DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS
UNIVERSITY OF NIJMEGEN The Netherlands

A Class of Counterexamples to the Biregular Cancellation Problem

Arno van den Essen   Peter van Rossum

Report No. 9826 (December 1998)

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS
UNIVERSITY OF NIJMEGEN
Toernooiveld
6525 ED Nijmegen
The Netherlands

A Class of Counterexamples to the Biregular Cancellation Problem

Arno van den Essen   Peter van Rossum

Abstract

If V and W are algebraic varieties over $\mathbb{C}$, then the Biregular Cancellation Problem asks whether or not $V \times \mathbb{C}^k \cong W \times \mathbb{C}^k$ implies $V \cong W$. This paper presents a class of examples where the answer is negative, using non-free stably free modules and locally nilpotent derivations.

1 Introduction

The Biregular Cancellation Problem for algebraic varieties asks the following question.

Problem 1 (Biregular Cancellation Problem, geometric formulation). *Let V and W be algebraic varieties over a field k and $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Does $V \times k^n \cong W \times k^n$ imply that $V \cong W$?*

This question can be reformulated as follows.

Problem 2 (Biregular Cancellation Problem, algebraic formulation). *Let A and B be affine domains over a field k and $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Consider the polynomial rings $A[X_1, \ldots, X_n]$ and $B[X_1, \ldots, X_n]$. Does $A[X_1, \ldots, X_n] \cong B[X_1, \ldots, X_n]$ imply that $A \cong B$ over k?*

A special case of the Biregular Cancellation Problem is the Cancellation Problem.

Problem 3 (Cancellation Problem, geometric formulation). *Let V be an algebraic variety over a field k and $n \in \mathbb{N}^*$. Does $V \times k \cong k^n$ imply that $V \cong k^{n-1}$?*

First results on the Biregular Cancellation Problem were obtained by Abhyankar, Heinzer and Eakin ([AHE72]) in 1972, who proved the claim in case $\operatorname{trdeg}_k Q(A) \leq 1$. In the same year, Hochster gave a counterexample for the case $k = \mathbb{R}$ ([Hoc72]). In 1989, Danielewski gave a counterexample to the Biregular Cancellation Problem ([Dan89], unpublished) over $\mathbb{C}$. He showed that for the algebraic varieties $Y_n := V(x^n y + z^2 - 1) \subseteq \mathbb{C}^3$, for $n \in \mathbb{N}^*$, the stabilizations $Y_n \times \mathbb{C}$ are all isomorphic. It was, however, shown by Fieseler that all Y_n are of different homotopy type. Recently, Makar-Limanov has studied algebraic varieties of the form $V(x^n y + p(z))$, for $n \in \mathbb{N}^*$ and $p(z) \in \mathbb{C}[z]$, and has characterized when such varieties are isomorphic ([Mak98], preprint). In particular, he has obtained a purely algebraic proof of the fact that the varieties Y_n are non-isomorphic.

See also the paper by Kraft ([Kra89]) and the survey papers by Kang ([Kan87, Kan92]) for background information on these and other cancellation problems in algebraic geometry.

This paper shows how to construct a whole class of counterexamples to the Biregular Cancellation Problem.

The construction in Section 3 has two ingredients. On the one hand, it uses the existence of commutative rings A with a unimodular row $(a_1, \ldots, a_n)$ over A that cannot be completed to an invertible square matrix. In other words, it uses the existence of commutative rings A for which there exists a stably free module of type 1 that is not free. This was in fact also a basic ingredient in Hochster's paper, who considered the ring $\mathbb{R}[x, y, z]/(x^2 + y^2 + z^2 - 1)$ and the unimodular row $(\bar{x}, \bar{y}, \bar{z})$. On the other hand, our construction uses the notion of locally nilpotent derivations. Section 2 contains a brief overview of the required facts about these derivations.

2 Derivations

Let k be a field of characteristic zero and let A be a commutative k-algebra. A *k-derivation* on A is a k-linear map $D\colon A \to A$ satisfying the Leibniz-rule, $D(ab) = a(Db) + (Da)b$ for all $a, b \in A$. It is said to be *locally nilpotent* if for all $a \in A$ there is an $n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $D^n(a) = 0$. The kernel of such a derivation D is denoted by A^D. A *slice* of D is an element $s \in A$ such that $D(s) = 1$.

If D is locally nilpotent and $t \in A$, then we can define a map $\phi_t\colon A \to A$ by $\phi_t(a) := \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{i!} D^i(a) t^i$. If D also has a slice s, this map can be used to easily describe the kernel of D.

Proposition 4 ([Ess93], Proposition 2.1). *Let D be a locally nilpotent derivation on a finitely generated commutative k-algebra $A = k[a_1, \ldots, a_n]$. Assume that D has a slice $s \in A$. Then*

$$A^D = \phi_{-s}(A) = k[\phi_{-s}(a_1), \ldots, \phi_{-s}(a_n)].$$

Proposition 5 ([Wri81], Proposition 2.1). *Let D be a locally nilpotent derivation on a commutative k-algebra A and assume that D has a slice $s \in A$. Then*

1. *$A = A^D[s]$;*
2. *s is algebraically independent over A [and therefore $A = A^D[s]$ is a polynomial ring in one variable over A^D];*
3. *$D = d/ds$.*

Remark 6. Note that if, in the above situation, A is a domain and $\operatorname{trdeg}_k Q(A)$ is finite, it follows that $\operatorname{trdeg}_k Q(A^D) = \operatorname{trdeg}_k Q(A) - 1$. In particular, if A is of the form $A = B[X_1, \ldots, X_n]$ for some domain B whose quotient field is of finite transcendence degree over k and $A^D = B[F_1, \ldots, F_{n-1}]$ for certain polynomials $F_1, \ldots, F_{n-1} \in A$, then the F_i are algebraically independent over k.

For more information on locally nilpotent derivations see for instance [Ess98], Chapter 1 or [Now94].

3 Counterexamples

Let k be a field of characteristic zero and let A be a finitely generated commutative k-algebra without zero divisors. Let $(a_1, \ldots, a_n)$ be a unimodular row over A, say $b_1, \ldots, b_n \in A$ with $b_1 a_1 + \cdots + b_n a_n = 1$, and assume that it cannot be completed to an invertible square matrix.

Let $A[X]$ denote the polynomial ring $A[X_1, \ldots, X_n]$ over A in n variables. Now define a k-derivation $D\colon A[X] \to A[X]$ by

$$D := b_1 \frac{\partial}{\partial X_1} + \cdots + b_n \frac{\partial}{\partial X_n}.$$

This derivation is locally nilpotent and has a slice, namely $s := a_1 X_1 + \cdots + a_n X_n$. Letting $B := A[X]^D$ be the kernel of the derivation, it follows from Proposition 5 that $A[X] = B[s]$, a polynomial ring over B in s, and from Proposition 4 that $B = A[X_1 - b_1 s, \ldots, X_n - b_n s]$.

Notation 7. For $F \in A[X]$ and $j \in \mathbb{N}$ we denote by $F_{(j)}$ the homogeneous part of F of degree j. So $F = F_{(0)} + F_{(1)} + \cdots + F_{(d)}$ where $d := \deg F$.

Lemma 8. *Let $F_1, \ldots, F_{n-1} \in A[X]$ and assume that $B = A[F_1, \ldots, F_{n-1}]$. Take $f_i := F_{i(1)}$ (i.e. the linear part of F_i). Then $B = A[f_1, \ldots, f_{n-1}]$.*

Proof. $\subseteq$: We may assume, without loss of generality, that the polynomials $F_1, \ldots, F_{n-1}$ do not have a constant term.

Now consider $X_i - b_i s \in B = A[F_1, \ldots, F_{n-1}]$. Then there is a polynomial $p(T_1, \ldots, T_{n-1}) \in A[T_1, \ldots, T_{n-1}]$ such that $X_i - b_i s = p(F_1, \ldots, F_{n-1})$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} X_i - b_i s &= (p(F_1, \ldots, F_{n-1}))_{(1)} && \text{(because } X_i - b_i s \text{ is linear)} \\ &= (p_{(1)}(F_1, \ldots, F_{n-1}))_{(1)} && \text{(because } F_1, \ldots, F_{n-1} \text{ have} \\ & && \text{no constant term)} \\ &= p_{(1)}(F_{1(1)}, \ldots, F_{n-1(1)}) && \text{(because } p_{(1)} \text{ is linear)} \\ &= p_{(1)}(f_1, \ldots, f_{n-1}) \in A[f_1, \ldots, f_{n-1}] \end{aligned}$$

$\supseteq$: Because $F_i \in B = A[X]^D$, every homogeneous part $F_{i(j)}$ of F_i is also in B. In particular $f_i \in B$. □

Lemma 9. *Let $f_1, \ldots, f_m \in A[X]$ be linear polynomials. Then*

$$A[f_1, \ldots, f_m] \cap AX_1 \oplus \cdots \oplus AX_n = Af_1 + \cdots + Af_m.$$

[i.e. every polynomial expression $p(f_1, \ldots, f_m)$ in the f_i which is linear in the X_i is in fact an A-linear combination of the f_i.]

Proof. $\subseteq$: Take $p(T_1, \ldots, T_m) \in A[T_1, \ldots, T_m]$ and let $g := p(f_1, \ldots, f_m)$ be a polynomial expression in the f_i. Assume that g is in fact linear in the X_i. Then, using essentially the same argument as in the proof of the previous lemma,

$$\begin{aligned} g &= (p(f_1, \ldots, f_m))_{(1)} \\ &= (p_{(1)}(f_1, \ldots, f_m))_{(1)} \\ &= p_{(1)}(f_1, \ldots, f_m) \in Af_1 + \cdots + Af_n. \end{aligned}$$

$\supseteq$: This is obvious. □

Lemma 10. *Let $f_1, \ldots, f_{n-1} \in A[X]$ be linear polynomials and assume that $B = A[f_1, \ldots, f_{n-1}]$. Then*

$$As \oplus Af_1 \oplus \cdots \oplus Af_{n-1} = AX_1 \oplus \cdots \oplus AX_n.$$

[i.e. every linear polynomial in $A[X]$ can be written in a unique way as an A-linear combination of $s, f_1, \ldots, f_{n-1}$.]

Proof. We first show that $As + Af_1 + \cdots + Af_{n-1} = AX_1 \oplus \cdots \oplus AX_n$.

$\subseteq$: This is obvious.

$\supseteq$: Take $g \in AX_1 \oplus \cdots \oplus AX_n$. Then $Dg \in A$ and therefore $D(g - (Dg)s) = Dg - (D^2 g)s - (Dg)(Ds) = Dg - Dg = 0$. So

$$\begin{aligned} g - (Dg)s &\in B \cap AX_1 \oplus \cdots \oplus AX_n \\ &= A[f_1, \ldots, f_{n-1}] \cap AX_1 \oplus \cdots \oplus AX_n \\ &= Af_1 + \cdots + Af_{n-1} \qquad \text{(by Lemma 9)} \end{aligned}$$

and hence $g \in As + Af_1 + \cdots + Af_{n-1}$.

To see that $As + Af_1 + \cdots + Af_n$ is in fact a direct sum, take $\mu, \lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_{n-1} \in A$ and assume that $\mu s + \lambda_1 f_1 + \cdots + \lambda_{n-1} f_{n-1} = 0$. Applying D to both sides yields $\mu = 0$, so $\lambda_1 f_1 + \cdots + \lambda_{n-1} f_{n-1} = 0$. The f_i, however, are even algebraically independent (by Remark 6) and therefore $\lambda_1 = \cdots = \lambda_{n-1} = 0$. □

Theorem 11. $B \ncong A[X_1, \ldots, X_{n-1}]$, *even though* $B[s] = A[X_1, \ldots, X_{n-1}][X_n]$.

Proof. Assume that $B \cong A[X_1, \ldots, X_{n-1}]$. Then $B = A[F_1, \ldots, F_{n-1}]$ for certain polynomials $F_1, \ldots, F_{n-1} \in A[X]$ and by Lemma 8 even $B = A[f_1, \ldots, f_{n-1}]$ for certain linear polynomials $f_1, \ldots, f_{n-1} \in A[X]$. Now Lemma 10 implies that

$$As \oplus Af_1 \oplus \cdots \oplus Af_{n-1} = AX_1 \oplus \cdots \oplus AX_n,$$

say $f_i = \lambda_{i1} X_1 + \cdots + \lambda_{in} X_n$ (and $s = a_1 X_1 + \cdots + a_n X_n$). This is an equality between free A-modules of rank n and the base transformation matrix is

$$\begin{pmatrix} a_1 & \ldots & a_n \\ \lambda_{11} & \ldots & \lambda_{1n} \\ \vdots & & \vdots \\ \lambda_{n-1\,1} & \ldots & \lambda_{n-1\,n} \end{pmatrix}.$$

This is an invertible matrix and hence the unimodular row $(a_1, \ldots, a_n)$ has been completed to an invertible matrix, which contradicts the assumption. □

So, every coordinate ring A of an affine variety that has a unimodular row that cannot be completed to an invertible matrix, gives rise to a counterexample to the Biregular Cancellation Problem.

Over the real numbers, we recover Hochster's example mentioned in the Introduction. Over the complex numbers, one can consider the "generic" example $A = \mathbb{C}[a,b,c,x,y,z]/(ax+by+cz-1)$. The unimodular row $(\bar{x},\bar{y},\bar{z})$ cannot be completed to an invertible square matrix. This was shown by Raynaud in [Ray68] using homological methods and, in a more general setting, by Suslin in [Sus82] (Theorem 2.8) using K-theory.

4 Acknowledgments

We would like to thank Wilberd van der Kallen for pointing out the references to the results of Raynaud and Suslin.

References

[AHE72] Shreeram S. Abhyankar, William Heinzer, and Paul Eakin, *On the uniqueness of the coefficient ring in a polynomial ring*, J. Alg. **23** (1972), 310–342.

[Dan89] W. Danielewski, *On the cancellation problem and automorphism group of affine algebraic varieties*, preprint, 1989.

[Ess93] Arno van den Essen, *An algorithm to compute the invariant ring of a G_a-action on an affine variety*, J. Symb. Comp. **16** (1993), 551–555.

[Ess98] Arno van den Essen, *Invertible polynomial maps and the Jacobian conjecture*, manuscript, 1998.

[Hoc72] M. Hochster, *Nonuniqueness of coefficient rings in a polynomial ring*, Proc. Am. Math. Soc. **34** (1972), no. 1, 81–82.

[Kan87] Ming-chang Kang, *The biregular cancellation problem*, J. Pure Apl. Alg. **45** (1987), 241–253.

[Kan92] Ming-chang Kang, *A note on the birational cancellation problem*, J. Pure Apl. Alg. **77** (1992), 141–154.

[Kra89] Hanspeter Kraft, *Algebraic automorphisms of affine space*, Topological Methods in Algebraic Transformation Groups (Boston-Basel-Berlin) (H. Kraft, T. Petrie, and G. Schwarz, eds.), Birkhäuser-Verlag, 1989.

[Mak98] Makar-Limanov, *Locally nilpotent derivations, a new ring invariant and applications*, preprint, 1998.

[Now94] A. Nowicki, *Commutative basis of derivations in polynomial and power series rings*, Univ. of Toruń, 1994.

[Ray68] Michèle Raynaud, *Modules projectifs universels*, Inven. Math. **6** (1968), 1–26.

[Sus82] A.A. Suslin, *Mennicke symbols and their applications in the K-theory of fields*, Algebraic K-Theory, Proceedings of a Conference Held at Oberwolfach, June 1980, Part I (Berlin) (R. Keith Dennis, ed.), Lecture Notes in Mathematics, vol. 966, Springer-Verlag, 1982, pp. 344–356.

[Wri81] David Wright, *On the Jacobian conjecture*, Illinois J. Math. **25** (1981), no. 3, 423–440.