

Locally Nilpotent Derivations of Polynomial Rings

F. B. Pakovich

§1. Let A be a ring and let D be a derivation on A , i.e., D is a mapping of the ring A into itself that satisfies the following conditions:

$$D(x + y) = Dx + Dy \quad \text{and} \quad D(xy) = xDy + yDx.$$

The subring C which is the kernel of this mapping is called the *subring of constants*. Denote by $\text{Nil}(D)$ the subset of A that consists of all elements x for which there exists an $n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $D^n(x) = 0$. It is clear that $\text{Nil}(D)$ is a subring of A . A derivation D is said to be *locally nilpotent* if $\text{Nil}(D) = A$. A subring $A' \subset A$ is said to be *D -simple* if the condition $Dx \in A'$ implies $x \in A'$.

Lemma. $\text{Nil}(D) = \bigcap A'$, where the intersection is taken over all D -simple subrings of the ring A .

Proof. Indeed, since both $\text{Nil}(D)$ and $\bigcap A'$ are clearly D -simple subrings, we have $\bigcap A' \subset \text{Nil}(D)$. On the other hand, if $x \in \text{Nil}(D)$, then there exists an n such that $D^n(x) = 0 \in \bigcap A'$. Since all A' are D -simple, this implies $x \in \bigcap A'$. \square

Corollary 1. A derivation D is locally nilpotent if and only if the ring A has no proper D -simple subrings.

Theorem 1 below also implies the following known assertion.

Corollary 2. Let a ring A contain the field of rationals. If there exists $t \in A$ such that $Dt = 1$, then $\text{Nil}(D) \cong C[t]$, where C is the subring of constants.

Proof. Indeed, we have $C[t] \subset \text{Nil}(D)$; moreover, if $Dx = \sum_{i=0}^n a_i t^i$ ($a_i \in C$), then we have the decomposition

$$x = \sum_{i=0}^n \frac{a_i t^{i+1}}{i+1} + u, \quad \text{where } u \in C.$$

Therefore, the ring $C[t]$ is D -simple, i.e., it coincides with $\text{Nil}(D)$. Moreover, it can be readily seen that t is transcendental over C , because otherwise we obtain a contradiction by differentiating a polynomial of minimal degree with the root t (at the point t). \square

§2. Denote by A^n the n -dimensional affine space over an algebraically closed field k , $\text{char } k = 0$.

Theorem 1. Let F be an irreducible algebraic curve in A^2 given by the equation $f(x, y) = 0$. Then $F \cong A^1$ if and only if

$$D_f = f_y \frac{\partial}{\partial x} - f_x \frac{\partial}{\partial y}$$

is a locally nilpotent derivation of the ring $k[x, y]$.

Proof. Assume that $F \cong A^1$; then, by the Abhyankar–Moh theorem [1], there exists a polynomial $g(x, y)$ such that $k[x, y] \cong k[f, g]$. Hence, we can define a locally nilpotent derivation $\partial/\partial g$ of the ring $k[x, y]$. Denote by $J(g, f)$ the Jacobian of the map $(x, y) \mapsto (g(x, y), f(x, y))$. Clearly, $J(g, f) \in k^*$. Consider the derivation $D = D_f - J(g, f)(\partial/\partial g)$. We have $Df = Dg = 0$. Hence, $D_f \equiv J(g, f)(\partial/\partial g)$. Conversely, let D_f be a locally nilpotent derivation. Then, by the Rentschler theorem [2], there exists an automorphism M of the ring $k[x, y]$ such that

$$MD_fM^{-1} = p(y) \frac{\partial}{\partial x}, \quad p(y) \in k[y].$$

Since $MD_fM^{-1}(Mf) = MD_f f = 0$, we obtain $Mf = q(y) \in k[y]$. Since the curve F is irreducible, the polynomial $q(y)$ is linear, i.e., it defines the equation of a straight line. Thus, $F \cong A^1$. \square

Translated from *Matematicheskie Zametki*, Vol. 58, No. 2, pp. 312–314, August, 1995.
Original article submitted August 23, 1994.

The surface $G \subset A^3$ given by the equation $g(x, y, z) = 0$ is said to be *rectifiable* if there exist polynomials $t_1, t_2 \in k[x, y, z]$ such that $k[x, y, z] \cong k[t_1, t_2, g]$.

Theorem 2. *The surface $G \subset A^3$ given by the equation $g(x, y, z) = 0$ is rectifiable if and only if there exists a locally nilpotent derivation D of the ring $k[x, y, z]$ such that $Dg = 1$.*

Proof. If G is rectifiable, then it is clear that the derivation $\partial/\partial g$ has the required properties.

Conversely, let D be a locally nilpotent derivation such that $Dg = 1$. Then, by Corollary 2, we have

$$k[x, y, z] \cong C[g], \tag{1}$$

where C is the subring of constants. Moreover, from the Zariski theorem (see [3, p. 52]) it follows that C is finitely generated, hence, it is a coordinate ring of some affine variety B . Since $C[g] \cong C \otimes_k k[g]$, relation (1) can be rewritten in the form $A^3 \cong B \times A^1$. Now from the cancellation theorem [4] it follows that $B \cong A^2$, i.e., the ring C is isomorphic to the polynomial ring in two variables. Hence, $k[x, y, z] \cong C[g] \cong k[t_1, t_2, g]$, and the surface G is rectifiable. \square

References

1. S. S. Abhyankar and T. T. Moh, *J. Reine Angew. Math.*, **276**, 148–166 (1975).
2. R. Rentschler, *C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris*, **267**, 384–387 (1968).
3. M. Nagata, *On the Fourteenth Problem of Hilbert*, Lecture in Tata Institute of Fundamental Research, Bombay (1965).
4. T. Fujita, *Proc. Japan Acad.*, **55**, ser. A, 106–110 (1979).

UNIVERSITÉ DE GRENOBLE 1, INSTITUT FOURIER

Translated by A. I. Shtern

Mathematical Notes, Vol. 58, No. 2, 1995

Special Representation of an Aperiodic Automorphism of a Lebesgue Space

A. A. Prikhod'ko

An aperiodic automorphism T of a Lebesgue space (X, \mathcal{B}, μ) , $\mu(X) = 1$, has the following property: for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists a measurable set B such that

$$\mu\left(\bigsqcup_{j=0}^{n-1} T^j B\right) > 1 - \varepsilon,$$

where the symbol \bigsqcup denotes, here and below, the union of disjoint sets. This assertion, which is known in ergodic theory as the Rokhlin–Halmos lemma, has numerous applications and generalizations [1–4]. In this note we present a generalization of this lemma concerning the following notions.

Definitions. By an *I-configuration* we mean a pair (I, α) , where I is a subset of \mathbb{N} and the mapping $\alpha: I \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ satisfies the condition $\sum_{i \in I} i\alpha(i) = 1$. A configuration (I, α) is said to be *finite* if the cardinality of the set I is finite. Let $\gcd(I)$ denote $\gcd\{i: i \in I\}$. We say that a configuration (I, α) is *regular* if $\gcd(I) = 1$.

Translated from *Matematicheskie Zametki*, Vol. 58, No. 2, pp. 314–317, August, 1995.

Original article submitted November 29, 1994.