

Thm The necessary & sufficient condition that a non-zero element a in a Euclidean ring R is unit is that $d(a) = 1$.

Proof Let a is unit in Euclidean ring R

$$\text{We have } d(1a) \geq d(1)$$

$$\Rightarrow d(a) \geq d(1) \text{ --- (1)}$$

Since a is unit in $R \Rightarrow a^{-1} \in R$ such that

$$aa^{-1} = 1.$$

$$\Rightarrow d(1) = d(aa^{-1}) \geq d(a)$$

$$\text{ie } d(1) \geq d(a) \text{ --- (2)}$$

From (1) & (2) $d(a) = d(1)$.

Conversely: Let $d(a) = d(1)$

We want to show that a is unit in R .

If a is not a unit in R

$$\text{then } d(1a) > d(1)$$

$$\Rightarrow d(a) > 1 \text{ (Contradiction)}$$

Hence a must be a unit in R

Thm: Let R be a Euclidean ring. Then every non-zero element in R is either a unit in R or can be written as product of finite number of prime elements of R .

Proof We will prove this theorem by induction on $d(a)$

We have $a = 1a$.

$$\therefore d(a) \geq d(1)$$

Thus 1 is an element in R which has minimal d -value. Also if $d(a) = d(1)$ then a is unit in R . Thus result of the theorem is true for $d(a) = d(1)$.

Let us assume inductively that the statement of theorem is true for all non-zero element x in R such that $d(x) < d(a)$.

We shall now show that theorem is true for a also.

If a is prime then theorem is true for a also.

If a is not prime then we can write $a = bc$ where neither b nor c is unit in R .

$$\therefore d(bc) > d(b) \text{ \& } d(bc) > d(c)$$

$$\Rightarrow d(b) < d(a) \text{ \& } d(c) < d(a) \quad (\because a = bc)$$

\therefore By induction hypothesis b & c can be written as a product of a finite number of prime elements in R .

Let $b = p_1 p_2 \dots p_m$ and $c = q_1 q_2 \dots q_n$

$$\Rightarrow a = bc = p_1 p_2 \dots p_m q_1 q_2 \dots q_n$$

Thus we have a as a product of a finite number of prime elements of R .

Hence by induction, theorem is proved.

Unique factorisation theorem

Let R be a Euclidean ring and a be a non-zero non-unit element in R . Suppose that

$$a = p_1 p_2 \dots p_m = q_1 q_2 \dots q_n$$

where p_i 's and q_j 's are prime elements of R . Then $m = n$ and each p_i is an associate of some q_j and each q_j is an associate of some p_i .

Proof We have $p_1 p_2 \dots p_m = q_1 q_2 \dots q_n$ ——— (1)

$$\Rightarrow p_1 \text{ is divisor of } q_1 q_2 \dots q_n$$

$$\Rightarrow p_1 \text{ is divisor of at least one of } q_1, q_2, \dots, q_n$$

Since R is commutative ring, without loss of generality we may suppose that $p_1 | q_1$

Since p_1 & q_1 both are prime elements

$$\Rightarrow p_1 \text{ & } q_1 \text{ must be associates.}$$

$$\text{i.e. } \exists \text{ a unit } u_1 \in R \text{ such that } p_1 = u_1 q_1$$

So from (1) we have

$$p_1 p_2 \dots p_m = u_1 p_1 q_2 q_3 \dots q_n$$

$$\Rightarrow p_2 p_3 \dots p_m = u_1 q_2 q_3 \dots q_n \text{ ——— (2)}$$

We repeat the same argument in ① with p_2 and so on. If $n > m$ then after m steps left hand side becomes 1 while right hand side reduces to product of some units in R and certain number of q_j 's. But q_j 's are prime elements of R , so product of some units and certain number of q_j 's can not be equal to 1.

So n can not be greater than m

$$\Rightarrow n \leq m. \text{ --- ①}$$

Also we have shown that each p_i is an associate of some q_j .

Interchanging the role of p_i & q_j we can show that $m \leq n$ and also each q_j is associate of some p_i . ②

$$\text{From ① \& ② } m = n$$

Hence theorem is established.

Note: Combination of previous two theorems. We can say that in a Euclidean ring every non-zero element can be uniquely written (upto associates) as a product of prime elements in R or unit in R .

Therefore a Euclidean ring is UFD.