

# Algebraic Geometry 1 - Assignment 5

Matteo Durante, 2303760, Leiden University

27th November 2018

## Exercise 7.9.12

Furthermore, we will use the fact that  $v_y(fg) = v_y(f) + v_y(g)$  and therefore  $v_y(f^n) = n \cdot v_y(f)$ .

(i) Notice that, by [1, ex. 7.3.6], since  $\mathcal{O}_U(U) = A = \mathbb{K}[x, y]/(f)$ ,  $\Omega^1(U) \cong \Omega_A^1 \cong (A \cdot dx \oplus A \cdot dy)/(A \cdot df)$ .

Now, since  $f = -y^n + x^{n-1} - 1$ ,  $df = -ny^{n-1}dy + (n-1)x^{n-2}dx$ .

In  $\Omega^1(U)$ , this implies that  $(n-1)x^{n-2}dx = ny^{n-1}dy$ .

(iii) By [1, ex. 7.9.10], it is sufficient to prove that, given  $P = (x_P, y_P) \in U \cap D(x)$ ,  $(\partial f/\partial x)(P) \neq 0$ , from which will follow that  $y - y(P)$  is a uniformizer of  $U$  at  $P$ .

By definition, a point  $P$  lying there is s.t.  $x_P \neq 0$ , hence  $(\partial f/\partial x)(P) = (n-1)x_P^{n-2} \neq 0$  and we are done.

(iv) Again, we only have to prove that  $(\partial f/\partial y)(P) \neq 0$  for every  $P = (x_P, y_P) \in U \cap D(y)$ .

By definition, a point  $P$  lying there is s.t.  $y_P \neq 0$ , hence  $(\partial f/\partial y)(P) = -ny_P^{n-1} \neq 0$  and we are done.

(v) We may distinguish among two cases:  $P \in U \cap D(x)$  and  $P \in U \cap D(y)$ .

In the former, since  $\omega_0 = \frac{dy}{(n-1)x^{n-2}}$  and  $y - y(P)$  is a uniformizer of  $U$  at  $P$ , having  $\omega_0 = g \cdot dy$  for  $g = \frac{1}{(n-1)x^{n-2}} \in K(X)$ , we have that  $v_P(\omega_0) = v_P(g)$ .

Furthermore,  $g$  is a rational function well defined on  $U \cap D(x)$  and  $\neq 0$  for every  $P \in U \cap D(x)$ , therefore  $g \in \mathcal{O}_U(U)$ . It follows that  $g = (y - y(P))^0 g$  and thus  $v_P(\omega_0) = v_P(g) = 0$ .

In the latter, since  $\omega_0 = \frac{dx}{ny^{n-1}}$  and  $x - x(P)$  is a uniformizer of  $U$  at  $P$ , having  $\omega_0 = g \cdot dx$  for  $g = \frac{1}{ny^{n-1}} \in K(X)$ , we have that  $v_P(\omega_0) = v_P(g)$ .

Furthermore,  $g$  is a rational function well defined on  $U \cap D(y)$  and  $\neq 0$  for every  $P \in U \cap D(y)$ , therefore  $g \in \mathcal{O}_U(U)$ . It follows that  $g = (x - x(P))^0 g$  and thus  $v_P(\omega_0) = v_P(g) = 0$ .

(ii) We see that  $\omega_0$  has no poles in  $U = (U \cap D(x)) \cup (U \cap D(y))$ , for it has order 0 at every point  $P \in U$ .

(vi)  $Q \in X \cap Z(x_2) \subset X \cap U_0$ , hence we may work with  $A = \mathcal{O}_X(X \cap U_0) \cong \mathbb{K}[x_{01}, x_{02}]/(x_{01}^n + x_{02}^n - x_{02}) \cong \mathbb{K}[u, v]/(u^n + v^n - v)$  under the isomorphism induced by  $\phi_0$ . In particular,  $\phi_0(Q) = (0, 0) \in Z(u^n + v^n - v) \subset \mathbb{A}_{\mathbb{K}}^2$ . Notice that  $X = (X \cap U_2) \cup \{Q\}$ .

We will show that  $u = u - u(0, 0)$  ( $x_{01} = x_{01} - x_{01}(Q)$ ) is a uniformizer of  $Z(u^n + v^n - v)$  ( $X \cap U_0$ , and hence  $X$ ) at  $(0, 0) = \phi_0(Q)$  ( $Q$ ) by applying again [1, ex. 7.9.10].

Indeed, given  $f := u^n + v^n - v$ ,  $\partial f/\partial v = -1 \neq 0$  and the thesis follows.

(vii) Remember that  $\mathcal{O}_X(X \cap U_0) \cong \mathbb{K}[x_{01}, x_{02}]/(x_{01}^n + x_{02}^n - x_{02})$  and  $x = x_{20} = x_{02}^{-1}$ ,  $y = x_{21} = x_{01}x_{20} = x_{01}x_{02}^{-1}$ .

Notice that  $x_{02}(1 - x_{02}^{n-1}) = x_{01}^n$ , hence  $x_{02} = \frac{x_{01}^n}{1 - x_{02}^{n-1}} = x_{01}^n \frac{1}{1 - x_{02}^{n-1}}$  and  $x = x_{01}^{-n} \cdot (1 - x_{02}^{n-1})$ .

Since  $1 - x_{02}^{n-1} \in \mathcal{O}(X \cap U_0)$  and  $(1 - x_{02}^{n-1})(Q) \neq 0$ , we get that  $v_Q(x) = -n$ .

In the same way,  $y = x_{01}^{-(n-1)} \cdot (1 - x_{02}^{n-1})$ , hence  $v_Q(y) = -(n-1)$ .

(viii) Remembering that  $\omega_0 = \frac{dx}{ny^{n-1}} = \frac{dy}{(n-1)x^{n-2}}$  and having  $x = v^{-1}$  and  $y = uv^{-1}$  on  $X \cap U_0$ , we get the following:

$$\begin{aligned}\omega_0 &= \frac{dx}{ny^{n-1}} = \frac{d(v^{-1})}{nu^{n-1}(v^{-1})^{n-1}} \\ &= -\frac{v^{n-3}}{nu^{n-1}}dv \\ \omega_0 &= \frac{dy}{(n-1)x^{n-2}} = \frac{d(uv^{-1})}{(n-1)(v^{-1})^{n-2}} = -\frac{v^{n-4}u}{n-1}dv + \frac{v^{n-3}}{n-1}du \\ &= \frac{u}{(n-1)v}nu^{n-1}\omega_0 + \frac{v^{n-3}}{n-1}du \\ \omega_0 &= \frac{v^{n-2}}{(n-1)v - nu^n}du = \frac{v^{n-2}}{(n-1)v + nv^n - nu}du = \frac{(1 - u^{n-1})v^{n-2}}{(1 - u^{n-1})((n-1)v + nv^n - nu)}du \\ &= \frac{(1 - u^{n-1})v^{n-3}}{(1 - u^{n-1})((n-1) + nv^{n-1}) - nv^{n-1}}du\end{aligned}$$

Now,  $v_Q(\omega_0) = v_Q(v^{n-3} \frac{1-u^{n-1}}{(1-u^{n-1})((n-1)+nv^{n-1})-nv^{n-1}}du)$ . Notice that  $\frac{(1-u^{n-1})}{(1-u^{n-1})((n-1)+nv^{n-1})-nv^{n-1}}$  is a rational function which is well defined and non-zero in  $Q$ , hence regular on a neighbourhood.

Remembering that  $v = x^{-1}$ , it follows that  $v_Q(\omega_0) = n(n-3)$ .

(ix) Let  $p(x, y) \in \mathcal{O}_X(X \cap U_0) \cong \mathbb{K}[x, y]/(x^{n-1} - y^n - 1)$ .

Then, since  $y^n = 1 - x^{n-1}$ , we may substitute  $y^n$  with  $1 - x^{n-1}$  until the maximum exponent  $y$  appears with is  $< n$ . Now,  $p(x, y)$  is a linear combination of the  $x^i y^j$ , where  $i \geq 0$  and  $0 \leq j < n$ . This means that the  $x^i y^j$  considered form a system of generators.

If  $\sum_{i \geq 0, 0 \leq j < n} a_{ij} x^i y^j = 0$  in  $\mathcal{O}_X(X \cap U_0)$  for some  $a_{ij} \in \mathbb{K}$ , then  $x^{n-1} - y^n - 1 \mid \sum_{i \geq 0, 0 \leq j < n} a_{ij} x^i y^j$  in  $\mathbb{K}[x, y]$ . Since  $y$  appears with degree  $< n$ , this implies that  $\sum_{i \geq 0, 0 \leq j < n} a_{ij} x^i y^j = 0$  in  $\mathbb{K}[x, y]$ , where they are linearly independent and hence  $a_{ij} = 0$  for every  $i, j$ .

Remembering that we have  $v_Q(x) = -n, v_Q(y) = -(n-1)$ , we get that  $v_Q(x^i y^j) = i \cdot v_Q(x) + j \cdot v_Q(y) = -ni - (n-1)j = -n(i+j) - j$ .

We only have to prove the injectivity of  $\mathbb{N} \times \{0, \dots, n-1\} \xrightarrow{h_n} \mathbb{N}$  mapping  $(i, j)$  to  $n(i+j) + j$ .

If  $n(i+j) + j = n(i'+j') + j'$ , then  $n(i+j-i'-j') = j'-j$ . Since  $n \geq 2$  and  $-n < j-j' < n$ ,  $n \mid j-j'$  implies that  $j-j' = 0$ , thus  $j = j'$ . Since  $n(i-i') = 0$ ,  $i = i'$  and we are done.

(x) Remember that  $\Omega^1(X)$  is a  $\mathcal{O}_X(X) \cong \mathbb{K}$ -module, hence a  $\mathbb{K}$ -vector space.

Furthermore, by (v) we know that  $\Omega^1(X \cap U_2) = \mathcal{O}_X(X \cap U_2) \cdot \omega_0$ , where the latter is a free  $\mathcal{O}_X(X \cap U_2)$ -module. It follows that  $\Omega^1(X \cap U_2)$  has a basis, as a  $\mathbb{K}$ -vector space, given by  $x^i y^j \omega_0$ , where  $i \geq 0$  and  $0 \leq j < n$ .

Here, I will consider an element of  $\Omega^1(X) \subset \Omega^1(X \cap U_0) \oplus \Omega^1(X \cap U_2)$  not as a pair of elements agreeing on the intersection, but as the 1-form obtained by glueing them: indeed, it is equivalent.

Notice that, if two 1-forms defined on  $X$  coincide on  $X \cap U_2$ , then they coincide on  $X$  by the irreducibility. Because of this, all of them will be unique extensions of elements of  $\Omega^1(X \cap U_2)$ , as, given two extensions of one element, they would coincide on  $X \cap U_2$ .

It follows that all we have to do is to check which elements of  $\Omega^1(X \cap U_2)$  are restrictions of the ones in  $\Omega^1(X)$ ; to do this, we may just check their order at  $Q$ , the only point of  $X$  not lying in

$X \cap U_2$ .

Since  $v_Q(x^i y^j \omega_0) = i \cdot v_Q(x) + j \cdot v_Q(y) + v_Q(\omega_0) = n(n-3-i-j) + j$ , we only require  $n(n-3-i-j) + j \geq 0$ . Since  $j < n$ , it means that  $n \geq 3+i+j$ .

Notice that an element in  $\Omega^1(X \cap U_2)$  is of the form  $g\omega_0$ , where  $g = \sum_{i \geq 0, 0 \leq j < n} a_{ij} x^i y^j$ . Furthermore, since  $v_Q(g\omega_0) = v_Q(g) + v_Q(\omega_0)$  and, having every  $x^i y^j$  different order,  $v_Q(g) = \min\{v_Q(x^i y^j) \mid a_{ij} \neq 0\}$ , the only 1-forms in  $\Omega^1(X \cap U_2)$  extensible to  $X$  are precisely those achievable through linear combinations of the  $x^i y^j \omega_0$  which extend to  $X$ .

This means that the extended  $x^i y^j \omega_0$  generate  $\Omega^1(X)$ , while the linear independence comes from the fact that their restrictions to  $X \cap U_2$  are linearly independent.

Now, for  $n = 2$ , the inequality has no solutions, hence  $\Omega^1(X) = 0$  with basis  $\emptyset$ .

For  $n = 3$ , we only have  $i = j = 0$ , thus  $\Omega^1(X) = \mathbb{K} \cdot \omega_0$  and it has dimension 1, with basis  $\{\omega_0\}$ .

For  $n = 4$ , the solutions are  $(0, 0)$ ,  $(1, 0)$ ,  $(0, 1)$ , hence  $\Omega^1(X) = \mathbb{K} \cdot \omega_0 \oplus \mathbb{K} \cdot x\omega_0 \oplus \mathbb{K} \cdot y\omega_0$  and it has dimension 3, with basis  $\{\omega_0, x\omega_0, y\omega_0\}$ .

## References

- [1] B. Edixhoven, D. Holmes, A. Kret, L. Taelman, *Algebraic Geometry*, 2018.