

Contents lists available at ScienceDirect

Journal of Number Theory





Corrigendum

Corrigendum to "On a generalization of a conjecture of Grosswald" [J. Number Theory 216 (2020) 216–241]



Pradipto Banerjee*, Ranjan Bera

Indian Institute of Technology – Hyderabad, Department of Mathematics, Kandi, Sangareddy, Medak, Telangana 502285, India

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:
Received 15 November 2020
Received in revised form 17
November 2020
Accepted 18 November 2020
Available online 23 December 2020
Communicated by S.J. Miller

MSC: 11R32 1C08 33C45

Keywords:
Bessel Polynomials
Generalized Laguerre polynomials
Irreducibility
Galois group

ABSTRACT

We extend the result of Lemma 4, [1] to the case that e=0 and $\ell=1$ which was missing in [1] but used in the proof of Theorem 1, [1].

© 2020 Elsevier Inc. All rights reserved.

DOI of original article: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jnt.2020.02.013.

^{*} Corresponding author.

E-mail addresses: pradipto.banerjee7@gmail.com (P. Banerjee), mal6resch11002@iith.ac.in (R. Bera).

1. The correction

On page 15, [1], in Case (ii), it is claimed in the fifth display that for $e \in \{0, 1\}$, the following holds.

$$\frac{1}{p-1} + \max\left\{\frac{1}{p-1}, \frac{1}{p-2\ell}, \frac{2\log(2n+\beta)}{p^s\log p}\right\} > \frac{1}{k}.$$

This was obtained by arguing that $\mu_e(g) \ge 1/k$ and that

$$\mu_e(g) < \frac{1}{p-1} + \max\left\{\frac{1}{p-1}, \frac{1}{p-2\ell}, \frac{2\log(2n+\beta)}{p^s \log p}\right\}.$$
 (1)

For the latter estimate, we had referred to Lemma 4, [1]. The bound obtained in Lemma 4, [1], is valid only for $e \ge \ell$. While, according to (b), Corollary 4, if e = 0, then $\ell = 1$, i.e., $e < \ell$. Thus, in order for our arguments to work in case (ii), we must justify the validity of (1) in Lemma 4, [1], in the case that e = 0 and $\ell = 1$. In the present note, we achieve this.

We follow the notations of [1]. In the case under consideration, e = 0 and $\ell = 1$. By (b), Corollary 4 [1], this is the case if $\beta \neq -2$. We let p be a prime factor of $n - \ell = n - 1$ satisfying $p > 2\ell + |\beta| = 2 + |\beta|$, as required in Lemma 4, [1]. We are to establish that

$$\mu_0(g) < \frac{1}{p-1} + \max\left\{\frac{1}{p-1}, \frac{1}{p-2}, \frac{2\log(2n+\beta)}{p^s \log p}\right\}.$$
(2)

We recall from [1] that

$$\mu_e(g) = \mu_{e,p}(g) = \max\left\{\frac{\nu(b_0) - \nu(b_j)}{j} : e < j \le n\right\}$$

where $g(x) = \sum_{j=0}^{n} b_j x^j$ and $\nu(b_j)$ is the highest power of p that divides b_j . From Lemma 4, [1], we already have that

$$\mu_1(g) < \frac{1}{p-1} + \max\left\{\frac{1}{p-1}, \frac{1}{p-2\ell}, \frac{2\log(2n+\beta)}{p^s \log p}\right\}.$$

Thus, in order to establish (2), it would suffice to show that

$$\nu(b_0) - \nu(b_1) \le 0.$$

Next, we recall from [1] that

$$b_j = \binom{n}{j} \frac{(2n+\beta-j)!}{(n+\beta)!}.$$

Thus,

$$b_0/b_1 = \frac{(2n+\beta)!}{(n+\beta)!} \frac{(n+\beta)!}{n(2n+\beta-1)!} = \frac{2n+\beta}{n}.$$

Therefore, $\nu(b_0) - \nu(b_1) > 0$ implies that $p|(2n+\beta)$. Also, as per our hypothesis, p divides n-1. Thus, p divides $2n+\beta-2n+2=\beta+2$. Since $p>2+|\beta|$, it must be that $\beta+2=0$. But this is a contradiction since $|\beta| \neq -2$ in this case. Our assertion now follows.

References

[1] P. Banerjee, R. Bera, On a generalization of a conjecture of Grosswald, J. Number Theory 216 (2020) 216–241.