

# DERIVATIONS AND CLOSED POLYNOMIALS IN POLYNOMIAL RINGS

TAKANORI NAGAMINE

ABSTRACT. In this paper, we study closed polynomials over an integral domain of characteristic zero and give a criterion for a non-constant polynomial to be a closed polynomial.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Let  $R$  be an integral domain with unit and let  $R[\mathbf{X}] := R[x_1, \dots, x_n]$  be the polynomial ring in  $n$  variables over  $R$ . We denote by  $Q(R)$  the quotient field of  $R$ . A non-constant polynomial  $f \in R[\mathbf{X}] \setminus R$  is a *closed polynomial* if the ring  $R[f]$  is integrally closed in  $R[\mathbf{X}]$ . An  $R$ -linear map  $D : R[\mathbf{X}] \rightarrow R[\mathbf{X}]$  is an  $R$ -derivation on  $R[\mathbf{X}]$  if  $D(fg) = fD(g) + gD(f)$  for  $f, g \in R[\mathbf{X}]$ . By using terms of derivations and their kernels, we can understand closed polynomials. The following result gives us a relation between closed polynomials and derivations and is a generalization of a part of [1, Theorem 1].

**Theorem 1.1.** (cf. [2, Theorem 3.1]) *Let  $R$  be an integral domain and  $K := Q(R)$ . For a non-constant polynomial  $f \in R[\mathbf{X}] \setminus R$  satisfying  $K[f] \cap R[\mathbf{X}] = R[f]$ , the following conditions are equivalent.*

- (1)  $f$  is a closed polynomial.
- (2) There are no polynomials  $g \in K[\mathbf{X}]$  with  $K[f] \subsetneq K[g]$ .

*If the characteristic of  $R$  equals zero, then the following condition (3) is equivalent to the condition (1).*

- (3) *There exist an  $R$ -derivation  $D$  on  $R[\mathbf{X}]$  such that  $\text{Ker } D = R[f]$ .*

Furthermore, closed polynomials relate the Jacobian conjecture as below. Let  $k$  be a field of characteristic zero and let  $k[\mathbf{X}] = k[x_1, \dots, x_n]$  be the polynomial ring in  $n$  variables over  $k$ . For polynomials  $f_1, \dots, f_n \in k[\mathbf{X}]$ , let  $F := (f_1, \dots, f_n)$ . Then  $F$  defines a  $k$ -endomorphism on  $k[\mathbf{X}]$  by  $F(x_i) = f_i$  for  $1 \leq i \leq n$ . We define the *Jacobian matrix* of  $F$  with respect to  $x_1, \dots, x_n$  by

---

*Key words and phrases.* Closed polynomials, Derivations.

$$J(F) := \begin{pmatrix} \frac{\partial f_1}{\partial x_1} & \cdots & \frac{\partial f_1}{\partial x_n} \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \frac{\partial f_n}{\partial x_1} & \cdots & \frac{\partial f_n}{\partial x_n} \end{pmatrix} \in k[\mathbf{X}].$$

Now we consider the following two conditions:

- (A)  $F$  defines a  $k$ -automorphism on  $k[\mathbf{X}]$ .
- (B)  $\det J(F)$  belongs to  $k \setminus \{0\}$ .

Jacobian conjecture says that the implication “(B)  $\Rightarrow$  (A)” holds true. If  $n = 1$ , then this conjecture is true. In the case where  $n \geq 2$ , however, this conjecture is still open. The following result gives us a relation between closed polynomials and this conjecture.

**Proposition 1.2.** *Let  $k$  be a field of characteristic zero. For polynomials  $f_1, \dots, f_n \in k[\mathbf{X}]$ , let  $F := (f_1, \dots, f_n)$ . If  $\det J(F) \in k \setminus \{0\}$ , then these polynomials  $f_1, \dots, f_n$  are closed polynomials.*

In this paper, we give a criterion for a polynomial  $f \in R[\mathbf{X}]$  to be a closed polynomial, in the case where  $R$  is an arbitrary integral domain of characteristic zero. The main result in this paper is Theorem 2.4. As a corollary of this theorem, we get Proposition 1.2.

## 2. CRITERIA FOR CLOSED POLYNOMIALS

Let  $R$  be an integral domain and let  $R[\mathbf{X}] = R[x_1, \dots, x_n]$  be the polynomial ring in  $n$  variables over  $R$ . For a polynomial  $f \in R[\mathbf{X}]$ ,

$$\hat{f} := \gcd(f_{x_1}, \dots, f_{x_n}),$$

where  $f_{x_i}$  is the partial derivative of  $f$  with respect to  $x_i$  and we take the greatest common divisor of  $f_{x_1}, \dots, f_{x_n}$  as polynomials in  $Q(R)[\mathbf{X}]$ . Now we represent  $f \in R[\mathbf{X}]$  as follows:

$$f = \sum_{\mathbf{a} \in (\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0})^n} u_{\mathbf{a}} x_1^{a_1} \cdots x_n^{a_n},$$

where  $u_{\mathbf{a}} \in R$  and  $\mathbf{a} = (a_1, \dots, a_n) \in (\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0})^n$ . We define the *support set* of  $f$  by  $\text{Supp}(f) := \{\mathbf{a} \in (\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0})^n \mid u_{\mathbf{a}} \neq 0\}$ . For  $\mathbf{w} = (w_1, \dots, w_n) \in (\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0})^n$ , we define the *weighted degree* of  $f$  with respect to  $\mathbf{w}$  by the maximal element of the set  $\{\mathbf{a} \cdot \mathbf{w} \mid \mathbf{a} \in \text{Supp}(f)\}$ , where  $\mathbf{a} \cdot \mathbf{w} = a_1 w_1 + \cdots + a_n w_n$  and denote by  $\deg_{\mathbf{w}}(f)$ . Note that the weighted degree of the zero-polynomial is  $-\infty$ . Also, we denote simply  $\deg(f)$  by the weighted degree of  $f$  with respect to  $(1, \dots, 1)$ .

**Remark 2.1.** For any  $\mathbf{w} \in (\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0})^n$ , the weighted degree of polynomials with respect to  $\mathbf{w}$  is a degree function on  $R[\mathbf{X}]$ . That is, for  $f, g \in R[\mathbf{X}]$ , the following conditions are satisfied.

- (1)  $\deg_{\mathbf{w}}(f) = -\infty$  if and only if  $f = 0$ .
- (2)  $\deg_{\mathbf{w}}(fg) = \deg_{\mathbf{w}}(f) + \deg_{\mathbf{w}}(g)$ .
- (3)  $\deg_{\mathbf{w}}(f + g) \leq \max\{\deg_{\mathbf{w}}(f), \deg_{\mathbf{w}}(g)\}$ .

**Definition 2.2.** Let  $f \in R[\mathbf{X}]$  and  $\mathbf{w} \in (\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0})^n$ . Assume that  $\deg_{\mathbf{w}}(f) \geq 2$ . Then we denote by  $N_{\mathbf{w}}(f)$  the smallest positive prime dividing  $\deg_{\mathbf{w}}(f)$ .

**Example 2.3.** For  $f = x^9 + x^6y^2 + x^3y^4 \in \mathbb{Z}[x, y]$ , we can easily see that  $\text{Supp}(f) = \{(9, 0), (6, 2), (3, 4)\}$ . Then,

- (1) for  $\mathbf{u} = (1, 1)$ ,  $\deg_{\mathbf{u}}(f) = \deg(f) = 9$  and  $N_{\mathbf{u}}(f) = 3$ ,
- (2) for  $\mathbf{v} = (0, 1)$ ,  $\deg_{\mathbf{v}}(f) = 4$  and  $N_{\mathbf{v}}(f) = 2$ ,
- (3) for  $\mathbf{w} = (1, 2)$ ,  $\deg_{\mathbf{w}}(f) = 11$  and  $N_{\mathbf{w}}(f) = 11$ .

In general, for given a polynomial  $f \in R[\mathbf{X}] \setminus R$ , it is difficult to understand whether  $f$  is a closed polynomial or not. The following gives a sufficient condition for  $f$  to be a closed polynomial and is the main theorem in this paper.

**Theorem 2.4.** (cf. [3, Proposition 3.11]) *Let  $R$  be an integral domain of characteristic zero and let  $f \in R[\mathbf{X}] \setminus R$  be a non-constant polynomial such that  $Q(R)[f] \cap R[\mathbf{X}] = R[f]$ . If there exists  $\mathbf{w} \in (\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0})^n$  such that  $\deg_{\mathbf{w}}(f) = 1$  or*

$$\deg_{\mathbf{w}}(f) \geq 2 \text{ and } \deg_{\mathbf{w}}(\hat{f}) < \frac{N_{\mathbf{w}}(f) - 1}{N_{\mathbf{w}}(f)} \deg_{\mathbf{w}}(f),$$

*then  $f$  is a closed polynomial.*

To show this theorem, we prepare the following lemma.

**Lemma 2.5.** *Let  $R$  be an integral domain. Let  $\mathbf{w} \in (\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0})^n$  and let  $f, g \in R[\mathbf{X}] \setminus R$  with  $f \in R[g]$ . Assume that  $\deg_{\mathbf{w}}(f) > 0$  and  $f = u(g)$  for a polynomial  $u(t) \in R[t]$  in one variable  $t$  of degree  $m \geq 1$ . Then the following assertions hold true.*

- (1)  $\deg_{\mathbf{w}}(f) = m \deg_{\mathbf{w}}(g)$ . In particular,  $m$  divides  $\deg_{\mathbf{w}}(f)$ .
- (2) If the characteristic of  $R$  equals zero, then

$$\deg_{\mathbf{w}}(\hat{f}) \geq \frac{m-1}{m} \deg_{\mathbf{w}}(f).$$

*Proof.* (1) For  $u_0 \in R \setminus \{0\}$  and  $u_1, \dots, u_m \in R$ ,

$$f = u(g) = u_0g^m + u_1g^{m-1} + \dots + u_{m-1}g + u_m.$$

Since  $\deg_{\mathbf{w}}(f) > 0$ ,  $\deg_{\mathbf{w}}(g) > 0$ . This implies that  $\deg_{\mathbf{w}}(g^i) \geq \deg_{\mathbf{w}}(g^j)$  if  $i \geq j$ . So,

$$\deg_{\mathbf{w}}(f) = \deg_{\mathbf{w}}(u(g)) = \deg_{\mathbf{w}}(u_0g^m) = m \deg_{\mathbf{w}}(g).$$

(2) Since  $f = u(g)$ ,  $f_{x_i} = u'(g)g_{x_i}$  for  $1 \leq i \leq n$ , where  $u'(t) = du/dt$ . This implies that each  $f_{x_i}$  is divided by  $u'(g)$ , so  $u'(g)$  divides  $\hat{f}$  as a polynomial defined over  $Q(R)$ . Therefore  $\deg_{\mathbf{w}}(\hat{f}) \geq \deg_{\mathbf{w}}(u'(g))$ . On the other hand, since the characteristic of  $R$  equals zero,  $mu_0 \neq 0$ . Therefore  $\deg_{\mathbf{w}} u'(g) = (m - 1) \deg_{\mathbf{w}}(g)$ , so we have

$$\deg_{\mathbf{w}}(\hat{f}) \geq \deg_{\mathbf{w}}(u'(g)) = (m - 1) \deg_{\mathbf{w}}(g) = \frac{m - 1}{m} \deg_{\mathbf{w}}(f).$$

□

Now, we start the proof of Theorem 2.4.

*Proof of Theorem 2.4.* Set  $K := Q(R)$ . By Theorem 1.1, we enough to show that for  $g \in K[\mathbf{X}]$  with  $K[f] \subset K[g]$ ,  $K[f] = K[g]$ .

Let  $g \in K[\mathbf{X}]$  with  $K[f] \subset K[g]$ . Since  $f \in K[g]$ , there exists  $u(t) \in K[t]$  of degree  $m$  such that  $f = u(g)$ . We write  $u(t)$  as

$$u(t) = u_0 t^m + u_1 t^{m-1} + \cdots + u_{m-1} t + u_m,$$

for some  $u_i \in K$  and  $u_0 \neq 0$ . By Lemma 2.5 (1),  $\deg_{\mathbf{w}}(f) = m \deg_{\mathbf{w}}(g)$ . We enough to show that  $m = 1$ . Indeed, if  $m = 1$ , then  $f = u_0 g + u_1$ . This implies  $g \in K[f]$ , so  $K[f] = K[g]$ .

If  $\deg_{\mathbf{w}}(f) = 1$ , then obviously  $m = 1$ . On the other hand, we suppose that  $\mathbf{w} \in (\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0})^n$  satisfies  $\deg_{\mathbf{w}}(f) \geq 2$  and

$$\deg_{\mathbf{w}}(\hat{f}) < \frac{N_{\mathbf{w}}(f) - 1}{N_{\mathbf{w}}(f)} \deg_{\mathbf{w}}(f).$$

Since the characteristic of  $R$  equals zero, by Lemma 2.5 (2),

$$\deg_{\mathbf{w}}(\hat{f}) \geq \frac{m - 1}{m} \deg_{\mathbf{w}}(f).$$

By comparing the above two inequalities, we have  $N_{\mathbf{w}}(f) > m$ . By using Lemma 2.5 (1) again, we see that  $m$  divides  $\deg_{\mathbf{w}}(f)$ . But the number  $N_{\mathbf{w}}(f)$  is the smallest positive prime dividing  $\deg_{\mathbf{w}}(f)$ , hence  $m = 1$ . Therefore  $f$  is a closed polynomial.

□

Next, we prove Proposition 1.2 by using Theorem 2.4.

*Proof of Proposition 1.2.* Suppose that  $\det J(F) \in k \setminus \{0\}$ , where  $F = (f_1, \dots, f_n)$ ,  $f_i \in k[\mathbf{X}]$  and  $k$  is a field of characteristic zero. Then there exist  $g_{ij} \in k[\mathbf{X}]$  such that

$$\frac{\partial f_i}{\partial x_j} = g_{ij} \hat{f}_i$$

for  $1 \leq i, j \leq n$ . Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} \det J(F) &= \sum_{\sigma \in S_n} \operatorname{sgn}(\sigma) \frac{\partial f_1}{\partial x_{\sigma(1)}} \cdots \frac{\partial f_n}{\partial x_{\sigma(n)}} \\ &= \sum_{\sigma \in S_n} \operatorname{sgn}(\sigma) g_{1\sigma(1)} \hat{f}_1 \cdots g_{n\sigma(n)} \hat{f}_n \\ &= (\hat{f}_1 \cdots \hat{f}_n) \cdot \sum_{\sigma \in S_n} \operatorname{sgn}(\sigma) g_{1\sigma(1)} \cdots g_{n\sigma(n)}, \end{aligned}$$

where  $S_n$  is the symmetric group on  $n$  elements. For each permutation  $\sigma \in S_n$ ,  $\operatorname{sgn}(\sigma)$  denotes the signature of  $\sigma$ . Since  $\det J(F) \in k \setminus \{0\}$ ,  $\hat{f}_i \in k \setminus \{0\}$ , so  $\deg(\hat{f}_i) = 0$  for  $1 \leq i \leq n$ . Therefore  $\hat{f}_i$  satisfies the inequality of Theorem 2.4 for  $\mathbf{w} = (1, \dots, 1)$  if  $\deg(f_i) \geq 2$ . Otherwise  $\deg(f_i) = 1$ . By Theorem 2.4,  $f_i$  is a closed polynomial for  $1 \leq i \leq n$ .  $\square$

**Proposition 2.6.** *Let  $k$  be a field of characteristic zero. For a non-constant polynomial  $f \in k[\mathbf{X}] \setminus k$ , the following conditions are equivalent.*

- (1)  $\deg(\hat{f}) = \deg(f) - 1$ .
- (2) *There exist  $r_1, \dots, r_n \in k$  with  $(r_1, \dots, r_n) \neq (0, \dots, 0)$  such that  $f \in k[r_1x_1 + \cdots + r_nx_n]$ .*

*Proof.* **(1)  $\Rightarrow$  (2)** There exist  $r_1, \dots, r_n \in k[\mathbf{X}]$  such that  $f_{x_i} = r_i \hat{f}$  for  $1 \leq i \leq n$ . We may assume that  $f_{x_1} \neq 0$ . Then

$$d - 1 = \deg(\hat{f}) \leq \deg(f_{x_1}) \leq d - 1,$$

so we have  $\deg(f_{x_1}) = d - 1 = \deg(\hat{f})$  and  $r_1 \in k \setminus \{0\}$ . For  $1 \leq i \leq n$  with  $f_{x_i} \neq 0$ , using the same argument, we have  $r_i \in k \setminus \{0\}$ . On the other hand, for  $1 \leq i \leq n$  with  $f_{x_i} = 0$ , we have  $r_i = 0$ . So  $r_i$  is either a non-zero constant polynomial or 0 for  $1 \leq i \leq n$ . Set  $g := r_1x_1 + \cdots + r_nx_n$ . By Theorem 2.4,  $g$  is a closed polynomial because  $\deg(g) = 1$ . Therefore, by Theorem 1.1, there exists a  $k$ -derivation  $D$  on  $k[\mathbf{X}]$  such that  $\operatorname{Ker} D = k[g]$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned} D(f) &= D(x_1)f_{x_1} + \cdots + D(x_n)f_{x_n} \\ &= D(x_1)r_1\hat{f} + \cdots + D(x_n)r_n\hat{f} \\ &= D(g) \cdot \hat{f} = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore  $f \in \operatorname{Ker} D = k[g]$ .

**(2)  $\Rightarrow$  (1)** Set  $g := r_1x_1 + \cdots + r_nx_n$ . Since  $f \in k[g]$ , there exists  $u(t) \in k[t]$  of degree  $\deg(f)$  with  $f = u(g)$ . Then  $f_{x_i} = r_i u'(g)$  for  $1 \leq i \leq n$ , where  $u'(t) = du(t)/dt$ . Then  $\deg(u'(g)) = \deg(f) - 1$  and  $u'(g)$  divides  $\hat{f}$ . So we have

$$\deg(u'(g)) \leq \deg(\hat{f}) \leq \deg(f) - 1.$$

Therefore  $\deg(\hat{f}) = \deg(f) - 1$ .  $\square$

**Remark 2.7.** In the proof of Proposition 2.6, we use a fundamental result on derivations. For an integral domain  $R$ , let  $D$  be an  $R$ -derivation on  $R[\mathbf{X}]$ . Then we can represent  $D$  as the following form:

$$D = D(x_1)\frac{\partial}{\partial x_1} + \cdots + D(x_n)\frac{\partial}{\partial x_n}.$$

**Corollary 2.8.** *Let  $k$  be a field of characteristic zero. For a non-constant polynomial  $f \in k[\mathbf{X}] \setminus k$  of degree prime, the following conditions are equivalent.*

- (1)  $f$  is a closed polynomial.
- (2)  $\deg(\hat{f}) < \deg(f) - 1$ .

*Proof.* **(1)  $\Rightarrow$  (2)** Suppose that  $\deg(\hat{f}) = \deg(f) - 1$ . By Proposition 2.6, there exist  $r_1, \dots, r_n \in k$  with  $(r_1, \dots, r_n) \neq (0, \dots, 0)$  such that  $f \in k[g]$ , where  $g := r_1x_1 + \cdots + r_nx_n$ . Since  $\deg(f)$  is prime, especially  $\deg(f) \geq 2$ ,  $k[f] \subsetneq k[g]$ . By Theorem 1.1,  $f$  is not a closed polynomial.

**(2)  $\Rightarrow$  (1)** Suppose that  $\deg(\hat{f}) < \deg(f) - 1$ . Since  $\deg(f)$  is prime,  $N_{\mathbf{w}}(f) = \deg(f)$ , where  $\mathbf{w} = (1, \dots, 1)$ . Then

$$\frac{N_{\mathbf{w}}(f) - 1}{N_{\mathbf{w}}(f)} \deg(f) = \frac{\deg(f) - 1}{\deg(f)} \deg(f) = \deg(f) - 1.$$

Therefore we have

$$\deg(\hat{f}) < \deg(f) - 1 = \frac{N_{\mathbf{w}}(f) - 1}{N_{\mathbf{w}}(f)} \deg(f).$$

By Theorem 2.4,  $f$  is a closed polynomial.  $\square$

From this, when you want to check the closedness of polynomial of degree prime, we only have to calculate  $\hat{f}$ .

## REFERENCES

- [1] I. V. Arzhantsev and A. P. Petravchuk, Closed polynomials and saturated subalgebras of polynomial algebras, *Ukrainian Math. J.*, **59** (2007), 1783–1790.
- [2] H. Kojima and T. Nagamine, Closed polynomials in polynomial rings over integral domains, *J. Pure Appl. Algebra*, **219** (2015), 5493–5499.
- [3] T. Nagamine, Derivations having divergence zero and closed polynomials over domains, *J. Algebra*, **462** (2016), 67–76.

(T. Nagamine) GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY, NIIGATA UNIVERSITY, 8050 IKARASHININOCHO, NISHI-KU, NIIGATA 950-2181, JAPAN

*E-mail address:* t.nagamine14@m.sc.niigata-u.ac.jp