

# Math 518 Assignment 2

Guo Haoyang

October 2025

## Contents

### 1 Solutions

2

# Solutions

1 (a) •  $I = \ker \alpha$ :  $I \subseteq \ker \alpha$  because  $\alpha(x^2 - y^3) = 0$  and  $\alpha(y^2 - z^3) = 0$ .

$\ker \alpha \subseteq I$ . Suppose  $f \in \ker \alpha$ . Then,  $f = q_1 \cdot (x^2 - y^3) + q_2 \cdot (y^2 - z^3) + r(x, y, z)$ . By quotienting  $I$ , all terms containing  $x^2$  and  $y^2$  can be eliminated by  $x^2 = y^3$  and  $y^2 = z^3$ . So, take a representative  $r$  of  $\bar{r} \in k[V]/I$ ,  $r$  can be written as

$$r(x, y, z) = R_1(y, z) + xR_2(y, z)$$

But,  $f \in \ker \alpha \Rightarrow \alpha(f) = \alpha(r(x, y, z)) = r(t^9, t^6, t^4) = R_1(t^6, t^4) + t^9 R_2(t^6, t^4) = 0$ . If this polynomial over  $t$  is a zero polynomial, every term should have zero coefficient. But notice that all terms in  $R_1(t^6, t^4)$  must be even degrees and all terms in  $t^9 R_2(t^6, t^4)$  must be odd degrees. So, both  $R_1$  and  $R_2$  must be zero polynomials. Whence,  $f \in I$ .

• To show  $I$  is prime, it suffices to show that  $k[x, y, z]/I$  is an integral domain. But by the isomorphism theorem,  $k[x, y, z]/I = k[x, y, z]/\ker \alpha \cong \text{im } \alpha = k[t^9, t^6, t^4]$  which is a subring of the integral domain  $k[t]$ . Hence,  $k[x, y, z]/I$  is an integral domain.

(b)  $\alpha : k[x, y, z] \rightarrow k[t]$  induces a map  $\bar{\alpha} : k[V] := k[x, y, z]/I \rightarrow k[t]$  illustrated by the following diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} k[x, y, z] & \xrightarrow{\pi} & k[x, y, z]/I \\ & \searrow \alpha & \downarrow \bar{\alpha} \\ & & k[t] \end{array}$$

Notice that  $k[\mathbb{A}^1(k)] = k[t]/I(\mathbb{A}^1(k)) = k[t]/\{0\} = k[t]$ . So,  $\phi : \mathbb{A}^1(k) \rightarrow V(I)$  induces a map  $\phi^* : k[V] \rightarrow k[t]$ . Now we have to regulate  $\phi$  to meet the requirement  $\phi^* = \bar{\alpha}$ . First, notice that  $\forall f \in k[V]$ ,  $\bar{\alpha}(f)(x, y, z) = f(t^9, t^6, t^4)$ . Second,  $\phi^*(f)(x, y, z) = f(\phi(t))$ . Hence,

$$f(\phi(t)) = \phi^*(f)(x, y, z) = \bar{\alpha}(f)(x, y, z) = f(t^9, t^6, t^4)$$

which suggests a way to define  $\phi$  by  $t \mapsto (t^9, t^6, t^4)$ .

$\phi$  is one-to-one, for  $(t^9, t^6, t^4) = (0, 0, 0) \Rightarrow t = 0$ .

$\phi$  is onto, because for any  $(x, y, z) \in V(I)$  (i.e.  $(x, y, z) \in \mathbb{A}^3(k)$ , such that  $x^2 = y^3$  and  $y^2 = z^3$ ), if  $z \neq 0$ , let  $t = \frac{x}{z^2}$ ; if  $z = 0$  let  $t = 0$ .

Suppose that  $\phi$  is an isomorphism. Then,  $\phi^* = \bar{\alpha}$  should also be an isomorphism. But,  $\text{im } \phi^* = k[t^9, t^6, t^4] \subsetneq k[t]$ , contradiction.

2(a) On  $V(x^2 + y^2 - 1)$ ,  $\frac{1-\bar{y}}{\bar{x}}$  has an equivalent representation  $\frac{\bar{x}}{1+\bar{y}}$ . The first representation gives candidates for non-regular points:  $(0, \pm 1)$ .  $(0, 1)$  is regular for the second representation, while  $(0, -1)$  is not regular for the second one. So, the regular points of  $V$  are  $V(x^2 + y^2 - 1) \setminus \{(0, -1)\}$ .

(b) On  $V(xw - yz)$ ,  $\frac{\bar{x}}{\bar{y}} = \frac{\bar{z}}{\bar{w}}$ , where  $=$  means equivalent representations. For the first representative to be regular,  $y \neq 0$ . For the second one to be regular,  $w \neq 0$ . So, all the regular points of  $V$  are  $\{(x, y, w, z) : (y, w) \neq (0, 0)\}$ .

3 (a) Let  $F = x^4 + y^4 - x^2y^2$ ,  $G = x^3 + y^3 - 3x^2 - 3y^2 + 3xy + 1$ . Singular points of a curve are the points in the vanishing set of its all partial derivatives.

• To find singular points of  $F$ , compute  $F_x := \frac{\partial F}{\partial x} = 2x(2x^2 - y^2)$  and  $F_y := \frac{\partial F}{\partial y} = 2y(2y^2 - x^2)$ . So all singular points are points in  $V(F_x, F_y)$ .  $F_x = 0$  gives those points  $(x_0, y_0)$  such that  $x_0 = 0$  and  $y_0^2 = 2x_0^2$ . Plugging those two kinds of solutions into  $F_y = 0$  yields the only solution  $(0, 0)$ . Since this point is on the curve, then  $(0, 0)$  is the only singular points of  $F$ .

• The process of finding singular points of  $G$  is similar. First compute  $G_x = x^2 - 2x + y$  and  $G_y = y^2 - 2y + x$ . For some solution  $(x_0, y_0) \in V(G_x, G_y)$ . Plugging  $G_x(x_0, y_0) = 0$  into  $G_y(x_0, y_0) = 0$  to eliminate all  $y_0$ , we have  $x_0(x_0 - 1)(x_0^2 - 3x_0 + 3) = 0$ . Solutions are  $x_0 = 0, 1, \frac{3 \pm \sqrt{3}i}{2}$ . The only one  $(x_0, y_0) \in V(G_x, G_y)$  and on  $G$  is  $(1, 1)$ . So,  $(1, 1)$  is the only singular point of  $G$ .

(b) Now let's suppose that  $F$  is an irreducible plane curve. Suppose that the collection of singular points of  $V(F, F_x, F_y)$  contains  $V(F)$ . Then, every points on  $F$  are singular points. So,  $V(F_x), V(F_y) \subseteq V(F)$  implies that  $F_x, F_y \in \langle F \rangle$ . Hence,  $F|F_x$  and  $F|F_y$ . But, the degrees of  $F_x$  and  $F_y$  are both  $\deg F - 1$  (on the field of characteristic 0). So, it is impossible that  $F|F_x$  nor  $F|F_y$ . Here we get a contradiction. So,  $V(F, F_x, F_y) \subsetneq V(F)$ .

When  $F_x \neq 0$  and  $F_y \neq 0$ ,  $F$  is irreducible  $\Rightarrow F_x$  and  $F_y$  does not have a common factor, which means that  $V(F, F_x, F_y)$  is a finite set.

When  $F_x = 0$  or  $F_y = 0$ , wlog, suppose that  $F_x = 0$ , then  $F$  only depends on  $y$ . If  $F$  is irreducible, then  $F(y) = y - c$  for some  $c \in k$ , which does not have any singularities.

4. If  $x = 0$ , then  $xy = xyz = 0$ . So the image of  $(x, y, z) \mapsto (x, xy, xyz)$  is  $S := \{(u, v, w) \in \mathbb{A}^3(k) : u \neq 0\} \cup \{(0, 0, 0)\}$ . Notice that  $U := \{(u, v, w) : u \neq 0\}$  is an (Zariski) open set in  $\mathbb{A}^3(k)$  because its complement  $\mathbb{A}^3(k) \setminus S = V(u)$  is determined by an Zariski closed set.

- $S$  is not Zariski closed because if it were,  $\overline{S} = S \subsetneq \mathbb{A}^3(k)$ . But any Zariski open set is dense,  $U \subseteq S \Rightarrow \mathbb{A}^3(k) = \overline{U} = \overline{S}$ , contradiction.

- $S$  is not Zariski open. Consider  $T := \mathbb{A}^3(k) \setminus S = \{(0, v, w) : (v, w) \neq (0, 0)\}$ . Notice that  $T \subsetneq V(u)$ . Suppose  $S$  is open, then  $T$  is closed and  $T$  must be determined by some certain set  $J \subseteq k[x, y, z]$  of polynomials. On one hand,  $V(J)$  is closed and then  $\overline{T} = \overline{V(J)} = V(J) = T$ . On the other hand,  $T$  is dense in  $V(u)$ . This is because  $\mathbb{A}^3(k) - \{(0, 0, 0)\}$  is open in  $\mathbb{A}^3(k)$  (because its complement is the vanishing set of  $k[x, y, z]$ ) and  $\overline{\mathbb{A}^3(k) - \{(0, 0, 0)\}} = \mathbb{A}^3(k)$ . Therefore,  $\overline{V(J)} = \mathbb{A}^3(k) - \{(0, 0, 0)\} \cap V(u) = \mathbb{A}^3(k) \cap V(u)$ . Hence,  $\overline{T} = V(u)$ , contradiction.

- $S$  is Zariski dense because of what is stated in 'not Zariski closed part',  $\mathbb{A}^3(k) = \overline{U} = \overline{S}$ .

5. All elements of  $\mathcal{O}_q(W)$  are rational functions that are regular at  $q$ . Hence, each of them is of the form  $\frac{g}{h}$  with  $g, h \in k[W]$  and  $h(q) \neq 0$ .

Define the extension  $\Phi^* : \mathcal{O}_q(W) \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_p(V)$  of  $\phi^*$  to be

$$\Phi^* : \mathcal{O}_q(W) \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_p(V) \quad \frac{g}{h} \mapsto \frac{\phi^*(g)}{\phi^*(h)}$$

- This  $\Phi^*$  is well-defined because  $\phi^*(g), \phi^*(h) \in k[V]$  and  $\phi^*(h)(p) = h(\phi(p)) = h(q) \neq 0$ .
- $\Phi^*$  is a ring homomorphism from properties of  $\phi^*$  and properties of fraction fields.
- The extension  $\Phi^*$  is unique. Suppose there is another extension  $\Psi^* : \mathcal{O}_q(W) \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_p(V)$ , then for any  $\frac{g}{h} \in \mathcal{O}_q(W)$ ,

$$\Psi^*\left(\frac{g}{h}\right) = \Psi^*(g)\Psi^*(h)^{-1} \quad \Psi^* \text{ is also a ring homomorphism} \quad (1)$$

$$= \phi^*(g)\phi^*(h)^{-1} \quad \Psi^* \text{ is an extension of } \phi^* \quad (2)$$

$$= \Phi^*(g)\Phi^*(h)^{-1} \quad \Phi^* \text{ is an extension of } \phi^* \quad (3)$$

$$= \Phi^*\left(\frac{g}{h}\right) \quad (4)$$

Hence,  $\Psi^*$  and  $\Phi^*$  agrees on every elements of  $\mathcal{O}_q(W)$  implying that  $\Psi^* = \Phi^*$ .

Recall  $\mathfrak{m}_q(W) = \{f \in \mathcal{O}_q(W) : f(q) = 0\}$ .  $\forall f \in \mathfrak{m}_q(W)$ , choose an representative of  $f = \frac{g}{h}$ . So,  $f(q) = 0 \Leftrightarrow g(q) = 0$ . Then,

$$\Phi^*(f)(p) = \frac{\phi^*(g)(p)}{\phi^*(h)(p)} = \frac{g(q)}{h(q)} = 0 \quad \Rightarrow \quad \Phi^*(f) \in \mathfrak{m}_p(V)$$

which implies that  $\Phi^*(\mathfrak{m}_q(W)) \subseteq \mathfrak{m}_p(V)$ .