# arXiv:2411.00523v1 [math.NT] 1 Nov 2024

# THE MONOGENICITY AND GALOIS GROUPS OF CERTAIN RECIPROCAL QUINTINOMIALS

LENNY JONES

ABSTRACT. We say that a monic polynomial  $f(x) \in \mathbb{Z}[x]$  is monogenic if f(x) is irreducible over  $\mathbb{Q}$  and  $\{1, \theta, \theta^2, \ldots, \theta^{\deg(f)-1}\}$  is a basis for  $\mathbb{Z}_K$ , the ring of integers of  $K = \mathbb{Q}(\theta)$ , where  $f(\theta) = 0$ . For  $n \geq 2$ , we define the reciprocal quintinomial

$$\mathcal{F}_{n,A,B}(x) := x^{2^n} + Ax^{3 \cdot 2^{n-2}} + Bx^{2^{n-1}} + Ax^{2^{n-2}} + 1 \in \mathbb{Z}[x].$$

In this article, we extend our previous work on the monogenicity of  $\mathcal{F}_{n,A,B}(x)$  to treat the specific previously-unaddressed situation of  $A \equiv B \equiv 1 \pmod{4}$ . Moreover, we determine the Galois group over  $\mathbb{Q}$  of  $\mathcal{F}_{n,A,B}(x)$  in special cases.

# 1. INTRODUCTION

We say that a monic polynomial  $f(x) \in \mathbb{Z}[x]$  is *monogenic* if f(x) is irreducible over  $\mathbb{Q}$  and  $\{1, \theta, \theta^2, \ldots, \theta^{\deg(f)-1}\}$  is a basis for  $\mathbb{Z}_K$ , the ring of integers of  $K = \mathbb{Q}(\theta)$ , where  $f(\theta) = 0$ . Hence, f(x) is monogenic if and only if  $\mathbb{Z}_K = \mathbb{Z}[\theta]$ . For the minimal polynomial f(x) of an algebraic integer  $\theta$  over  $\mathbb{Q}$ , it is well known [2] that

(1.1) 
$$\Delta(f) = \left[\mathbb{Z}_K : \mathbb{Z}[\theta]\right]^2 \Delta(K),$$

where  $\Delta(f)$  and  $\Delta(K)$  are the discriminants over  $\mathbb{Q}$  of f(x) and the number field K, respectively. Thus, from (1.1), f(x) is monogenic if and only if  $\Delta(f) = \Delta(K)$ . Throughout this article, for  $A, B, n \in \mathbb{Z}$  with  $AB \neq 0$  and  $n \geq 2$ , we let:

(1.2) 
$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{F}_{n,A,B}(x) &= x^{2^{n}} + Ax^{3 \cdot 2^{n-2}} + Bx^{2^{n-1}} + Ax^{2^{n-2}} + 1, \\ W_{1} &= B + 2 - 2A, \quad W_{2} &= B + 2 + 2A, \quad W_{3} &= A^{2} - 4B + 8, \\ P &= \gcd(W_{1}, W_{3}), \quad Q &= \gcd(W_{1}, W_{2}), \quad R &= \gcd(W_{2}, W_{3}), \\ D_{n} \text{ denote the dihedral group of order } 2n, \\ C_{n} \text{ denote the cyclic group of order } n. \end{aligned}$$

The following theorem was proven in [8]:

**Theorem 1.1.** If  $W_1W_2W_3$  is squarefree and

 $(A \mod 4, B \mod 4) \in \{(1,3), (3,1), (3,3)\},\$ 

then  $\mathcal{F}_{n,A,B}(x)$  is monogenic for all  $n \geq 2$ .

It is the goal of this article to extend Theorem 1.1 by providing an investigation of the monogenicity of  $\mathcal{F}_{n,A,B}(x)$  in the specific previously-unaddressed situation

Date: November 4, 2024.

<sup>2020</sup> Mathematics Subject Classification. Primary 11R04; Secondary 11R09, 11R32.

Key words and phrases. monogenic, reciprocal, quintinomial, Galois.

of  $A \equiv B \equiv 1 \pmod{4}$ . Moreover, we determine the Galois group of  $\mathcal{F}_{n,A,B}(x)$  in some special cases. More precisely, we prove

**Theorem 1.2.** Assuming the notation of (1.2), suppose that  $A \equiv B \equiv 1 \pmod{4}$ . Then

(1)  $\mathcal{F}_{2,A,B}(x)$  is irreducible over  $\mathbb{Q}$  and

$$\operatorname{Gal}(\mathcal{F}_{2,A,B}) \simeq \begin{cases} C_4 & \text{if and only if} \quad W_1 W_2 W_3 \text{ is a square,} \\ D_4 & \text{if and only if} \quad W_1 W_2 W_3 \text{ is not a square.} \end{cases}$$

- (2)  $\mathcal{F}_{2,A,B}(x)$  is monogenic if and only if  $W_1$ ,  $W_2$  and  $W_3$  are squarefree.
- (3) There exist infinitely many pairs (A, B) such that  $\mathcal{F}_{2,A,B}(x)$  is monogenic with  $\operatorname{Gal}(\mathcal{F}_{2,A,B}) \simeq D_4$ . Furthermore, for any two such pairs  $(A_i, B_i) \neq$  $(A_j, B_j)$  where  $\mathcal{F}_{2,A_i,B_i}(\theta_i) = \mathcal{F}_{2,A_j,B_j}(\theta_j) = 0$ , we have that  $\mathbb{Q}(\theta_i) \neq 0$  $\mathbb{Q}(\theta_i).$
- (4)  $\mathcal{F}_{2,A,B}(x)$  is monogenic with  $\operatorname{Gal}(\mathcal{F}_{2,A,B}) \simeq C_4$  if and only if A = B = 1.
- (5)  $\mathcal{F}_{3,A,B}(x)$  is reducible over  $\mathbb{Q}$  if and only if

$$A = 4t - 4s^{2} - 4s + 1 \quad and$$
  
$$B \in \{4t^{2} + 4t - 8s^{2} - 8s + 1, \ 4t^{2} + 4t + 8s^{2} + 8s + 5\},\$$

for some  $s, t \in \mathbb{Z}$ .

- (6) There exist infinitely many values of A such that  $\operatorname{Gal}(\mathcal{F}_{3,A,A})$  is isomorphic to the wreath product  $C_2^2 \wr C_2$ .
- (7) When  $n \geq 3$ ,  $\mathcal{F}_{n,A,A}(x)$  is irreducible over  $\mathbb{Q}$  if and only if  $A \neq 1$ .
- (8)  $\mathcal{F}_{n,A,A}(x)$  is never monogenic when  $n \geq 3$ .

# 2. Preliminaries

The first result will be useful in the proof of item (4) of Theorem 1.2.

**Proposition 2.1.** [10] For  $N \in \mathbb{Z}$ , let  $\mathfrak{L}_N$  and  $\mathfrak{F}_N$  denote, respectively, the Nth Lucas and Nth Fibonacci numbers, where  $\mathfrak{L}_0 = 2$  and  $\mathfrak{F}_0 = 0$ . Then

- $\begin{array}{ll} (1) \ \mathfrak{L}_{-N} = (-1)^N \mathfrak{L}_N, \\ (2) \ 5\mathfrak{F}_N = 2\mathfrak{L}_{N+1} \mathfrak{L}_N. \\ (3) \ \mathfrak{L}_{2N} + (-1)^N 2 = \mathfrak{L}_N^2. \end{array}$

The proof of the next proposition can be found in [8].

**Proposition 2.2.**  $\Delta(\mathcal{F}_{n,A,B}) = 2^{2^n(n-2)} (W_1 W_2 W_3^2)^{2^{n-2}}$ 

The following proposition, which follows from a generalization of a theorem of Capelli, is a special case of the results in [4], and gives simple necessary and sufficient conditions for the irreducibility of polynomials of the form  $w(x^{2^k}) \in \mathbb{Z}[x]$ , when w(x) is monic and irreducible.

**Proposition 2.3.** [4] Let  $w(x) \in \mathbb{Z}[x]$  be monic and irreducible, with  $\deg(w) = m$ . Then  $w(x^{2^k})$  is reducible if and only if there exist  $S_0(x), S_1(x) \in \mathbb{Z}[x]$  such that either

(2.1) 
$$(-1)^m w(x) = (S_0(x))^2 - x (S_1(x))^2,$$

- or
- $k \ge 2$  and  $w(x^2) = (S_0(x))^2 x(S_1(x))^2$ . (2.2)

The following theorem, known as *Dedekind's Index Criterion*, or simply *Dedekind's Criterion* if the context is clear, is a standard tool used in determining the monogenicity of a polynomial.

**Theorem 2.4** (Dedekind [2]). Let  $K = \mathbb{Q}(\theta)$  be a number field,  $T(x) \in \mathbb{Z}[x]$  the monic minimal polynomial of  $\theta$ , and  $\mathbb{Z}_K$  the ring of integers of K. Let q be a prime number and let  $\overline{*}$  denote reduction of \* modulo q (in  $\mathbb{Z}, \mathbb{Z}[x]$  or  $\mathbb{Z}[\theta]$ ). Let

$$\overline{T}(x) = \prod_{i=1}^{k} \overline{\tau_i}(x)^{e_i}$$

be the factorization of T(x) modulo q in  $\mathbb{F}_q[x]$ , and set

$$h_1(x) = \prod_{i=1}^k \tau_i(x),$$

where the  $\tau_i(x) \in \mathbb{Z}[x]$  are arbitrary monic lifts of the  $\overline{\tau_i}(x)$ . Let  $h_2(x) \in \mathbb{Z}[x]$  be a monic lift of  $\overline{T}(x)/\overline{h_1}(x)$  and set

$$F(x) = \frac{h_1(x)h_2(x) - T(x)}{q} \in \mathbb{Z}[x].$$

Then

$$[\mathbb{Z}_K : \mathbb{Z}[\theta]] \not\equiv 0 \pmod{q} \iff \gcd\left(\overline{F}, \overline{h_1}, \overline{h_2}\right) = 1 \text{ in } \mathbb{F}_q[x]$$

**Theorem 2.5.** Let  $G(t) \in \mathbb{Z}[t]$ , and suppose that G(t) factors into a product of distinct non-constant polynomials  $\gamma_i(t) \in \mathbb{Z}[x]$  that are irreducible over  $\mathbb{Z}$ , such that the degree of each  $\gamma_i(t)$  is at most 3. Define

$$N_G(X) = |\{p \le X : p \text{ is prime and } G(p) \text{ is squarefree}\}|.$$

Then,

(2.3) 
$$N_G(X) \sim C_G \frac{X}{\log(X)},$$

where

(2.4) 
$$C_G = \prod_{\ell \text{ prime}} \left( 1 - \frac{\rho_G(\ell^2)}{\ell(\ell-1)} \right)$$

and  $\rho_G(\ell^2)$  is the number of  $z \in (\mathbb{Z}/\ell^2\mathbb{Z})^*$  such that  $G(z) \equiv 0 \pmod{\ell^2}$ .

**Remark 2.6.** Theorem 2.5 follows from work of Helfgott, Hooley and Pasten [5, 6,13]. For more details, see the discussion following [7, Theorem 2.11].

**Definition 2.7.** In the context of Theorem 2.5, for  $G(t) \in \mathbb{Z}[t]$  and a prime  $\ell$ , if  $G(z) \equiv 0 \pmod{\ell^2}$  for all  $z \in (\mathbb{Z}/\ell^2\mathbb{Z})^*$ , we say that G(t) has a *local obstruction at*  $\ell$ . A polynomial  $G(t) \in \mathbb{Z}[t]$  is said to have *no local obstructions*, if for every prime  $\ell$  there exists some  $z \in (\mathbb{Z}/\ell^2\mathbb{Z})^*$  such that  $G(z) \not\equiv 0 \pmod{\ell^2}$ .

Note that  $C_G > 0$  in (2.4) if and only if G(t) has no local obstructions. Consequently, it follows that  $N_G(X) \to \infty$  as  $X \to \infty$  in (2.3), when G(t) has no local obstructions. Hence, we have the following immediate corollary of Theorem 2.5.

### LENNY JONES

**Corollary 2.8.** Let  $G(t) \in \mathbb{Z}[t]$ , and suppose that G(t) factors into a product of distinct non-constant polynomials  $\gamma_i(t) \in \mathbb{Z}[x]$  that are irreducible over  $\mathbb{Z}$ , such that the degree of each  $\gamma_i(t)$  is at most 3. To avoid the situation when  $C_G = 0$  (in (2.4)), we suppose further that G(t) has no local obstructions. Then there exist infinitely many primes p such that G(p) is squarefree.

The following lemma, which generalizes a discussion found in [8], will be useful in the proof of item (4) of Theorem 1.2.

**Lemma 2.9.** Let  $G(t) \in \mathbb{Z}[t]$  with  $\deg(G) = N$ , and suppose that G(t) factors into a product of distinct non-constant polynomials that are irreducible over  $\mathbb{Z}$ , such that the degree of each factor is at most 3. If G(t) has an obstruction at the prime  $\ell$ , then  $\ell \leq (N_{\ell}+2)/2$ , where  $N_{\ell}$  is the number of not-necessarily distinct non-constant linear factors of G(t) in  $\mathbb{F}_{\ell}[t]$ .

*Proof.* Since no factors of G(t) in  $\mathbb{Z}[t]$  are constant, we can assume that the content of every factor of G(t) is 1. Furthermore, since a nonlinear irreducible factor of  $G(t) \pmod{\ell}$  never has a zero in  $(\mathbb{Z}/\ell^2\mathbb{Z})^*$ , we can also assume, without loss of generality, that G(t) factors completely into N, not-necessarily distinct, non-constant linear factors in  $\mathbb{Z}[t]$ . Thus,

(2.5) 
$$G(t) \equiv c \prod_{j=0}^{\ell-1} (t-j)^{e_j} \pmod{\ell},$$

where  $c \not\equiv 0 \pmod{\ell}$ ,  $e_j \geq 0$  for each j and  $N = \sum_{j=0}^{\ell-1} e_j$ . Observe that if  $e_j = 0$  for some  $j \neq 0$  in (2.5), then  $G(j) \not\equiv 0 \pmod{\ell^2}$ , contradicting the fact that G(t) has an obstruction at the prime  $\ell$ . If  $e_j = 1$  for some  $j \neq 0$  in (2.5), then the zero j of  $x - j \pmod{\ell}$  lifts to the unique zero j of  $x - j \pmod{\ell^2}$ . Thus,  $G(j + \ell) \not\equiv 0 \pmod{\ell^2}$ , again contradicting the fact that G(t) has an obstruction at the prime  $\ell$ . Hence,  $e_j \geq 2$  for all  $j \in \{1, 2, \ldots, \ell - 1\}$ . Assume, by way of contradiction, that  $\ell > (N + 2)/2$ . Then

$$2(\ell - 1) > N = \sum_{j=0}^{\ell - 1} e_j = e_0 + \sum_{j=1}^{\ell - 1} e_j \ge e_0 + 2(\ell - 1),$$

which is impossible, and the proof is complete.

The next theorem follows from [1].

**Theorem 2.10.** Assuming the notation of (1.2), suppose that  $A \equiv B \equiv 1 \pmod{4}$ . If  $\mathcal{F}_{3,A,B}(x)$  is irreducible over  $\mathbb{Q}$ , then  $\operatorname{Gal}(\mathcal{F}_{3,A,B}) \simeq C_2^2 \wr C_2$  if and only if

none of  $W_1$ ,  $W_2$ ,  $W_1W_2$ ,  $W_1W_3$ ,  $W_2W_3$  and  $W_1W_2W_3$  is a square,

### 3. The Proof of Theorem 1.2

The following lemma will be useful in the proof of item (8) of Theorem 1.2

**Lemma 3.1.** If  $\mathcal{F}_{n,A,B}(x)$  is monogenic for some  $n \geq 3$ , then  $\mathcal{F}_{n-1,A,B}(x)$  is monogenic.

*Proof.* Let  $\mathbb{Z}_{K_n}$  be the ring of integers of  $K_n = \mathbb{Q}(\theta)$ , where  $\mathcal{F}_{n,A,B}(\theta) = 0$ . Then  $\{1, \theta, \theta^2, \ldots, \theta^{2^n-1}\}$  is a basis for  $\mathbb{Z}_{K_n}$  since  $\mathcal{F}_{n,A,B}(x)$  is monogenic. Observe that  $\mathcal{F}_{n,A,B}(x) = \mathcal{F}_{n-1,A,B}(x^2)$ . It follows that  $\mathcal{F}_{n-1,A,B}(x)$  is the minimal polynomial

of  $\theta^{1/2}$  and  $\{1, \theta^{1/2}, \theta, \theta^{3/2}, \dots, \theta^{(2^{n-1}-1)/2}\}$  is a power basis for  $\mathbb{Z}_{K_{n-1}}$ , the ring of integers of  $K_{n-1} = \mathbb{Q}(\theta^{1/2})$ .

Proof of Theorem 1.2. For item (1), since  $A \equiv B \equiv 1 \pmod{4}$ , it is easy to verify that

$$W_1W_2 \equiv W_3 \equiv 5 \pmod{8},$$

which implies that neither  $W_1W_2$  nor  $W_3$  is a square. Hence, item (1) follows from [3].

For item (2), let  $K = \mathbb{Q}(\theta)$  with ring of integers  $\mathbb{Z}_K$ , where  $\mathcal{F}_{2,A,B}(\theta) = 0$ . Suppose first that  $\mathcal{F}_{2,A,B}(x)$  is monogenic and assume, by way of contradiction, that  $W_i$  is not squarefree for some *i*. Since  $A \equiv B \equiv 1 \pmod{4}$ , note that  $2 \nmid W_i$ .

We begin with i = 1, and suppose that q is a prime such that  $q^2 \mid W_1$ . Using q, we apply Theorem 2.4 with  $T(x) := \mathcal{F}_{n,A,B}(x)$ . Then  $B \equiv 2A - 2 \pmod{q}$ , so that

$$T(x) \equiv (x+1)^2 g(x) \pmod{q},$$

where  $g(x) = x^2 + (A - 2)x + 1$ .

If g(x) is irreducible in  $\mathbb{F}_q[x]$ , then we can let

$$h_1(x) = (x+1)g(x)$$
 and  $h_2(x) = x+1$ .

Thus,

$$F(x) = \frac{h_1(x)h_2(x) - T(x)}{q} = \frac{(x+1)^2 g(x) - T(x)}{q}$$
$$= -\left(\frac{B+2-2A}{q}\right)x^2 \equiv 0 \pmod{q},$$

which implies that  $gcd(\overline{F}, \overline{h_1}, \overline{h_2}) \neq 1$ . Hence,  $q \mid [\mathbb{Z}_K : \mathbb{Z}[\theta]]$  by Theorem 2.4, contradicting the fact that  $\mathcal{F}_{2,A,B}(x)$  is monogenic.

If g(x) is reducible in  $\mathbb{F}_q[x]$ , then we can let

$$h_1(x) = (x+1)(x-r_1)(x-r_2)$$
 and  $h_2(x) = x+1$ ,

for some  $r_1, r_2 \in \mathbb{Z}$  with  $r_1 + r_2 \equiv 2 - A \pmod{q}$  and  $r_1 r_2 \equiv 1 \pmod{q}$ . Thus,

$$F(x) = \frac{h_1(x)h_2(x) - T(x)}{q}$$
  
=  $\left(\frac{2 - A - r_1 - r_2}{q}\right)x^3 + \left(\frac{1 + r_1r_2 - 2r_1 - 2r_2 - B}{q}\right)x^2$   
+  $\left(\frac{-A - r_1 - r_2 + 2r_1r_2}{q}\right)x + \frac{r_1r_2 - 1}{q}.$ 

Then, since  $F(-1) = -(B+2-2A)/q \equiv 0 \pmod{q}$ , it follows that  $gcd(\overline{F}, \overline{h_1}, \overline{h_2}) \equiv 0 \pmod{x+1}$ ,

again contradicting the fact that  $\mathcal{F}_{2,A,B}(x)$  is monogenic. Hence,  $W_1$  is squarefree. The case i = 2 is similar and we omit the details.

Now let i = 3, and let q be a prime with  $q^2 \mid W_3$ . Since  $B \equiv (A^2 + 8)/4 \pmod{q}$ , we have that  $T(x) \equiv g(x)^2 \pmod{q}$ , where  $g(x) = x^2 + (A/2)x + 1$ .

If g(x) is irreducible in  $\mathbb{F}_q[x]$ , we can let

$$h_1(x) = h_2(x) = x^2 + \left(\frac{A+q}{2}\right)x + 1 \in \mathbb{Z}[x].$$

Thus,

$$F(x) = \frac{h_1(x)h_2(x) - T(x)}{q} = x\left(x^2 + \left(\frac{\frac{A^2 - 4B + 8}{q} + 2A + q}{4}\right)x + 1\right).$$

Hence, since  $q^2 \mid W_3$ , it follows that

$$\overline{F}(x) = x(x^2 + (A/2)x + 1) = xg(x),$$

and it is easy to see that  $gcd(\overline{F}, \overline{h_1}, \overline{h_2}) \neq 1$ . Hence,  $q \mid [\mathbb{Z}_K : \mathbb{Z}[\theta]]$  by Theorem 2.4, again contradicting the fact that  $\mathcal{F}_{2,A,B}(x)$  is monogenic.

If g(x) is reducible in  $\mathbb{F}_q[x]$ , then

$$\overline{T}(x) = \left(x - \frac{-A - \sqrt{A^2 - 16}}{4}\right)^2 \left(x - \frac{-A + \sqrt{A^2 - 16}}{4}\right)^2.$$

Thus, we can let  $h_1(x) = h_2(x) = (x - r_1)(x - r_2)$  for some  $r_1, r_2 \in \mathbb{Z}$  with

$$r_1 \equiv \frac{-A - \sqrt{A^2 - 16}}{4} \pmod{q}$$
 and  $r_2 \equiv \frac{-A + \sqrt{A^2 - 16}}{4} \pmod{q}$ .

Therefore,

$$F(x) = \frac{h_1(x)h_2(x) - T(x)}{q}$$
  
=  $-\left(\frac{A + 2(r_1 + r_2)}{q}\right)x^3 + \left(\frac{(r_1 + r_2)^2 - B + 2r_1r_2}{q}\right)x^2$   
 $-\left(\frac{A + 2r_1r_2(r_1 + r_2)}{q}\right)x + \frac{(r_1r_2)^2 - 1}{q},$ 

so that

$$F(r_1) = -\frac{r_1^4 + Ar_1^3 + Br_1^2 + Ar_1 + 1}{q} = -\frac{T(r_1)}{q}$$

Since  $T(r_1) \equiv T'(r_1) \equiv 0 \pmod{q}$ , it follows by Hensel that  $T(r_1) \equiv 0 \pmod{q^2}$ . Hence,  $\overline{F}(r_1) = 0$  so that  $gcd(\overline{F}, \overline{h_1}, \overline{h_2}) \neq 1$  and  $q \mid [\mathbb{Z}_K : \mathbb{Z}[\theta]]$  by Theorem 2.4, supplying the final contradiction in this direction to the fact that  $\mathcal{F}_{2,A,B}(x)$  is monogenic.

Conversely, suppose now that  $W_1$ ,  $W_2$  and  $W_3$  are squarefree, and recall the definition of P, Q and R in (1.2). If P = Q = R = 1, then  $\Delta(\mathcal{F}_{2,A,B}) = \Delta(K)$  from (1.1), so that  $\mathcal{F}_{2,A,B}(x)$  is monogenic. That is, we only have to address the primes q dividing PQR. Note that  $q \geq 3$  since  $2 \nmid W_1 W_2 W_3$ .

Suppose first then that q is a prime with  $q \mid P$ . Then  $B \equiv 2A - 2 \pmod{q}$ , since  $q \mid W_1$ , so that

$$W_3 = A^2 - 4B + 8 \equiv (A - 4)^2 \equiv 0 \pmod{q},$$

since  $q \mid W_3$ . Hence,  $A \equiv 4 \pmod{q}$  and  $B \equiv 6 \pmod{q}$  since  $q \neq 2$ . Then, with  $T(x) := \mathcal{F}_{2,A,B}(x)$ , we have that

$$\overline{T}(x) = (x+1)^4.$$

Therefore, applying Theorem 2.4, we can let

$$h_1(x) = x + 1$$
 and  $h_2(x) = (x + 1)^3$ 

6

to get

$$F(x) = \frac{h_1(x)h_2(x) - T(x)}{q} = -x\left(\left(\frac{A-4}{q}\right)x^2 + \left(\frac{B-6}{q}\right)x + \frac{A-4}{q}\right).$$

Then

$$F(-1) = -\frac{B+2-2A}{q} \not\equiv 0 \pmod{q},$$

since B + 2 - 2A is squarefree. Hence,  $gcd(\overline{F}, \overline{h_1}, \overline{h_2}) = 1$ , and  $q \nmid [\mathbb{Z}_K : \mathbb{Z}[\theta]]$  by Theorem 2.4.

Suppose next that q is a prime with  $q \mid Q$ . Then, since  $q \mid W_1$  and  $q \mid W_2$ , we have that

$$B \equiv 2A - 2 \equiv -2A - 2 \pmod{q},$$

which implies that  $q \mid A$  since  $q \neq 2$ , and  $B \equiv -2 \pmod{q}$ . Letting  $T(x) := \mathcal{F}_{2,A,B}(x)$ , straightforward calculations yield

$$\overline{T}(x) = (x-1)^2(x+1)^2$$

Hence, we can let

$$h_1(x) = h_2(x) = (x - 1)(x + 1),$$

and apply Theorem 2.4 to get that

$$F(x) = \frac{h_1(x)h_2(x) - T(x)}{q} = -x\left(\left(\frac{A}{q}\right)x^2 + \left(\frac{B+2}{q}\right)x + \frac{A}{q}\right).$$

Thus, since  $W_1$  and  $W_2$  are squarefree, it follows that

$$F(1) = -\frac{B+2+2A}{q} \not\equiv 0 \pmod{q}$$
 and  $F(-1) = -\frac{B+2-2A}{q} \not\equiv 0 \pmod{q}$ .

Therefore,  $gcd(\overline{F}, \overline{h_1}, \overline{h_2}) = 1$ , and  $q \nmid [\mathbb{Z}_K : \mathbb{Z}[\theta]]$  by Theorem 2.4.

The last possibility of  $q \mid R$  is similar and we omit the details. Thus, the proof of item (2) is complete.

For item (3), let A = 8k+1 and B = 8t+1, where  $k \in \mathbb{Z}$  and t is an indeterminate. Then

$$W_1 = 8t - 16k + 1$$
,  $W_2 = 8t + 16k + 5$  and  $W_3 = 32t - 64k^2 - 16k - 5$ .

Let  $G(t) := W_1 W_2 W_3 \in \mathbb{Z}[t]$ . Then G(t) has no obstructions by Lemma 2.9. Hence, by Corollary 2.8, there exist infinitely many primes p such that G(p) is squarefree. Moreover, since deg(G(t)) = 3, we can assume that there exist infinitely many such primes p with G(p) > 1. Consequently,  $W_1$ ,  $W_2$  and  $W_3$  are squarefree for each such prime p, and therefore,  $\mathcal{F}_{2,A,B}(x)$  is monogenic by item (2). Furthermore, for each such prime p, it follows that  $\operatorname{Gal}(\mathcal{F}_{2,A,B}) \simeq D_4$  by item (2). To see that these quartic fields are distinct, we assume, by way of contradiction, that there exist primes  $p_1 \neq p_2$  such that  $G(p_i)$  is squarefree,  $K_1 = \mathbb{Q}(\theta_1) = K_2 = \mathbb{Q}(\theta_2)$ , where

$$\mathcal{F}_{2,8k+1,8p_1+1}(\theta_1) = 0 = \mathcal{F}_{2,8k+1,8p_2+1}(\theta_2).$$

Since  $\mathcal{F}_{2,8k+1,8p_1+1}(x)$  and  $\mathcal{F}_{2,8k+1,8p_1+1}(x)$  are both monogenic, it follows that

(3.1) 
$$\Delta(\mathcal{F}_{2,8k+1,8p_1+1}) = \Delta(\mathcal{F}_{2,8k+1,8p_2+1}).$$

Recall from (2.2) that  $\Delta(\mathcal{F}_{2,8k+1,8t+1}) = W_1 W_2 W_3^2$ . Because  $G(p_1)$  and  $G(p_2)$  are squarefree, it then follows from (3.1) that

(3.2) 
$$W_1 W_2|_{t=p_1} = W_1 W_2|_{t=p_2}$$
 and  $W_3|_{t=p_1} = \pm W_3|_{t=p_2}$ .

Maple easily reveals the impossibility in integers of the equations in (3.2) when  $p_1 \neq p_2$ , which completes the proof of item (3).

We turn now to item (4). Since  $\mathcal{F}_{2,1,1}(x) = \Phi_5(x)$ , we see that  $\mathcal{F}_{2,1,1}(x)$  is monogenic with  $\operatorname{Gal}(\mathcal{F}_{2,1,1}) \simeq C_4$ , which proves the direction assuming A = B = 1.

For the converse, we assume that  $\mathcal{F}_{2,A,B}(x)$  is monogenic with  $\operatorname{Gal}(\mathcal{F}_{2,A,B}) \simeq C_4$ . For part of this proof, we use an approach that is a modification of methods employed in [9, pp. 26–28]. Although the arguments are similar, we provide details for the sake of completeness.

Since  $\mathcal{F}_{2,A,B}(x)$  is monogenic with  $\operatorname{Gal}(\mathcal{F}_{2,A,B}) \simeq C_4$ , it follows from items (2) and (1) of this theorem, respectively, that

(3.3) 
$$W_1$$
,  $W_2$  and  $W_3$  are squarefree, and  $W_1W_2W_3$  is a square.

Since  $W_1W_2W_3$  is a square, we have that  $W_1W_2$  and  $W_3$  are either both positive or both negative. If

$$W_1W_2 = (B+2)^2 - 4A^2 < 0$$
 and  $W_3 = A^2 - 4B + 8 < 0$ 

then

$$(B+2)^2 < 4A^2 < 16B - 32,$$

which yields the contradiction

$$(B-6)^2 = (B+2)^2 - 16B + 32 < 0.$$

Hence,

(3.4) 
$$W_1 W_2 > 0$$
 and  $W_3 > 0$ .

Then,

(3.5)  

$$|W_1| = |B + 2 - 2A| = PQ$$

$$|W_2| = |B + 2 + 2A| = QR$$

$$W_3 = A^2 - 4B + 8 = PR,$$

where PQR is squarefree. Thus, either PQR = 1 or PQR is the product of distinct odd primes. If PQR = 1, then P = Q = R = 1, which implies that A = 0 from (3.5), contradicting the fact that  $A \equiv 1 \pmod{4}$ . Hence, PQR > 1 is the product of distinct odd primes.

We claim that R > 1. To establish this claim, we assume, by way of contradiction, that R = 1. Then, regardless of whether  $W_1$  and  $W_2$  are both positive or both negative in (3.4), it follows from (3.5) that  $W_1 = W_2 W_3$ . Solving this equation in Maple reveals that

$$y^{2} = A^{4} + 16A^{3} + 94A^{2} + 304A + 225 = (A+9)(A+1)(A^{2} + 6A + 25),$$

for some  $y \in \mathbb{Z}$ . Using the command

# IntegralQuarticPoints([1, 16, 94, 304, 225], [-1, 0]);

in Magma yields the solutions  $A \in \{-1, 0, -9, -11, 4\}$ . Since  $A \equiv 1 \pmod{4}$ , we see that A = -11, so that  $B \in \{21, 31\}$ . Since  $B \equiv 1 \pmod{4}$ , we conclude that the only viable coefficient pair is (A, B) = (-11, 21), in which case we have that  $W_1 = B + 2 - 2A = 45$ , contradicting the fact that  $W_1$  is squarefree.

We proceed by providing details first in the situation when  $W_1 > 0$  and  $W_2 > 0$ . Invoking Maple to solve the system (3.5), we get that

$$(3.6) P^2 Q^2 - 2PQ^2 R + Q^2 R^2 - 32PQ - 32QR - 16PR + 256 = 0.$$

It follows from (3.6) that

(3.7) 
$$P \mid (QR - 16), \quad Q \mid (PR - 16) \text{ and } R \mid (PQ - 16).$$

Thus, since PQR is odd and squarefree, we deduce from (3.7) that PQR divides

$$Z := \frac{(QR - 16)(PR - 16)(PQ - 16) - PQR(PQR - 16P - 16Q - 16R)}{256}$$
$$= PQ + QR + PR - 16.$$

Suppose that  $P \ge 3$  and  $Q \ge 3$ . It is then easy to see that Z > 0. Hence, since PQR divides Z, we have that  $H := PQR - Z \le 0$ . However, using Maple, we see that the minimum value of H, subject to the constraints  $\{P \ge 3, Q \ge 3, R \ge 3\}$ , is 16. Thus, we deduce that P = 1 or Q = 1.

Letting P = 1 in (3.6), and solving for Q yields

(3.8) 
$$Q = \frac{4(4R + 4 \pm \sqrt{R^3 - 2R^2 + 65R})}{(R-1)^2}.$$

For Q to be a viable solution, we conclude from (3.8) that

(3.9) 
$$y^2 = R^3 - 2R^2 + 65R,$$

for some integer y. Using Sage to find all integral points (with  $y \ge 0$ ) on the elliptic curve (3.9) we get

 $(R, y) \in \{(0, 0), (1, 8), (5, 20), (13, 52), (16, 68), (45, 300), (65, 520), (1573, 62348)\}.$ 

Since  $R \ge 3$  is odd and squarefree, we have that  $R \in \{5, 13, 65\}$ . Plugging these values into (3.8) reveals only the three valid integer solution triples

$$(3.10) (P,Q,R) \in \{(1,11,5), (1,3,13), (1,1,5)\}.$$

Next, we let Q = 1 so that  $W_1 W_2 = W_3$  from which it follows that

(3.11) 
$$A^2 - 5\left(\frac{B+4}{5}\right)^2 = -4$$

It is well known [11, 12] that the solutions to the Pell equation  $X^2 - 5Y^2 = -4$  are

$$(X,Y) = (\pm \mathfrak{L}_{2n-1}, \pm \mathfrak{F}_{2n-1})$$

where  $\mathfrak{L}_N$  and  $\mathfrak{F}_N$  are, respectively, the Nth Lucas and Nth Fibonacci numbers, with  $\mathfrak{L}_0 = 2$  and  $\mathfrak{F}_0 = 0$ . Thus, from (3.11), we have

$$A = \pm \mathfrak{L}_{2n-1} \quad \text{and} \quad B = \pm 5\mathfrak{F}_{2n-1} - 4.$$

Since

$$\mathfrak{L}_{2n-1} \equiv \begin{cases} 1 \pmod{4} & \text{if and only if} \quad n \equiv 1 \pmod{3} \\ 3 \pmod{4} & \text{if and only if} \quad n \equiv 0 \pmod{3}, \end{cases}$$
$$\mathfrak{F}_{2n-1} \equiv \begin{cases} 1 \pmod{4} & \text{if and only if} \quad n \equiv 0, 1 \pmod{3} \\ 3 \pmod{4} & \text{is not possible,} \end{cases}$$

and  $A \equiv B \equiv 1 \pmod{4}$ , the solutions to (3.11) are

(3.12) 
$$(A,B) = \begin{cases} (-\mathfrak{L}_{2n-1}, 5\mathfrak{F}_{2n-1} - 4) & \text{if } n \equiv 0 \pmod{3} \\ (\mathfrak{L}_{2n-1}, 5\mathfrak{F}_{2n-1} - 4) & \text{if } n \equiv 1 \pmod{3} \\ & \text{no solutions} & \text{if } n \equiv 2 \pmod{3}. \end{cases}$$

LENNY JONES

We provide details only in the case  $n \equiv 1 \pmod{3}$ , since the case  $n \equiv 0 \pmod{3}$ is similar and yields no new solutions. Using (3.12), Proposition 2.1 and basic properties of the recurrence relation for Lucas numbers, we deduce that

(3.13) 
$$P = B + 2 - 2A = \mathfrak{L}_{2(n-2)} - 2 = \mathfrak{L}_{n-2}^2 \quad \text{if } n \equiv 1 \pmod{6},$$
$$R = B + 2 + 2A = \mathfrak{L}_{2(n+1)} - 2 = \mathfrak{L}_{n+1}^2 \quad \text{if } n \equiv 4 \pmod{6}.$$

Observe then that (3.13) contradicts the fact that P and R are squarefree unless n = 1, in which case A = B = 1 and  $\mathcal{F}_{2,A,B}(x) = \Phi_5(x)$ . Note that  $(P,Q,R) = \Phi_5(x)$ . (1, 1, 5), which has already been found in (3.10).

Thus, we only need to analyze the other two solutions

$$(P,Q,R) \in \{(1,11,5), (1,3,13)\}$$

from (3.10). The corresponding coefficient pairs (A, B) for  $\mathcal{F}_{2,A,B}(x)$  are, respectively, (A, B) = (11, 31) and (A, B) = (9, 19), which contradicts the fact that  $A \equiv B \equiv 1 \pmod{4}$ . Consequently, the only solution found when  $W_1 > 0$  and  $W_2 > 0$  is A = B = 1.

We turn now to the situation when  $W_1 < 0$  and  $W_2 < 0$ . Using Maple to solve the system (3.5) yields the equation

$$(3.14) P^2Q^2 - 2PQ^2R + Q^2R^2 + 32PQ - 16PR + 32QR + 256 = 0$$

Solving (3.14) for P gives

(3.15) 
$$P = \frac{Q^2 R \pm 4\sqrt{R(Q^2 + 4)(R - 4Q)} - 16Q + 8R}{Q^2}.$$

Since P and R are positive integers, we see from (3.15) that we must have R > 4Q. Moreover, since R is odd and squarefree with gcd(R,Q) = 1, it follows that R divides  $Q^2 + 4$  since  $R(Q^2 + 4)(R - 4Q)$  must be a square. Then, making the observation that equation (3.14) is symmetric in P and R (or simply solving (3.14)for R), we deduce that P > 4Q and P divides  $Q^2 + 4$ . Piecing together this information tells us, on the one hand, that  $PR > 16Q^2$  and, on the other hand, that PR divides  $(Q^2 + 4)$ , since gcd(P, R) = 1. That is, we conclude that

$$16Q^2 < PR \le Q^2 + 4,$$

an obvious contradiction. Therefore, there are no additional solutions arising from the vacuous situation of  $W_1 < 0$  and  $W_2 < 0$ , and the proof of item (4) is complete. For item (5), let  $A = 4t - 4s^2 - 4s + 1$ . Then, we see that

+1

$$\mathcal{F}_{3,A,B}(x) = \begin{cases} \mathcal{F}_{2,2s+1,2t+1}(x)\mathcal{F}_{2,-(2s+1),2t+1}(x) & \text{if } B = 4t^2 + 4t - 8s^2 - 8s + 1\\ \mathcal{G}_{2,2s+1,2t+1}(x)\mathcal{G}_{2,-(2s+1),2t+1}(x) & \text{if } B = 4t^2 + 4t + 8s^2 + 8s + 5, \end{cases}$$

where

$$\mathcal{G}_{2,C,D}(x) := x^4 + Cx^3 + Dx^2 - Cx + 1.$$

Conversely, to derive these parametric values of A and B, we assume that  $\mathcal{F}_{3,A,B}(x) = \mathcal{F}_{2,A,B}(x^2)$  is reducible. Since  $\mathcal{F}_{2,A,B}(x)$  is irreducible over  $\mathbb{Q}$ , it follows that  $\mathcal{F}_{3,A,B}(\pm 1) = B + 2 + 2A \neq 0$ . Hence,  $\mathcal{F}_{3,A,B}(x)$  has no linear factors. If we assume that  $\mathcal{F}_{3,A,B}(x)$  has an irreducible quadratic factor, then Maple tells us in every viable situation that  $\mathcal{F}_{2,A,B}(x)$  is reducible, contradicting the fact that  $\mathcal{F}_{2,A,B}(x)$  is irreducible. Thus, we deduce that

$$\mathcal{F}_{3,A,B}(x) = u_1(x)u_2(x),$$

10

where  $u_i(x) = x^4 + a_i x^3 + b_i x^2 + c_i x \pm 1$  is irreducible over  $\mathbb{Q}$ . Next, we expand  $u_1(x)u_2(x)$ , equate coefficients with  $\mathcal{F}_{3,A,B}(x)$  and use Maple to solve the resulting systems of equations, which ultimately yields the parametric values of A and B given here.

Next, for item (6), we recall notation from (1.2) and note then that

$$W_1 = 2 - A$$
,  $W_2 = 3A + 2$  and  $W_3 = A^2 - 4A + 8$ .

Since  $A \equiv 1 \pmod{4}$ , we can write A = 4t + 1 for some  $t \in \mathbb{Z}$ . Let

$$G(t) := (4t - 1)(12t + 5)(16t^2 - 8t + 5).$$

Since  $G(t) \equiv 2(t+2)(t^2+t+2) \pmod{3}$ , we see from Lemma 2.9 that we only have to check for obstructions at the prime  $\ell = 2$ . Since  $G(1) \equiv 3 \pmod{4}$ , we conclude that G(t) has no obstructions. Thus, by Corollary 2.8, we deduce that there are infinitely many primes p such that G(p) is squarefree. Let p be such a prime, and let A = 4p + 1. It follows that  $W_1, W_2$  and  $W_3$  are squarefree. Also,  $\mathcal{F}_{3,A,A}(x)$  is irreducible over  $\mathbb{Q}$  by item (6) since  $A \neq 1$ . Since  $2 \nmid W_1 W_2 W_3$ , straightforward gcd calculations reveal that

$$P = Q = 1$$
 and  $R \in \{1, 5\}.$ 

Observe that  $|W_3| = 1$  has no integer solutions. Furthermore, in integers,

$$|W_1| = 1$$
 if and only if  $A \in \{1, 3\}$ , while  $|W_2| = 1$  if and only if  $A = -1$ .

It follows that

(3.16) none of  $W_1$ ,  $W_2$ ,  $W_1W_2$ ,  $W_1W_3$ ,  $W_2W_3$  and  $W_1W_2W_3$  is a square,

except possibly when  $W_2 = W_3 = \pm 5$ . Since  $W_2 = W_3 = -5$  has no integer solutions and  $W_2 = W_3 = 5$  has only the solution A = 1, we conclude that (3.16) holds. Consequently,  $\operatorname{Gal}(\mathcal{F}_{3,A,A}) \simeq C_2^2 \wr C_2$  by Theorem 2.10.

We turn now to item (7). For n = 3, we see by item (5) that

(3.17) 
$$4t - 4s^2 - 4s + 1 = 4t^2 + 4t - 8s^2 - 8s + 1$$
  
or

$$(3.18) 4t - 4s^2 - 4s + 1 = 4t^2 + 4t + 8s^2 + 8s + 5.$$

Solving (3.18) reveals no solutions, while solving (3.17) yields the solutions  $(s,t) \in \{(0,0), (-1,0)\}$ . Both of these solutions produce the value A = 1, and it is easy to verify that  $\mathcal{F}_{3,1,1}(x) = \Phi_5(x)\Phi_{10}(x)$ . It follows then that  $\mathcal{F}_{n,1,1}(x)$  is reducible over  $\mathbb{Q}$  for all  $n \geq 3$ .

Alternatively, we can let  $w(x) := \mathcal{F}_{2,A,A}(x)$  in Proposition 2.3. Then, using Maple, it is easy to verify that the only solution to  $w(x) = S_0(x)^2 - xS_1(x)^2$  is

$$S_0(x) = x^2 + x + 1$$
 and  $S_1(x) = x + 1$ ,

so that A = 1, and that  $w(x^2) = S_0(x)^2 - xS_1(x)^2$  has no solutions (see the argument in [8]). Hence, we conclude that  $\mathcal{F}_{n,A,A}(x)$  is reducible if and only if A = 1.

Finally, for item (8), we first note that  $\mathcal{F}_{3,1,1}(x)$  is not monogenic since  $\mathcal{F}_{3,1,1}(x)$  is reducible over  $\mathbb{Q}$ . Assume then that  $A \neq 1$  so that  $\mathcal{F}_{3,A,A}(x)$  is irreducible over  $\mathbb{Q}$  by item (6). Recall from (2.2) that

$$\Delta(\mathcal{F}_{3,A,A}) = 2^8 W_1^2 W_2^2 W_3^4.$$

Although  $\mathcal{F}_{2,A,A}(x)$  is monogenic by item (2), we use Theorem 2.4 with q = 2and  $T(x) := \mathcal{F}_{3,A,A}(x)$  to show in contrast that  $\mathcal{F}_{3,A,A}(x)$  is not monogenic. Since  $A \equiv 1 \pmod{4}$ , we have that

$$\overline{T}(x) = \Phi_5(x)^2 = (x^4 + x^3 + x^2 + x + 1)^2,$$

and so we can let  $h_1(x) = h_2(x) = \Phi_5(x)$ . Then

$$F(x) = \frac{h_1(x)h_2(x) - T(x)}{2}$$
  
=  $\frac{\Phi_5(x)^2 - \mathcal{F}_{3,A,A}(x)}{2}$   
=  $x^7 - \left(\frac{A-3}{2}\right)x^6 + 2x^5 - \left(\frac{A-5}{2}\right)x^4 + 2x^3 - \left(\frac{A-3}{2}\right)x^2 + x$ ,

which implies that

$$\overline{F}(x) = x^7 + x^6 + x^2 + x = x(x+1)^2 \Phi_5(x),$$

since  $A \equiv 1 \pmod{4}$ . Hence,  $gcd(\overline{F}, \overline{h_1}, \overline{h_2}) \neq 1$ , and consequently, by Theorem 2.4, we conclude that  $\mathcal{F}_{3,A,A}(x)$  is not monogenic. It then follows from Lemma 3.1 that  $\mathcal{F}_{n,A,A}(x)$  is not monogenic for all  $n \geq 3$ , which completes the proof of the theorem.

## References

- C. Awtrey and F. Patane, On the Galois group of a reciprocal even octic polynomial, Commun. Alg. 52 (2024), no. 7, 3018–3026.
- [2] H. Cohen, A Course in Computational Algebraic Number Theory, Springer-Verlag, 2000.
- [3] L. E. Dickson, The Galois Group of a Reciprocal Quartic Equation, Amer. Math. Monthly 15 (1908), no. 4, 71–78.
- [4] N. Guersenzvaig, Elementary criteria for irreducibility of  $f(x^r)$ , Israel J. Math. **169** (2009), 109–123.
- [5] H. A. Helfgott, Square-free values of f(p), f cubic, Acta Math. **213** (2014), no. 1, 107–135.
- [6] C. Hooley, Applications of Sieve Methods to the Theory of Numbers, Cambridge Tracts in Mathematics, No. 70. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge-New York-Melbourne, (1976). xiv+122 pp.
- [7] L. Jones, Infinite families of reciprocal monogenic polynomials and their Galois groups, New York J. Math. 27 (2021), 1465–1493.
- [8] L. Jones, Reciprocal monogenic quintinomials of degree 2<sup>n</sup>, Bull. Aust. Math. Soc. 106 (2022), no. 3, 437–447.
- [9] L. Jones, Monogenic even octic polynomials and their Galois groups, arXiv:2404.17921[math.NT].
- [10] T. Koshy, Fibonacci and Lucas numbers with applications, Pure and Applied Mathematics (New York), Wiley-Interscience, New York, (2001).
- [11] W. J. Leveque, Topics in Number Theory, Volume 1, Dover (2002).
- [12] D. A. Lind, The quadratic field Q(√5) and a certain diophantine equation, The Fibonacci Quaterly, 6.1 (1968), 86–93. v 5) and a certain diophantine equation, The Fibonacci Quaterly, 6.1 (1968), 86–93.
- [13] H. Pasten, The ABC conjecture, arithmetic progressions of primes and squarefree values of polynomials at prime arguments, Int. J. Number Theory 11 (2015), no. 3, 721–737.

PROFESSOR EMERITUS, DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, SHIPPENSBURG UNIVERSITY, SHIPPENSBURG, PENNSYLVANIA 17257, USA

Email address, Lenny Jones: doctorlennyjones@gmail.com