

# Galois Theory, Progress Test 1

February 20, 2018

Please find below a brief report on Progress Test 1, question by question.

## Question 1 (9 points over 20)

- Q1 (i) The criterion was stated correctly by most of the students. Some students got 0.5/1 since they forgot to write which ring the polynomial  $f$  in question must belong to or because they missed some conditions the prime  $p$  must satisfy. The whole point was deducted when the criterion was given as a necessary condition for a polynomial to be irreducible, when the divisibility conditions holding among  $p$  and the coefficients were the wrong ones or when  $f$  was required to belong to  $\mathbb{Q}[x]$  (the criterion is significant when  $f \in A[x]$ ,  $A$  UFD!).
- Q1 (ii)(a) The exercise was successfully solved by almost all students. Students who wrote the factorisation into irreducibles without justifying the irreducibility of the polynomial  $x^4+x^3+x^2+x+1$  got 1/2, while students who didn't even claim that  $x^4+x^3+x^2+x+1$  is irreducible got 0.5/2.
- Q1 (ii)(b) Nothing to mention. Basically no mistakes here.
- Q1 (ii)(c) Also this exercise was correctly tackled by almost all students. The two most recurrent arguments were: i) Eisenstein's criterion with  $p = 5$ , or ii) a polynomial of degree 3 in  $\mathbb{Q}[x]$  is irreducible if and only if it has no rational roots. Some marks were deducted due to inaccuracies in the argument (e.g.  $x^3 = 5$  does not imply  $x = \sqrt[3]{5}$ , or, also, a primitive polynomial  $p \in \mathbb{Z}[x]$  of degree 3 which is reducible over  $\mathbb{Z}$  must have a linear factor, but not necessarily an integer root - one needs to observe that the polynomial is monic to conclude this).
- Q1 (ii)(d) The exercise was OK on average. As in Q1 (ii)(a), students who wrote the factorisation into irreducibles without justifying that  $x^3 + x + 1$  is so got 1/2 and students who did not even claim that  $x^3 + x + 1$  is irreducible got 0.5/2. A few students left the exercise blank and two students solved the wrong exercise. As in Q1 (ii)(c), some marks were deducted due to inaccuracies in the argument: assuming there exists a rational root  $a/b$  of  $x^3 + x + 1$ , with  $a$  and  $b$  coprime, a contradiction can be deduced only after excluding the case  $a = \pm 1$ ,  $b = \pm 1$ , and, again, as in Q1 (ii)(c), having a linear factor in  $\mathbb{Z}[x]$  is equivalent to have an integer root only because the polynomial considered is monic.

Question 2 (11 points over 20)

- Q2 (a) Almost everyone provided a correct proof here. (A few students do not know the sine and the cosine of  $2\pi/3!!!$ )
- Q2 (b)  $\sim 1/4$  of the students did not understand how to use part (a) to find a polynomial with  $w$  as a root or left the exercise blank, while practically all the students who understood the hint got the exercise right.  
Some students stated that the polynomial  $p(x) = w^3 - 3w + 1$  was irreducible without providing a justification ( $-0.5/3$ ), and a few of them did not even mention that  $p$  was irreducible to conclude it was the minimal polynomial of  $w$  ( $-1/3$ ).
- Q2 (c)  $\sim 1/3$  of the students provided a wrong solution or left the exercise blank, while a few students provided a correct answer for  $K_1$ , but without justifying it ( $-1.5/3$ ) or giving only a partial explanation ( $-0.5/3$  or  $-1.5/3$ ). A common mistake was setting  $K_1 = \mathbb{Q}(\sqrt{3})$  (with this choice,  $K_1$  is not contained in  $K!$ ). Further, some students seem not to know the notation for the degree of an extension of fields: if  $L \subset K$ , one writes  $[K : L]$  and not  $[L : K]$ .
- Q2 (d) Lots of missing or incomplete answers here. On average, in order to compute the degree  $[K : \mathbb{Q}]$ , the tower law was applied correctly, but the fact that  $[K : K_1] = 3$  was left without an explanation or with only a partial one. On the other hand, the few who fully computed  $[K : \mathbb{Q}]$  used several different proofs, some of them quite nice ones. Regarding the second part, WITH the assumption that  $[K : \mathbb{Q}] = 6$ , the argument to conclude the irreducibility of  $\phi$  was well explained in general.