



HAL
open science

The Filtration Induced by a Locally Nilpotent Derivation

Bachar Alhajjar

► **To cite this version:**

| Bachar Alhajjar. The Filtration Induced by a Locally Nilpotent Derivation. 2013. hal-00872823

HAL Id: hal-00872823

<https://hal.science/hal-00872823v1>

Preprint submitted on 14 Oct 2013

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

THE FILTRATION INDUCED BY A LOCALLY NILPOTENT DERIVATION

BACHAR ALHAJJAR

ABSTRACT. We investigate the filtration corresponding to the degree function induced by a non-zero locally nilpotent derivations ∂ and its associated graded algebra. As an application we provide an efficient method to recover the Makar-Limanov invariants, isomorphism classes and automorphism groups of classically known algebras. We also present a new class of examples which can be fully described with this method.

Introduction

Let k be a field of characteristic zero, and let B be a commutative k -domain. A k -derivation $\partial \in \text{Der}_k(B)$ is said to be *locally nilpotent* if for every $a \in B$, there is an integer $n \geq 0$ such that $\partial^n(a) = 0$. An important invariant of k -domains admitting non-trivial locally nilpotent derivations is the so called *Makar-Limanov invariant* which was defined by Makar-Limanov as the intersection $\text{ML}(B) \subset B$ of kernels of all locally nilpotent derivations of B ([2]). This invariant was initially introduced as a tool to distinguish certain k -domains from polynomial rings but it has many other applications for the study of k -algebras and their automorphism groups ([3]). One of the main difficulties in applications is to compute this invariant without a prior knowledge of all locally nilpotent derivations of a given k -domain.

In [4] S. Kaliman and L. Makar-Limanov developed general techniques to determine the ML-invariant for a class of finitely generated k -domains B . The idea is to reduce the problem to the study of homogeneous locally nilpotent derivations on graded algebras $\text{Gr}(B)$ associated to B . For this, one considers appropriate filtrations $\mathcal{F} = \{\mathcal{F}_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{R}}$ on B generated by so called real-valued weight degree functions in such a way that every non-zero locally nilpotent derivation on B induces a non-zero homogeneous locally nilpotent derivation on the associated graded algebra $\text{Gr}_{\mathcal{F}}(B)$.

In particular, every k -domain B admitting a non-zero locally nilpotent derivation ∂ comes equipped with a natural filtration by the k -sub-vector-spaces $\mathcal{F}_i = \ker(\partial^{i+1})$, $i \geq 0$, that we call the ∂ -filtration.

In this article we show that this filtration is convenient for the computation of the ML-invariant, and we give general methods to describe the sub-spaces $\ker(\partial^{i+1})$ and their associated graded algebra.

Knowing this filtration gives a very precise understanding of the structure of *semi-rigid* k -domains, that is, k -domains for which every locally nilpotent derivation gives rise to the same filtration. For such rings the study of the ∂ -filtration is a very efficient tool to determine isomorphism types and automorphism groups. We

illustrate how the computation of ML-invariant of classically known semi-rigid k -domains can be simplified using these types of filtration. We also present a new class of semi-rigid k -domains which can be studied with this method.

1. Preliminaries

In this section we briefly recall basic facts on filtered algebra and their relation with derivation in a form appropriate to our needs.

In the sequel, unless otherwise specified B will denote a commutative domain over a field k of characteristic zero. The set $\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ of non-negative integers will be denoted by \mathbb{N} .

1.1. Filtration and associated graded algebra.

Definition 1.1. An \mathbb{N} -filtration of B is a collection $\{\mathcal{F}_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ of k -sub-vector-spaces of B with the following properties:

- 1- $\mathcal{F}_i \subset \mathcal{F}_{i+1}$ for all $i \in \mathbb{N}$.
- 2- $B = \cup_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \mathcal{F}_i$.
- 3- $\mathcal{F}_i \cdot \mathcal{F}_j \subset \mathcal{F}_{i+j}$ for all $i, j \in \mathbb{N}$.

The filtration is called *proper* if the following additional property holds:

- 4- If $a \in \mathcal{F}_i \setminus \mathcal{F}_{i-1}$ and $b \in \mathcal{F}_j \setminus \mathcal{F}_{j-1}$, then $ab \in \mathcal{F}_{i+j} \setminus \mathcal{F}_{i+j-1}$.

There is a one-to-one correspondence between proper \mathbb{N} -filtrations and so called \mathbb{N} -degree functions:

Definition 1.2. An \mathbb{N} -degree function on B is a map $\deg : B \rightarrow \mathbb{N} \cup \{-\infty\}$ such that, for all $a, b \in B$, the following conditions are satisfied:

- (1) $\deg(a) = -\infty \Leftrightarrow a = 0$.
- (2) $\deg(ab) = \deg(a) + \deg(b)$.
- (3) $\deg(a + b) \leq \max\{\deg(a), \deg(b)\}$.

If the equality in (2) replaced by the inequality $\deg(ab) \leq \deg(a) + \deg(b)$, we say that \deg is an \mathbb{N} -semi-degree function.

Indeed, for an \mathbb{N} -degree function on B , the sub-sets $\mathcal{F}_i = \{b \in B \mid \deg(b) \leq i\}$ are k -subvector spaces of B that give rise to a proper \mathbb{N} -filtration $\{\mathcal{F}_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$. Conversely, every proper \mathbb{N} -filtration $\{\mathcal{F}_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$, yields an \mathbb{N} -degree function $\omega : B \rightarrow \mathbb{N} \cup \{-\infty\}$ defined by $\omega(0) = -\infty$ and $\omega(b) = i$ if $b \in \mathcal{F}_i \setminus \mathcal{F}_{i-1}$.

Definition 1.3. Given a k -domain $B = \cup_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \mathcal{F}_i$ equipped with a proper \mathbb{N} -filtration, the associated graded algebra $\text{Gr}(B)$ is the k -vector space

$$\text{Gr}(B) = \bigoplus_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \mathcal{F}_i / \mathcal{F}_{i-1}$$

equipped with the unique multiplicative structure for which the product of the elements $a + \mathcal{F}_{i-1} \in \mathcal{F}_i / \mathcal{F}_{i-1}$ and $b + \mathcal{F}_{j-1} \in \mathcal{F}_j / \mathcal{F}_{j-1}$, where $a \in \mathcal{F}_i$ and $b \in \mathcal{F}_j$, is the element

$$(a + \mathcal{F}_{i-1})(b + \mathcal{F}_{j-1}) := ab + \mathcal{F}_{i+j-1} \in \mathcal{F}_{i+j} / \mathcal{F}_{i+j-1}.$$

Property 4 (proper) in Definition 1.1 ensures that $\text{Gr}(B)$ is a commutative k -domain when B is an integral domain. Since for each $a \in B$ the set $\{n \in \mathbb{N} \mid a \in \mathcal{F}_n\}$ has a minimum, there exists i such that $a \in \mathcal{F}_i$ and $a \notin \mathcal{F}_{i-1}$. So we can define a k -linear map $\text{gr} : B \rightarrow \text{Gr}(B)$ by sending a to its class in $\mathcal{F}_i / \mathcal{F}_{i-1}$, i.e $a \mapsto a + \mathcal{F}_{i-1}$, and $\text{gr}(0) = 0$. We will frequently denote $\text{gr}(a)$ simply by \bar{a} . Observe that $\text{gr}(a) = 0$ if and only if $a = 0$.

Denote by \deg the \mathbb{N} -degree function $\deg : B \rightarrow \mathbb{N} \cup \{-\infty\}$ corresponding to the proper \mathbb{N} -filtration $\{\mathcal{F}_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$. We have the following properties.

Lemma 1.4. *Given $a, b \in B$ the following holds:*

P1) $\overline{ab} = \overline{a}\overline{b}$, i.e. gr is a multiplicative map.

P2) If $\deg(a) > \deg(b)$, then $\overline{a+b} = \overline{a}$.

P3) If $\deg(a) = \deg(b) = \deg(a+b)$, then $\overline{a+b} = \overline{a} + \overline{b}$.

P4) If $\deg(a) = \deg(b) > \deg(a+b)$, then $\overline{a+b} = 0$, in particular gr is not an additive map in general.

Proof. Let us assume that $\deg(a) = i$ and $\deg(b) = j$. By definition, $\deg(ab) = i+j$ means that $ab \in \mathcal{F}_{i+j}$ and $ab \notin \mathcal{F}_{i+j-1}$, so $\overline{ab} = ab + \mathcal{F}_{i+j-1} := (a + \mathcal{F}_{i-1})(b + \mathcal{F}_{j-1}) = \overline{a}\overline{b}$. Which gives P1. For P2 we observe that since $\deg(a+b) = \deg(a)$, we have $\overline{a+b} = (a+b) + \mathcal{F}_{i-1} = (a + \mathcal{F}_{i-1}) + (b + \mathcal{F}_{i-1})$, and since $\mathcal{F}_{j-1} \subset \mathcal{F}_j \subseteq \mathcal{F}_{i-1}$ as $i > j$, we get $b + \mathcal{F}_{i-1} = 0$. P3) is immediate, by definition. Finally, assume by contradiction that $\overline{a+b} \neq 0$, then $\overline{a+b} = (a + \mathcal{F}_{i-1}) + (b + \mathcal{F}_{i-1}) = ((a+b) + \mathcal{F}_{i-1}) \neq 0$, which means that $a+b \notin \mathcal{F}_{i-1}$ and $\deg(a+b) = i$, which is absurd. So P4 follows. \square

1.2. Derivations.

By a *k-derivation* of B , we mean a k -linear map $D : B \rightarrow B$ which satisfies the Leibniz rule: For all $a, b \in B$; $D(ab) = aD(b) + bD(a)$. The set of all k -derivations of B is denoted by $\text{Der}_k(B)$.

The *kernel* of a derivation D is the subalgebra $\ker D = \{b \in B; D(b) = 0\}$ of B .

The *plinth ideal* of D is the ideal $\text{pl}(D) = \ker D \cap D(B)$ of $\ker D$, where $D(B)$ denotes the image of B .

An element $s \in B$ such that $D(s) \in \ker(D) \setminus \{0\}$ is called a *local slice* for D .

Definition 1.5. Given a k -algebra $B = \cup_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \mathcal{F}_i$ equipped with a proper \mathbb{N} -filtration, a k -derivation D of B is said to respect the filtration if there exists an integer d such that $D(\mathcal{F}_i) \subset \mathcal{F}_{i+d}$ for all $i \in \mathbb{N}$.

If so, we define a k -linear map $\overline{D} : \text{Gr}(B) \rightarrow \text{Gr}(B)$ as follows: If $D = 0$, then $\overline{D} = 0$ the zero map. Otherwise, if $D \neq 0$ then we let d be the least integer such that $D(\mathcal{F}_i) \subset \mathcal{F}_{i+d}$ for all $i \in \mathbb{N}$ and we define

$$\overline{D} : \mathcal{F}_i / \mathcal{F}_{i-1} \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_{i+d} / \mathcal{F}_{i+d-1}$$

by the rule $\overline{D}(a + \mathcal{F}_{i-1}) = D(a) + \mathcal{F}_{i+d-1}$. One checks that \overline{D} satisfies the Leibniz rule, therefore it is a k -derivation of the graded algebra $\text{Gr}(B)$. Moreover it is homogeneous of degree d , i.e \overline{D} sends homogeneous elements of degree i to zero or to homogeneous elements of degree $i+d$.

Observe that $\overline{D} = 0$ if and only if $D = 0$. In addition, $\text{gr}(\ker D) \subset \ker \overline{D}$.

2. LND-Filtrations and Associated Graded Algebras

In this section we introduce the ∂ -filtration associated with a locally nilpotent derivation ∂ . We explain how to compute this filtration and its associated graded algebra in certain situation.

Definition 2.1. A k -derivation $\partial \in \text{Der}_k(B)$ is said to be *locally nilpotent* if for every $a \in B$, there exists $n \in \mathbb{N}$ (depending of a) such that $\partial^n(a) = 0$. The set of all locally nilpotent derivations of B is denoted by $\text{LND}(B)$.

In particular, every locally nilpotent derivation ∂ of B gives rise to a proper \mathbb{N} -filtration of B by the sub-spaces $\mathcal{F}_i = \ker \partial^i$, $i \in \mathbb{N}$, that we call the ∂ -filtration. It is straightforward to check (see Prop. 1.9 in [1]) that the ∂ -filtration corresponds to the \mathbb{N} -degree function $\deg_\partial : B \rightarrow \mathbb{N} \cup \{-\infty\}$ defined by

$$\deg_\partial(a) := \min\{i \in \mathbb{N} \mid \partial^{i+1}(a) = 0\}, \text{ and } \deg_\partial(0) := -\infty.$$

Note that by definition $\mathcal{F}_0 = \ker \partial$ and that $\mathcal{F}_1 \setminus \mathcal{F}_0$ consists of all local slices for ∂ . Let $\text{Gr}_\partial(B) = \bigoplus_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \mathcal{F}_i / \mathcal{F}_{i-1}$ denote the associated graded algebra relative to the ∂ -filtration $\{\mathcal{F}_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$. Let $\text{gr}_\partial : B \rightarrow \text{Gr}_\partial(B)$; $a \xrightarrow{\text{gr}_\partial} \bar{a}$ be the natural map between B and $\text{Gr}_\partial(B)$ defined in 1.3, where \bar{a} denote $\text{gr}_\partial(a)$.

The next Proposition, which is due to Daigle (Theorem 2.11 in [1]), implies in particular that if B is of finite transcendence degree over k , then every non-zero $D \in \text{LND}(B)$ respects the ∂ -filtration and therefore induces a non-zero homogeneous locally nilpotent derivation \bar{D} of $\text{Gr}_\partial(B)$.

Proposition 2.2. (Daigle) *Suppose that B is a commutative domain, of finite transcendence degree over k . Then for every pair $D \in \text{Der}_k(B)$ and $\partial \in \text{LND}(B)$, D respects the ∂ -filtration. Consequently, \bar{D} is a well defined homogeneous derivation of the integral domain $\text{Gr}_\partial(B)$ relative to this filtration, and it is locally nilpotent if D is locally nilpotent.*

2.1. Computing the ∂ -filtration.

Here, given a finitely generated k -domain B , we describe a general method which enables the computation of the ∂ -filtration for a locally nilpotent derivation ∂ with finitely generated kernel. First we consider a more general situation where the plinth ideal $\text{pl}(\partial)$ is finitely generated as an ideal in $\ker \partial$ then we deal with the case where $\ker \partial$ is itself finitely generated as a k -algebra.

Let $B = k[X_1, \dots, X_n] / I = k[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ be a finitely generated k -domain, and let $\partial \in \text{LND}(B)$ be such that $\text{pl}(\partial)$ is generated by precisely m elements f_1, \dots, f_m as an ideal in $\ker \partial$. Denote by $\mathcal{F} = \{\mathcal{F}_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ the ∂ -filtration, then:

By definition $\mathcal{F}_0 = \ker \partial$. Furthermore, given elements $s_i \in \mathcal{F}_1$ such that $\partial(s_i) = f_i$ for every $i \in \{1, \dots, m\}$, it is straightforward to check that

$$\mathcal{F}_1 = \mathcal{F}_0 s_1 + \dots + \mathcal{F}_0 s_m + \mathcal{F}_0.$$

Letting $\deg_\partial(x_i) = d_i$, we denote by H_j the \mathcal{F}_0 -sub-module in B generated by elements of degree j relative to \deg_∂ of the form $s_1^{u_1} \dots s_m^{u_m} x_1^{v_1} \dots x_n^{v_n}$, i.e.,

$$H_j := \sum_{\sum_j u_j + \sum_i d_i v_i = j} \mathcal{F}_0 (s_1^{u_1} \dots s_m^{u_m} x_1^{v_1} \dots x_n^{v_n})$$

where $u_j, v_i \in \mathbb{N}$ for all i and j . The integer $\sum_j u_j + \sum_i d_i v_i$ is nothing but $\deg_\partial(s_1^{u_1} \dots s_m^{u_m} x_1^{v_1} \dots x_n^{v_n})$. Then we define a new \mathbb{N} -filtration $\mathcal{G} = \{\mathcal{G}_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ of B by setting

$$\mathcal{G}_i = \sum_{j \leq i} H_j.$$

By construction $\mathcal{G}_i \subseteq \mathcal{F}_i$ for all $i \in \mathbb{N}$, with equality for $i = 0, 1$. The following result provides a characterization of when these two filtrations coincide:

Lemma 2.3. *The filtrations \mathcal{F} and \mathcal{G} are equal if and only if \mathcal{G} is proper.*

Proof. One direction is clear since \mathcal{F} is proper. Conversely, suppose that \mathcal{G} is proper with the corresponding \mathbb{N} -degree function ω on B (see §1.1). Given $f \in \mathcal{F}_i \setminus \mathcal{F}_{i-1}$, $i > 1$, for every local slice $s \in \mathcal{F}_1 \setminus \mathcal{F}_0$, there exist $f_0 \neq 0, a_i \neq 0, a_{i-1}, \dots, a_0 \in \mathcal{F}_0$ such that $f_0 f = a_i s^i + a_{i-1} s^{i-1} + \dots + a_0$ (see the proof of Lemma 4 in [7]). Since $\omega(g) = 0$ (resp. $\omega(g) = 1$) for every $g \in \mathcal{F}_0$ (resp. $g \in \mathcal{F}_1 \setminus \mathcal{F}_0$), we obtain

$$\omega(f) = \omega(f_0 f) = \omega(a_i s^i + a_{i-1} s^{i-1} + \dots + a_0) = \max\{\omega(a_i s^i)\} = i,$$

and so $f \in \mathcal{G}_i$. \square

Next, we determine the ∂ -filtration, for a locally nilpotent derivation ∂ with finitely generated kernel, by giving an effective criterion to decide when the \mathbb{N} -filtration \mathcal{G} defined above is proper.

Hereafter, we assume that $0 \in \text{Spec}(B)$ and that $\ker(\partial)$ is generated by elements $z_i(x_1, \dots, x_n) \in B$ such that $z_i(0, \dots, 0) = 0$, $i \in \{1, \dots, r\}$, which is always possible since $k \subset \ker(\partial)$. Since $\ker(\partial)$ is finitely generated k -algebra, the plinth ideal $\text{pl}(\partial)$ is finitely generated. So there exist $s_1(x_1, \dots, x_n), \dots, s_m(x_1, \dots, x_n) \in \mathcal{F}_1$ such that $\mathcal{F}_1 = \mathcal{F}_0 s_1 + \dots + \mathcal{F}_0 s_m + \mathcal{F}_0$. We can also assume that $s_i(0, \dots, 0) = 0$.

Letting $J \subset k^{[r+n+m]} = k[Z_1, \dots, Z_r][X_1, \dots, X_n][S_1, \dots, S_m]$ be the ideal generated by I and the elements $Z_1 = z_1(X_1, \dots, X_n), \dots, Z_r = z_r(x_1, \dots, x_n), S_1 = s_1(X_1, \dots, X_n), \dots, S_m = s_m(x_1, \dots, x_n)$, then we have

$$B = k[Z_1, \dots, Z_r][X_1, \dots, X_n][S_1, \dots, S_m]/J.$$

Note that by construction $(0, \dots, 0) \in \text{Spec}(k^{[r+n+m]}/J)$.

We define an \mathbb{N} -degree function ω on $k^{[r+n+m]}$ by declaring that $\omega(Z_i) = 0 = \deg_{\partial}(z_i)$ for all $i \in \{1, \dots, r\}$, $\omega(S_i) = 1 = \deg_{\partial}(s_i)$ for all $i \in \{1, \dots, m\}$, and $\omega(X_i) = \deg_{\partial}(x_i) = d_i$ for all $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$. The corresponding proper \mathbb{N} -filtration $\mathcal{Q}_i := \{P \in k^{[n]} \mid \omega(P) \leq i\}$, $i \in \mathbb{N}$, on $k^{[r+n+m]}$ has the form $\mathcal{Q}_i = \bigoplus_{j \leq i} \mathcal{H}_j$ where

$$\mathcal{H}_j := \bigoplus_{\sum_j u_j + \sum_i d_i v_i = j} k[Z_1, \dots, Z_r] S_1^{u_1} \dots S_m^{u_m} X_1^{v_1} \dots X_n^{v_n}.$$

By construction $\pi(\mathcal{Q}_i) = \mathcal{G}_i$ where $\pi : k^{[r+n+m]} \rightarrow B$ denotes the natural projection. Indeed, since

$$\pi(\mathcal{Q}_i) = \sum_{j \leq i} \pi(\mathcal{H}_j)$$

and $\pi(\mathcal{H}_j) = \sum_{\sum_j u_j + \sum_i d_i v_i = j} k[z_1, \dots, z_r] s_1^{u_1} \dots s_m^{u_m} x_1^{v_1} \dots x_n^{v_n}$, we get

$$\pi(\mathcal{H}_j) = \sum_{\sum_j u_j + \sum_i d_i v_i = j} (\ker \partial) s_1^{u_1} \dots s_m^{u_m} x_1^{v_1} \dots x_n^{v_n}$$

which means precisely that $\pi(\mathcal{Q}_i) = \mathcal{G}_i$.

Let $\hat{J} \subset k^{[r+n+m]}$ be the homogeneous ideal generated by the highest homogeneous components relative to ω of all elements in J . Then we have the following result, which is inspired by the technique developed by S. Kaliman and L. Makar-Limanov:

Proposition 2.4. *The \mathbb{N} -filtration \mathcal{G} is proper if and only if \hat{J} is prime.*

Proof. It is enough to show that $\mathcal{G} = \{\pi(\mathcal{Q}_i)\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ coincides with the filtration corresponding to the \mathbb{N} -semi-degree function ω_B on B defined by $\omega_B(p) := \min_{P \in \pi^{-1}(p)} \{\omega(P)\}$. Indeed, if so, the result will follow from Lemma 3.2 in [4] which asserts in particular

that ω_B is an \mathbb{N} -degree function on B if and only if \hat{J} is prime. Let $\{\mathcal{G}'_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ be the filtration corresponding to ω_B . Given $f \in \mathcal{G}'_i$ there exists $F \in \mathcal{Q}_i$ such that $\pi(F) = f$, which means that $\mathcal{G}'_i \subset \pi(\mathcal{Q}_i)$. Conversely, it is clear that $\omega_B(z_i) = \omega(Z_i) = 0$ for all $i \in \{1, \dots, r\}$. Furthermore $\omega_B(s_i) = \omega(S_i) = 1$ for all $i \in \{1, \dots, m\}$, for otherwise $s_i \in \ker \partial$ which is absurd. Finally, if $d_i \neq 0$ and $\omega_B(x_i) < \omega(X_i) = d_i \neq 0$, then $x_i \in \pi(\mathcal{Q}_{d_i-1}) \subset \ker \partial^{d_i-1}$ which implies that $\deg_{\partial}(x_i) < d_i$, a contradiction. So $\omega_B(x_i) = d_i$. Thus $\omega_B(f) \leq i$ for every $f \in \pi(\mathcal{Q}_i)$ which means that $\pi(\mathcal{Q}_i) \subset \mathcal{G}'_i$. \square

The next Proposition, which is a reinterpretation of Prop. 4.1 in [4], describes in particular the associated graded algebra $Gr_{\partial}(B)$ of the filtered algebra (B, \mathcal{F}) in the case where the \mathbb{N} -filtration \mathcal{G} is proper:

Proposition 2.5. *If the \mathbb{N} -filtration \mathcal{G} is proper then $Gr_{\partial}(B) \simeq k^{[r+n+m]}/\hat{J}$.*

Proof. By virtue of (Prop. 4.1 in [4]) the graded algebra associated to the filtered algebra (B, \mathcal{G}) is isomorphic to $k^{[r+n+m]}/\hat{J}$. So the assertion follows from Lemma 2.3. \square

3. Semi-Rigid and Rigid k -Domains

In [6] D. Finston and S. Maubach considered rings B whose sets of locally nilpotent derivations are “one-dimensional” in the sense that $\text{LND}(B) = \ker(\partial) \cdot \partial$ for some non-zero $\partial \in \text{LND}(B)$. They called them almost-rigid rings. Hereafter, we consider the following definition which seems more natural in our context (see Prop. 3.2 below for a comparison between the two notions).

Definition 3.1. A commutative domain B over a field k of characteristic zero is called *semi-rigid* if all non-zero locally nilpotent derivations of B induce the same proper \mathbb{N} -filtration (equivalently, the same \mathbb{N} -degree function).

Recall that the *Makar-Limanov invariant* of a commutative k -domain B over a field k of characteristic zero is defined by

$$\text{ML}(B) := \bigcap_{D \in \text{LND}(B)} \ker(D).$$

In particular, B is semi-rigid if and only if $\text{ML}(B) = \ker(\partial)$ for any non-zero $\partial \in \text{LND}(B)$. Indeed, given $D, E \in \text{LND}(B) \setminus \{0\}$ such that $A := \ker(D) = \ker(E)$, there exist non-zero elements $a, b \in A$ such that $aD = bE$ (see [1] Principle 12) which implies that the D -filtration is equal to the E -filtration. So if $\text{ML}(B) = \ker(\partial)$ for any non-zero $\partial \in \text{LND}(B)$ then B is semi-rigid. The other implication is clear by definition.

Recall that $D \in \text{Der}_k(B)$ is *irreducible* if and only if $D(B)$ is contained in no proper principal ideal of B , and that B is said to satisfy the ascending chain condition (ACC) on principal ideals if and only if every infinite chain $(b_1) \subset (b_2) \subset (b_3) \subset \dots$ of principal ideals of B eventually stabilizes. B is said to be a *highest common factor ring*, or HCF-ring, if and only if the intersection of any two principal ideals of B is again principal.

Proposition 3.2. *Let B be a semi-rigid k -domain satisfying the ACC on principal ideals. If $\text{ML}(B)$ is an HCF-ring, then there exists a unique irreducible $\partial \in \text{LND}(B)$ up to multiplication by unit.*

Proof. Existence: since B satisfies the ACC on principal ideals, then for every non-zero $T \in \text{LND}(B)$, there exists an irreducible $T_0 \in \text{LND}(B)$ and $c \in \ker(T)$ such that $T = cT_0$. (see [1], Prop. 2.2 and Principle 7).

Uniqueness: the following argument is similar to that in [1] Prop. 2.2.b, but with a little difference, that is, in [1] it is assumed that B itself is an HCF-ring while here we only require that $\text{ML}(B)$ is an HCF-ring.

Let $D, E \in \text{LND}(B)$ be irreducible derivations, and denote $A = \text{ML}(B)$. By hypothesis $\ker(D) = \ker(E) = A$, so there exist non-zero $a, b \in A$ such that $aD = bE$ (see [1] Principle 12). Here we can assume that a, b are not units otherwise we are done. Set $T = aD = bE$. Since A is an HCF-ring, there exists $c \in A$ such that $aA \cap bA = cA$. Therefore, $T(B) \subset cB$, and there exists $T_0 \in \text{LND}(B)$ such that $T = cT_0$. Write $c = as = bt$ for $s, t \in B$. Then $cT_0 = asT_0 = aD$ implies $D = sT_0$, and likewise $E = tT_0$. By irreducibility, s and t are units of B , and we are done. \square

In particular, for a ring B as in 3.2, every $D \in \text{LND}(B)$ has the form $D = f\partial$ for some irreducible $\partial \in \text{LND}(B)$ and $f \in \ker(\partial)$, and so B is almost rigid in the sense introduced by Finston and Maubach.

Recall that a ring A is called *rigid* if the zero derivation is the only locally nilpotent derivation of A . Equivalently, A is rigid if and only if $\text{ML}(A) = A$. It is well known that the only non rigid k -domains of transcendence degree one are polynomial rings in one variable over algebraic extensions of k ([1] Corollary 1.24 and Corollary 1.29). In particular, we have the following elementary criterion for rigidity that we will use frequently in the sequel:

Lemma 3.3. *A domain B of transcendence degree one over a field k of characteristic zero is rigid if one of the following properties hold:*

- (1) B is not factorial.
- (2) $\text{Spec}(B)$ has a singular point.

3.1. Elementary examples of semi-rigid k -domains.

The next Proposition, which is due to Makar-Limanov ([7] Lemma 21, also [8] Theorem 3.1), presents some of the simplest examples of semi-rigid k -domains.

Proposition 3.4. (Makar-Limanov) *Let A be a rigid domain of finite transcendence degree over a field k of characteristic zero. Then the polynomial ring $A[x]$ is semi-rigid.*

Proof. For the convenience of the reader, we provide an argument formulated in the LND-filtration language. Let ∂ be the locally nilpotent derivation of $A[x]$ defined by $\partial(a) = 0$ for every $a \in A$ and $\partial(x) = 1$. Then the ∂ -filtration $\{\mathcal{F}_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ is given by $\mathcal{F}_i = Ax^i \oplus \mathcal{F}_{i-1}$ where $\mathcal{F}_0 = \ker(\partial) = A$. So the associated graded algebra is $\text{Gr}(A[x]) = \bigoplus_{i \in \mathbb{N}} A\bar{x}^i$, where $\bar{x} := \text{gr}(x)$. By Proposition 2.2, every non-zero $D \in \text{LND}(A[x])$ respects the ∂ -filtration and induces a non-zero homogeneous locally nilpotent derivation \bar{D} of $\text{Gr}(A[x])$ of a certain degree d .

Let $f \in \ker(D)$ and assume that $f \notin A$. Then \bar{x} divides \bar{f} . Since $\bar{f} \in \ker(\bar{D})$ and $\ker(\bar{D})$ is factorially closed ([1] Principle 1), we have $\bar{x} \in \ker(\bar{D})$. Note that \bar{D} sends homogeneous elements of degree i to zero or to homogeneous elements of degree $i + d$, therefore \bar{D} has the form $\bar{D} = a\bar{x}^d E$, where $a \in A$, $d \in \mathbb{N}$, and $E \in \text{LND}(A)$ see [1] Principle 7. But since A is rigid, $E = 0$. Thus $\bar{D} = 0$, a contradiction. This means $f \in A$ which implies that $\ker(D) \subset A$. Finally, since

$\text{tr.deg}_k(A) = \text{tr.deg}_k(\ker(D))$ and A is algebraically closed in $A[x]$, we get the equality $\ker(D) = A$. Hence $\text{ML}(A[x]) = A$. \square

4. Computing the ML-Invariant using LND-Filtration

Here we illustrate the use of the ∂ -filtration in the computation of ML-invariants, for classes of already well-studied examples.

4.1. Classical examples of semi-rigid k -domains.

We first consider in 4.1.1, certain surfaces in $\mathbb{A}^{[3]}$ defined by equations $X^n Z - P(Y)$ where $n > 1$ and $\deg_Y P(Y) > 1$, which were first discussed by Makar-Limanov in [7], where he computed their ML-invariants. Later on Poloni [10] used similar methods to compute ML-invariants for a larger class. In the second example 4.1.2, we consider certain threefolds whose invariants were computed by S. Kaliman and L. Makar-Limanov [5] in the context of the linearization problem for \mathbb{C}^* -action on \mathbb{C}^3 .

In these examples, the use of LND-filtrations is more natural and less tedious than other existing approaches.

4.1.1. Danielewski hypersurfaces.

Let

$$B_{n,P} = k[X, Y, Z] / \langle X^n Z - P(X, Y) \rangle$$

where

$$P(X, Y) = Y^m + f_{m-1}(X)Y^{m-1} + \dots + f_0(X),$$

$f_i(X) \in k[X]$, $n \geq 2$, and $m \geq 2$.

Let x, y, z be the images of X, Y, Z in $B_{n,P}$. Define ∂ by $\partial(x) = 0$, $\partial(y) = x^n$, $\partial(z) = \frac{\partial P}{\partial y}$ where

$$\frac{\partial P}{\partial y} = my^{m-1} + (m-1)f_{m-1}(x)y^{m-2} + \dots + f_1(x)$$

We see that $\partial \in \text{LND}(B_{n,P})$ with $\ker(\partial) = k[x]$, and y is a local slice for ∂ . Moreover, we have $\deg_\partial(x) = 0$, $\deg_\partial(y) = 1$, $\deg_\partial(z) = m$. The plinth ideal is $\text{pl}(\partial) = \langle x^n \rangle$. Up to a change of variable of the form $Y \mapsto Y - c$ where $c \in k$, we can always assume that $0 \in \text{Spec}(B)$. A consequence of Lemma 2.3, Proposition 2.4, and Proposition 2.5 (see the Proof of Prop. 5.1 for more details) is that

1- The ∂ -filtration $\{\mathcal{F}_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ is given by:

$$\mathcal{F}_{mi+j} = k[x]y^j z^i + \mathcal{F}_{mi+j-1}$$

where $i \in \mathbb{N}$ and $j \in \{0, \dots, m-1\}$.

2- The associated graded algebra $\text{Gr}(B_{n,P}) = \bigoplus_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \overline{B}_i$, where $\overline{B}_i = \mathcal{F}_i / \mathcal{F}_{i-1}$, is generated by $\overline{x} = gr_\partial(x)$, $\overline{y} = gr_\partial(y)$, $\overline{z} = gr_\partial(z)$ as an algebra over k with relation $\overline{x}^n \overline{z} = \overline{y}^m$, i.e. $\text{Gr}(B_{n,P}) = k[\overline{X}, \overline{Y}, \overline{Z}] / \langle \overline{X}^n \overline{Z} - \overline{Y}^m \rangle$. And we have :

$$\overline{B}_{mi+j} = k[\overline{x}]\overline{y}^j \overline{z}^i$$

where $i \in \mathbb{N}$ and $j \in \{0, \dots, m-1\}$.

Proposition 4.1. *With the notation above we have:*

- (1) $\text{ML}(B_{n,P}) = k[x]$. Consequently $B_{n,P}$ is semi-rigid.
- (2) Every $D \in \text{LND}(B_{n,P})$ has the form $D = f(x)\partial$.

Proof. (1) By Proposition 2.2 a non-zero $D \in \text{LND}(B)$ induces a non-zero $\overline{D} \in \text{LND}(\text{Gr}(\overline{B}))$. Let $f \in \ker(D) \setminus k$, then $\overline{f} \in \ker(\overline{D}) \setminus k$. There exists $i \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\overline{f} \in \overline{B}_i$.

Assume that $\overline{f} \notin k[\overline{x}] = \overline{B}_0$, then one of the elements $\overline{y}, \overline{z}$ must divide \overline{f} . Which leads to a contradiction as follows:

If \overline{y} divides \overline{f} , then $\overline{y} \in \ker(\overline{D})$ because $\ker(\overline{D})$ is factorially closed in $\text{Gr}(B)$ ([1] Principle 1). For the same reason $\overline{x}, \overline{z} \in \ker(\overline{D})$ because $\overline{x}^n \overline{z} = \overline{y}^m$. So $\overline{D} = 0$, a contradiction.

If \overline{z} divides \overline{f} , then $\overline{D}(\overline{z}) = 0$. So \overline{D} extends to a locally nilpotent derivation \tilde{D} of the ring $\tilde{B} = k(\overline{z})[\overline{x}, \overline{y}] / \langle \overline{x}^n \overline{z} - \overline{y}^m \rangle$. Since $0 \in \text{Spec}(B)$ is a singular point when $n \geq 2$ and $m \geq 2$, \tilde{B} is rigid (Lemma 3.3). Therefore, $\tilde{D} = 0$ which means $\overline{D} = 0$, a contradiction.

So the only possibility is that $\overline{f} \in k[\overline{x}]$. This means that $\deg_{\partial}(f) = 0$, and hence that $f \in k[x]$. So $\ker(D) \subset k[x]$, and finally $k[x] = \ker(D)$ because $\text{tr.deg}_k(\ker(D)) = 1$ and $k[x]$ is algebraically closed in B . So we get $\text{ML}(B) = k[x]$.

(2) is an immediate consequence of Proposition 3.2. \square

4.1.2. Koras-Russell hypersurfaces of the second type.

Here we consider hypersurfaces associated with k -algebras of the form:

$$B_{n,e,l,Q} = k[X, Y, Z, T] / \langle Y(X^n + Z^e)^l - Q(X, Z, T) \rangle$$

where

$$Q(X, Z, T) = T^m + f_1(X, Z)T^{m-1} + \dots + f_m(X, Z)$$

$f_i(X, Z) \in k[X, Z]$, $n > 1$, $e > 1$, $l > 1$, and $m > 1$. We may assume without loss of generality that $Q(0, 0, 0) = 0$. A particular case of this family corresponds to the so called Koras-Russell hypersurfaces of the second type considered by S. Kaliman and L. Makar-Limanov ([5]) where they computed their ML-invariants. Here we explain how to apply the LND-filtration method to compute this invariant for all algebras $B_{n,e,l,Q}$.

Let x, y, z, t be the images of X, Y, Z, T in $B_{n,e,l,Q}$. Define ∂ by

$$\partial = \frac{\partial Q}{\partial t} \partial_y + (X^n + Z^e)^l \partial_t$$

We see that $\partial \in \text{LND}(B_{n,e,l,Q})$ with $\ker(\partial) = k[x, z]$, and t is a local slice for ∂ . Moreover, we have $\deg_{\partial}(x) = 0$, $\deg_{\partial}(y) = m$, $\deg_{\partial}(z) = 0$, and $\deg_{\partial}(t) = 1$. The plinth ideal is $\text{pl}(\partial) = \langle (X^n + Z^e)^l \rangle$. By Lemma 2.3, Prop. 2.4, and Prop. 2.5 we get the following.

1- The ∂ -filtration $\{\mathcal{F}_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ is given by:

$$\mathcal{F}_{mi+j} = k[x, z]t^j y^i + \mathcal{F}_{mi+j-1}$$

where $i \in \mathbb{N}$, and $j \in \{0, \dots, m-1\}$.

2- The associated graded algebra $\text{Gr}(B_{n,e,l,Q}) = \bigoplus_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \overline{B}_i$, where $\overline{B}_i = \mathcal{F}_i / \mathcal{F}_{i-1}$, is generated by $\overline{x} = \text{gr}_{\partial}(x)$, $\overline{y} = \text{gr}_{\partial}(y)$, $\overline{z} = \text{gr}_{\partial}(z)$, $\overline{t} = \text{gr}_{\partial}(t)$ as an algebra over k with the relation $\overline{y}(\overline{x}^n + \overline{z}^e)^l = \overline{t}^m$, i.e. $\text{Gr}(B_{n,e,l,Q}) = k[\overline{X}, \overline{Y}, \overline{Z}, \overline{T}] / \langle \overline{Y}(\overline{X}^n + \overline{Z}^e)^l - \overline{T}^m \rangle$. And we have :

$$\overline{B}_{mi+j} = k[\overline{x}, \overline{z}] \overline{t}^j \overline{y}^i$$

where $i \in \mathbb{N}$, and $j \in \{0, \dots, m-1\}$.

Proposition 4.2. *With the notation above we have:*

- (1) $\text{ML}(B_{n,e,l,Q}) = k[x, z]$. *Consequently B is semi-rigid.*
- (2) *Every $D \in \text{LND}(B_{n,e,l,Q})$ has the form $D = f(x, z)\partial$.*

Proof. (1) Given a non-zero $D \in \text{LND}(B)$. By Proposition 2.2 D induces a non-zero $\overline{D} \in \text{LND}(\text{Gr}(B))$. Suppose that $f \in \ker(D) \setminus k$, then $\overline{f} \in \ker(\overline{D}) \setminus k$. So there exists $i \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\overline{f} \in \overline{B}_i$. Assume that $\overline{f} \notin k[\overline{x}, \overline{z}] = \overline{B}_0$, then one of the elements $\overline{t}, \overline{y}$ must divides \overline{f} (see §4.1.2 above). Which leads to a contradiction as follows:

If \overline{t} divides \overline{f} , then $\overline{t} \in \ker(\overline{D})$ as $\ker(\overline{D})$ is factorially closed, and for the same reason $\overline{y}, (\overline{x}^n + \overline{z}^e)^l \in \ker(\overline{D})$ due to the relation $\overline{y}(\overline{x}^n + \overline{z}^e)^l = \overline{t}^m$. So $\overline{x}^n + \overline{z}^e \in \ker(\overline{D})$ which implies that $\overline{x}, \overline{z} \in \ker(\overline{D})$ ([1] Lemma 9.3). This means $\overline{D} = 0$, a contradiction.

Finally, if \overline{y} divides \overline{f} , then $\overline{D}(\overline{y}) = 0$. Choose $H \in \ker(\overline{D})$ which is homogeneous and algebraically independent of \overline{y} , which is possible, since $\text{tr.deg}_k \ker(\overline{D}) = 2$ and $\ker(\overline{D})$ is generated by homogeneous elements. Then by §4.1.2, H has the form $H = h(\overline{x}, \overline{z}) \cdot \overline{y}^l$. By algebraic dependence, we may assume $H = h(\overline{x}, \overline{z})$, which is non-constant, and that $h(0, 0) = 0$. So \overline{D} extends to a locally nilpotent derivation \tilde{D} of the ring $\tilde{B} = k(\overline{y}, H)[\overline{x}, \overline{z}, \overline{t}] / \langle h(\overline{x}, \overline{z}) - H, \overline{y}(\overline{x}^n + \overline{z}^e)^l - \overline{t}^m \rangle$. But \tilde{B} is of transcendence degree one over the field $k(\overline{y}, H)$ whose spectrum has a singular point at 0. This means that \tilde{B} is rigid (Lemma 3.3). Thus $\tilde{D} = 0$, which implies $\overline{D} = 0$, a contradiction.

So the only possibility is that $\overline{f} \in k[\overline{x}, \overline{z}]$, and this means $\deg_\partial(f) = 0$, thus $f \in k[x, z]$ and $\ker(D) \subset k[x, z]$. Finally, $k[x, z] = \ker(D)$ because $\text{tr.deg}_k(\ker(D)) = 2$. So we get $\text{ML}(B) = k[x, z]$

- (2) follows again from Proposition 3.2. □

5. A new class of semi-rigid rings

In this section, we use the LND-filtration method to establish the semi-rigidity of new families of two dimensional domains of the form

$$R = k[X, Y, Z] / \langle X^n Y - P(X, Q(X, Y) - X^e Z) \rangle$$

for suitable integers $n, e \geq 2$ and polynomials $P(X, T), Q(X, T) \in k[X, T]$. They share with Danielewski hypersurfaces discussed in 4.1.1 above, the property to come naturally equipped with an irreducible locally nilpotent derivation induced by a locally nilpotent derivation of $k[X, Y, Z]$. But in contrast with the Danielewski hypersurfaces case, the corresponding derivation on $k[X, Y, Z]$ are no longer triangular, in fact not even triangulable by virtue of characterization due to Daigle [9].

We will begin with a very elementary example illustrating the steps needed to determine the LND-filtration and its associated graded algebra, and then we proceed to the general case.

5.1. A toy example.

We let

$$R = k[X, Y, Z] / \langle X^2 Y - (Y^2 - XZ)^2 \rangle$$

and we let x, y, z be the images of X, Y, Z in R . A direct computation reveals that the derivation

$$2XS\partial_Y + (4YS - X^2)\partial_Z$$

of $k[X, Y, Z]$ where $S := Y^2 - XZ$ is locally nilpotent and annihilates the polynomial $X^2Y - (Y^2 - XZ)^2$. It induces a locally nilpotent derivation ∂ of R for which we have $\partial(x) = 0$, $\partial^3(y) = 0$, $\partial^5(z) = 0$. Furthermore, the element $s = y^2 - xz$ is a local slice for ∂ with $\partial(s) = x^3$. The kernel of ∂ is $k[x]$ and the plinth ideal is the principal ideal generated by x^3 . We have $\deg_\partial(x) = 0$, $\deg_\partial(y) = 2$, $\deg_\partial(z) = 4$, $\deg_\partial(s) = 1$.

Proposition 5.1. *With the notation above, we have:*

(1) *The ∂ -filtration $\{\mathcal{F}_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ is given by :*

$$\mathcal{F}_{4i+2j+l} = k[x]s^l y^j z^i + \mathcal{F}_{4i+2j+l-1}$$

where $i \in \mathbb{N}$, $j \in \{0, 1\}$, $l \in \{0, 1\}$.

(2) *The associated graded algebra $\text{Gr}_\partial(R) = \bigoplus_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \overline{R}_i$, where $\overline{R}_i = \mathcal{F}_i/\mathcal{F}_{i-1}$, is generated by $\overline{x} = gr_\partial(x)$, $\overline{y} = gr_\partial(y)$, $\overline{z} = gr_\partial(z)$, $\overline{s} = gr_\partial(s)$ as an algebra over k with relations $\overline{x}^2\overline{z} = \overline{s}^2$ and $\overline{x}\overline{z} = \overline{y}^2$, i.e. $\text{Gr}_\partial(R) = k[\overline{X}, \overline{Y}, \overline{Z}, \overline{S}]/\langle \overline{X}^2\overline{Z} - \overline{S}^2, \overline{X}\overline{Z} - \overline{Y}^2 \rangle$. Furthermore:*

$$\overline{R}_{4i+2j+l} = k[\overline{x}]\overline{s}^l \overline{y}^j \overline{z}^i$$

where $i \in \mathbb{N}$, $j \in \{0, 1\}$, $l \in \{0, 1, 2, 3\}$.

Proof. 1) First, the ∂ -filtration $\{\mathcal{F}_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ is given by $\mathcal{F}_r = \sum_{h \leq r} H_h$ where $H_h := \sum_{u+2v+4w=h} k[x](s^u y^v z^w)$ and $u, v, w, h \in \mathbb{N}$. To show this, let J be the ideal in $k^{[4]} = k[X, Y, Z, S]$ defined by $J = (X^2Y - (Y^2 - XZ)^2, Y^2 - XZ - S)$. Define an \mathbb{N} -degree function ω on $k^{[4]}$ by declaring that $\omega(X) = 0$, $\omega(S) = 1$, $\omega(Y) = 2$, and $\omega(Z) = 4$. By Lemma 2.4, the \mathbb{N} -filtration $\{\mathcal{G}_r\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ where $\mathcal{G}_r = \sum_{h \leq r} H_h$ is proper if and only if \hat{J} is prime. Which is the case since $\hat{J} = \langle X^2Y - S^2, Y^2 - XZ \rangle$ is prime. Thus by Lemma 2.3 we get the desired description.

Second, let $l \in \{0, 1\}$ and $j \in \{0, 1, 2, 3\}$ be such that $l := r \bmod 2$, $j := r - l \bmod 4$, and $i := \frac{r-2j-l}{4}$. Then we get the following unique expression $r = 4i + 2j + l$. Since $\mathcal{F}_r = \sum_{u+2v+4w=r} k[x](s^u y^v z^w) + \mathcal{F}_{r-1}$, we conclude in particular that $\mathcal{F}_r \supseteq k[x]s^l y^j z^i + \mathcal{F}_{r-1}$. For the other inclusion, the relation $x^2y = s^2$ allows to write $s^u y^v z^w = x^e s^l y^{v_0} z^w$ and from the relation $y^2 = s + xz$ we get $x^e s^l y^{v_0} z^w = x^e s^l y^j (s + xz)^n z^w$. Since the monomial with the highest degree relative to \deg_∂ in $(s + xz)^n$ is $x^n z^n$, we deduce that $x^e s^l y^j (s + xz)^n z^w = x^{e+n} s^l y^j z^{w+n} + \sum M_\beta$ where M_β is monomial in x, y, s, z of degree less than r . Since the expression $r = 4i + 2j + l$ is unique, we get $w + n = i$. So $s^u y^v z^w = x^{e+n} s^l y^j z^i + f$ where $f \in \mathcal{F}_{r-1}$. Thus $k[x](s^u y^v z^w) \subseteq k[x]s^l y^j z^i + \mathcal{F}_{r-1}$ and finally $\mathcal{F}_r = k[x]s^l y^j z^i + \mathcal{F}_{r-1}$.

2) By part (1), an element f of degree r can be written as $f = g(x)s^l y^j z^i + f_0$ where $f_0 \in \mathcal{F}_{r-1}$, $l = r \bmod 2$, $j = r - l \bmod 4$, $i = \frac{r-2j-l}{4}$, and $i \in \mathbb{N}$, $j \in \{0, 1\}$, $l \in \{0, 1\}$. So by Lemma 1.4, P2, P1, P3 respectively we get

$$\overline{f} = \overline{g(x)s^l y^j z^i} + \overline{h} = \overline{g(x)s^l y^j z^i} = \overline{g(x)\overline{s}^l \overline{y}^j \overline{z}^i} = \overline{g(\overline{x})\overline{s}^l \overline{y}^j \overline{z}^i}$$

and therefore $\overline{B}_{4i+2j+l} = k[\overline{x}]\overline{s}^l \overline{y}^j \overline{z}^i$.

Finally, by Proposition 2.5, $\text{Gr}_\partial(B) = k[\overline{X}, \overline{Y}, \overline{Z}, \overline{S}]/\langle \overline{X}^2\overline{Z} - \overline{S}^2, \overline{X}\overline{Z} - \overline{Y}^2 \rangle$. \square

5.2. A more general family.

We now consider more generally rings R of the form

$$k[X, Y, Z]/\langle X^n Y - P(X, Q(X, Y) - X^e Z) \rangle$$

where

$$P(X, S) = S^d + f_{d-1}(X)S^{d-1} + \cdots + f_1(X)S + f_0(X)$$

$$Q(X, Y) = Y^m + g_{m-1}(X)Y^{m-1} + \cdots + g_1(X)Y + g_0(X)$$

$n \geq 2$, $d \geq 2$, $m \geq 1$, and $e \geq 1$. Up to a change of variable of the form $Y \mapsto Y - c$ where $c \in k$, we may assume that $0 \in \text{Spec}(R)$.

Let x, y, z be the images of X, Y, Z in R . Define ∂ by: $\partial(x) = 0$, $\partial(s) = x^{n+e}$ where $s := Q(x, y) - x^e z$. Considering the relation $x^n y = P(x, Q(x, y) - x^e z)$, a simple computation leads to $\partial(y) = x^e \frac{\partial P}{\partial s}$, $\partial(z) = \frac{\partial Q}{\partial y} \frac{\partial P}{\partial s} - x^n$, i.e.

$$\partial := x^e \frac{\partial P}{\partial s} \partial_y + \left(\frac{\partial Q}{\partial y} \frac{\partial P}{\partial s} - x^n \right) \partial_z$$

where $\frac{\partial P}{\partial s} = ds^{d-1} + (d-1)f_{d-1}(x)s^{d-2} + \cdots + f_1(x)$, and $\frac{\partial Q}{\partial y} = my^{m-1} + (m-1)g_{m-1}(x)y^{m-2} + \cdots + g_1(x)$. Since $\partial(x^n y - P(x, Q(x, y) - x^e z)) = 0$ and $\partial^{d+1}(y) = 0$, $\partial^{md+1}(z) = 0$, ∂ is a well-defined locally nilpotent derivation of R . The kernel of ∂ is equal to $k[x]$ and the element s is a local slice for ∂ by construction. One checks further that the plinth ideal is equal to $\text{pl}(\partial) = \langle x^{n+e} \rangle$. A direct computation shows that $\deg_{\partial}(x) = 0$, $\deg_{\partial}(y) = d$, $\deg_{\partial}(z) = md$ and $\deg_{\partial}(s) = 1$. Furthermore:

1- The ∂ -filtration $\{\mathcal{F}_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ is given by :

$$\mathcal{F}_{mdi+dj+l} = k[x]s^l y^j z^i + \mathcal{F}_{m di+d j+l-1}$$

where $i \in \mathbb{N}$, $j \in \{0, \dots, m-1\}$, $l \in \{0, \dots, d-1\}$.

2- The associated graded algebra $\text{Gr}(R) = \bigoplus_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \bar{R}_i$, where $\bar{R}_i = \mathcal{F}_i / \mathcal{F}_{i-1}$, is generated by $\bar{x} = gr_{\partial}(x)$, $\bar{y} = gr_{\partial}(y)$, $\bar{z} = gr_{\partial}(z)$, $\bar{s} = gr_{\partial}(s)$ as an algebra over k with relations $\bar{x}^n \bar{z} = \bar{s}^d$ and $\bar{x}^e \bar{z} = \bar{y}^m$, i.e. $\text{Gr}(R) = k[\bar{X}, \bar{Y}, \bar{Z}, \bar{S}] / \langle \bar{X}^n \bar{Z} - \bar{S}^d, \bar{X}^e \bar{Z} - \bar{Y}^m \rangle$.

And we have :

$$\bar{R}_{mdi+dj+l} = k[\bar{x}] \bar{s}^l \bar{y}^j \bar{z}^i$$

where $i \in \mathbb{N}$, $j \in \{0, \dots, m-1\}$, $l \in \{0, \dots, d-1\}$.

Theorem 5.2. *With the above notation the following hold:*

- (1) $\text{ML}(R) = k[x]$. Consequently R is semi-rigid.
- (2) Every $D \in \text{LND}(R)$ has form $D = f(x)\partial$, i.e. R is almost rigid.

Proof. (1) Given a non-zero $D \in \text{LND}(R)$. By Proposition 2.2, D respects the ∂ -filtration and induces a non-zero locally nilpotent derivation \bar{D} of $\text{Gr}(R)$. Suppose that $f \in \ker(D) \setminus k$, then $\bar{f} \in \ker(\bar{D}) \setminus k$ is an homogenous element of $\text{Gr}(R)$. So there exists $i \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\bar{f} \in \bar{R}_i$.

Assume that $\bar{f} \notin k[\bar{x}] = \bar{R}_0$, then one of the elements $\bar{s}, \bar{y}, \bar{z}$ must divides \bar{f} by 5.2.2. Which leads to a contradiction as follows :

If \bar{s} divides \bar{f} , then $\bar{s} \in \ker(\bar{D})$ as $\ker(\bar{D})$ is factorially closed, and for the same reason $\bar{x}, \bar{y} \in \ker(\bar{D})$ due to the relation $\bar{x}^n \bar{y} = \bar{s}^d$. Then by the relation $\bar{x}^e \bar{z} = \bar{y}^m$, we must have $\bar{z} \in \ker(\bar{D})$, which means $\bar{D} = 0$, a contradiction. In the same way, we get a contradiction if \bar{y} divides \bar{f} .

Finally, if \bar{z} divides \bar{f} , then $\bar{D}(\bar{z}) = 0$. So \bar{D} induces in a natural way a locally nilpotent derivation \tilde{D} of the ring $\tilde{R} = k(\bar{z})[\bar{x}, \bar{y}, \bar{s}] / \langle \bar{x}^n \bar{z} - \bar{s}^d, \bar{x}^e \bar{z} - \bar{y}^m \rangle$. But since $0 \in \text{Spec}(\tilde{R})$ is a singular point, \tilde{R} is rigid (Lemma 3.3). So $\tilde{D} = 0$, which implies $\bar{D} = 0$, a contradiction.

So the only possibility is that $\bar{f} \in k[\bar{x}]$, and this means $\deg_{\partial}(f) = 0$, thus $f \in k[x]$ and $\ker(D) \subset k[x]$. Finally, $k[x] = \ker(D)$ because $\text{tr.deg}_k(\ker(D)) = 1$ and $k[x]$ is algebraically closed in B . So $\text{ML}(R) = k[x]$.

(2) follows again from Proposition 3.2. □

6. Further applications of the LND-filtration

Given a commutative domain B over an algebraically closed field k of characteristic zero, we denote $\text{Aut}_k(B)$ the group of algebraic k -automorphisms of B . This group acts by conjugation on $\text{LND}(B)$. An immediate consequence is that $\alpha(\text{ML}(B)) = \text{ML}(B)$ for every $\alpha \in \text{Aut}_k(B)$ which yield in particular an induced action of $\text{Aut}_k(B)$ on $\text{ML}(B)$. Let $\partial_{\alpha} = \alpha^{-1}\partial\alpha$ be the conjugate of ∂ by a given automorphism α of B , it is straightforward to check that $\alpha\{\ker(\partial_{\alpha})\} = \ker(\partial)$ and more generally that $\deg_{\partial_{\alpha}}(b) = \deg_{\partial}(\alpha(b))$ for any $b \in B$. In other words, α respects \deg_{∂} and $\deg_{\partial_{\alpha}}$ (i.e. α sends an element of degree n relative to $\deg_{\partial_{\alpha}}$, to an element of the same degree n relative to \deg_{∂}).

Definition 6.1. We say that an algebraic k -automorphism α preserves the ∂ -filtration for some $\partial \in \text{LND}(B)$ if $\deg_{\partial}(\alpha(b)) = \deg_{\partial}(b)$ for any $b \in B$.

Lemma 6.2. *Let $\partial \in \text{LND}(B)$ and $\alpha \in \text{Aut}_k(B)$. Then ∂ and ∂_{α} are equivalent, i.e. have the same kernel, if and only if α preserve the ∂ -filtration.*

Proof. Suppose that ∂ and ∂_{α} are equivalents, then $\deg_{\partial}(\alpha(b)) = \deg_{\partial_{\alpha}}(b)$ for every $b \in B$, and by hypothesis $\ker(\partial) = \ker(\partial_{\alpha})$, so $\deg_{\partial} = \deg_{\partial_{\alpha}}$. Then we obtain $\deg_{\partial}(\alpha(b)) = \deg_{\partial}(b)$. Thus α preserves the ∂ -filtration. Since the other direction is obvious we are done. □

The following Corollary shows a nice property of a semi-rigid ring. That is, every algebraic automorphism α has to preserve the unique filtration induced by any locally nilpotent derivation ∂ , i.e. α sends an element of degree i relative to ∂ to an element of the same degree relative to ∂ . Which makes the computation of the group of automorphisms easier up to the automorphism group of $\ker(\partial)$.

Corollary 6.3. *Let B be a semi-rigid k -domain, then every k -automorphism of B preserve the ∂ -filtration for every $\partial \in \text{LND}(B)$.*

Proof. A direct consequence of Definition 3.1 and Lemma 6.2. □

6.1. The group of algebraic k -automorphisms of a semi-rigid k -domain.

Suppose that B is a semi-rigid k -domain. Then, it has a unique proper filtration $\{\mathcal{F}_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ which is the ∂ -filtration corresponding to any non-zero locally nilpotent derivation ∂ of B . Since every algebraic k -automorphism of B preserves this filtration (Corollary 6.3), we obtain an exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow \text{Aut}_k(B, \text{ML}(B)) \rightarrow \text{Aut}_k(B) \rightarrow \text{Aut}_k(\text{ML}(B))$$

where $\text{Aut}_k(B, \text{ML}(B))$ is by definition the sub-group of $\text{Aut}_k(B)$ consisting of elements whose induced action on $\text{ML}(B)$ is trivial. Furthermore, every element of $\text{Aut}_k(B, \text{ML}(B))$ induces for every $i \geq 1$ an automorphism of \mathcal{F}_0 -module of each \mathcal{F}_i . In this section we illustrate how to exploit these information to compute $\text{Aut}_k(B)$ for certain semi-rigid k -domains B .

6.1.1. Aut_k for example 4.1.1.

In [7] Makar-Limanov computed the k -automorphism group for surfaces in $k^{[3]}$ defined by equation $X^n Z - P(Y) = 0$ where $n > 1$ and $\deg_Y P(Y) > 1$. Then Poloni, see [10], generalized Makar-Limanov's method to obtained similar results for the rings considered in 4.1.1 above. Here we briefly indicate how to recover these results using LND-filtrations. So let

$$B_{n,P} = k[X, Y, Z] / \langle X^n Z - P(X, Y) \rangle$$

where $P(X, Y) = Y^m + f_{m-1}(X)Y^{m-1} + \dots + f_0(X)$, $f_i(X) \in k[X]$, $n \geq 2$, and $m \geq 2$. Up to change of variable of the form Y by $Y - \frac{f_{m-1}(X)}{m}$ we may assume without loss of generality that $f_{m-1}(X) = 0$.

Proposition 6.4. *Let $B_{n,P}$ be as above. Then every algebraic k -automorphism α of B has the form*

$$\alpha(x, y, z) = (\lambda x, \mu y + x^n a(x), \frac{\mu^m}{\lambda^n} z + \frac{P(\lambda x, \mu y + x^n a(x)) - \mu^m P(x, y)}{\lambda^n x^n})$$

where $\lambda, \mu \in k^*$ satisfy $f_{m-i}(\lambda x) \equiv \mu^i \cdot f_{m-i}(x) \pmod{x^n}$ for all i , and $a(x) \in k[x]$.

Proof. By Proposition 4.1, (1) and §4.1.1, $\text{ML}(B) = k[x]$ and the ∂ -filtration $\{\mathcal{F}_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ is given by $\mathcal{F}_{im+j} = k[x]y^{im+j} + k[x]y^{im+j-m}z + \dots + k[x]y^j z^i + \mathcal{F}_{im+j-1}$, where $\partial = x^n \cdot \partial_y + \frac{\partial P}{\partial y} \cdot \partial_z$, $\deg_{\partial}(x) = 0$, $\deg_{\partial}(y) = 1$, and $\deg_{\partial}(z) = m$. In particular $\mathcal{F}_0 = k[x]$, $\mathcal{F}_1 = k[x]y + \mathcal{F}_0$, and $\mathcal{F}_m = k[x]y^m + k[x]z + \mathcal{F}_{m-1}$.

Now by Corollary 6.3 α preserve \deg_{∂} , so we must have $\alpha(x) \in \mathcal{F}_0 = k[x]$, $\alpha(y) \in \mathcal{F}_1 = k[x]y + k[x]$ and $\alpha(z) \in \mathcal{F}_m = k[x]y^m + k[x]z + \mathcal{F}_{m-1}$. Since α is invertible we get $\alpha(x) = \lambda x + c$, $\alpha(y) = \mu y + b(x)$, and $\alpha(z) = \xi z + h(x, y)$ where $\lambda, \mu, \xi \in k^*$, $c \in k$, $b \in k[x]$, $h(x, y) \in k[x, y]$, and $\deg_y h(x, y) \leq m$.

By Proposition 4.1 (2) every $D \in \text{LND}(B)$ has the form $D = f(x)\partial$. In particular, $\partial_{\alpha} = f(x)\partial$ for some $f(x) \in k[x]$. Since $\alpha\partial_{\alpha} = \partial\alpha$ we have $\partial(\alpha(y)) = \alpha(f(x)\partial(y)) = f(\alpha(x))\alpha(x^n)$ where $(\partial(y)) = x^n$. So we get $\partial(\mu y + b(x)) = f(\alpha(x))(\lambda x + c)^n$. Since $\partial(\mu y + b(x)) = \mu x^n$, x divides $(\lambda x + c)^n$ in $k[x]$, and this is possible only if $c = 0$, so we get $\alpha(x) = \lambda x$.

Applying α to the relation $x^n z = P(x, y)$ in $B_{P,n}$, we get $\lambda^n x^n \alpha(z) = P(\lambda x, \mu y + b(x)) = \mu^m P(x, y) + m\mu^{m-1}y^{m-1}b(x) + H(x, y)$ where $\deg_y H \leq m - 2$. Since x^n divides $P = x^n z$ and $\deg_y H \leq m - 2$, x^n divides $m\mu^{m-1}y^{m-1}b(x) + H(x, y)$ in $k[x, y]$. So x^n divides $b(x)$, i.e. $\alpha(y) = \mu y + x^n a(x)$.

In addition, x^n divides every coefficient of H as a polynomial in y , so x^n divides $-\mu^m f_{m-i}(x) + \mu^{m-i} f_{m-i}(\lambda x)$ because coefficients of $H(y)$ are of the form $q(x, y)b(x) - \mu^m f_{m-i}(x) + \mu^{m-i} f_{m-i}(\lambda x)$ and $b(x)$ is divisible by x^n . So x^n divides $-\mu^i f_{m-i}(x) + f_{m-i}(\lambda x)$ for every i . And we are done. \square

6.1.2. Aut_k for example 5.2.

The same method as in 6.1.1 can be applied to compute automorphism groups of rings R defined as in Theorem 5.2. For simplicity we only deal with the case where $Q(X, Y) = Y^m$, the general case can be deduced in the same way at the cost of longer and more complicated computation. Again we make a substitution in S as in 6.1.1 to get relation of the form presented in the following result:

Theorem 6.5. *Let R denote the ring $R = k[X, Y, Z] / \langle X^n Y - P(X, Y^m - X^e Z) \rangle = k[x, y, z]$ where $P(X, S) = S^d + f_{d-2}(X)S^{d-2} + \dots + f_1(X)S + f_0(S)$, $n \geq 2$, $d \geq 2$,*

$m \geq 1$, and $e \in \mathbb{N}$. Then, every algebraic k -automorphism of B has the form

$$\alpha(x, y, z) = \left(\lambda x, \frac{\mu^d}{\lambda^n} y + F, \frac{\mu^{dm}}{\lambda^{nm+e}} z + \frac{\left(\frac{\mu^d}{\lambda^n} y + F\right)^m - \frac{\mu^{dm}}{\lambda^{nm}} y^m + x^{n+e} a(x)}{\lambda x^e} \right)$$

where:

$\lambda, \mu \in k^*$ verify both $\frac{\mu^{dm}}{\lambda^{nm}} = \mu$ and $f_{d-i}(\lambda x) \equiv \mu^i f_{d-i}(x) \pmod{x^{n+e}}$ for every $i \in \{2, \dots, d\}$. $s = y^m - x^e z$, and $F = \frac{P(\lambda x, \mu s + x^{n+e} a(x)) - \mu^d P(x, s)}{\lambda^n x^n}$, $a(x) \in k[x]$.

Proof. A similar argument as in the proof of Proposition 6.4 leads to $\alpha(x) = \lambda x$ and $\alpha(s) = \mu s + x^n a(x)$ where $\lambda, \mu \in k^*$ verify $f_{d-i}(\lambda x) \equiv \mu^i f_{d-i}(x) \pmod{x^n}$ for all i . Now $\alpha(x)$ and $\alpha(s)$ determine

$$\alpha(y) = \frac{\mu^d}{\lambda^n} y + \frac{P(\lambda x, \mu s + x^n a(x)) - \mu^d P(x, s)}{\lambda^n x^n}.$$

Apply α to $x^e z = y^m - s$ to get $\lambda^e x^e \alpha(z) = \left(\frac{\mu^h}{\lambda^n} y + F\right)^m - \mu s - x^n a(x)$ where $F = \frac{P(\lambda x, \mu s + x^n a(x)) - \mu^h P(x, s)}{\lambda^n x^n} \in k[x, s]$. So we have $\lambda^e x^e \alpha(z) = \left[\frac{\mu^{hm}}{\lambda^{nm}} y^m - \frac{\mu^{hm}}{\lambda^{nm}} s\right] + \left(\frac{\mu^{hm}}{\lambda^{nm}} - \mu\right) s + m \left(\frac{\mu^h}{\lambda^n} y\right)^{m-1} F + \dots + F^m - x^n a(x)$. Since $\frac{\mu^{hm}}{\lambda^{nm}} y^m - \frac{\mu^{hm}}{\lambda^{nm}} s = \frac{\mu^{hm}}{\lambda^{nm}} x^e z$, we see that x^e divides $G := \left(\frac{\mu^{hm}}{\lambda^{nm}} - \mu\right) s + m \left(\frac{\mu^h}{\lambda^n} y\right)^{m-1} F + \dots + F^m - x^n a(x)$ in $k[x, s, y] \subset B$ because $F \in k[x, s]$. Thus x^e divides every coefficients of G as a polynomial in y because $\deg_s G \leq d - 1$. So x^e divides F and $\frac{\mu^{hm}}{\lambda^{nm}} - \mu = 0$. This means that x^{n+e} divides $f_{d-i}(\lambda x) - \mu^i f_{d-i}(x)$ for all $i \in \{2, \dots, d\}$ (see proof of Proposition 6.4), and $\frac{\mu^{hm}}{\lambda^{nm}} = \mu$. Finally, by the relation $s = y^m - x^e z$, we get $\alpha(z) = \frac{\mu^{hm}}{\lambda^{nm+e}} z + \frac{m \left(\frac{\mu^h}{\lambda^n} y\right)^{m-1} F + \dots + F^m + x^n a(x)}{\lambda x^e}$, and we are done. \square

6.2. Isomorphisms.

We are going to use the previous facts about semi-rigid k -domains to give a necessary and sufficient condition for two hypersurfaces of the family 4.1.1 to be isomorphic.

Let $\Psi : A \rightarrow B$ be an algebraic isomorphism, we refer to this by $\Psi \in \text{Isom}_k(A, B)$, between two finitely generated k -domains $A = k[y_1, \dots, y_r]$, $B = k[x_1, \dots, x_r]$ where y_1, \dots, y_r and x_1, \dots, x_r are minimal sets of generators. Since $\Psi(A) = k[\Psi(y_1), \dots, \Psi(y_r)] = k[x_1, \dots, x_r]$, there exists an automorphism $\psi : B \rightarrow B$ such that for every $i \in \{1, \dots, r\}$ there exists $j \in \{1, \dots, r\}$ such that $\psi(x_i) = \Psi(y_j)$.

Given $\partial \in \text{LND}(B)$ and $\Psi \in \text{Isom}_k(A, B)$. For any $n \in \mathbb{N}$ we have $(\Psi^{-1} \partial \Psi)^n = \Psi^{-1} \partial^n \Psi$. So we see that $\Psi^{-1} \partial \Psi \in \text{LND}(A)$. An immediate result is $\Psi(\text{ML}(A)) = \text{ML}(B)$ for any $\Psi \in \text{Isom}_k(A, B)$. Denote $\partial_\Psi := \Psi^{-1} \partial \Psi$, we have the following properties

- (1) $\Psi\{\ker(\partial_\Psi)\} = \ker(\partial)$.
- (2) $\deg_{\partial_\Psi}(a) = \deg_\partial(\Psi(a))$ for all $a \in A$.

In [10], Poloni obtained similar results to the next Proposition.

Proposition 6.6. *Let $B_1 = k[x_1, y_1, z_1]$ and $B_2 = k[x_2, y_2, z_2]$ be as in 4.1.1 where*

$$P_1 = y_1^{m_1} + f_{m_1-2}(x_1) y_1^{m_1-2} + \dots + f_0(x_1)$$

$$P_2 = y_2^{m_2} + g_{m_2-2}(x_2) y_2^{m_2-2} + \dots + g_0(x_2)$$

$f_i(x_1) \in k[x_1]$, $g_i(x_2) \in k[x_2]$ and $n_i > 1, m_i > 1$. Then

B_1 and B_2 are isomorphic if and only if $n = n_1 = n_2$, $m = m_1 = m_2$, and $f_{m-i}(\lambda x) \equiv \mu^i g_{m-i}(x) \pmod{x^n}$ for every $i \in \{2, \dots, m\}$.

In addition, every isomorphism between B_1 and B_2 takes the form

$$\Psi(x_1, y_1, z_1) = (\lambda x_2, \mu y_2 + x_2^{n_2} a(x_2), \frac{\mu^{m_1}}{\lambda^{n_1}} z_2 + \frac{P_1(\lambda x_2, \mu y_2 + x_2^{n_2} a(x_2)) - \mu^{m_1} P_2(x_2, y_2)}{\lambda^{n_1} x_2^{n_2}}),$$

where $a(x) \in k[x]$ and $\lambda \in k^*$, $\mu \in k^*$ satisfy $f_{m-i}(\lambda x) \equiv \mu^i g_{m-i}(x) \pmod{x^n}$ for all i .

Proof. Let $D \in \text{LND}(B_2)$, and let $\Psi \in \text{Isom}_k(B_1, B_2)$. By property 2, $\deg_{D_\Psi}(x_1) = \deg_D(\Psi(x_1))$, but we saw before that $\deg_E(x_1) = 0$ for all $E \in \text{LND}(B_1)$, so we get $\deg_{D_\Psi}(x_1) = 0 = \deg_D(\Psi(x_1))$ and $\Psi(x_1) \in \mathcal{F}_0 = k[x_2]$. The same argument shows that $\deg_{D_\Psi}(y_1) = 1 = \deg_D(\Psi(y_1))$, $\Psi(y_1) \in \mathcal{F}_1 - \mathcal{F}_0$, and $\deg_{D_\Psi}(z_1) = m_1 = \deg_D(\Psi(z_1))$. This implies that the only possibility for ψ defined as in 6.2 is $\psi(x_2) = \Psi(x_1)$, $\psi(y_2) = \Psi(y_1)$ and $\psi(z_2) = \Psi(z_1)$.

Now by Proposition 6.4

$$\psi(x_2, y_2, z_2) = (\lambda x_2, \mu y_2 + x_2^{n_2} a(x_2), \frac{\mu^{m_2}}{\lambda^{n_2}} z_2 + \frac{Q_2(\lambda x_2, \mu y_2 + x_2^{n_2} a(x_2)) - \mu^{m_2} Q_2(x_2, y_2)}{\lambda^{n_2} x_2^{n_2}}),$$

where $a(x_2) \in k[x_2]$ and $\lambda \in k^*$, $\mu \in k^*$ such that $g_{m-i}(\lambda x) \equiv \mu^i g_{m-i}(x) \pmod{x^{n_2}}$ for all i . So we get

$$\Psi(x_1, y_1, z_1) = (\lambda x_2, \mu y_2 + x_2^{n_2} a(x_2), \frac{\mu^{m_2}}{\lambda^{n_2}} z_2 + \frac{Q_2(\lambda x_2, \mu y_2 + x_2^{n_2} a(x_2)) - \mu^{m_2} Q_2(x_2, y_2)}{\lambda^{n_2} x_2^{n_2}}).$$

Since $\deg_D(z_2) = m_2$ for any non-zero $D \in \text{LND}(B_2)$, and since ψ preserves \deg_D , we get $m_2 = \deg_D(z_2) = \deg_D(\psi(z_2)) = \deg_D(\Psi(z_1)) = \deg_{D_\Psi}(z_1) = m_1$, i.e. $m_1 = m_2$.

By applying Ψ to relation $x_1^{n_1} z_1 = Q_1(x_1, y_1)$ in B_1 , we obtain

$$\lambda^{n_1} x_2^{n_1} (\frac{\mu^{m_2}}{\lambda^{n_2}} z_2 + \frac{Q_2(\lambda x_2, \mu y_2 + x_2^{n_2} a(x_2)) - \mu^{m_2} Q_2(x_2, y_2)}{\lambda^{n_2} x_2^{n_2}}) = Q_1(\lambda x_2, \mu y_2 + x_2^{n_2} a(x_2)).$$

Applying the map gr_D to the last equation, we get

$$\lambda^{n_1} \frac{\mu^{m_2}}{\lambda^{n_2}} \bar{x}_2^{n_1} \bar{z}_2 = \mu^{m_2} \bar{y}_2^{m_2}.$$

On the other hand $\bar{x}_2^{n_2} \bar{z}_2 = \bar{y}_2^{m_2}$ (apply gr_D to $x_2^{n_2} z_2 = Q_2(x_2, y_2)$), the last two equations give $\lambda^{n_1} \frac{\mu^{m_2}}{\lambda^{n_2}} \bar{x}_2^{n_1} = \mu^{m_2} \bar{x}_2^{n_2}$ which means that $n_1 = n_2$. We could have obtained that $n_1 = n_2$ in this way: from $\lambda^{n_1} x_2^{n_1} \Psi(z_1) = Q_1(\lambda x_2, \mu y_2 + x_2^{n_2} a(x_2))$ we conclude that $\lambda^{n_1} x_2^{n_1} \partial(\Psi(z_1)) = \partial(y_2) H(x_2, y_2)$ where $\deg_{y_2} H < m_2$ and x_2 does not divide H . So $x_2^{n_1}$ divides $\partial(y_2) = x_2^{n_2}$ where ∂ is defined as in 4.1.1, which mean that $n_1 \leq n_2$. Since B_1 and B_2 play symmetric roles the equality follows. \square

REFERENCES

- [1] G. Freudenburg, *Algebraic Theory of Locally Nilpotent Derivation*, Encycl. Math. Sci., 136, Inv. Theory and Alg. Tr. Groups, VII, Springer-Verlag, 2006.
- [2] L. Makar-Limanov, *On the hypersurface $x + x^2 y + z^2 + t^3 = 0$ in \mathbb{C}^4 or a \mathbb{C}^3 -like threefold which is not \mathbb{C}^3* , Israel J. Math., 96 (1996), pp. 419-429.

- [3] L. Makar-Limanov, *On the group of automorphisms of a surface $x^n y = P(z)$* , Israel J. Math., 121 (2001), pp. 113–123.
- [4] Sh. Kaliman and L. Makar-Limanov, *AK-invariant of affine domains*, Affine Algebraic Geometry, 231–255, Osaka University Press, 2007.
- [5] Sh. Kaliman and L. Makar-Limanov, *On the Russell-Koras contractible three-folds*, J. Algebraic Geom., 6 no. 2 (1997), 247–268
- [6] D. Finston and S. Maubach, *Constructing (almost) rigid rings and a UFD having infinitely generated Derksen and Makar-Limanov invariant*, Canad. Math. Bull.
- [7] L. Makar-Limanov, *Locally nilpotent derivations, a new ring invariant and applications*, available at <http://www.math.wayne.edu/~lml/lmlnotes.pdf>.
- [8] A. Crachiola and L. Makar-Limanov, *An algebraic proof of a cancellation theorem for surfaces*, J. Algebra 320 (2008), no. 8, 3113–3119.
- [9] D. Daigle, *A necessary and sufficient condition for triangulability of derivation of $k[X, Y, Z]$* , J. Pure Appl. Algebra 113 (1996), 297–305.
- [10] P.-M. Poloni, *Sur les plongements des hypersurfaces de Danielewski*. These de doctorat. Universite de Bourgogne (2008).

BACHAR ALHAJJAR, INSTITUT DE MATHÉMATIQUES DE BOURGOGNE, UNIVERSITÉ DE BOURGOGNE, 9 AVENUE ALAIN SAVARY, BP 47870, 21078 DIJON, FRANCE.

E-mail address: `bachar.alhajjar@gmail.com`