

REMARKS ON RINGS OF CONSTANTS OF DERIVATIONS

WEI LI

(Communicated by Louis J. Ratliff, Jr.)

ABSTRACT. Let k be a field of characteristic $p > 0$ and $D \neq 0$ a family of k -derivations of $k[x, y]$. We prove that $k[x, y]^D$, the ring of constants with respect to D , is a free $k[x^p, y^p]$ -module of rank p or 1 and $k[x, y]^D = k[x^p, y^p, f_1, \dots, f_{p-1}]$ for some $f_1, \dots, f_{p-1} \in k[x, y]^D$.

In this note we generalize some results of A. Nowicki and M. Nagata on rings of constants for k -derivations of $k[x, y]$ in their paper [N-N]. Before stating their results let us set up notations which will be used throughout this paper.

We assume that k is always a field of characteristic $p > 0$. A k -linear map $d: k[x_1, \dots, x_n] \rightarrow k[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ is called a k -derivation of $k[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ if d satisfies the condition:

$$d(fg) = d(f)g + fd(g), \quad \forall f, g \in k[x_1, \dots, x_n].$$

If D is a family of k -derivations of $k[x_1, \dots, x_n]$, we denote by $k[x_1, \dots, x_n]^D$ the set of constants of D in $k[x_1, \dots, x_n]$, i.e.,

$$k[x_1, \dots, x_n]^D = \{f \in k[x_1, \dots, x_n] \mid d(f) = 0, \forall d \in D\}.$$

If $D = \{d\}$, we simply write $k[x_1, \dots, x_n]^D = k[x_1, \dots, x_n]^d$.

It is easy to see that for any family D of k -derivations of $k[x_1, \dots, x_n]$, $k[x_1^p, \dots, x_n^p] \subseteq k[x_1, \dots, x_n]^D$; and $k[x_1, \dots, x_n]^D$, as a $k[x_1^p, \dots, x_n^p]$ -submodule of $k[x_1, \dots, x_n]$, is a finitely generated $k[x_1^p, \dots, x_n^p]$ -module. It is interesting to consider relations between these two rings. Among other things, in their recent paper [N-N] Nowicki and Nagata prove the following results:

- A. [N-N, Proposition 4.2] *If $D \neq 0$, $p = 2$, then there exists an $f \in k[x, y]$ such that $k[x, y]^D = k[x^p, y^p, f]$;*
- B. [N-N, Theorem 4.4] *$k[x, y]^d$ is a free $k[x^p, y^p]$ -module for any single k -derivation d .*

In this note we generalize these two results; namely, we prove the following theorem.

Received by the editors November 21, 1988.

1980 *Mathematics Subject Classification* (1985 Revision). Primary 13B10.

Key words and phrases. Derivations, rings of constants of derivations.

©1989 American Mathematical Society
0002-9939/89 \$1.00 + \$.25 per page

Theorem. Let k be a field of characteristic $p > 0$, $D \neq 0$ a family of k -derivations of $k[x, y]$. Then

- (i) $k[x, y]^D$ is a free $k[x^p, y^p]$ -module of rank p or 1 ;
- (ii) there exist $g_1, \dots, g_{p-1} \in k[x, y]^D$ such that $k[x, y]^D = k[x^p, y^p, g_1, \dots, g_{p-1}]$.

Note that $k[x, y]^D$ is always a two-dimensional normal domain; hence it is Cohen-Macaulay. It is a natural question whether $k[x, y]^D$ is regular. We shall give a negative answer to this question by giving an example which is not locally UFD. We shall also give an example showing that for $n \geq 3$, $k[x_1, \dots, x_n]^D$ may not be Cohen-Macaulay.

To prove the theorem, we need the following theorem (see [M], p. 140).

Theorem A. Let A be a regular local ring, and B a domain containing A which is a finite A -module. Then B is free over A iff B is Cohen-Macaulay.

Proof of theorem. Denote $A = k[x, y]^D$. A is a finitely generated $k[x^p, y^p]$ -module, as being a $k[x^p, y^p]$ -submodule of $k[x, y]$. Let \mathcal{M} be a maximal ideal of $k[x^p, y^p]$. Then $k[x^p, y^p]_{\mathcal{M}}$ is a regular local ring, $A_{\mathcal{M}}$ is a finite $k[x^p, y^p]_{\mathcal{M}}$ -module. Since A is a normal domain, $A_{\mathcal{M}}$ is normal. Note that $\dim A_{\mathcal{M}} = 2$. Hence, by [M, Theorem 38, p. 124], $A_{\mathcal{M}}$ is Cohen-Macaulay. Therefore, by using Theorem A, $A_{\mathcal{M}}$ is a free $k[x^p, y^p]_{\mathcal{M}}$ -module. It follows that A is projective over $k[x^p, y^p]$. Thus, by Seshadri [S] (see [L]), $A = k[x, y]^D$ is a free $k[x^p, y^p]$ -module.

Assume that $k[x, y]^D$, as a free $k[x^p, y^p]$ -module, has rank s . Let $f_1, \dots, f_s \in k[x, y]^D$ be a set of generators of $k[x, y]^D$ -module $k[x, y]^D$. Denote $F = k(x^p, y^p)[f_1, \dots, f_s]$. Then F is the field of quotients of $k[x, y]^D$ since f_1, \dots, f_s are integral over $k(x^p, y^p)$. Denote $t = [F : k(x^p, y^p)]$. Then $t = 1, p$, or p^2 . But $t = p^2$ is impossible, as $D \neq 0$. Note that

$$F = k(x^p, y^p) \otimes_{k[x^p, y^p]} k[x, y]^D$$

and that $k[x, y]^D$ is a free $k[x^p, y^p]$ -module. It follows that f_1, \dots, f_s is a basis of F over $k(x^p, y^p)$, and hence $s = t$. Therefore $s = 1$ or p , proving (i).

To prove (ii), we may assume that $s = p$ and $k[x, y]^D$ is generated by f_1, \dots, f_p as a $k[x^p, y^p]$ -module. We have

$$1 = \sum_{i=1}^p r_i f_i, \quad r_i \in k[x^p, y^p], \quad i = 1, \dots, p.$$

This means that (r_1, \dots, r_p) is a unimodular row over $k[x, y]$. Since $k[x, y]$ is integral over $k[x^p, y^p]$, (r_1, \dots, r_p) must be a unimodular row over $k[x^p, y^p]$. Using Seshadri [S] (see [L]) again, (r_1, \dots, r_p) can be completed as a $p \times p$ matrix over $k[x^p, y^p]$ with determinant in k^* . Then a basis change

gives a generating set $\{g_1 = 1, g_2, \dots, g_p\}$ of $k[x, y]^D$ as a $k[x^p, y^p]$ -module. Hence $k[x, y]^D = k[x^p, y^p, g_2, \dots, g_p]$. \square

Note that for any family D of k -derivations, $k[x, y]^D$ is a two-dimensional normal domain; hence it is Cohen-Macaulay. We here give an example showing that $k[x, y]^D$ may not be regular. Note that if k is of characteristic zero, $k[x, y]^D$ is always regular (see [N-N]).

Example 1. [N-N, Example 4.3] Let k be a field of characteristic $p > 0$ and let d be the k -derivation of $k[x, y]$ defined by

$$d(f) = \frac{\partial f}{\partial x}x + \frac{\partial f}{\partial y}y, \quad f \in k[x, y].$$

We are going to show that $k[x, y]^d$ is not locally UFD. This implies that $k[x, y]^d$ is not regular. Let $\mathcal{M} = (x, y)k[x, y] \cap k[x, y]^d$. Since $k[x, y]$ is integral over $k[x, y]^d$, \mathcal{M} is a maximal ideal of $k[x, y]^d$. Denote $A = k[x, y]^d$. We claim that $A_{\mathcal{M}}$ is not a UFD. It is easy to check that $x^p, y^p, x^{p-1}y, xy^{p-1} \in A$. They are all irreducible elements in A since any proper factor of them is not in $k[x, y]^d = A$. We want to prove that $x^p, y^p, x^{p-1}y$, and xy^{p-1} are all irreducible in $A_{\mathcal{M}}$. Suppose, for example, that $x^{p-1}y$ is reducible in $A_{\mathcal{M}}$. Then

$$x^{p-1}y = \frac{g_1}{h_1} \cdot \frac{g_2}{h_2}$$

where $g_1, g_2 \in \mathcal{M}$, $h_1, h_2 \in A - \mathcal{M}$. Hence

$$g_1g_2 = x^{p-1}yh_1h_2.$$

We may assume that $y|g_2$ (in $k[x, y]$). Then $g_1 = x^r h$, where $1 \leq r \leq p - 1$ and $h \in k[x, y]$ such that $h|h_1h_2$ (in $k[x, y]$). Since $h_1, h_2 \in A - \mathcal{M}$, $h_1h_2 \notin (x, y)k[x, y]$, hence $h \notin (x, y)k[x, y]$. We have $d(x^r h) = d(g_1) = 0$ since $g_1 \in A$. But

$$\begin{aligned} d(x^r h) &= \frac{\partial}{\partial x}(x^r h)x + \frac{\partial}{\partial y}(x^r h)y \\ &= rx^r h + x^{r+1} \frac{\partial h}{\partial x} + x^r y \frac{\partial h}{\partial y}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore

$$rh = -x \frac{\partial h}{\partial x} - y \frac{\partial h}{\partial y} \in (x, y)k[x, y].$$

Noticing that $r \not\equiv 0(p)$, we have $h \in (x, y)k[x, y]$, which is a contradiction. Hence $x^{p-1}y$ is irreducible in $A_{\mathcal{M}}$. Similarly, x^p, y^p , and xy^{p-1} are all irreducible in $A_{\mathcal{M}}$. We have

$$(xy)^p = x^p \cdot y^p = (x^{p-1}y) \cdot (xy^{p-1}).$$

To prove that $A_{\mathcal{M}}$ is not UFD, it suffices to prove that neither $x^p/x^{p-1}y$ nor x^p/xy^{p-1} is a unit in $A_{\mathcal{M}}$. But $x^p/x^{p-1}y = x/y$, $x^p/xy^{p-1} = x^{p-1}/y^{p-1}$.

Therefore, to prove that $A_{\mathcal{M}}$ is not UFD, it suffices to prove that $x^{p-1}/y^{p-1} \notin A_{\mathcal{M}}$. Suppose $x^{p-1}/y^{p-1} \in A_{\mathcal{M}}$. Then there exists an $f \in k[x, y]$ such that $x^{p-1}f \in A$, $y^{p-1}f \in A - \mathcal{M}$. But $y^{p-1}f \in (x, y)k[x, y]$, implying that $x^{p-1}f \in (x, y)k[x, y] \cap A = \mathcal{M}$. This is a contradiction, proving the claim that $A_{\mathcal{M}}$ is not UFD. \square

If $n \geq 3$, $k[x_1, \dots, x_n]^D$ may not be Cohen-Macaulay, as will be shown by the following example:

Example 2 [N-N, Example 4.6]. Let $n \geq 3$, and let d be the k -derivation of $k[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ defined by

$$d(f) = \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\partial f}{\partial x_i} x_i^p, \quad f \in k[x_1, \dots, x_n].$$

Denote $A = k[x_1^p, \dots, x_n^p]$, $B = k[x_1, \dots, x_n]^d$. It is proved in [N-N] that B is not a free A -module. There exists a maximal ideal \mathcal{M} of A such that $B_{\mathcal{M}}$ is not a free $A_{\mathcal{M}}$ -module. Using Theorem A, $B_{\mathcal{M}}$ is not Cohen-Macaulay. Hence there exists a maximal ideal $\mathcal{N} \subset B$ such that $\mathcal{N} \cap (A - \mathcal{M}) = \emptyset$, $(B_{\mathcal{M}})_{\mathcal{N}} = B_{\mathcal{N}}$ is not Cohen-Macaulay. Therefore B is not Cohen-Macaulay. \square

Indeed one can prove, using Theorem A, that for any D , $k[x_1, \dots, x_n]^D$ is Cohen-Macaulay if and only if it is free over $k[x_1^p, \dots, x_n^p]$.

REFERENCES

- [L] T. Y. Lam, *Serre's conjecture*, Lecture Notes in Math., no. 635, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1978.
- [M] H. Matsumura, *Commutative algebra*, 2nd edition, Benjamin Cummings, 1980.
- [N-N] A. Nowicki and M. Nagata, *Rings of constants for k -derivations in $k[x_1, \dots, x_n]$* , J. Math. Kyoto Univ. **28** (1988), 111–118.
- [S] C. S. Seshadri, *Triviality of vector bundles over the affine space K^2* , Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci. U.S.A. **44** (1958), 456–458.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, PURDUE UNIVERSITY, WEST LAFAYETTE, INDIANA 47907