## Homework 3 Solutions

Problem 1 [13.2.18] Let $k$ be a field and let $k(x)$ be the field of rational functions in $x$ with coefficients from $k$. Let $t \in k(x)$ be the rational function $\frac{P(x)}{Q(x)}$ with relatively prime polynomials $P(x), Q(x) \in k[x]$, with $Q(x) \neq 0$.
(a) Show that the polynomial $P(X)-t Q(X)$ in the variable $X$ and coefficients in $k(t)$ is irreducible over $k(t)$ and has $x$ as a root.
(b) Show that the degree of $P(X)-t Q(X)$ as a polynomial in $X$ with coefficients in $k(t)$ is the maximum of the degrees of $P(x)$ and $Q(x)$.
(c) Show that $[k(x): k(t)]=\left[k(x): k\left(\frac{P(x)}{Q(x)}\right)\right]=\max (\operatorname{deg} P(x), \operatorname{deg} Q(x))$.

Proof. (a) Since $k[t]$ is an UFD and $k(t)$ is its fields of fractions, Gauss' Lemma tells us that the polynomial $P(X)-t Q(X)$ is irreducible over $(k(t))[X]$ if and only if it is irreducible in $(k[t])[X]$. Now $(k[t])[X]=(k[X])[t]$, and $P(X)-t Q(X)$ is linear, and thus irreducible in $(k[X])[t]$. By the above, it is irreducible over $k(t)$. In addition, $P(x)-t Q(x)=P(x)-\frac{P(x)}{Q(x)} Q(x)=0$, so $x$ is a root.
(b) Let $n=\max (\operatorname{deg} P(x), \operatorname{deg} Q(x))$. Then $P(x)=a_{n} x^{n}+($ lower degree terms) and $Q(x)=$ $b_{n} x^{n}+$ (lower degree terms), and at least one of $a_{n}$ and $b_{n}$ is not zero. Clearly, $\operatorname{deg}(P(X)-t Q(X)) \leq$ $n$. Note that the coefficient of $X^{n}$ in $P(X)-t Q(X)$ is $a_{n}-t b_{n}$. Since $t \in k(x)$, but $t \notin k$ (as $P$ and $Q$ are relatively prime) it follows that $a_{n}-t b_{n} \neq 0$, and thus $\operatorname{deg}(P(X)-t Q(X))=n$.
(c) We know from (a) that $P(X)-t Q(X)$ is irreducible over $k(t)$ and has $x$ as a root, so $P(X)-t Q(X)$ is the minimal polynomial of $x$ over $k(t)$. By (b)

$$
[k(x): k(t)]=\operatorname{deg}(P(X)-t Q(X))=\max (\operatorname{deg}(P(x)), \operatorname{deg}(Q(x)))
$$

Problem 2 [13.5.7] Suppose $K$ is a field of characteristic $p$ which is not a perfect field: $K \neq K^{p}$. Prove there exist irreducible inseparable polynomials over $K$. Conclude that there exist inseparable finite extensions of $K$.

Proof. Since $K \neq K^{p}$ there exists an element $c \in K$ such that $c \notin K^{p}$. Consider $f(x)=x^{p}-$ $c \in K[x]$, and let $\alpha$ be a root of $f$ in an algebraic closure of $K$, i.e. $c=\alpha^{p}$. We obtain that $f(x)=x^{p}-c=x^{p}-\alpha^{p}=(x-\alpha)^{p}$ so $\alpha$ is the unique root (of multiplicity $p$ ) of $f$, showing that $f$ is inseparable over $K$.

Now suppose that $g(x) \in K[x]$ is an irreducible factor of $f(x)$. By the above, it must be of the form $g(x)=(x-\alpha)^{q}$ for some $q \leq p$. By the binomial expansion $g(x)=(x-\alpha)^{q}=$ $x^{q}-q x^{r-1} \alpha+\ldots+(-\alpha)^{q} \in K[x]$. In particular $q \alpha \in K$, and since $\alpha \notin K$ (for otherwise, $c=\alpha^{p} \in K^{p}$ ) we infer that $q=p$ and $g=f$. Therefore, $f(x)$ is an irreducible inseparable polynomial over $K$. In conclusion, $K(\alpha)$ is an inseparable finite extension of $K$.

Problem 3 [13.6.6] Prove that for $n$ odd, $n>1, \Phi_{2 n}(x)=\Phi_{n}(-x)$.
Proof. Let $-\zeta_{n}$ be a root of $\Phi_{n}(-x)$, then $\left(-\zeta_{n}\right)^{2 n}=(-1)^{2}=1$ and so $-\zeta_{n}$ is a root of $\Phi_{2 n}(x)$.
Conversely, if $\zeta_{2 n}$ is a root of $\Phi_{2 n}(x)$ then $\zeta_{2 n}=e^{2 k i \pi / 2 n}=e^{k i \pi / n}$ for some positive integer $k$, which is relatively prime to $2 n$. Hence $-\left(\zeta_{2 n}\right)^{n}=-e^{k i \pi}=1$, showing that $\zeta_{2 n}$ is a root if $\Phi_{n}(-x)$.

Consequently, the two polynomials $\Phi_{2 n}(x)$ and $\Phi_{n}(-x)$ share the same roots. Moreover, both of them are monic, irreducible, and of the same degree (as $\phi(2 n)=\phi(2) \phi(n)=\phi(n)$ for $n$-odd) meaning that they should in fact be equal.

Problem 4. Let $\alpha$ be a real number such that $\alpha^{4}=5$.
(a) Is $\mathbb{Q}\left(i \alpha^{2}\right)$ normal over $\mathbb{Q}$ ?
(b) Is $\mathbb{Q}(\alpha+i \alpha)$ normal over $\mathbb{Q}\left(i \alpha^{2}\right)$ ?
(c) Is $\mathbb{Q}(\alpha+i \alpha)$ normal over $\mathbb{Q}$ ?

Solution. (a) The roots of the polynomial $x^{2}+5 \in \mathbb{Q}[x]$ are $\pm i \alpha^{2}$, so this polynomial splits completely in $\mathbb{Q}\left(i \alpha^{2}\right)$. Therefore $\mathbb{Q}\left(i \alpha^{2}\right) / \mathbb{Q}$ is normal.
(b) The roots of the polynomial $x^{2}-2 i \alpha^{2} \in \mathbb{Q}\left(i \alpha^{2}\right)[x]$ are $\pm(\alpha+i \alpha)$, so this polynomial splits completely in $\mathbb{Q}(\alpha+i \alpha)$. Therefore $\mathbb{Q}(\alpha+i \alpha) / \mathbb{Q}\left(i \alpha^{2}\right)$ is normal.
(c) Since $\alpha+i \alpha$ satisfies the polynomial $f(x)=x^{4}+20$ we get that $F=\mathbb{Q}(\alpha+i \alpha)$ is an extension of degree at most 4 over $\mathbb{Q}$. Now if $F / \mathbb{Q}$ were normal, then this extension would contain all roots of $f$, so in particular $\alpha-i \alpha \in F$. But then $\alpha$ and $i$ are in $F$, so $\mathbb{Q}(\alpha, i) \subset F$. However, it is not hard to see that $\mathbb{Q}(\alpha, i)$ is of degree 8 over $\mathbb{Q}$ which contradicts the above fact that $[F: \mathbb{Q}] \leq 4$. In conclusion, $F$ is not normal over $\mathbb{Q}$.

Remark. Notice that every degree 2 extension is normal. Indeed, if $[K: F]=2$ then $K=F(\alpha)$, where $\alpha$ is a root of an irreducible (quadratic) polynomial $f$ over $F$. But then $f(x)=(x-\alpha) g(x)$ with $\operatorname{deg} g=1$. Therefore $f$ splits in $K$, so $K / F$ is normal.

Problem 5. Let $K$ be a field of characteristic $p$. If $L$ is a finite extension of $K$ such that $[L: K]$ is relatively prime to $p$, show that $L$ is separable over $K$.

Proof. Since $L / K$ is a finite extension we can write $L=K\left(\alpha_{1}, \ldots \alpha_{n}\right)$. It is enough to show that each $\alpha_{i}$ is separable over $F$. Choose any $\alpha_{i}$ (call it $\alpha$ ) and let $f(x)$ be its minimal polynomial over $K$. If $f(x)$ were not separable over $K$, then (by Proposition 33, Sec 13.5) $f(x)$ and $D_{x}(f(x)$ ) would not be relatively prime. By definition $f(x)$ is irreducible, so it must be the case that $f(x) \mid D_{x}(f(x))$. Since $|f(x)|>\left|D_{x}(f(x))\right|$ it follows that $D_{x}(f(x))=0$.

Now denote by $m=\operatorname{deg}(f(x))$, then clearly $m \mid[L: K]$. Since $p$ is a prime not dividing $[L: K]$, we have that $p \nmid m$, and thus the derivative $D_{x}(f(x))$ is not identically 0 , which is a contradiction. Therefore, $f(x)$ is separable over $K$.

