### Introduction to Modern Algebra

Part IX. Factorization IX.46. Euclidean Domains

<span id="page-0-0"></span>







<span id="page-2-0"></span>**Proof.** Let D be a Euclidean domain with a Euclidean norm y and let N be an ideal in D. If  $N = \{0\}$ , then  $N = \langle 0 \rangle$  and N is principal. Suppose that  $N \neq \{0\}$ . Then there exists  $b \neq 0$  in N.

**Proof.** Let D be a Euclidean domain with a Euclidean norm v and let N be an ideal in D. If  $N = \{0\}$ , then  $N = \langle 0 \rangle$  and N is principal. Suppose that  $N \neq \{0\}$ . Then there exists  $b \neq 0$  in N. Choose a nonzero  $b \in N$ such that  $v(b)$  is minimal among all  $v(n)$  for  $n \in N$  (this can be done since v is defined on the nonzero elements of  $D$  and v takes on nonnegative integer values).

**Proof.** Let D be a Euclidean domain with a Euclidean norm v and let N be an ideal in D. If  $N = \{0\}$ , then  $N = \langle 0 \rangle$  and N is principal. Suppose that  $N \neq \{0\}$ . Then there exists  $b \neq 0$  in N. Choose a nonzero  $b \in N$ such that  $v(b)$  is minimal among all  $v(n)$  for  $n \in N$  (this can be done since v is defined on the nonzero elements of D and v takes on **nonnegative integer values).** We now show that  $\langle b \rangle = N$ . Let  $a \in N$ . By Condition 1 for a Euclidean domain, there exists  $q$  and r in D such that  $a = bq + r$  where either  $r = 0$  or  $v(r) < v(b)$ .

**Proof.** Let D be a Euclidean domain with a Euclidean norm  $v$  and let N be an ideal in D. If  $N = \{0\}$ , then  $N = \langle 0 \rangle$  and N is principal. Suppose that  $N \neq \{0\}$ . Then there exists  $b \neq 0$  in N. Choose a nonzero  $b \in N$ such that  $v(b)$  is minimal among all  $v(n)$  for  $n \in N$  (this can be done since v is defined on the nonzero elements of D and v takes on nonnegative integer values). We now show that  $\langle b \rangle = N$ . Let  $a \in N$ . By Condition 1 for a Euclidean domain, there exists  $q$  and  $r$  in  $D$  such that  $a = bq + r$  where either  $r = 0$  or  $v(r) < v(b)$ . Now  $r = a - bq$  where a,  $b \in N$ . We have  $b(-q) = -bq \in N$  since N is an ideal (recall N is an ideal if  $xN \subseteq N$  and  $Ny \subseteq N$  for all  $x, y \in D$ ).

**Proof.** Let D be a Euclidean domain with a Euclidean norm  $v$  and let N be an ideal in D. If  $N = \{0\}$ , then  $N = \langle 0 \rangle$  and N is principal. Suppose that  $N \neq \{0\}$ . Then there exists  $b \neq 0$  in N. Choose a nonzero  $b \in N$ such that  $v(b)$  is minimal among all  $v(n)$  for  $n \in N$  (this can be done since v is defined on the nonzero elements of D and v takes on nonnegative integer values). We now show that  $\langle b \rangle = N$ . Let  $a \in N$ . By Condition 1 for a Euclidean domain, there exists  $q$  and  $r$  in  $D$  such that  $a = bq + r$  where either  $r = 0$  or  $v(r) < v(b)$ . Now  $r = a - bq$  where a,  $b \in N$ . We have  $b(-q) = -bq \in N$  since N is an ideal (recall N is an ideal if  $xN \subset N$  and  $Ny \subset N$  for all  $x, y \in D$ ).

# Theorem 46.4. (Continued)

Theorem. 46.4. Every Euclidean domain is a PID.

**Proof. (Continued)** So  $r = a - bq \in N$  ("clearly" N is closed under addition by the definition of ideal). But then  $v(r) < v(b)$  is impossible since  $v(b)$  is maximal over all nonzero elements of N, under  $r = 0$ . Then  $a = bq$  and  $a \in \langle b \rangle$ . Therefore  $N = \langle b \rangle$ , that is N is a principal ideal, and D is a PID.

# Theorem 46.4. (Continued)

Theorem. 46.4. Every Euclidean domain is a PID.

**Proof. (Continued)** So  $r = a - bq \in N$  ("clearly" N is closed under addition by the definition of ideal). But then  $v(r) < v(b)$  is impossible since  $v(b)$  is maximal over all nonzero elements of N, under  $r = 0$ . Then  $a = bq$  and  $a \in \langle b \rangle$ . Therefore  $N = \langle b \rangle$ , that is N is a principal ideal, and D is a PID.

**Theorem. 46.6.** For a Euclidean domain with a Euclidean norm  $v, v(1)$  is minimal among all  $v(a)$  nonzero  $a \in D$ , and  $u \in D$  is a unit if and only if  $v(u) = v(1)$ .

<span id="page-9-0"></span>**Proof.** Condition 2 implies that for nonzero  $a \in D$  we have  $v(1) \le v(1a) = v(a)$ , so  $v(1)$  is minimal. Next, if u is a unit in D, with inverse  $u^{-1}$ , then  $v(u) \leq v(uu^{-1} = v(1)$  and since  $v(1)$  is minimal then  $v(u) = v(1)$ .

**Theorem. 46.6.** For a Euclidean domain with a Euclidean norm  $v, v(1)$  is minimal among all  $v(a)$  nonzero  $a \in D$ , and  $u \in D$  is a unit if and only if  $v(u) = v(1)$ .

**Proof.** Condition 2 implies that for nonzero  $a \in D$  we have  $v(1) \le v(1a) = v(a)$ , so  $v(1)$  is minimal. Next, if u is a unit in D, with inverse  $u^{-1}$ , then  $v(u)\le v(uu^{-1}=v(1)$  and since  $v(1)$  is minimal then  $v(u) = v(1)$ .

Now suppose  $v(u) = v(1)$  for nonzero  $u \in D$ . Then by Condition 1 there exists  $q, v \in D$  such that  $1 = uq + r$  where either  $r = 0$  or  $v(v) < v(u)$ .

**Theorem. 46.6.** For a Euclidean domain with a Euclidean norm  $v, v(1)$  is minimal among all  $v(a)$  nonzero  $a \in D$ , and  $u \in D$  is a unit if and only if  $v(u) = v(1)$ .

**Proof.** Condition 2 implies that for nonzero  $a \in D$  we have  $v(1) \le v(1a) = v(a)$ , so  $v(1)$  is minimal. Next, if u is a unit in D, with inverse  $u^{-1}$ , then  $v(u)\le v(uu^{-1}=v(1)$  and since  $v(1)$  is minimal then  $v(u) = v(1)$ .

Now suppose  $v(u) = v(1)$  for nonzero  $u \in D$ . Then by Condition 1 there exists  $q, v \in D$  such that  $1 = uq + r$  where either  $r = 0$  or  $v(v) < v(u)$ . But since  $v(1) = v(u)$  is minimal, then it must be that  $r = 0$  and  $1 = uq$ . So  $g$  is an inverse of  $u$  and  $u$  is a unit.

**Theorem. 46.6.** For a Euclidean domain with a Euclidean norm  $v, v(1)$  is minimal among all  $v(a)$  nonzero  $a \in D$ , and  $u \in D$  is a unit if and only if  $v(u) = v(1)$ .

**Proof.** Condition 2 implies that for nonzero  $a \in D$  we have  $v(1) \le v(1a) = v(a)$ , so  $v(1)$  is minimal. Next, if u is a unit in D, with inverse  $u^{-1}$ , then  $v(u)\le v(uu^{-1}=v(1)$  and since  $v(1)$  is minimal then  $v(u) = v(1)$ .

Now suppose  $v(u) = v(1)$  for nonzero  $u \in D$ . Then by Condition 1 there exists  $q, v \in D$  such that  $1 = uq + r$  where either  $r = 0$  or  $v(v) < v(u)$ . But since  $v(1) = v(u)$  is minimal, then it must be that  $r = 0$  and  $1 = uq$ . So  $g$  is an inverse of  $u$  and  $u$  is a unit.

<span id="page-13-0"></span>**Theorem. 46.9. Euclidean Algorithm** Let  $D$  be a Euclidean domain with a Euclidean norm  $v$ , and let a and b be nonzero elements of  $D$ . Let  $r_1$  be as in Condition 1 for a Euclidean norm, that is  $a = bq_1 + r_1$  where either  $r_1 = 0$  or  $v(r_1) < v(b)$ . If  $r_1 \neq 0$ , let  $r_2$  be such that  $b = r_1q_2 + r_2$ where either  $r_2 = 0$  or  $v(r_2) < v(r_1)$ . Recursively, let  $r_{i+1}$  be such that  $r_{i-1} = r_i q_{i+1} + r_{i+1}$  where either  $r_{i+1} = 0$  or  $v(r_{i+1}) < v(r_i)$ . Then the sequence  $r_1, r_2, ...$  must terminate with some  $r_3 = 0$ . If  $r_1 = 0$ , then b is a gcd of a and b. If  $r_1 \neq 0$  and  $r_5 = 0$  is the first  $r_i = 0$  then a gcd of a and b is  $r_{s-1}$ . Furthermore, if d is a gcd of a and b, then there exist  $\lambda$  and  $\mu$ in D such that  $d = \lambda a + \mu b$ .

#### Theorem. 46.9. Euclidean Algorithm

**Proof.** Since  $v(r_i) < v(r_{i-1})$  and  $v(r_i)$  is a nonnegative integer, then after some finite number of steps we must arrive at a point where we cannot have  $v(r_s) < v(r_{s-1})$  and so  $r_s = 0$ . If  $r_1 = 0$  then  $a = bq_1$  and b is a gcd of a and b. Suppose  $r_1 \neq 0$ . (1) Then if d | a and d | b we have d  $|(a - bq_1)|$  and so d |  $r_1$  since  $r_1 = a - bq_1$ . (2) But if  $d_1 | r_1$  and  $d_1 | b$  then  $d_1 | (bq_1 + r_1)$  and so  $d_1 | a$ since  $a = bq_1 + r_1$ .

#### Theorem. 46.9. Euclidean Algorithm

**Proof.** Since  $v(r_i) < v(r_{i-1})$  and  $v(r_i)$  is a nonnegative integer, then after some finite number of steps we must arrive at a point where we cannot have  $v(r_s) < v(r_{s-1})$  and so  $r_s = 0$ . If  $r_1 = 0$  then  $a = bq_1$  and b is a gcd of a and b. Suppose  $r_1 \neq 0$ . (1) Then if d | a and d | b we have d |  $(a - bq_1)$  and so d |  $r_1$  since  $r_1 = a - bq_1$ . (2) But if  $d_1 | r_1$  and  $d_1 | b$  then  $d_1 | (bq_1 + r_1)$  and so  $d_1 | a$ **since**  $a = ba_1 + r_1$ **.** These two conditions show that the set of commons divisors of a and b is the same set as the set of commons divisors of b and  $r_1$ .

#### Theorem. 46.9. Euclidean Algorithm

**Proof.** Since  $v(r_i) < v(r_{i-1})$  and  $v(r_i)$  is a nonnegative integer, then after some finite number of steps we must arrive at a point where we cannot have  $v(r_s) < v(r_{s-1})$  and so  $r_s = 0$ . If  $r_1 = 0$  then  $a = bq_1$  and b is a gcd of a and b. Suppose  $r_1 \neq 0$ . (1) Then if d | a and d | b we have d |  $(a - bq_1)$  and so d |  $r_1$  since  $r_1 = a - bq_1$ . (2) But if  $d_1 | r_1$  and  $d_1 | b$  then  $d_1 | (bq_1 + r_1)$  and so  $d_1 | a$ since  $a = bq_1 + r_1$ . These two conditions show that the set of commons divisors of a and b is the same set as the set of commons divisors of b and r<sub>1</sub>. In general, we have hypothesized that  $r_{i-1} = r_i q_{i+1} + r_{i+1}$  so we similarly have (replacing *a* with  $r_{i-1}$ ,  $b$  with  $r_i$ ,  $q_1$  with  $q_{i+1}$ , and  $r_1$  with  $(r_{i+1})$  that if  $r_{i+1}\neq 0$  then the set of common divisors of  $r_{i-1}$  and  $r_i$  is the same as the set of commons divisors of  $r_i$  and  $r_{i+1}$ .

#### Theorem. 46.9. Euclidean Algorithm

**Proof.** Since  $v(r_i) < v(r_{i-1})$  and  $v(r_i)$  is a nonnegative integer, then after some finite number of steps we must arrive at a point where we cannot have  $v(r_s) < v(r_{s-1})$  and so  $r_s = 0$ . If  $r_1 = 0$  then  $a = bq_1$  and b is a gcd of a and b. Suppose  $r_1 \neq 0$ . (1) Then if d | a and d | b we have d  $|(a - bq_1)|$  and so d |  $r_1$  since  $r_1 = a - bq_1$ . (2) But if  $d_1 | r_1$  and  $d_1 | b$  then  $d_1 | (bq_1 + r_1)$  and so  $d_1 | a$ since  $a = bq_1 + r_1$ . These two conditions show that the set of commons divisors of a and b is the same set as the set of commons divisors of b and r<sub>1</sub>. In general, we have hypothesized that  $r_{i-1} = r_i q_{i+1} + r_{i+1}$  so we similarly have (replacing *a* with  $r_{i-1}$ ,  $b$  with  $r_i$ ,  $q_1$  with  $q_{i+1}$ , and  $r_1$  with  $(r_{i+1})$  that if  $r_{i+1}\neq 0$  then the set of common divisors of  $r_{i-1}$  and  $r_i$  is the same as the set of commons divisors of  $r_i$  and  $r_{i+1}$ .

#### Theorem. 46.9. Euclidean Algorithm

**Proof. (Continued)** So inductively, the set of common divisors of a and b (say, when  $i = D$  set  $r_{-1} = a$  and  $r_0 = b$ ) is the same as the set of common divisors of  $r_{s-2}$  and  $r_{s-1}$  (with  $i=s-2$ ), where  $r_s$  is the first  $r_i$ **equal to 0.** Then a gcd of  $r_{s-2}$  and  $r_{s-1}$  is also a gcd of a and b. But we have

$$
r_{s-2} = r_{s-1}q_s + r_s = q_s r_{s-1} \tag{1}
$$

since  $r_s = 0$ , a a gcd of  $r_{s-2}$  and  $r_{s-1}$  in  $r_{s-1}$ .

#### Theorem. 46.9. Euclidean Algorithm

**Proof. (Continued)** So inductively, the set of common divisors of a and b (say, when  $i = D$  set  $r_{-1} = a$  and  $r_0 = b$ ) is the same as the set of common divisors of  $r_{s-2}$  and  $r_{s-1}$  (with  $i=s-2$ ), where  $r_s$  is the first  $r_i$ equal to 0. Then a gcd of  $r_{s-2}$  and  $r_{s-1}$  is also a gcd of a and b. But we have

$$
r_{s-2} = r_{s-1}q_s + r_s = q_s r_{s-1} \tag{1}
$$

since  $r_s = 0$ , a a gcd of  $r_{s-2}$  and  $r_{s-1}$  in  $r_{s-1}$ .

#### Theorem. 46.9. Euclidean Algorithm

**Proof. (Continued)** Now for the "furthermore" claim. That is, if  $d$  is a gcd of 'a' and b then  $d = \lambda a + \mu b$  for some  $\lambda, \mu \in D$ . If  $d = b$  (and  $r_1 = 0$ ) then  $d = 0a + 1b$  and we are done. If  $d = r_s$  then working backward through the equations given above, we can inductively express each  $r_i$  in the form  $r_i = \lambda_i r_{i-1} + \mu_i r_{i-2}$  for some  $\lambda_i, \mu_i \in D$  (namely, since we hypothesize  $r_{i-1} = r_i q_{i+1} + r_{i+1}$  OR  $r_{i-2} = r_{i-1} q_i + r_i$ , we have  $r_i = -q_i r_{i-1} + r_{i-2}$ , so we take  $\lambda_i = -q_i$  and  $\mu_i = 1$ ).

#### Theorem. 46.9. Euclidean Algorithm

**Proof. (Continued)** Now for the "furthermore" claim. That is, if  $d$  is a gcd of 'a' and b then  $d = \lambda a + \mu b$  for some  $\lambda, \mu \in D$ . If  $d = b$  (and  $r_1 = 0$ ) then  $d = 0a + 1b$  and we are done. If  $d = r_s$  then working backward through the equations given above, we can inductively express each  $r_i$  in the form  $r_i = \lambda_i r_{i-1} + \mu_i r_{i-2}$  for some  $\lambda_i, \mu_i \in D$  (namely, since we hypothesize  $r_{i-1} = r_i q_{i+1} + r_{i+1}$  OR  $r_{i-2} = r_{i-1} q_i + r_i$ , we have  $r_i = -q_i r_{i-1} + r_{i-2}$ , so we take  $\lambda_i = -q_i$  and  $\mu_i = 1$ ). So we have

$$
d = r_{s-1} = \lambda_{s-1}r_{s-2} + \mu_{s-1}r_{s-3}
$$
  
=  $\lambda_{s-1}(\lambda_{s-2}r_{s-3} + \mu_{s-2}r_{s-4}) + \mu_{s-1}r_{s-3}$   
=  $(\lambda_{s-1}\lambda_{s-2} + \mu_{s-1})r_{s-3} + \mu_{s-2}r_{s-4}$  (2)

which can be written in the form of a "linear combination" of  $r_{s-3}$  and  $r_{s=4}$ , then as a "linear combination of  $r_{s=4}$  and  $r_{s=5}$ .

#### Theorem. 46.9. Euclidean Algorithm

**Proof. (Continued)** Now for the "furthermore" claim. That is, if  $d$  is a gcd of 'a' and b then  $d = \lambda a + \mu b$  for some  $\lambda, \mu \in D$ . If  $d = b$  (and  $r_1 = 0$ ) then  $d = 0a + 1b$  and we are done. If  $d = r_s$  then working backward through the equations given above, we can inductively express each  $r_i$  in the form  $r_i = \lambda_i r_{i-1} + \mu_i r_{i-2}$  for some  $\lambda_i, \mu_i \in D$  (namely, since we hypothesize  $r_{i-1} = r_i q_{i+1} + r_{i+1}$  OR  $r_{i-2} = r_{i-1} q_i + r_i$ , we have  $r_i = -q_i r_{i-1} + r_{i-2}$ , so we take  $\lambda_i = -q_i$  and  $\mu_i = 1$ ). So we have

$$
d = r_{s-1} = \lambda_{s-1}r_{s-2} + \mu_{s-1}r_{s-3}
$$
  
=  $\lambda_{s-1}(\lambda_{s-2}r_{s-3} + \mu_{s-2}r_{s-4}) + \mu_{s-1}r_{s-3}$   
=  $(\lambda_{s-1}\lambda_{s-2} + \mu_{s-1})r_{s-3} + \mu_{s-2}r_{s-4}$  (2)

which can be written in the form of a "linear combination" of  $r_{s-3}$  and  $r_{s-4}$ , then as a "linear combination of  $r_{s-4}$  and  $r_{s-5}$ .

#### Theorem. 46.9. Euclidean Algorithm

<span id="page-23-0"></span>**Proof. (Continued)** Continuing this process (inductively) we get  $d$  as a linear combination of  $a = r_{-1}$  and  $b = r_0$ :  $d = \lambda a + \mu b$  for some  $\lambda, \mu \in D$ . Finally, if d' is any other gcd of a and b then  $d' = du$  for some unit  $u \in D$ (see the note after Definition 45.19), so  $d' = (\lambda u)a + (\mu u)b$ .