IRREDUCIBILITY OF $x^n - x - 1$

KEITH CONRAD

In 1956, Selmer [2] proved the following theorem.

Theorem 1 (Selmer)**.** *For all $n \geq 2$, the polynomial $x^n - x - 1$ is irreducible in $\mathbf{Q}[x]$.*

None of the standard irreducibility tests, such as reduction mod p or the Eisenstein criterion, can be applied to $x^n - x - 1$ for general n. However, in a special case we can use one of these tests: if $n = p$ is prime then $x^p - x - 1$ is irreducible mod p and therefore is irreducible in $\mathbf{Q}[x]$. More generally, if a is an integer not divisible by p then $x^p - x - a$ is irreducible in $\mathbf{Q}[x]$ because the polynomial is irreducible mod p; a proof of this is in many books on abstract algebra or field theory. Such a proof of irreducibility does not extend to $x^{p^m} - x - 1$ when $m \geq 2$, since this polynomial is generally reducible mod p.

Example 2. If an integer $m > 1$ is not divisible by p then a root of $x^p - x - 1/m$ in characteristic p is a root of $x^{p^m} - x - 1$:

$$\alpha^p = \alpha + \frac{1}{m} \Longrightarrow \alpha^{p^k} = \alpha + \frac{k}{m} \text{ in characteristic } p$$

for all $k \geq 1$ by induction. Setting $k = m$ gives us $\alpha^{p^m} = \alpha + 1$. The polynomial $x^p - x - 1/m$ is irreducible in $\mathbf{F}_p[x]$, so $x^p - x - 1/m$ is a nontrivial factor of $x^{p^m} - x - 1$ in $\mathbf{F}_p[x]$.

Selmer's original proof of Theorem 1 involved studying the distribution of the roots of $x^n - x - 1$ in $\mathbf{C}$, relying at the end on the arithmetic–geometric mean inequality. The irreducibility proof that we give below is shorter and more algebraic. I learned it from David Rohrlich, who in turn learned it from Michael Filaseta.

Proof. For nonzero $f(x) = a_n x^n + a_{n-1}x^{n-1} + \cdots + a_1 x + a_0$ of degree n, let $\widetilde{f}(x)$ be its *reciprocal polynomial*:

$$\widetilde{f}(x) = a_0 x^n + a_1 x^{n-1} + \cdots + a_{n-1}x + a_n = x^{\deg f} f(1/x).$$

We call $\widetilde{f}(x)$ the reciprocal polynomial because its roots are the reciprocals of the roots of $f(x)$. More precisely, if $f(x)$ has leading coefficient a_0 and $f(0) \neq 0$ then

$$f(x) = a_0(x - r_1)\cdots(x - r_n) \Longrightarrow \widetilde{f}(x) = f(0)(x - 1/r_1)\cdots(x - 1/r_n).$$

The following properties of this construction will be used below without comment:

- if $f(0) \neq 0$ then $\deg f = \deg \widetilde{f}$ and $\widetilde{\widetilde{f}} = f$,
- if $f = gh$ then $\widetilde{f} = \widetilde{g}\widetilde{h}$,
- for every nonzero constant c, $\widetilde{cf} = c\widetilde{f}$,
- if $f(x) = \displaystyle\sum_{i=0}^{n} a_i x^i$ has degree n then the x^n-coefficient of $f(x)\widetilde{f}(x)$ is $a_0^2 + a_1^2 + \cdots + a_n^2$.

Check all of these properties yourself. The last one is the most interesting.

The proof of the theorem will be presented in three steps.

Step 1: For $n \geq 2$, $x^n - x - 1$ and its reciprocal polynomial have no common root in characteristic 0.

The reciprocal polynomial is $-x^n - x^{n-1} + 1$. If this shares a root with $x^n - x - 1$ in characteristic 0, say α, then

$$\alpha^n = \alpha + 1 \text{ and } \alpha^n = -\alpha^{n-1} + 1, \tag{1}$$

so $-\alpha^{n-1} = \alpha$. Thus $\alpha^n = -\alpha^2$. Substituting this into either equation in (1) gives us $-\alpha^2 = \alpha + 1$, which implies $\alpha^3 = 1$, so every power of α is either 1, α, or α^2. If $\alpha^n = 1$ then the first equation in (1) becomes $1 = \alpha + 1$, which is false since $\alpha \neq 0$. If $\alpha^n = \alpha$ then $\alpha = \alpha + 1$, which is absurd. If $\alpha^n = \alpha^2$ then the two equations in (1) become $\alpha^2 = \alpha + 1$ and $\alpha^2 = -\alpha + 1$, so $\alpha = -\alpha$, but $\alpha \neq 0$. Thus a common root α in characteristic 0 doesn't exist.

Step 2: For $f(x) \in \mathbf{Z}[x]$, assume $f(0) \neq 0$ and $f(x)$ and $\widetilde{f}(x)$ have no common roots in characteristic 0. If $f(x) = g(x)h(x)$ for some nonconstant $g(x)$ and $h(x)$ in $\mathbf{Z}[x]$, then there is a $k(x)$ in $\mathbf{Z}[x]$ with $\deg k = \deg f$ such that $f\widetilde{f} = k\widetilde{k}$ and $k \neq \pm f$ or $\pm\widetilde{f}$. If $f(x)$ is monic and $f(0) = \pm 1$ then we can choose $k(x)$ to be monic with $k(0) = \pm 1$.

Since $f(0) \neq 0$, both $g(0)$ and $h(0)$ are not 0, so $\deg \widetilde{g} = \deg g$ and $\deg \widetilde{h} = \deg h$. Define

$$k(x) = g(x)\widetilde{h}(x).$$

Then $\deg k = \deg g + \deg \widetilde{h} = \deg g + \deg h = \deg f$ and $k\widetilde{k} = (g\widetilde{h})(\widetilde{g}h) = (gh)(\widetilde{g}\widetilde{h}) = f\widetilde{f}$. If k and f are equal up to sign then $g\widetilde{h}$ and gh are equal up to sign, so $\widetilde{h}$ and h are equal up to sign, but then every root of h (it has roots since h is nonconstant) would be a common root of $f = gh$ and $\widetilde{f} = \widetilde{g}\widetilde{h}$, which is a contradiction. The proof that k and $\widetilde{f}$ are not equal up to sign is similar with g in place of h.

If $f(x)$ is monic and $f(0) = \pm 1$ then $(f\widetilde{f})(0) = f(0)(\text{lead } f) = \pm 1$ so also $(k\widetilde{k})(0) = \pm 1$, or $k(0)(\text{lead } k) = \pm 1$. This is in $\mathbf{Z}$, so $k(0)$ and lead k are ± 1 (maybe not equal). Replacing k with $-k$ doesn't change $\deg k$ or $k\widetilde{k}$, so with a sign change we can make k monic.

Step 3: (We're ready!) The polynomial $x^n - x - 1$, for $n \geq 2$, is irreducible in $\mathbf{Q}[x]$.

We argue by contradiction, and can assume $n > 2$ since the case $n = 2$ can be checked directly. If $x^n - x - 1$ is reducible in $\mathbf{Q}[x]$ then it factors into a product of two nonconstant polynomials in $\mathbf{Z}[x]$. Set $f(x) = x^n - x - 1$. By Steps 1 and 2, $f\widetilde{f} = k\widetilde{k}$ for some monic $k \in \mathbf{Z}[x]$ of degree n with $k(0) = \pm 1$ and k is not $\pm f$ or $\pm\widetilde{f}$. Write $k(x) = b_n x^n + b_{n-1}x^{n-1} + \cdots + b_1 x + b_0$, so $b_n = 1$ and $b_0 = \pm 1$. Comparing the coefficients of x^n in both $f\widetilde{f}$ and $k\widetilde{k}$,

$$1^2 + (-1)^2 + (-1)^2 = b_0^2 + b_1^2 + \cdots + b_n^2.$$

Since $b_n = 1$ and $b_0 = \pm 1$, we get $b_1^2 + \cdots + b_{n-1}^2 = 1$ in $\mathbf{Z}$, so exactly one of $b_1, \ldots, b_{n-1}$ is ± 1 and the rest are 0: $k(x) = x^n + b_i x^i + b_0$ with $1 \leq i \leq n-1$ and $b_i = \pm 1$. Let's look at the terms of $f\widetilde{f}$ and $k\widetilde{k}$ in degrees above n:

$$f\widetilde{f} = (x^n - x - 1)(-x^n - x^{n-1} + 1) = -x^{2n} - x^{2n-1} + x^{n+1} + \cdots$$

and

$$k\widetilde{k} = (x^n + b_i x^i + b_0)(b_0 x^n + b_i x^{n-i} + 1) = b_0 x^{2n} + b_i x^{2n-i} + b_0 b_i x^{n+i} + \cdots$$

where $\cdots$ means terms of degree n or less. From the leading terms $b_0 = -1$, so

$$-x^{2n} - x^{2n-1} + x^{n+1} + \cdots = -x^{2n} + b_i x^{2n-i} - b_i x^{n+i} + \cdots.$$

The terms on the left have distinct degrees since $2n > 2n-1 > n+1$ (the last inequality uses $n > 2$), so on the right side $2n - i \neq n + i$. If $2n - i > n + i$ then $i = 1$ and $b_i = -1$, so $k = x^n - x - 1 = f$. If $n + i > 2n - i$ then $i = n - 1$ and $b_i = 1$, so $k = x^n + x^{n-1} - 1 = -\widetilde{f}$. Recalling that k is *not* $\pm f$ or $\pm\widetilde{f}$, we have reached a contradiction. □

In the appendix we discuss how this proof applies to more trinomials $x^n \pm x^m \pm 1$.

Remark 3. Before Selmer's work on $x^n - x - 1$, Perron [1] had proved irreducibility of $x^n + ax \pm 1$ in $\mathbf{Q}[x]$ for all integers a such that $|a| \geq 3$, and also for $|a| = 2$ provided 1 or -1 are not roots (*e.g.*, $x^n - 2x + 1$ has 1 as a root and $x^{2m} + 2x + 1$ has -1 as a root).

Appendix A. More irreducible trinomials

The irreducibility argument we gave for $x^n - x - 1$ can be applied to nearly all trinomials of the form $x^n \pm x^m \pm 1$, in the sense that it tells us exactly when they are irreducible.

Theorem 4. *For $1 < m < n$ with $m \neq n/2$, and δ and ε equal to ± 1, the polynomial $x^n + \delta x^m + \varepsilon$ is irreducible in $\mathbf{Q}[x]$ if and only if it has no root in common with its reciprocal polynomial.*

Proof. Let $f(x) = x^n + \delta x^m + \varepsilon$. Then $\widetilde{f}(x) = \varepsilon x^n + \delta x^{n-m} + 1 = \varepsilon(x^n + \varepsilon\delta x^{n-m} + \varepsilon)$. Since $m \neq n/2$ the middle terms of $f(x)$ and $\widetilde{f}(x)$ have different degrees, so $f(x)$ and $\widetilde{f}(x)$ are not scalar multiples of each other. Therefore irreducibility of $f(x)$ in $\mathbf{Q}[x]$ implies $f(x)$ and $\widetilde{f}(x)$ have no common root.

Conversely, if $f(x)$ and $\widetilde{f}(x)$ have no common root then the proof of Theorem 1 goes through with $f(x)$ in place of $x^n - x - 1$. (As in that proof, the product $f(x)\widetilde{f}(x)$ has three terms of degree above n because $m \neq n/2$.) Details are left to the reader. □

In down-to-earth terms, if $m \neq n/2$ and $\delta, \varepsilon \in \{\pm 1\}$, then $x^n + \delta x^m + \varepsilon$ is irreducible except when it has a root in common with $x^n + \varepsilon\delta x^{n-m} + \varepsilon$.

Example 5. Let's apply Theorem 4 to $x^n + x + 1$. Computer data suggest that $x^n + x + 1$ is reducible if and only if $n \equiv 2 \bmod 3$ with $n > 2$, and in this case $x^2 + x + 1$ is a factor of $x^n + x + 1$. For example,

$$\begin{aligned} x^5 + x + 1 &= (x^2 + x + 1)(x^3 - x^2 + 1), \\ x^8 + x + 1 &= (x^2 + x + 1)(x^6 - x^5 + x^3 - x^2 + 1), \\ x^{11} + x + 1 &= (x^2 + x + 1)(x^9 - x^8 + x^6 - x^5 + x^3 - x^2 + 1). \end{aligned}$$

To prove $x^2 + x + 1$ is a factor of $x^n + x + 1$ if $n \equiv 2 \bmod 3$, work in $\mathbf{Q}[x]/(x^2 + x + 1)$: $x^2 \equiv -x - 1$ and $x^3 \equiv 1$, so $x^{3j+2} + x + 1 \equiv x^2 + x + 1 \equiv 0$.

Next we will prove that if $x^n + x + 1$ is reducible in $\mathbf{Q}[x]$ then $n \equiv 2 \bmod 3$. By Theorem 4, reducibility implies $x^n + x + 1$ and its reciprocal polynomial $x^n + x^{n-1} + 1$ have a common root, say α:

$$\alpha^n + \alpha + 1 = 0 \text{ and } \alpha^n + \alpha^{n-1} + 1 = 0.$$

Thus $\alpha = \alpha^{n-1}$, so $\alpha^n = \alpha^2$, which makes both of the equations above $\alpha^2 + \alpha + 1 = 0$. That implies $\alpha^3 = 1$, and definitely $\alpha \neq 1$, so from $\alpha^n = \alpha^2$ we must have $n \equiv 2 \bmod 3$.

Selmer [2] showed that when $n \equiv 2 \bmod 3$ and $n > 2$, so $x^n + x + 1 = (x^2 + x + 1)g_n(x)$, the polynomial $g_n(x)$ is irreducible over $\mathbf{Q}$.

The polynomials $x^n - x + 1$ and $x^n + x - 1$ have properties similar to Example 5: in each case there is a congruence condition on $n \bmod 6$ that gives the polynomial an automatic low-degree factor (discover it yourself by generating numerical data), and that congruence condition on n turns out to be equivalent to the polynomial having a common root with its reciprocal polynomial, so those n not fitting the congruence condition mod 6 lead to an irreducible polynomial.

Theorem 4 avoids the case $m = n/2$. What happens in that case?

Corollary 6. *For all $m \geq 1$ and $\delta = \pm 1$, the polynomial $x^{2m} + \delta x^m - 1$ is irreducible in* $\mathbf{Q}[x]$.

Proof. The proof of Theorem 1 still works when it is applied to both $x^{2m} + x^m - 1$ and $x^{2m} - x^m - 1$ (here the degree n is $2m$). Details are left to the reader. □

The polynomials $x^{2m} + \delta x^m + 1$ with constant term 1 and $\delta = \pm 1$ are more subtle, with irreducibility being the exception rather than the norm. For $m \geq 1$, numerical evidence suggests that $x^{2m} + x^m + 1$ is irreducible over $\mathbf{Q}$ if and only if m is a power of 3 and $x^{2m} - x^m + 1$ is irreducible over $\mathbf{Q}$ if and only if $m = 2^i 3^j$ for some i and j.

References

[1] O. Perron, Neue Kriterien für die Irreduzibilität algebraischer Gleichungen, *J. reine angew. Math.* **132** (1907), 288–307. Online at https://eudml.org/doc/149269.

[2] E. Selmer, On the Irreducibility of Certain Trinomials, *Math. Scand.* **4** (1956), 287–302. Online at https://eudml.org/doc/165635.