3-43.2.227. Cited on page 11.
- [Gas14] T. Alden Gassert. Discriminants of Chebyshev radical extensions. *J. Théor. Nombres Bordx.*, 26(3):607–633, 2014. doi.org/10.5802/jtnb.882. Cited on pages 2, 16, 17, and 18.
- [Gas17] T. Alden Gassert. A note on the monogeneity of power maps. *Albanian J. Math.*, 11(1):3–12, 2017. doi.org/10.51286/albjm/1495919797. Cited on page 2.
- [Gok19] Vefa Goksel. On the orbit of a post-critically finite polynomial of the form $x^d + c$. *Functiones et Approximatio Commentarii Mathematici*, 62, 10 2019. doi.org/10.7169/facm/1799. Cited on page 16.

- [HT15] Benjamin Hutz and Adam Towsley. Misiurewicz points for polynomial maps and transversality. *New York Journal of Mathematics*, 21:297–319, 01 2015. nyjm.albany.edu/j/2015/21-13v.pdf. Cited on page 16.
- [Jon21] Lenny Jones. Monogenically stable polynomials. *Albanian Journal of Mathematics*, 15(2):85–98, 2021. doi.org/10.51286/albjm/1635847634. Cited on pages 2, 9, and 13.
- [Li22] Ruofan Li. On number fields towers defined by iteration of polynomials. *Arch. Math. (Basel)*, 119(4):371–379, 2022. doi.org/10.1007/s00013-022-01770-w. Cited on page 2.
- [Odo85] R. W. K. Odoni. The Galois Theory of Iterates and Composites of Polynomials. *Proceedings of the London Mathematical Society*, s3-51(3):385–414, 11 1985. doi.org/10.1112/plms/s3-51.3.385. Cited on page 11.
- [Ser79] J.P. Serre. *Local Fields*. Graduate texts in mathematics. Springer, 1979. doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4757-5673-9. Cited on page 11.
- [Sil07] Joseph H. Silverman. *The Arithmetic of Dynamical Systems*. Springer, New York, 2007. doi.org/10.1007/978-0-387-69904-2. Cited on page 16.
- [Smi21] Hanson Smith. The monogeneity of radical extensions. *Acta Arith.*, 198(3):313–327, 2021. doi.org/10.4064/aa200811-7-10. Cited on page 2.
- [Smi23] Hanson Smith. Radical dynamical monogeneity. 2023. arxiv.org/abs/2306.11815. Cited on page 2.
- [SSL24] Himanshu Sharma, Ritumoni Sarma, and Shanta Laishram. Monogeneity of iterates of irreducible binomials. *Communications in Algebra*, 52(11):4678–4684, 2024. doi.org/10.1080/00927872.2024.2356250. Cited on page 2.
- [SW24] Hanson Smith and Zack Wolske. Iterates of quadratics and monogeneity. 2024. arxiv.org/abs/2406.03629. Cited on pages 2 and 9.
- [Tur98] Gerhard Turnwald. Reducibility of translates of Dickson polynomials. *Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society*, 126(4):965–971, 1998. doi.org/10.1090/S0002-9939-98-04363-9. Cited on pages 14 and 18.
- [Uch77] Kôji Uchida. When is $\mathbb{Z}[\alpha]$ the ring of the integers? *Osaka Journal of Mathematics*, 14:155–157, 1977. doi.org/10.18910/8668. Cited on page 3.
- [VV21] Xavier Vidaux and Carlos R. Videla. Dedekind’s criterion for the monogeneity of a number field versus Uchida’s and Lüneburg’s. *Tohoku Mathematical Journal*, 73(3):433 – 447, 2021. doi.org/10.2748/tmj.20200602. Cited on page 3.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS EDUCATION, KOREA NATIONAL UNIVERSITY OF EDUCATION, 250
TAESEONGTABYEON-RO, CHEONGJU 28173, SOUTH KOREA

Email address: jkoenig@knue.ac.kr

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY SAN MARCOS, 333 S. TWIN OAKS
VALLEY RD., SAN MARCOS, CA 92096

Email address: hsmith@csusm.edu

TORONTO, ONTARIO

Email address: zackwolske@gmail.com