16 Friday, March 11, 2011

Finite group action on an integrally closed finite-type domain $B, A = B^G$, (has the?) invariants

 $\max A \leftrightarrow G$ -orbit in $\max B$

A is finite type and integrally closed

B is a finite A-module

Definition. A is normal if it's integrally closed in the field of fractions of A (i.e., it's own fraction field).

Theorem. Let G be a finite group that acts on an integrally closed finite-type domain B, $A = B^G$. Then

- PSpec $A \leftrightarrow (PSpec B)/G$
- This preserves inclusions. More formally, If $P \leftrightarrow orbit \{Q_j\}$ and $P' \leftrightarrow orbit \{Q'_i\}$, then $P \subset P'$ if and only if $\forall j \exists i$ such that $Q_j \subset Q'_i$.

We have $Q \rightsquigarrow A \cap Q$, Spec $B \rightarrow \operatorname{Spec} A$

Lemma. Let Q_1, \ldots, Q_m ; Q'_1, \ldots, Q'_n be prime ideals of B. Suppose $Q_j \not\subset any Q'_i$, $j = 1, \ldots, m$, $i = 1, \ldots, n$. Then there exists $\alpha \in B$, $\alpha \in Q_1, \ldots, Q_m$, $\alpha \notin Q'_1, \ldots, Q'_n$.

Proof. Plan: Solve for a single Q_j . Find $\alpha_j \in Q_j, \notin Q'_1, \ldots, Q'_n$. Then the product $(\alpha_1 \cdots \alpha_m)$ works; $\alpha_1 \cdots \alpha_m \in Q'_i \Longrightarrow \text{some } \alpha_j \in Q'_i$. This would be a contradiction.

Take
$$Q_1 = Q, Q'_1, \dots, Q'_n, \alpha \in Q, \notin Q'_i$$
.
 $\alpha = \beta_i \in Q, \notin Q'_i, i = 1, \dots, \beta_1 \dots \beta_n \in Q. \dots \text{(Proof not included)}$

Proof. (of theorem)

In C:

$$B \xrightarrow{\sigma} B$$

$$A \xrightarrow{\text{id}} A$$

Since Q is a prime ideal of B and $P = A \cap Q$, we have that σQ is a prime ideal of B and $P = A \cap \sigma Q$. Then an orbit of Q corresponds to one point in PSpec A. By the lying over theorem, Spec $B \to \operatorname{Spec} A$ is surjective. Therefore $(\operatorname{Spec} B)/G \to \operatorname{Spec} A$ is also surjective.

Injective: $\{Q_1,\ldots,Q_m\}, \{Q'_1,\ldots,Q'_n\}$ distinct orbits. $A\cap Q_j=P, A\cap Q'_i=P'$, show $P\neq P'$.

Claim. We can't have $Q_i \subset Q'_j$ for some i, j and also $Q'_k \subset Q_\ell$ for some k, ℓ .

Proof. We can renumber, i = j = 1. $Q'_k \subset Q_\ell \implies \sigma Q'_k \subset \sigma Q_\ell$. We may then assume that $\ell = 1$; since σ runs through the whole orbit, we can choose an appropriate σ .

Then $Q_1 \subset Q_1'$, $Q_k' \subset Q_1$. Then $Q_k' \subset Q_1 \subset Q_1'$. Then $Q_k' \subset Q_1'$. Thus k = 1, because $Q_k' = \sigma Q_1'$ for some σ (and permutations can't take sets to proper subsets of themselves). Then $Q_1' \subset Q_1 \subset Q_1'$, so $Q_1 = Q_1'$. This is a contradiction, since orbits are disjoint. Thus, we may suppose that $Q_j \not\subset Q_i'$ for any i, j.

There exists an $\alpha \in Q_1 \cap \cdots \cap Q_m$, $\notin Q_i'$. Take $\gamma = \prod_{\sigma} \sigma \alpha$, $\gamma \in Q_j$, $\notin Q_i'$, and $\gamma \in A$. Thus, $\gamma \in P$, $\notin P'$, so $P \neq P'$.

The proof of the second point is skipped (See notes that Prof. Artin posted). \Box

Let B be a finite A-module for a normal A.



$$P' = A \cap Q', P = A \cap Q$$

Theorem (Going Up). In the diagram above, given P, P', Q, there exists a Q'.

Theorem (Going Down). In the diagram above, given P, P', Q', there exists a Q.

Proof. Let K be the fraction field of A and L be the fraction field of B.

Case 1: L/K is Galois, has Galois group G(?). B is normal.

 σ acts on B: The elements of B are integral of A. If β is integral, so is $\sigma\beta$. Then, since B is normal, B is the integral closure of A in B. Thus, B0 is the integral closure of B1.

 $A = B^G$. (We know that B is a finite B^G -module.): $A \subset B^G$ and A is normal. Since B is integral over A, B^G is integral over A, so $A = B^G$.

Then the theorem follows from the previous theorem.

Case 2: (general case): L/G not Galois, and/or B not normal: Put $L \subset F$ a Galois extension of K with Galois group G. Let C be the integral closure of A in F. This is a finite A-module. Then G operates on C. Then $A = C^G$ (by the same reasoning as in case 1).

$$A \xrightarrow{} B \xrightarrow{} C$$

$$P' \qquad Q' \qquad R'$$

$$P \qquad R$$

By lying over, there exists a prime ideal R', $B \cap R' = Q'$. Case 1 says that there exists an R. Then $A \cap R = P$. Put $Q = B \cap R$.