

# Math 137 Problem Set 5

Lev Kruglyak

April 21, 2022

Throughout,  $K$  is assumed to be an algebraically closed field. I collaborated with AJ LaMotta.

**Problem 1.** Let  $f \in K[X_1, \dots, X_n]$ . Show that if

$$\mathcal{V}\left(f, \frac{\partial f}{\partial X_1}, \dots, \frac{\partial f}{\partial X_n}\right) = \emptyset,$$

then the polynomial  $f$  is squarefree.

Suppose  $f = g^2h$  for  $g, h \in K[X_1, \dots, X_n]$ . Then

$$\frac{\partial f}{\partial x_i} = \frac{\partial g^2}{\partial x_i}h + g^2 \frac{\partial h}{\partial x_i} = 2g \frac{\partial g}{\partial x_i}h + g^2 \frac{\partial h}{\partial x_i} = g \left( 2 \frac{\partial g}{\partial x_i}h + g \frac{\partial h}{\partial x_i} \right) = gh_i.$$

for some  $h_i \in K[X_1, \dots, X_n]$ . We can assume that  $\frac{\partial f}{\partial x_i} \neq 0$  without loss of generality, so we know that  $\mathcal{V}(g^2h, gh_1, \dots, gh_n) = \emptyset$ . However this means that  $g$  has no roots, yet since  $K$  is algebraically closed,  $g$  must be a constant polynomial. This proves that  $f$  is squarefree.

**Problem 2.** Show that every monomial order  $\leq$  on  $\mathcal{S}(X_1, \dots, X_n)$  is a well-order.

Let  $\leq$  is a monomial order, suppose for the sake of contradiction that  $\leq$  isn't a well order. By definition this means that there is an infinitely descending chain of monomials, i.e. monomials  $M_1, M_2, \dots$  with  $M_1 > M_2 > \dots$ . Now letting  $I_n = (M_1, \dots, M_n)$  be the ideal generated by the first  $n$  monomials, we know that  $M_{n+1} \notin I_n$  because otherwise  $M_{n+1} = c_1M_1 + \dots + c_nM_n$  so  $M_{n+1}$  would be divisible by a greater monomial in the order  $M_i$ . Then  $M_{n+1} = RM_i$  for some monomial  $R$ , which implies that  $M_{n+1} < RM_i = M_{n+1}$  which is clearly contradictory. However this contradiction gives rise to an infinite increasing chain of ideals  $I_1 \subset I_2 \subset \dots$ , which is impossible since  $K[X_1, \dots, X_n]$  is a Noetherian ring.

**Problem 3.** Let  $G$  be a Gröbner basis of  $I \subseteq K[X_1, \dots, X_n]$ . Show that the set  $\mathcal{V}(I)$  is finite if and only if for all  $1 \leq i \leq n$ , there is an element  $g \in G$  such that  $\text{lm}(g) = X_i^t$  for some  $t \geq 0$ .

To prove the forward direction, suppose  $\mathcal{V}(I)$  is finite. Then we have

$$\sqrt{I} \ni (X_i - a_1) \cdots (X_i - a_m)$$

where  $a_1, \dots, a_m$  are the  $i$ -th coordinates of points in  $\mathcal{V}(I)$ . Then the leading monomial of this polynomial is  $X_i^m$ . Recall that there is some  $t$  such that  $I \supset (\sqrt{I})^t$  so there is a polynomial in  $I$  with leading monomial  $X_i^{tm}$ . Since  $G$  is a Gröbner basis, there must be a  $g$  with  $\text{lm}(g) = X_i^{tm}$ . We can do this for every  $X_i$ , so we are done.

To prove the backward direction, suppose that  $\text{lm}(g_i) = X_i^{a_i}$  for a collection of Gröbner bases  $g_1, \dots, g_n$ . Then the standard monomials of  $I$  are of the form  $X_i^{b_i}$  with  $b_i < a_i$ . This is a finite collection, so by Corollary 8.3 the vanishing locus of  $I$  must be finite as well.

**Problem 4.**

a) Let  $a, b > 0$  and consider the set

$$V = \{(x, y) \in \mathbb{Z}^2 : x, y \geq 0 \text{ and } ax + by \leq 1\}.$$

Fix any monomial ordering. Show that  $X^r Y^s$  is a standard monomial for  $\mathcal{I}(V)$  if and only if  $(r, s) \in V$ .

b) What is the smallest (total) degree  $d$  of a nonzero polynomial  $f \in \mathcal{I}(V)$ ?

(a) First, let  $(r, s) \in V$ . Let  $A = \{0, 1, \dots, r\}$ , and  $B = \{0, 1, \dots, s\}$ . Applying the combinatorial Nullstellensatz to  $A \times B$ , we conclude that  $X^r Y^s$  is a standard monomial for  $\mathcal{I}(A \times B)$ . However note that  $\mathcal{I}(V) \subset \mathcal{I}(A \times B)$  since  $A \times B \subset V$ , so a standard monomial for  $\mathcal{I}(A \times B)$  is also a standard monomial for  $\mathcal{I}(V)$ . Since  $V$  is finite of size  $(1 + \lfloor 1/a \rfloor)(1 + \lfloor 1/b \rfloor)$  so there are  $|V|$  standard monomials in  $\mathcal{I}(V)$ , and they are all exactly of the form  $X^r Y^s$ .

(b) We claim that  $d = \min(\lfloor 1/a \rfloor, \lfloor 1/b \rfloor) + 1$ . We've seen in  $A$  that the leading monomial of any nonzero  $f \in \mathcal{I}(V)$  must be of the form  $X^r Y^s$  with  $(r, s) \notin V$ , this means that  $ar + bs > 1$ . The smallest degree (with respect to lexicographic ordering) is  $d = \min\{x + y \mid ax + by > 1\}$ . However this quantity is straightforwardly proven to be  $\min(\lfloor 1/a \rfloor, \lfloor 1/b \rfloor) + 1$ , as desired.

**Problem 5.** Let  $\leq$  be any monomial order on  $K[X_1, \dots, X_n]$  and let  $0 \neq f, g \in K[X_1, \dots, X_n]$ . Show that if  $\gcd(\text{lm}(f), \text{lm}(g)) = 1$ , then 0 is a reduction of

$$S(f, g) = \frac{M}{\text{lt}(f)} \cdot f - \frac{M}{\text{lt}(g)} \cdot g$$

with respect to  $\{f, g\}$ , where  $M = \text{lcm}(\text{lm}(f), \text{lm}(g)) = \text{lm}(fg)$ .

Let's express the polynomials  $f$  and  $g$  as  $f = \sum_{i=1}^k a_i M_i$  and  $g = \sum_{i=1}^\ell b_i N_i$  for some nonzero coefficients. Let's further assume without loss of generality that  $M_1 < M_2 < \dots < M_k$  and  $N_1 < N_2 < \dots < N_\ell$ , so that  $\text{lm}(f) = M_k$  and  $\text{lm}(g) = N_\ell$ . Then we have

$$S(f, g) = \left( \sum_{i=1}^k \frac{a_i}{a_k} N_\ell M_i \right) - \left( \sum_{i=1}^\ell \frac{b_i}{b_\ell} M_k N_i \right).$$

Now note that if  $N_\ell M_i = M_k N_j$  for some  $j < \ell$  then we have  $N_\ell \mid M_k N_j$ , and since  $N_\ell$  is coprime to  $M_k$  we have  $N_\ell \mid N_j$ . This is a contradiction since  $j < \ell$ . We get the same thing if we consider the  $M$  side, so the terms coming from  $M$  all cancel. Next, consider the identity

$$S(f, g) = \left( \frac{\text{lt}(g) - g}{\text{lc}(f)\text{lc}(g)} \right) f + \left( \frac{f - \text{lt}(f)}{\text{lc}(f)\text{lc}(g)} \right) g.$$

Notice then that if the first summand is nonzero, we have

$$\text{lm} \left( \left( \frac{\text{lt}(g) - g}{\text{lc}(f)\text{lc}(g)} \right) f \right) = \text{lm}(\text{lt}(g) - g)\text{lm}(f) \leq \text{lm}(S(f, g)).$$

However  $S(f, g) = 0$ , so repeating the same argument for the second summand, we have that 0 is a reduction of  $S(f, g)$  with respect to  $\{f, g\}$ .