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1. Introduction. Lipka [10] obtained some irreducibility criteria for integer polynomials of the form $f(X) = a_nX^n + a_{n-1}X^{n-1} + \cdots + a_1X + a_0p^k$ with $a_0a_n \neq 0$, $p$ a prime number and $k$ a positive integer. For instance, he proved that for fixed $p, a_0, a_1, \ldots, a_n$ with $a_0a_1a_n \neq 0$, $f$ is irreducible over $\mathbb{Q}$ for all but finitely many positive integers $k$.

Another criterion proved in [10] is that given integers $a_0, a_1, \ldots, a_n$ with $a_0a_n \neq 0$, the polynomial $a_0X^n + a_{n-1}X^{n-1} + \cdots + a_1X + a_0p$ is irreducible over $\mathbb{Q}$ for all but finitely many prime numbers $p$, this result being a consequence of a theorem of Ore [14, Th. 5, p. 151].

These results can be formulated equivalently as in the earlier paper of Weisner [23]:

If a polynomial $f(X) \in \mathbb{Z}[X]$ has a simple rational root, then for a fixed integer $c \neq 0$ and a fixed prime number $p$, the polynomial $f(X) + cp^k$ is irreducible over $\mathbb{Q}$ for all but finitely many positive integers $k$.

If $f(X) \in \mathbb{Z}[X]$ has a rational root and $c \neq 0$ is a fixed integer, then $f(X) + cp$ is irreducible over $\mathbb{Q}$ for all but finitely many prime numbers $p$.

Inspired by some results of Fried [6] and Langmann [7] in connection with Hilbert’s irreducibility theorem, Cavachi [2] studied the irreducibility of polynomials of the form $f(X) + pg(X)$ with $p$ prime and $f, g$ relatively prime, and proved that for any relatively prime $f, g \in \mathbb{Q}[X]$ with $\deg f < \deg g$, the polynomial $f(X) + pg(X)$ is irreducible over $\mathbb{Q}$ for all but finitely many prime numbers $p$. In [3] this result was strengthened, by providing an explicit bound $\alpha$ depending on $f$ and $g$ such that for all primes $p > \alpha$ the polynomial $f(X) + pg(X)$ is irreducible over $\mathbb{Q}$. Explicit upper bounds for the number of factors over $\mathbb{Q}$ of a linear combination $n_1f(X) + n_2g(X)$, in particular irreducibility criteria covering also the case $\deg f = \deg g$, have been derived.
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in [1]. Similar irreducibility criteria have also been obtained for polynomials in several variables over a given field. More specifically, the following result has been proved in [4].

Let $K$ be a field, $n \geq 2$ and $g \in K(X_1, \ldots, X_{n-1})[X_n]$ with $\deg X_n g = d$. For any polynomial $p \in K[X_1, \ldots, X_{n-1}]$, irreducible over $K$, and any $f \in K(X_1, \ldots, X_{n-1})[X_n]$ such that $\deg X_n f < d$, $f$ is relatively prime to $g$ in $K(X_1, \ldots, X_{n-1})[X_n]$ and
\[
\max_{1 \leq j \leq n-1} \{\deg_{X_j} p - (d + 1)H_j(f) - 3dH_j(g)\} > 0,
\]
the polynomial $f + pg$ is irreducible over $K(X_1, \ldots, X_{n-1})$.

Here, for any polynomial $F \in K(X_1, \ldots, X_{n-1})[X_n]$, written in the form
\[
F = (a_0 + a_1X + \cdots + a_dX^d)/q,
\]
with $a_0, a_1, \ldots, a_d, q \in K[X_1, \ldots, X_{n-1}]$, $a_d \neq 0$, $q$ relatively prime to $\gcd(a_0, \ldots, a_d)$, and for any index $j$ with $1 \leq j \leq n$, $H_j(F)$ stands for $\max\{\deg_{X_j} a_0, \ldots, \deg_{X_j} a_d, \deg_{X_j} q\}$.

The problem of the reducibility of lacunary polynomials has been investigated by Schinzel in a series of papers including [15]–[21], and by Filaseta and Schinzel [5], H. W. Lenstra Jr. [8], [9] and Ljunggren [11]. For the study of lacunary polynomials over arbitrary fields, and over Kroneckerian fields, the reader is referred to Chapters 2 and 6, respectively, of Schinzel’s book [22].

In this paper we first prove an irreducibility criterion for lacunary polynomials with integer coefficients, which is similar to the first result of Lipka mentioned above. Then, by using technics similar to those employed in [1], [4] and [10], we extend this criterion, as well as the first result of Lipka, to polynomials in several variables over a given field. Our proofs are effective, providing explicit conditions on the leading coefficient, which ensure the irreducibility of the polynomials considered. For lacunary polynomials with integer coefficients we prove the following results.

**Theorem 1.** Let
\[
f(X) = a_0 + \cdots + a_{n-3}X^{n-3} + p^e a_{n-2}X^{n-2} + p^m a_n X^n \in \mathbb{Z}[X]
\]
with $n \geq 3$, $a_0 a_{n-2} a_n \neq 0$ and $p$ a prime number, $p \nmid a_{n-2} a_n$. If
\[
p^m > |a_n a_{n-2}|p^{3e} + \sum_{i=3}^{n} |a_i^{-1} a_{n-i}|p^{i e}
\]
and $m \neq e \pmod{2}$, then $f$ is irreducible over $\mathbb{Q}$.

**Corollary 1.** Let $f \in \mathbb{Z}[X]$ be a polynomial of degree $n \geq 3$, having a rational root $\alpha/\beta$ of multiplicity 2. Let $e \neq 0$ be a fixed integer and $p$ a prime number, $p \nmid c \beta$. Denote by $e$ the multiplicity of $p$ in the prime decomposition
of $\beta^{n-2}f''(\alpha/\beta)/2$. If $m \not\equiv e \mod 2$ and
\[ p^m > \sum_{i=2}^{n} n^i |\beta|^{i(n-2)} \left\lceil \frac{f^{(i)}(\alpha/\beta)}{i!} \right\rceil p^{ie}, \]
then the polynomial $f(X) + cp^m$ is irreducible over $\mathbb{Q}$.

The irreducibility criteria for polynomials in several variables will be deduced from the following two results for polynomials in two variables $X, Y$ over a field $K$.

**Theorem 2.** Let $K$ be a field, $n \geq 2$ a fixed integer, and let
\[ f(X,Y) = a_0 + a_1 Y + \cdots + a_{n-2} Y^{n-2} + p^e a_{n-1} Y^{n-1} + p^m a_n Y^n \in K[X,Y] \]
with $a_0, \ldots, a_n, p \in K[X]$, $a_0 a_{n-1} a_n \neq 0$, $p$ irreducible over $K$ and $p \not| a_{n-1} a_n$. If
\[ m > n e + \frac{(n-1) \deg a_n + \max\{\deg a_0, \ldots, \deg a_{n-2}, \deg p e a_{n-1}\}}{\deg p}, \]
then $f$ is irreducible over $K(X)$.

**Theorem 3.** Let $K$ be a field, $n \geq 3$ a fixed integer, and let
\[ f(X,Y) = a_0 + a_1 Y + \cdots + a_{n-3} Y^{n-3} + p^e a_{n-2} Y^{n-2} + p^m a_n Y^n \in K[X,Y] \]
with $a_0, \ldots, a_{n-2}, a_n, p \in K[X]$, $a_0 a_{n-2} a_n \neq 0$, $p$ irreducible over $K$ and $p \not| a_{n-2} a_n$. If $m \not\equiv e \mod 2$ and
\[ m > n e + \frac{(n-1) \deg a_n + \max\{\deg a_0, \ldots, \deg a_{n-3}, \deg p e a_{n-2}\}}{\deg p}, \]
then $f$ is irreducible over $K(X)$.

Immediate consequences of Theorems 2 and 3 above are two irreducibility criteria for polynomials in $r \geq 2$ variables $X_1, \ldots, X_r$ over $K$. For any $f \in K[X_1, \ldots, X_r]$ and any $j \in \{1, \ldots, r\}$ we denote by $\deg_j f$ the degree of $f$ as a polynomial in $X_j$ with coefficients in $K[X_1, \ldots, \hat{X}_j, \ldots, X_r]$, where the hat denotes omission of the corresponding variable. With this notation, one has the following results, obtained by writing $Y$ for $X_r$ and $X$ for a suitable $X_j$, and by replacing the field $K$ with the field $K(X_1, \ldots, \hat{X}_j, \ldots, X_{r-1})$ of rational functions.

**Corollary 2.** Let $K$ be a field, fix integers $n, r \geq 2$, and let
\[ f(X_1, \ldots, X_r) = a_0 + a_1 X_r + \cdots + a_{n-2} X_r^{n-2} + p^e a_{n-1} X_r^{n-1} + p^m a_n X_r^n \]
with $a_0, \ldots, a_n, p \in K[X_1, \ldots, X_{r-1}]$, $a_0 a_{n-1} a_n \neq 0$ and $p \not| a_{n-1} a_n$. Assume that for some $j \in \{1, \ldots, r-1\}$, $p$ as a polynomial in $X_j$ is irreducible over
If
\[ m > ne + \frac{(n - 1) \deg_j a_n + \max\{\deg_j a_0, \ldots, \deg_j a_{n-2}, \deg_j p^e a_{n-1}\}}{\deg_j p}, \]
then \( f \) is irreducible over \( K(X_1, \ldots, X_{r-1}) \).

**Corollary 3.** Let \( K \) be a field, fix integers \( n \geq 3, r \geq 2 \), and let
\[ f(X_1, \ldots, X_r) = a_0 + a_1 X_r + \cdots + a_{n-3} X_r^{n-3} + p^e a_{n-2} X_r^{n-2} + p^m a_n X_r^n \]
with \( a_0, \ldots, a_{n-2}, a_n, p \in K[X_1, \ldots, X_{r-1}] \), \( a_0 a_{n-2} a_n \neq 0 \) and \( p \nmid a_{n-2} a_n \). Assume that for some \( j \in \{1, \ldots, r - 1\} \), \( p \) as a polynomial in \( X_j \) is irreducible over \( K(X_1, \ldots, \hat{X}_j, \ldots, X_{r-1}) \). If \( m \neq e \) mod 2 and
\[ m > ne + \frac{(n - 1) \deg_j a_n + \max\{\deg_j a_0, \ldots, \deg_j a_{n-3}, \deg_j p^e a_{n-2}\}}{\deg_j p}, \]
then \( f \) is irreducible over \( K(X_1, \ldots, X_{r-1}) \).

In the last section of the paper we give a couple of applications of Corollaries 2 and 3, which are in some sense analogous to the first result of Weisner mentioned above, and to Corollary 1, respectively. The proofs of the main results are presented in Sections 2 and 3 below.

**2. Proof of Theorem 1.** Assume by contradiction that \( f \) decomposes as \( f(X) = f_1(X) \cdot f_2(X) \) with
\[ f_1(X) = b_0 + b_1 X + \cdots + b_{j-1} X^{j-1} + p^d b_j X^j, \]
\[ f_2(X) = c_0 + c_1 X + \cdots + c_{k-1} X^{k-1} + p^{m-d} c_k X^k, \]
where \( d \geq 0, j, k \geq 1, j + k = n, b_0, \ldots, b_j, c_0, \ldots, c_k \in \mathbb{Z}, b_j c_k = a_n, \) and \( b_0 c_0 = a_0 \). One may obviously assume that
\[ d \leq m - d. \]
Let us further assume that \( j, k \geq 2 \). Equating the coefficients in the equality
\[ f(X) = f_1(X) \cdot f_2(X), \]
we obtain
\[ p^d b_j c_{k-1} + p^{m-d} b_{j-1} c_k = 0, \tag{5} \]
\[ p^d b_j c_{k-2} + b_{j-1} c_{k-1} + p^{m-d} b_{j-2} c_k = p^e a_{n-2}. \tag{6} \]
Let \( b_{j-1} = p^{n_1} g_1 \) and \( c_{k-1} = p^{n_2} g_2 \) with \( n_1, n_2 \geq 0 \) and \( p \nmid g_1 g_2 \). By (5) we then find
\[ d + n_2 = m - d + n_1, \]
so (6) becomes
\[ p^d b_j c_{k-2} + p^{m-2d+2n_1} g_1 g_2 + p^{m-d} b_{j-2} c_k = p^e a_{n-2}. \tag{7} \]
If we now assume that \( e < d \), it follows by (4) and (7) that we must have \( e = m - 2d + 2n_1 \), which contradicts the fact that \( m \neq e \) mod 2. Therefore,
$e \geq d$, and one may easily check that this conclusion still holds for $j = 1$ or $k = 1$. Consider now the factorizations of $f$ and $f_1$, say
\[
f(X) = p^m a_n (X - \xi_1) \cdots (X - \xi_n),
\]
\[
f_1(X) = p^d b_j (X - \xi_1) \cdots (X - \xi_j),
\]
with $\xi_1, \ldots, \xi_n \in \mathbb{C}$. It is well known that if the leading coefficient of a complex polynomial $F(X) = \alpha_n + \alpha_1 X + \cdots + \alpha_n X^n$ satisfies the inequality $|\alpha_n| > |\alpha_{n-1}| + |\alpha_{n-2}| + \cdots + |\alpha_0|$, then all the roots of $F$ lie in the disk $|z| < 1$. Let us now fix an arbitrarily chosen real $\delta \geq 1$ and assume that
\[
|p^m a_n| > \delta^2 |p^e a_{n-2}| + \delta^3 |a_{n-3}| + \cdots + \delta^n |a_0|.
\]
Then all the roots of $f(X/\delta)$ will lie in the disk $|z| < 1$, so for any $i \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$ one must have $|\xi_i| < 1/\delta$, and therefore
\[
|\xi_1 \cdots \xi_j| < \frac{1}{\delta^j}.
\]
On the other hand, $b_0 \neq 0$ and hence $|b_0| \geq 1$, and since $b_j | a_n$ and $d \leq e$, we must have
\[
|\xi_1 \cdots \xi_j| = \left| \frac{b_0}{p^d b_j} \right| \geq \frac{1}{p^e |a_n|}.
\]
In view of (9) and (10), to reach a contradiction we will choose $\delta$ satisfying
\[
\frac{1}{p^e |a_n|} \geq \frac{1}{\delta^j}.
\]
Since $j \geq 1$, instead of (11) it will be sufficient to have $\delta \geq p^e |a_n|$. A suitable candidate for $\delta$ is therefore $p^e |a_n|$, so one derives the desired contradiction for all integers $m \not\equiv e \mod 2$ satisfying
\[
p^m > |a_n a_{n-2}| p^3e + \sum_{i=3}^n |a_{n-i}^i a_{n-i}^e| p^i e,
\]
which completes the proof. \qed

For the proof of Corollary 1, we first use the fact that $f(X) + cp^m$ is irreducible over $\mathbb{Q}$ if and only if $f(X + \alpha/\beta) + cp^m$ is. It will therefore be sufficient to test the irreducibility of $\beta^{n-2} [f(X + \alpha/\beta) + cp^m]$. Since our assumption $f(\alpha/\beta) = f'(\alpha/\beta) = 0$ and $f''(\alpha/\beta) \neq 0$, we have
\[
\beta^{n-2} \left[ f \left( X + \frac{\alpha}{\beta} \right) + cp^m \right] = p^m c \beta^{n-2} + p^e \frac{\beta^{n-2} f''(\alpha/\beta)}{2!} X^2 + \sum_{i=3}^n \frac{\beta^{n-2} f^{(i)}(\alpha/\beta)}{i!} X^i.
\]
If we now replace $f$ by $X^{\deg f} \cdot f(1/X)$ in Theorem 1, we see that a polynomial of the form $f(X) = p^m a_0 + p^e a_2 X^2 + a_3 X^3 + \cdots + a_n X^n$ with $n \geq 3$,
an integer \( k > s \) of Theorem 1 may be false, as seen from the following example. Take
\[
354 \quad p \equiv 2, \quad \text{fulfilled, being equivalent to } 2^k = \beta \]
\[
\text{The conclusion follows by applying (12) to } \beta^{n-2}[f(X + \alpha/\beta) + cp^n]. \quad \blacksquare
\]

**Remarks.**

1. Without our assumption that \( m \not\equiv e \pmod{2} \), the conclusion of Theorem 1 may be false, as seen from the following example. Take an integer \( k > 1 \) and let \( f_k(X) = 2^{2k}X^4 + (2^{k+1} - 1)X^2 + 1 \). Here we have \( p = 2, \ m = 2k, \ e = 0 \), and hence \( m \not\equiv e \pmod{2} \). Although condition (1) is fulfilled, being equivalent to \( 2^{2k} > 2^{k+1} \), our polynomials \( f_k \) are all reducible over \( \mathbb{Q} \), since

\[
2^{2k}X^4 + (2^{k+1} - 1)X^2 + 1 = (2^kX^2 + X + 1)(2^kX^2 - X + 1).
\]

2. Some additional information on the coefficients of \( f \) may allow one to obtain sharper bounds than those exhibited in Theorem 1, by searching for sharper estimates for the moduli of the roots of \( f \). Such estimates may be obtained by using ideas of Mignotte [12] and Mignotte and Ștăfănescu [13]. However, our assumption on the size of \( p^m \) is in some cases best possible, in the sense that there exist polynomials for which equality in (1) holds and \( m \not\equiv e \pmod{2} \), and which are reducible over \( \mathbb{Q} \). To see this, take \( k \geq 2 \) and let

\[
f_k(X) = 1 + X + X^2 + \cdots + X^{2k-4} + 2X^{2k-3} - 2^kX^{2k-1}.
\]

Here \( p = 2, \ m = 2k, \ e = 1 \), and hence \( m \not\equiv e \pmod{2} \). On the other hand we have equality in (1), since \( 2^{2k} = 2^3 + \sum_{i=3}^{2k-1}2i \), and \( f_k \) is reducible over \( \mathbb{Q} \), since \( f_k(1/2) = 0 \).

3. Note that once we fix the integers \( a_0, \ldots, a_{n-2}, a_n, m, e \) such that \( a_0a_{n-2}a_n \neq 0, \ m \not\equiv e \pmod{2} \) and \( m > ne \), the inequality (1) will hold for all but finitely many prime numbers \( p \).

**3. Proof of Theorems 2 and 3.** Let \( a_0, \ldots, a_n, p \) be as in the statement of Theorem 2, and assume by contradiction that \( f(X, Y) = f_1(X, Y) \cdot f_2(X, Y) \) with

\[
f_1(X, Y) = b_0 + b_1Y + \cdots + b_{j-1}Y^{j-1} + p^db_jY^j,
\]

\[
f_2(X, Y) = c_0 + c_1Y + \cdots + c_{k-1}Y^{k-1} + p^{m-d}c_kY^k,
\]

where \( d \geq 0, \ j, k \geq 1, \ j + k = n, \ b_0, \ldots, b_j, c_0, \ldots, c_k \in K[X], \ b_jc_k = a_n \) and \( b_0c_0 = a_0 \). One may obviously assume that

\[
d \leq m - d.
\]

Equating the coefficients, we find that \( p^ea_{n-1} = p^db_jc_{k-1} + p^{m-d}b_{j-1}c_k \), so in view of (13) we must have \( e \geq d \).
We now introduce a nonarchimedean absolute value \( | \cdot | \) on \( K(X) \) as follows. We fix a real number \( \varrho > 1 \), and for any \( F(X) \in K[X] \) we define
\[
|F(X)| = \varrho^\deg F(X).
\]
We then extend \( | \cdot | \) to \( K(X) \) by multiplicativity. Thus for any \( H(X) = F(X)/G(X) \) with \( F(X), G(X) \in K[X], G(X) \neq 0 \), we let \( |H(X)| = |F(X)|/|G(X)| \). Note that for any non-zero element \( u \) of \( K[X] \) one has \(|u| \geq 1\). Let then \( K(X) \) be a fixed algebraic closure of \( K(X) \), and fix an extension of the absolute value \( | \cdot | \) to \( \overline{K(X)} \), which we will also denote by \( | \cdot | \).

Consider the factorizations of \( f \) and \( f_1 \), say
\[
f(X,Y) = p^m a_n(Y - \xi_1) \cdots (Y - \xi_n),
\]
\[
f_1(X,Y) = p^d b_j(Y - \eta_1) \cdots (Y - \eta_j),
\]
with \( \xi_1, \ldots, \xi_n \in \overline{K(X)} \). If we now fix an arbitrarily chosen real \( \delta \geq 0 \) and assume that
\[
|p^m a_n| > \varrho^\delta \max\{|a_0|, \ldots, |a_{n-2}|, |p^e a_{n-1}|\},
\]
then for any \( j \in \{1, \ldots, n\} \) we must have
\[
|\xi_j| < 1/\varrho^{\delta/n}.
\]
Indeed, since our absolute value also satisfies the triangle inequality, we have
\[
0 = |a_0 + a_1 \xi_j + \cdots + a_{n-2} \xi_j^{n-2} + p^e a_{n-1} \xi_j^{n-1} + p^m a_n \xi_j^n| \\
\geq |p^m a_n| \cdot |\xi_j|^n - |a_0 + a_1 \xi_j + \cdots + a_{n-2} \xi_j^{n-2} + p^e a_{n-1} \xi_j^{n-1}| \\
\geq |p^m a_n| \cdot |\xi_j|^n - \max\{|a_0|, |a_1 \xi_j|, \ldots, |a_{n-2} \xi_j^{n-2}|, |p^e a_{n-1} \xi_j^{n-1}|\}.
\]
Therefore, if \(|\xi_j| > 1\) we find
\[
0 \geq |p^m a_n| \cdot |\xi_j|^n - \max\{|a_0|, |a_1|, \ldots, |a_{n-2}|, |p^e a_{n-1}|\} \cdot |\xi_j|^{n-1} \\
= |\xi_j|^{n-1} (|p^m a_n| \cdot |\xi_j| - \max\{|a_0|, |a_1|, \ldots, |a_{n-2}|, |p^e a_{n-1}|\}) \\
> |\xi_j|^{n-1} (|p^m a_n| - \varrho^\delta \max\{|a_0|, |a_1|, \ldots, |a_{n-2}|, |p^e a_{n-1}|\}) > 0,
\]
while if \(1 \geq |\xi_j| \geq 1/\varrho^{\delta/n}\) we obtain
\[
0 \geq |p^m a_n| \cdot \frac{1}{\varrho^{\delta/n}} - \max\{|a_0|, |a_1|, \ldots, |a_{n-2}|, |p^e a_{n-1}|\} > 0,
\]
again a contradiction.

Using (15) one obtains
\[
|\xi_1 \cdots \xi_j| < 1/\varrho^{\delta/n}.
\]
On the other hand, \( b_0 \neq 0 \) and hence \(|b_0| \geq 1\), and since \(b_j | a_n\) and \(d \leq e\) we obviously have
\[
|\xi_1 \cdots \xi_j| = \frac{|b_0|}{|p^d b_j|} \geq \frac{1}{|p|^e |a_n|}.
\]
Recalling the definition of our absolute value, inequality (14) reads

\[ q^{m \deg p + \deg a_n} > q^\delta + \max \{ \deg a_0, \ldots, \deg a_{n-2}, \deg p^e a_{n-1} \} , \]
or equivalently,

\[ m \deg p \geq \delta + \max \{ \deg a_0, \ldots, \deg a_{n-2}, \deg p^e a_{n-1} \} - \deg a_n. \]

In view of (16) and (17), to reach a contradiction it remains to choose \( \delta \) such that

\[ \frac{1}{|p|^e |a_n|} \geq 1/q^{\delta/n}. \]

Since \( j \geq 1 \), instead of (19) it will be sufficient to have \( q^{\delta/n} \geq |p|^e |a_n| \), or equivalently

\[ \delta \geq n \deg a_n + ne \deg p. \]

A suitable candidate for \( \delta \) is therefore \( n \deg a_n + ne \deg p \), so we derive a contradiction if

\[ (m - ne) \deg p > (n - 1) \deg a_n + \max \{ \deg a_0, \ldots, \deg a_{n-2}, \deg p^e a_{n-1} \} , \]

and this completes the proof.

For the proof of Theorem 3, we assume as before that \( f \) decomposes as \( f(X, Y) = f_1(X, Y) \cdot f_2(X, Y) \) with

\[ f_1(X, Y) = b_0 + b_1 Y + \cdots + b_{j-1} Y^{j-1} + p^d b_j Y^j , \]
\[ f_2(X, Y) = c_0 + c_1 Y + \cdots + c_{k-1} Y^{k-1} + p^m - d k Y^k , \]

where \( d \geq 0, j, k \geq 1, j + k = n, b_0, \ldots, b_j, c_0, \ldots, c_k \in K[X] \), \( b_j c_k = a_n \), and \( b_0 c_0 = a_0 \). One may again assume that \( d \leq m - d \). Then, with exactly the same arguments as in the proof of Theorem 1, one shows that \( e \geq d \). The remainder of the proof is similar to that of Theorem 2, with \( \max \{ |a_0|, \ldots, |a_{n-2}|, |p^e a_{n-1}| \} \) replaced by \( \max \{ |a_0|, \ldots, |a_{n-3}|, |p^e a_{n-2}| \} \).

Remarks. 1. Here too, one may find polynomials for which equality in (2) holds, and which are reducible over \( K(X) \). To see this, take \( p \in K[X] \), \( p \) irreducible over \( K \), let \( n \geq 3 \) and choose \( a_0, a_2, \ldots, a_{n-1} \in K[X] \) of degree less than or equal to \( m \deg p \) and such that \( a_0 a_{n-1} \neq 0, p \nmid a_{n-1} \). Define then \( a_1 \in K[X] \) by the equality \( a_1(X) = -p(X)^n - a_0(X) - a_2(X) - \cdots - a_{n-1}(X) \), and let \( f(X, Y) = a_0 + a_1 Y + \cdots + a_{n-1} Y^{n-1} + p^m Y^n \). Here \( e = 0 \) and obviously \( m \deg p = \max \{ \deg a_0, \ldots, \deg a_{n-1} \} \), so one has equality in (2). On the other hand, \( f \) is reducible over \( K(X) \), being divisible by \( Y - 1 \).

In a similar way one can find polynomials for which \( m \not\equiv e \mod 2 \) and equality in (3) holds, and which are reducible over \( K(X) \).

2. Let \( K = \mathbb{Q} \), take an integer \( k \geq 1 \) and consider the polynomials
\[ f_k(X, Y) = X^{2k} Y^4 + (2X^k - 1) Y^2 + 1. \]
Here we have \( p(X) = X, m = 2k \),
$e = 0$, and hence $m \equiv e \mod 2$. Although condition (3) is fulfilled, our polynomials $f_k$ are all reducible over $\mathbb{Q}(X)$, since

$$X^{2k}Y^4 + (2X^k - 1)Y^2 + 1 = (X^kY^2 + Y + 1)(X^kY^2 - Y + 1).$$

So in the case of Theorem 3 too, one has to assume that $m \not\equiv e \mod 2$.

3. If we fix the polynomials $a_0, \ldots, a_n$ as in Theorem 2, and take integers $m, e$ with $m > (n + 1)e$, the inequality (2) will hold for all the irreducible polynomials $p \in K[X]$ with

$$\deg p^e a_{n-1} \geq \max\{\deg a_0, \ldots, \deg a_{n-2}\},$$

$$\deg p > (n - 1)\deg a_n + \deg a_{n-1}.$$

Similarly, if we fix the polynomials $a_0, \ldots, a_{n-2}, a_n$ as in Theorem 3, and take integers $m, e$ with $m > (n + 1)e$ and $m \not\equiv e \mod 2$, the inequality (3) will hold for all the irreducible polynomials $p \in K[X]$ with

$$\deg p^e a_{n-2} \geq \max\{\deg a_0, \ldots, \deg a_{n-3}\},$$

$$\deg p > (n - 1)\deg a_n + \deg a_{n-2}.$$

We end with two immediate applications of Corollaries 2 and 3.

**Corollary 4.** Let $K$ be a field of characteristic 0, $r \geq 2$ a fixed integer, and $f(X_1, \ldots, X_r) \in K[X_1, \ldots, X_r]$ a polynomial of degree $n \geq 2$ in $X_r$. Assume that $f$ has a linear factor in $X_r$ of multiplicity 1, say $\beta X_r - \alpha$, with $\alpha, \beta \in K[X_1, \ldots, X_{r-1}]$, $\beta \neq 0$. Let $p, c \in K[X_1, \ldots, X_{r-1}]$, $c \neq 0$, $p \nmid c\beta$, and assume that for some $j \in \{1, \ldots, r - 1\}$, $p$ as a polynomial in $X_j$ is irreducible over $K(X_1, \ldots, \hat{X}_j, \ldots, X_{r-1})$. Let $e$ be maximum with the property that

$$p^e \mid \beta^{n-1} \frac{\partial f}{\partial X_j}\left(X_1, \ldots, X_{r-1}, \alpha(X_1, \ldots, X_{r-1}), \frac{\alpha(X_1, \ldots, X_{r-1})}{\beta(X_1, \ldots, X_{r-1})}\right).$$

Then for every integer $m$ satisfying

$$(n - 1)\deg_j c \beta^{n-1} + \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \deg_j \beta^{n-1} \frac{\partial f}{\partial X_i}
(X_1, \ldots, X_r - 1, \frac{\alpha(X_1, \ldots, X_{r-1})}{\beta(X_1, \ldots, X_{r-1})})
\geq m + ne + \frac{\deg_j p}{\deg_j p}$$

the polynomial $f + cp^m$ is irreducible over $K(X_1, \ldots, X_{r-1})$.

**Corollary 5.** Let $K$ be a field of characteristic 0, $r \geq 2$ a fixed integer, and $f(X_1, \ldots, X_r) \in K[X_1, \ldots, X_r]$ a polynomial of degree $n \geq 3$ in $X_r$. Assume that $f$ has a linear factor in $X_r$ of multiplicity 2, say $\beta X_r - \alpha$, with $\alpha, \beta \in K[X_1, \ldots, X_{r-1}]$, $\beta \neq 0$. Let $p, c \in K[X_1, \ldots, X_{r-1}]$, $c \neq 0$, $p \nmid c\beta$, and assume that for some $j \in \{1, \ldots, r - 1\}$, $p$ as a polynomial in $X_j$ is irreducible over $K(X_1, \ldots, \hat{X}_j, \ldots, X_{r-1})$. Let $e$ be maximum with the
property that

\[ p^e \mid \beta^{n-2} \frac{\partial^2 f}{\partial X_r^2} \left( X_1, \ldots, X_{r-1}, \frac{\alpha(X_1, \ldots, X_{r-1})}{\beta(X_1, \ldots, X_{r-1})} \right). \]

Then for every integer \( m \not\equiv e \mod 2 \) satisfying

\[ (n-1) \deg_j c \beta^{n-2} + \max_{2 \leq i \leq n} \deg_j \beta^{n-2} \frac{\partial^i f}{\partial X_i^i} \left( X_1, \ldots, X_{r-1}, \frac{\alpha(X_1, \ldots, X_{r-1})}{\beta(X_1, \ldots, X_{r-1})} \right) \]

\[ m > ne + \frac{\deg_j p}{\deg_j} \]

the polynomial \( f + cp^m \) is irreducible over \( K(X_1, \ldots, X_{r-1}) \).

For the proof of Corollary 4 it will be sufficient to test the irreducibility over \( K(X_1, \ldots, X_{r-1}) \) of the polynomial \( g \) defined by

\[ g(X_1, \ldots, X_r) = \beta^{n-1} \left\{ f \left( X_1, \ldots, X_{r-1}, X_r + \frac{\alpha(X_1, \ldots, X_{r-1})}{\beta(X_1, \ldots, X_{r-1})} \right) + cp^m \right\}. \]

Let us denote the \( r \)-tuple \( (X_1, \ldots, X_{r-1}, \frac{\alpha(X_1, \ldots, X_{r-1})}{\beta(X_1, \ldots, X_{r-1})}) \) by \( \bar{X} \). Since by our assumption we have \( f(\bar{X}) = 0 \) and \( \frac{\partial f}{\partial X_r}(\bar{X}) \neq 0 \), we obtain

\[ g(X_1, \ldots, X_r) = p^m c \beta^{n-1} + p^e \beta^{n-1} \frac{\beta \frac{\partial f}{\partial X_r}(\bar{X})}{1! p^e} \cdot X_r + \sum_{i=2}^n \frac{\beta^{n-1}}{i!} \left( \frac{\partial^i f}{\partial X_r^i} \right)(\bar{X}) \cdot X_r^i. \]

If we replace now \( f \) by \( X_r^{\deg f} \cdot f(1/X_r) \) in Corollary 2, we see that a polynomial of the form \( f(X_1, \ldots, X_r) = p^n a_0 + p^e a_1 X_r + a_2 X_r^2 + a_3 X_r^3 + \cdots + a_n X_r^n \) with \( a_0, \ldots, a_n, p \in K[X_1, \ldots, X_{r-1}], a_0 a_1 a_n \neq 0, p \nmid a_0 a_1, \) must be irreducible over \( K(X_1, \ldots, X_{r-1}) \) if for some \( j \in \{1, \ldots, r-1\}, p \) as a polynomial in \( X_j \) is irreducible over \( K(X_1, \ldots, \hat{X}_j, \ldots, X_{r-1}) \) and

\[ m > ne + \frac{(n-1) \deg_j a_0 + \max \{ \deg_j p^e a_1, \deg_j a_2, \ldots, \deg_j a_n \}}{\deg_j p}. \]

The conclusion now follows by applying (20) to \( g(X_1, \ldots, X_r) \).

In order to prove Corollary 5, we first see from Corollary 3 that a polynomial of the form \( f(X_1, \ldots, X_r) = p^n a_0 + p^e a_2 X_r^2 + a_3 X_r^3 + \cdots + a_n X_r^n \) with \( a_0, a_2, \ldots, a_n, p \in K[X_1, \ldots, X_{r-1}], a_0 a_2 a_n \neq 0, p \nmid a_0 a_2, m \not\equiv e \mod 2 \) will be irreducible over \( K(X_1, \ldots, X_{r-1}) \) if for some \( j \in \{1, \ldots, r-1\}, p \) as a polynomial in \( X_j \) is irreducible over \( K(X_1, \ldots, \hat{X}_j, \ldots, X_{r-1}) \) and

\[ m > ne + \frac{(n-1) \deg_j a_0 + \max \{ \deg_j p^e a_2, \deg_j a_3, \ldots, \deg_j a_n \}}{\deg_j p}. \]

Here it will be sufficient to test the irreducibility over \( K(X_1, \ldots, X_{r-1}) \) of the polynomial \( \bar{g} \) defined by

\[ \bar{g}(X_1, \ldots, X_r) = \beta^{n-2} \left\{ f \left( X_1, \ldots, X_{r-1}, X_r + \frac{\alpha(X_1, \ldots, X_{r-1})}{\beta(X_1, \ldots, X_{r-1})} \right) + cp^m \right\}. \]
Since now the linear factor $\beta X_r - \alpha$ has multiplicity 2, we have $f(X) = 0$, $\frac{\partial f}{\partial X_r}(X) = 0$ and $\frac{\partial^2 f}{\partial X_r^2}(X) \neq 0$. Thus, we obtain
\[
\overline{g}(X_1, \ldots, X_r) = p^m c \beta^{n-2} + p^e \frac{\beta^{n-2}}{2! p^e} \frac{\partial f}{\partial X_r}(X) \cdot X_r^2 + \sum_{i=3}^{n} \frac{\beta^{n-2}}{i!} \frac{\partial^i f}{\partial X_r^i}(X) \cdot X_r^i,
\]
and the proof finishes by applying (21) to $\overline{g}(X_1, \ldots, X_r)$.
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