

SOME STABLY TAME POLYNOMIAL AUTOMORPHISMS

SOORAJ KUTTYKRISHNAN

ABSTRACT. We study the structure of length three polynomial automorphisms of $R[X, Y]$ when R is a UFD. These results are used to prove that if $\text{SL}_m(R[X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n]) = \text{E}_m(R[X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n])$ for all $n, \geq 0$ and for all $m \geq 3$ then all length three polynomial automorphisms of $R[X, Y]$ are stably tame.

1. INTRODUCTION

Unless otherwise specified R will be a commutative ring with 1 and $R^{[n]} = R[X] = R[X_1, \dots, X_n]$ is the polynomial ring in n variables. A polynomial map is a map $F = (F_1, \dots, F_n) : \mathbb{A}_R^n \rightarrow \mathbb{A}_R^n$ where each $F_i \in R^{[n]}$. Such an F is said to be invertible if there exists $G = (G_1, \dots, G_n), G_i \in R^{[n]}$ such that $G_i(F_1, \dots, F_n) = X_i$ for $1 \leq i \leq n$. Invertible polynomial maps are in one to one correspondence with R -automorphisms of the polynomial ring $R^{[n]}$ via the map $F \rightarrow F^*, F^*(g) = g(F), g \in R^{[n]}$. So we identify the group of R -automorphisms of $R^{[n]}$ with the group of all invertible polynomial maps in n variables. Notice that this identification is not an isomorphism but rather an anti isomorphism. We would like to understand the structure of

- $\text{GA}_n(R) = \{F = (F_1, \dots, F_n) : F \text{ is invertible} \}$.

Some subgroups of $\text{GA}_n(R)$ are the following.

- The affine subgroup: $\text{Af}_n(R) = \{(a_{11}X_1 + a_{12}X_2 + \dots + a_{1n}X_n + b_1, \dots, a_{n1}X_1 + \dots + a_{nn}X_n + b_n) : (a_{ij}) \in \text{GL}_n(R) \text{ and } b_i \in R\}$
- The elementary subgroup: $\text{EA}_n(R) =$ The subgroup generated by automorphisms of the form $(X_1, X_2, \dots, X_{i-1}, X_i + f(X_1, \dots, X_{i-1}, \hat{X}_i, X_{i+1}, \dots, X_n), \dots, X_n)$ where $f \in R[X_1, X_2, \dots, \hat{X}_i, \dots, X_n], i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$.
- The triangular subgroup: $\text{BA}_n(R) =$ The subgroup of all R -automorphisms of the form $F = (a_1X_1 + f_1(X_2, \dots, X_n), a_2X_2 + f_2(X_3, \dots, X_n), \dots, a_nX_n + f_n)$ where each $a_i \in R^*$ and $f_i \in R[X_{i+1}, \dots, X_n]$ for all $1 \leq i \leq n-1$ and $f_n \in R$.
- Tame subgroup: $\text{T}_n(R) = \langle \text{Af}_n(R), \text{EA}_n(R) \rangle$.

It is easy to see that $\text{GA}_1(R) = \text{Af}_1(R)$ when R is a domain. The structure of $\text{GA}_2(R)$ when R is a field k is well known and is the so-called Jung-van der Kulk theorem or the Automorphism Theorem.[Jun42], [vdK53]

This is part of the author's doctoral thesis, written at Washington University under the direction of David Wright.

Theorem 1.1. (*Jung, van der Kulk*) *If k is a field then $\text{GA}_2(k) = \text{T}_2(k)$. Further, $\text{T}_2(k)$ is the amalgamated free product of $\text{Af}_2(k)$ and $\text{BA}_2(k)$ over their intersection.*

However, not much is known about $\text{GA}_3(k)$. A natural question is whether $\text{T}_3(k)$ the whole group $\text{GA}_3(k)$? Nagata [Nag72] conjectured that the answer is no and gave a candidate counterexample.

Example 1.1. (Nagata)

$$N = (X + t(tY + X^2), Y - 2(tY + X^2)X - t(tY + X^2)^2, t) \in \text{GA}_3(k)$$

Let R be a domain. Then the following algorithm from [vdE00] will determine if $F = (P(X, Y), Q(X, Y)) \in \text{GA}_2(R)$ is in $\text{T}_2(R)$. Let $tdeg(F) = deg(P) + deg(Q)$ and h_1 be the highest degree term of P and h_2 that of Q .

Algorithm 1.1. Input: $F = (P, Q)$.

- 1) Let $(d_1, d_2) = (deg(P), deg(Q))$.
- 2) If $d_1 = d_2 = 1$, go to 7.
- 3) If $d_1 \neq d_2$, go to 5.
- 4) If there exists $\tau \in \text{Af}_2(R)$ with $tdeg(\tau \circ F) < tdeg(F)$, replace F by $\tau \circ F$ and go to 1, else stop : $F \notin \text{T}_2(R)$.
- 5) If $d_2 < d_1$, replace F by (Q, P) .
- 6) If $d_1 \mid d_2$ and there exists $c \in R$ with $h_2 = ch_1^{d_2/d_1}$, replace F by $(X, Y - cX^{d_2/d_1}) \circ F$ and go to 1, else stop : $F \notin \text{T}_2(R)$.
- 7) If $\det JF \in R^*$, stop: $F \in \text{T}_2(R)$, else stop : $F \notin \text{T}_2(R)$.

Using this algorithm we can easily conclude that $N \notin \text{T}_2(k[t])$. We say that N is ‘ t ’ wild. Shestakov and Umirbaev in 2002 [SU03] proved that $N \notin \text{T}_3(k)$ and thus proved Nagata’s conjecture.

We can extend N from the Example 1.1 naturally as $\tilde{N} = (N, W) \in \text{GA}_4(k)$. Martha Smith proved [Smi89] that $\tilde{N} \in \text{T}_4(k)$.

Definition 1.1. Let $F, G \in \text{GA}_n(R)$. Then

- (1) F is *stably tame* if there exists $m \in \mathbb{N}$ and new variables X_{n+1}, \dots, X_{n+m} such that the extended map $\tilde{F} = (F, X_{n+1}, \dots, X_{n+m})$ is tame.
i.e $(F, X_{n+1}, \dots, X_{n+m}) \in \text{T}_{n+m}(R)$
- (2) F is *tamely equivalent* (\sim) to G if there exists $H_1, H_2 \in \text{T}_n(R)$ such that $H_1 \circ F \circ H_2 = G$.
- (3) F is *stable tamely equivalent* (\sim_{st}) to $H \in \text{GA}_{n+m}(R)$ if there exists $\tilde{H}_1, \tilde{H}_2 \in \text{T}_{n+m}(R)$ such that $\tilde{H}_1 \circ \tilde{F} \circ \tilde{H}_2 = H$ where $\tilde{F} = (F, X_{n+1}, \dots, X_{n+m})$

So N from Nagata’s example is stably tame with one more variable. Also, N fixes ‘ t ’ and so $N \in \text{GA}_2(k[t])$. Viewed this way, by the automorphism theorem N is a tame $k(t)$ -automorphism. In fact this phenomenon occurs in a more general situation as described in the next section.

2. LENGTH OF AN AUTOMORPHISM

Proposition 2.1. *Let R be a domain K its fraction field and $F \in \text{GA}_2(R)$. Then $F = L \circ D_{a,1} \circ F_m \circ F_{m-1} \circ \dots \circ F_1$ where $L = (X + c, Y + d)$, $D_{a,1} = (aX, Y)$, $F_i = (X, Y + f(X))$ or $F_i = (X + g(Y), Y)$ for some $c, d \in R$, $a \in R^*$, $f(X), g(X) \in K[X]$*

Proof. Let $F = (P(X, Y), Q(X, Y))$, where $P(X, Y), Q(X, Y) \in R[X, Y]$ and $L = (X + c, Y + d)$, with $c = P(0, 0)$ and $d = Q(0, 0)$. Let $G = L^{-1} \circ F \in \text{GA}_2^0(R)$. Viewed as an element of $\text{GA}_2^0(K)$, by the Automorphism Theorem $G \in \text{T}_2^0(K)$. When R is a domain, by the results of Wright [Wri76], the group $\text{T}_2^0(K)$ of tame automorphisms of $K[X, Y]$ preserving the augmentation has a similar description as a free amalgamated product as $\text{GA}_2(k)$ where k is any field. In particular, $\text{T}_2^0(K)$ is generated by the automorphisms

$$F_1 = (X, Y + f(X)), F_2 = (X + g(Y), Y), D_{a,b} = (aX, bY)$$

where $f(X) \in K[X]$, $g(Y) \in R[Y]$, $f(0) = g(0) = 0$, $a, b \in K^*$. Since $D_{a,b} = D_{ab,1} \circ D_{b^{-1},b}$ and $SL_2(K) = E_2(K)$ we have that $D_{b^{-1},b}$ is a product of elementary linear automorphisms and hence we can assume that $b = 1$. We also have the following equalities.

$$F_1 \circ D_{a,1} = (aX, Y + f(aX)) = D_{a,1} \circ F'_1 \text{ where } F'_1 = (X, Y + f(aX)).$$

$$F_2 \circ D_{a,1} = (aX + g(Y), Y) = D_{a,1} \circ F'_2 \text{ where } F'_2 = (X + a^{-1}g(Y), Y).$$

So if $G \in \text{GA}_2^0(R)$ then $G = D_{a,1} \circ F_m \circ F_{m-1} \circ \dots \circ F_2 \circ F_1$ where each F_i is either of the type $(X, Y + f_i(X))$ or $(X + g_i(Y), Y)$, $f_i(X), g_i(X) \in K[X]$ and $a \in K^*$. The linear components of G and $F_m \circ F_{m-1} \circ \dots \circ F_2 \circ F_1$ are in $GL_2(R)$ and $SL_2(K)$, respectively. This implies that $a \in R^*$ and both $D_{a,1}, F_m \circ F_{m-1} \circ \dots \circ F_2 \circ F_1 \in \text{GA}_2^0(R)$. \square

Definition 2.1.

- (1) *Length* of $F \in \text{GA}_2^0(R)$ is the smallest natural number m such that $F = D_{a,1} \circ F_m \circ F_{m-1} \circ \dots \circ F_2 \circ F_1$ where each F_i is either of the type $(X, Y + f_i(X))$ or $(X + g_i(Y), Y)$ with $f_i(X), g_i(X) \in K[X]$, $a \in R^*$ and $f_i(0) = g_i(0) = 0$.
- (2) $L^{(m)}(R) = \{F \in \text{GA}_2^0(R) : F \text{ is of length } m\}$

Remark 2.1. If $F \in L^{(m)}(R)$ as above and $F = D_{a,1} \circ F_m \circ F_{m-1} \circ \dots \circ F_2 \circ F_1 \in L^{(m)}(R)$ then F is tamely equivalent to $G = F_m \circ F_{m-1} \circ \dots \circ F_2 \circ F_1$. Thus F is stably tame iff G is stably tame.

Clearly if $F \in L^{(1)}(R)$ then $F \in \text{T}_2(R)$. Suppose $F \in L^{(2)}(R)$. Then $F = D_{a,1} \circ F_2 \circ F_1$ with $F_1 = (X, Y + f_1(X))$ and $F_2 = (X + g(Y), Y)$ as in the definition above. $G = D_{a,1}^{-1} \circ F = (X + g(Y + f(X)), Y + f(X)) \in \text{GA}_2(R) \Rightarrow f(X) \in R[X]$. Putting $X = 0$ in the first coordinate of G we get that $g(Y) \in R[Y]$. So $F \in \text{T}_2(R)$. Thus the first non trivial case is of length three.

Now lets go back to Nagata's example.

$$\text{Let } F_1 = (X, Y + \frac{X^2}{t}, t) \text{ and } F_2 = (X + t^2Y, Y)$$

$$\text{Then } N = F_1^{-1} \circ F_2 \circ F_1.$$

So Nagata's example is of length three and it is stably tame with one more variable. Drensky and Yu [DY01] began a systematic study of length three automorphisms and proved the following result.

Theorem 2.1. (*Drensky, Yu*) *Let k be a field of characteristic zero and $F \in L^{(3)}(k[t])$ such that $F = F_1^{-1} \circ G \circ F_1$ where $F_1 = (X, Y + f(X))$, $G = (X + g(Y), Y)$ with $f(X), g(X) \in k[t][X]$. Then F is stably tame with one more variable.*

3. STABLE TAMENESS OF POLYNOMIALS

Another important notion is the stable tameness of polynomials. This was studied by Berson in [Ber02], Edo and Vénéreau in [EV01] and Edo in [Edo05]. We'll give some relevant results from these papers below.

Let A be any commutative ring with 1. A polynomial $P(X) \in A^{[n]}$ is said to be a variable if there exists $F \in \text{GA}_n(A)$ such that $F = (F_1, F_2, \dots, F_n)$ and $F_1(X) = P(X)$.

Definition 3.1.

$$\text{VA}_n(A) = \{P \in A^{[n]} : \text{There exists } F \in \text{GA}_n(A) \text{ } F = (F_1, F_2, \dots, F_n) \text{ and } F_1(X) = P(X).\}$$

$$\text{TV}_n(A) = \{P \in A^{[n]} : \text{There exists } F \in \text{T}_n(A) \text{ } F = (F_1, F_2, \dots, F_n) \text{ and } F_1(X) = P(X).\}$$

Following definition is due to Berson [Ber02].

Definition 3.2. (Berson's Class) $l \in \mathbb{N}, p_0 \in A^*, g_0, p_1, \dots, p_l \in A$ and $Q_1, \dots, Q_l \in A^{[1]}$, we define $P_l \in A^{[2]}$ by induction on l .

$$\begin{aligned} P_0 &= p_0 X + g_0, \\ P_1 &= p_1 Y + Q_1(X), \\ P_2 &= p_2 X + Q_2(p_1 Y + Q_1(X)), \\ P_l &= p_l P_{l-2} + Q_l(P_{l-1}) \text{ for } l \geq 3. \end{aligned}$$

$$\mathcal{B}^l(A) = \{P_l : p_0 \in A^*, g_0, p_1, \dots, p_l \in A, Q_1, \dots, Q_l \in A^{[1]}\}$$

$$\mathcal{B}(A) = \bigcup_{l \in \mathbb{N}} \mathcal{B}^l(A) \quad (\text{Berson's polynomials})$$

$$\mathcal{BV}_2(A) = \text{VA}_2(A) \cap \mathcal{B}(A) \quad (\text{Berson's variables})$$

$$\mathcal{BV}_2^l(A) = \text{VA}_2(A) \cap \bigcup_{i \leq l} \mathcal{B}^i(A)$$

Definition 3.3.

- (1) (Stably tame polynomial) A polynomial $P \in R^{[n]}$ is stably tame if there exists $F \in \text{T}_{n+m}(R)$, $m \geq 0$ such that $F = (F_1, F_2, \dots, F_n)$ and $F_1(X) = P(X)$
- (2) (Totally stably tame polynomial)(Edo, [Edo05]) A polynomial $P \in R^{[n]}$ is totally stably tame if there exists a stably tame automorphism $F \in \text{GA}_n(R)$ such that $F = (F_1, F_2, \dots, F_n)$ and $F_1(X) = P(X)$.

Following theorem is claimed by Eric Edo [Edo05]. However, it appears that additional hypothesis are required in his proof.

Theorem 3.1. *If $F \in \mathcal{BV}_2^2(R)$ where R is a UFD then F is totally stably tame*

Remark 3.1.

- (1) If $F \in R^{[n]}$ is totally stably tame then it is stably tame.
- (2) If $P \in R^{[2]}$ is a totally stably tame polynomial and $F \in \text{GA}_2(R)$ be such that $F(X_1) = P$ then F is a stably tame automorphism.

4. MAIN THEOREM AND STRUCTURE OF LENGTH THREE AUTOMORPHISMS

Let $SL_n(R)$ denote the set of all $n \times n$ matrices with entries from R and determinant equal to 1 and $E_n(R)$ denote the group generated by the set of all $n \times n$ elementary matrices with entries from R .

Theorem 4.1. (Main Theorem) *Suppose R is a UFD such that*

$$SL_m(R[X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n]) = E_m(R[X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n])$$

for all $n \geq 0$ and for all $m \geq 3$. Then $F \in L^{(3)}(R) \Rightarrow F$ is stably tame.

Eric Edo claimed this result in [Edo05] (Theorem 7) without the assumption that $SL_m(R[X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n]) = E_m(R[X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n])$ for all $n \geq 0$ and for all $m \geq 3$. A brief outline of his proof is as follows. If $F = (F_1, F_2) \in L^{(3)}(R)$ then F_1 has the form $qX + H(pY + G(X))$, $q, p \in R$, $H, G \in R[X]$. If $ht(p) = 0$, then F is tame. The next step is to show that $F \sim_{st} F^1(F_1^1, F_2^1) \in L^{(3)}(R[X])$ where F_1^1 has the form $q^1X + H^1(p^1Y + G^1(X))$, $q^1, p^1 \in R[X]$, $H, G \in R[X][W]$ with $ht(p^1) < ht(p)$ and then we are done by induction on $ht(p)$. However this step involves composing F with an affine map $a_3(R) \in Af_2(R)$. At the next step of the induction such a map will be in $Af_2(R[X])$ and hence not necessarily in $T_3(R)$. So we believe that the assumption that $SL_m(R[X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n]) = E_m(R[X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n])$ for all $n \geq 0$ and for all $m \geq 3$ is required. Also, our methods are quite different from his.

Remark 4.1. $SL_m(R[X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n]) = E_m(R[X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n])$ for all $n \geq 0$ and for all $m \geq 3$ if R is a regular ring.

Remark 4.2. In [BvdEW] Berson, van den Essen and Wright recently proved that if $F \in GA_2(R)$, where R is a regular ring then F is stably tame. This is a much stronger result. However, our result does not require the ring to be regular.

We will give two different proofs of Theorem 4.1. First proof will use Theorem 3.1. The second proof is different, self contained and will use the hypothesis that $SL_2(R[X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n]) = E_2(R[X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n])$ for all n . However, before proving these theorems, we would like to know if there are examples of length three automorphisms that are not covered by Drensky and Yu's theorem [DY01]. i.e Does $F \in L^{(3)}(R) \Rightarrow F = F_1^{-1} \circ G_1 \circ F_1$? Automorphisms of this kind are called conjugates. The answer is no and here is an example due to Wright[Wri].

Example 4.1. Let $t \in R \setminus \{0\}$ and $F = F_2 \circ G_1 \circ F_1$ where

$$F_1 = (X, Y + \frac{X^2}{t^2}), \quad G_1 = (X + t^3Y, Y) \quad \text{and} \quad F_2 = (X, Y - \frac{X^2}{t^2} + \frac{2X^3}{t}).$$

$$\text{Then } F = (X + t(t^2Y + X^2), Y - (t^2Y + X^2)^2 - 2tYX + t^2(t^2Y + X^2)^3 + 3X^2(t^2Y + X^2) + 3tX(t^2Y + X^2)^2).$$

Following [DY01] we prove the below lemma.

Lemma 4.1. *Let $F \in L^{(3)}(R)$, and $F = F_2 \circ G_1 \circ F_1$ where $F_i = (X, Y + f_i(X))$, $G_1 = (X + g(Y), Y)$, $f_i \in K[X]$, $g \in K[Y]$, $f_i(0) = g(0) = 0$. Then $f_i = \frac{A_i(X)}{b}$ and $g = D(bY)$ where $A_i(X) \in R[X]$, $D(Y) \in R[Y]$, $b \in R$ and b and A_i do not have any common factors in $R[X]$.*

Proof. We rewrite $f_i = \frac{A_i(X)}{b_i}$, where $A_i(X) \in R[X]$, $A_i(0) = 0$, $b_i \in R$ and $A_i(X)$ and b_i has no common factors in $R[X]$.

Since $F = (X + g(Y + f_1(X), Y + f_1(X)) + f_2(X + g(Y + f_1(X)))) \in \text{GA}_2^0(R)$,

$$(1) \quad g(Y + f_1(X)) = g\left(Y + \frac{A_1(X)}{b_1}\right) = \sum_{i=0}^n \frac{g^{(i)}(Y)A_1^i(X)}{i!b_1^i} \in R[X, Y].$$

Putting $X = 0$ in (1) we get $g(Y) \in R[Y] \Rightarrow \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{g^{(i)}(Y)A_1^i(X)}{i!b_1^i} \in R[X, Y]$. So,

$$A_1(X) \left(\frac{g'(Y)b_1^{n-1}}{1!} + \frac{g''(Y)A_1(X)b_1^{n-2}}{2!} + \dots + \frac{g^{(n)}(Y)A_1(X)^{n-1}}{n!} \right) \equiv 0 \pmod{b_1^n}.$$

Since $A_1(X)$ and b_1 does not have a common factor we get,

$$(2) \quad \left(\frac{g'(Y)b_1^{n-1}}{1!} + \frac{g''(Y)A_1(X)b_1^{n-2}}{2!} + \dots + \frac{g^{(n)}(Y)A_1(X)^{n-1}}{n!} \right) \equiv 0 \pmod{b_1^n}$$

Putting $X = 0$ in (2) we get,

$$g'(Y)b_1^{n-1} \equiv 0 \pmod{b_1^n} \Rightarrow g'(Y) \equiv 0 \pmod{b_1}$$

Hence the coefficient of Y^i in $g(Y)$ is divisible by b_1 for $i \geq 1$. Let $g'(Y) = b_1g_1(Y)$ for some $g_1(Y) \in R[Y]$. So (2) becomes

$$\begin{aligned} & \left(\frac{g_1(Y)b_1^n}{1!} + \frac{g_1'(Y)A_1(X)b_1^{n-1}}{2!} + \dots + \frac{g_1^{(n-1)}(Y)A_1(X)^{n-1}b_1}{n!} \right) \equiv 0 \pmod{b_1^n} \\ \Rightarrow & \left(\frac{g_1(Y)b_1^{n-1}}{1!} + \frac{g_1'(Y)A_1(X)b_1^{n-2}}{2!} + \dots + \frac{g_1^{(n-1)}(Y)A_1(X)^{n-1}}{n!} \right) \equiv 0 \pmod{b_1^{n-1}} \\ & \Rightarrow A_1(X) \left(\frac{g_1'(Y)b_1^{n-2}}{2!} + \dots + \frac{g_1^{(n-1)}(Y)A_1(X)^{n-2}}{n!} \right) \equiv 0 \pmod{b_1^{n-1}} \end{aligned}$$

Again since $\gcd(A_1(X), b_1) = 1$ we get,

$$(3) \quad \left(\frac{g_1'(Y)b_1^{n-2}}{2!} + \frac{g_1''(Y)b_1^{n-3}A_1(X)}{3!} + \dots + \frac{g_1^{(n-1)}(Y)A_1(X)^{n-2}}{n!} \right) \equiv 0 \pmod{b_1^{n-1}}$$

Putting $X = 0$ in (3) we get,

$$g_1'(Y) \equiv 0 \pmod{b_1}$$

Again the coefficient of Y^i in $g_1(Y)$ is divisible by b_1 for $i \geq 1$ and hence the coefficient of Y^{i+1} in $g(Y)$ is divisible by b_1^2 . Repeating this process we get that the coefficient of Y^i in $g(Y)$ is divisible by b_1^i for all $i \geq 1$. i.e $g(Y) = D(b_1Y)$ for some $D(Y) \in R[Y]$. Thus we have

$$\begin{aligned} F &= \left(X + D(b_1Y + A_1(X)), Y + \frac{A_1(X)}{b_1} + \frac{A_2(X + D(b_1Y + A_1(X)))}{b_2} \right) \text{ and} \\ F^{-1} &= \left(X - D(b_1Y - \frac{b_1A_2(X)}{b_2}), Y - \frac{A_2(X)}{b_2} - \frac{A_1(X - D(b_1Y - \frac{b_1A_2(X)}{b_2}))}{b_1} \right) \end{aligned}$$

Now we will show that $b_1 = b_2$.

$$(4) \quad F \in \text{GA}_2^0(R) \Rightarrow \frac{A_1(X)}{b_1} + \frac{A_2(X + D(b_1Y + A_1(X)))}{b_2} \in R[X, Y]$$

$$(5) \quad F^{-1} \in \text{GA}_2^0(R) \Rightarrow \frac{-A_2(X)}{b_2} - \frac{A_1(X - D(b_1Y - \frac{b_1 A_2(X)}{b_2}))}{b_1} \in R[X, Y]$$

Putting $Y = 0$ in (4) we get that

$$b_2 A_1(X) + b_1 A_2(X + D(A_1(X))) \equiv 0 \pmod{(b_1 b_2)}.$$

Since A_1 and b_1 have no common factors it follows that $b_2 \equiv 0 \pmod{b_1}$. Similarly from (5) we get that $b_2 \equiv 0 \pmod{b_1}$. Thus $b_2 = cb_1$ for some $c \in R^*$. Replacing A_2 with $\frac{A_2}{c}$ and b_2 with b_1 the result follows. \square

4.1. A Proof of Theorem 4.1. We may assume that F is of the form in the hypothesis of Lemma 4.1. So from Lemma 4.1 we get that

$$(6) \quad F = \left(X + D(bY + A_1(X)), Y + \frac{A_1(X) + A_2(X + D(bY + A_1(X)))}{b} \right)$$

Taking 1 for p_2 , b for p_1 , $D(Y)$ for $G_2(Y)$ and $A_1(X)$ for $G_1(X)$ we see that the first co-ordinate of F is in $\mathcal{B}^2(A)$ and hence $F \in \mathcal{BV}_2^2(A)$. By theorem 3, first coordinate of F is totally stably tame and hence F is stably tame. This concludes the proof using Theorem 3.1

5. ANOTHER PROOF OF THEOREM 4.1

We now proceed with some preparations for a self contained proof of Theorem 4.1.

Lemma 5.1. *We use notations from the Lemma 4.1. Let p be an irreducible factor of b . Then p divides $D(Y)$ or each of the following polynomials.*

- (1) $D(Y) - D'(0)Y$
- (2) $A_1(X) - A_1'(0)X$
- (3) $A_2(X) - A_2'(0)X$

Proof. Since $b_1 = b_2 = b$, from (4) and (5) we get the following.

$$(7) \quad \frac{A_1(X) + A_2(X + D(bY + A_1(X)))}{b} \in R[X, Y]$$

$$(8) \quad \frac{A_2(X) + A_1(X - D(bY - A_2(X)))}{b} \in R[X, Y]$$

Putting $Y = 0$ in (7) and (8) we have,

$$(9) \quad p \mid A_1(X) + A_2(X + D(A_1(X))) \text{ and}$$

$$(10) \quad p \mid A_2(X) + A_1(X - D(-A_2(X)))$$

Let $S = \frac{R}{pR}$ and denote the image of $a \in R$ in S by \bar{a} . Suppose p does not divide $D(Y)$. Let $\overline{A_i(X)} = \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} \bar{a}_{ij} X^j$ for $i = 1, 2$ and $\overline{D(Y)} = \sum_{j=1}^{n_3} \bar{d}_j Y^j$, $\bar{d}_{n_3} \neq \bar{0}$. Since p does not divide $D(Y)$ we may assume that $n_3 \geq 1$. Also since $\gcd(A_i, b) = 1$ we may further assume that $\bar{a}_{n_i} \neq \bar{0}$ for $i = 1, 2$.

Case 1 ($n_2 \geq n_1$):-

Since $p \mid A_1(X) + A_2(X + D(A_1(X)))$,

$$(11) \quad \overline{A_1(X) + A_2(X + D(A_1(X)))} = \sum_{j=1}^{n_1} \overline{a_{1j}} X^j + \sum_{j=1}^{n_2} \overline{a_{2j}} \left(X + \sum_{l=1}^{n_3} \overline{d_j} \left(\sum_{m=1}^{n_1} \overline{a_{1j}} X^m \right)^l \right)^j = \overline{0}$$

Suppose $n_1 = n_3 = 1$ and $n_2 > 1$ then the top term in the expression (11) is $\overline{a_{2n_2}(1 + d_1 a_{11})^{n_2} X^{n_2}} = \overline{0}$ which implies $\overline{1 + d_1 a_{11}} = \overline{0}$. Now lets look at the lowest degree term in the expression (11) which is

$$\overline{a_{11} + a_{21}(1 + d_1 a_{11})} X = \overline{a_{11}} X = \overline{0}. \text{ Hence } \overline{A_1(X)} = \overline{0}.$$

This is a contradiction to assumption that $\gcd(A_1(X), b) = 1$. Thus $n_1 = n_3 = 1 \Rightarrow n_2 = 1$.

So lets assume that $n_1 > 1$ or $n_3 > 1$. We look at the coefficient of the highest degree term in the expression (11).

Suppose $n_1 > 1$ and $n_3 > 1$. Then $n_2 > 1$ and hence $n_1 n_2 n_3 > n_1$.

So the highest degree term in (11) is $\overline{a_{2n_2} d_{n_3}^{n_2} a_{1n_1}^{n_2 n_3} X^{n_1 n_2 n_3}} = \overline{0}$.

This is a contradiction to the assumption that $\overline{d_{n_3}}$, $\overline{a_{1n_1}}$, and $\overline{a_{2n_2}}$ are not equal to $\overline{0}$.

Now suppose $n_1 > 1$ and $n_3 = 1$. Again $n_2 > 1$ and hence $n_1 n_2 > n_1$.

So the highest degree term in the expression (11) is $\overline{a_{2n_2} d_1^{n_2} a_{1n_1}^{n_2 n_3} X^{n_1 n_2}} = \overline{0}$.

This is a contradiction to the assumption that $\overline{d_1}$, $\overline{a_{1n_1}}$, and $\overline{a_{2n_2}}$ are not equal to $\overline{0}$.

Last case is when $n_3 > 1$ and $n_1 = 1$. Again $n_2 \geq 1$ and so $n_2 n_3 > n_1$.

So the highest degree term in expression (11) is $\overline{a_{n_2} d_{n_3}^{n_2} a_{11}^{n_2 n_3} X^{n_2 n_3}} = \overline{0}$, again a contradiction.

Thus $n_1 = n_3 = 1$ which implies $n_2 = 1$ as well.

Case 2 ($n_1 \geq n_2$):-

Since $p \mid A_2(X) + A_1(X - D(bY - A_2(X)))$ (from (10)) we get the following.

$$(12) \quad \overline{-A_2(X) - A_1(X - D(bY - A_2(X)))} = - \sum_{j=1}^{n_1} \overline{a_{2j}} X^j - \sum_{j=1}^{n_2} \overline{a_{1j}} \left(X - \sum_{l=1}^{n_3} \overline{d_j} \left(\sum_{m=1}^{n_1} \overline{-a_{1j}} X^m \right)^l \right)^j = \overline{0}$$

Proof of Case 2 is exactly like Case 1. We can look at the top term of (12) to conclude that $n_1 = n_2 = n_3 = 1$. \square

Let $P(X, Y) = D(bY + A_1(X)) - D'(0)A_1'(0)X$ and $\tilde{\mathfrak{b}}$ be the product of irreducible factors of b . Then by Lemma 5.1 we have that $\tilde{\mathfrak{b}} \mid P(X, Y)$. So we can rewrite 6 as

$$F = (aX + \tilde{\mathfrak{b}}P_1(X, Y), Y + P_2(X, Y))$$

where $a = 1 + D'(0)A_1'(0)$ and

$$(13) \quad P_1(X, Y) = \frac{P(X, Y)}{\tilde{\mathfrak{b}}} = \frac{D(bY + A_1(X)) - (a-1)X}{\tilde{\mathfrak{b}}}$$

and $P_2(X, Y) = \frac{A_1(X) + A_2(X + D(bY + A_1(X)))}{b}$

The following lemma was proved in [DY01] when $R = k[t]$. We reprove it here when R is any UFD. The proof given here is simpler.

Lemma 5.2. *Let $F = F_1^{-1} \circ G \circ F_1 \in L^{(3)}(R)$ where $F_1 = (X, Y + \frac{A_1(X)}{a})$, $G = (X + g(Y), Y)$, $A_1(X) \in R[X]$, $g(Y) \in K[Y]$, $a \in R$. Then $g(Y) = D(aY)$ for $D(Y) \in R[Y]$ and $a \mid D(Y)$.*

Proof. Since $F \in L^{(3)}(R)$ by Lemma 4.1 we have that $g(Y) = D(aY)$. Let $a = a_1^{p_1} a_2^{p_2} \dots a_l^{p_l}$ where each a_i is irreducible in R . Then by Lemma 5.1 we know that $a_i \mid D(Y) - D'(0)Y$.

$$\text{Also, } F = (X + D(aY + A(X)), Y + \frac{A(X) - A(X + D(aY + A(X)))}{a})$$

Putting $Y = 0$ in the second coordinate of F we get that

$$(14) \quad \begin{aligned} A(X) - A(X + D(A(X))) &\equiv 0 \pmod{a} \\ \Rightarrow A(X) - A(X + D(A(X))) &\equiv 0 \pmod{a_i^{p_i}} \text{ for every } i \end{aligned}$$

Similarly putting $Y = 0$ in the second coordinate of F^{-1} we get

$$(15) \quad \begin{aligned} A(X) - A(X - D(A(X))) &\equiv 0 \pmod{a} \\ \Rightarrow A(X) - A(X - D(A(X))) &\equiv 0 \pmod{a_i^{p_i}} \text{ for every } i \end{aligned}$$

From 14 and 15 we get that

$$(16) \quad A(X - D(A(X))) - A(X + D(A(X))) \equiv 0 \pmod{a_i^{p_i}} \text{ for every } i$$

It is enough to show that for each i , $a_i^{p_i} \mid D(Y)$. So we fix an i .

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Let } A(X) &= \sum_{j=1}^n a_j X^j \equiv 0 \pmod{a_i} \text{ and} \\ D(Y) &= \sum_{j=1}^m d_j Y^j \equiv 0 \pmod{a_i} \end{aligned}$$

Looking at the linear part of the left hand side in 16 gives us

$$\begin{aligned} a_1 X - a_1^2 d_1 X - a_1 X - a_1^2 d_1 X &\equiv 0 \pmod{a_i} \\ \Rightarrow 2a_1^2 d_1 &\equiv 0 \pmod{a_i} \\ \Rightarrow d_1 &\equiv 0 \pmod{a_i} \end{aligned}$$

Hence $D(Y) \equiv 0 \pmod{a_i}$. Let $D(Y) = a_i^{jt} D_1(Y)$ for some $D_1(Y) \in R[Y]$ such that $\gcd(D_1(Y), a_i) = 1$ and $t \geq 1$. Then 14 reads as

$$\begin{aligned} A(X) - \sum_{j=0}^n A^{(j)}(X) D_1(A(X))^j a_i^{jt} &\equiv 0 \pmod{a_i^{p_i}} \\ \Rightarrow \sum_{j=1}^n A^{(j)}(X) D_1(A(X))^j a_i^{jt} &\equiv 0 \pmod{a_i^{p_i}} \end{aligned}$$

If $t < p_i$, then we get that $A'(X) D_1(A(X)) \equiv 0 \pmod{a_i}$. Also, $\gcd(A(X), a) = 1 \Rightarrow \gcd(A'(X), a) = 1$.

$$\begin{aligned} \text{So } D_1(A(X)) &\equiv 0 \pmod{a_i} \\ \sum_{j=0}^m \frac{D_1^{(j)}(0) A(X)^j}{j!} &\equiv 0 \pmod{a_i} \\ \text{Since } D_1(0) = 0, \text{ we get that } \sum_{j=1}^m \frac{D_1^{(j)}(0) A(X)^j}{j!} &\equiv 0 \pmod{a_i} \\ A(X) \left(\sum_{j=1}^m \frac{D_1^{(j)}(0) A(X)^{j-1}}{j!} \right) &\equiv 0 \pmod{a_i} \\ \text{Since } \gcd(A(X), a) = 1, \sum_{j=1}^m \frac{D_1^{(j)}(0) A(X)^{j-1}}{j!} &\equiv 0 \pmod{a_i} \\ \text{Putting } X = 0 \text{ we get, } D_1'(0) &\equiv 0 \pmod{a_i} \end{aligned}$$

Proceeding like this we get that $D_1^{(j)}(0) \equiv 0 \pmod{a_i}$ which contradicts the fact that $\gcd(D_1(Y), a_i) = 1$. So $t = p_i$ and we are done. \square

5.1. Proof of the Main Theorem. Again we may assume that F is of the form in the hypothesis of Lemma 4.1. So we get,

$$F = \left(X + D(bY + A_1(X)), Y + \frac{A_1(X) + A_2(X + D(bY + A_1(X)))}{b} \right)$$

Let $b = b_1^{s_1} b_2^{s_2} \dots b_r^{s_r}$, $s_i \geq 1$, b_i irreducible in R . We define $s(F) = s_1 + s_2 + \dots + s_r$ and $b(F) = b$, $\tilde{\mathbf{b}} = b_1 b_2 \dots b_r$. If b is a unit in R then we are done. If not we extend F to $(F, W) \in \mathbb{L}^{(3)}(R[W])$ and call this extension F . Let $\tau = (X, Y, W + P_1(X, Y))$, $\gamma = (X - \tilde{\mathbf{b}}W, Y, W)$. Then

$$(17) \quad \gamma \circ F \circ \tau = (aX - \tilde{\mathbf{b}}W, Y + P_2(X, Y), W + P_1(X, Y))$$

$(a, \tilde{\mathbf{b}})$ is a unimodular row and we can extend this to a 3×3 matrix in $\text{SL}_3(R)$

say $A = \begin{pmatrix} a & 0 & -\tilde{\mathbf{b}} \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ c & 0 & d \end{pmatrix}$. Since $\det(A) = 1$, we have $A^{-1} = \begin{pmatrix} d & 0 & \tilde{\mathbf{b}} \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ -c & 0 & a \end{pmatrix}$ with

$$ad + \tilde{\mathbf{b}}c = 1.$$

We have $\gamma \circ F \circ \tau \circ A^{-1} = (X, Y + P_2(dX + \tilde{\mathbf{b}}W, Y), -cX + aW + P_1(dX + \tilde{\mathbf{b}}W, Y))$.

Substituting for P_1 from 5 we get,

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma \circ F \circ \tau \circ A^{-1} &= \\ &\left(X, Y + P_2(dX + \tilde{\mathfrak{b}}W, Y), -cX + aW + \right. \\ &\quad \left. \frac{D(bY + A_1(dX + \tilde{\mathfrak{b}}W)) - (a-1)(dX + \tilde{\mathfrak{b}}W)}{\tilde{\mathfrak{b}}} \right) \\ &= \left(X, Y + P_2(dX + \tilde{\mathfrak{b}}W, Y), W + \frac{D(bY + A_1(dX + \tilde{\mathfrak{b}}W)) + (d-1)X}{\tilde{\mathfrak{b}}} \right) \end{aligned}$$

Notice that F is stable tamely equivalent to $\gamma \circ F \circ \tau \circ A^{-1}$. For our purpose we may replace $\gamma \circ F \circ \tau \circ A^{-1}$ by

$$\begin{aligned} F^1 &= \left(X, Y + P_2(dX + \tilde{\mathfrak{b}}W, Y) - P_2(dX, 0), \right. \\ &\quad \left. W + \frac{D(bY + A_1(dX + \tilde{\mathfrak{b}}W)) + (d-1)X - D(A_1(dX)) - (d-1)X}{\tilde{\mathfrak{b}}} \right) \\ &= \left(X, Y + \frac{A_1(dX + \tilde{\mathfrak{b}}W) + A_2(dX + \tilde{\mathfrak{b}}W + D(bY + A_1(X)))}{b}, \right. \\ &\quad \left. \frac{-A_1(dX) - A_2(dX + D(A_1(X)))}{b}, \right. \\ &\quad \left. W + \frac{D(bY + A_1(dX + \tilde{\mathfrak{b}}W)) + (d-1)X - D(A_1(dX)) - (d-1)X}{\tilde{\mathfrak{b}}} \right) \end{aligned}$$

Then $F^1 = F_1^1 \circ G^1 \circ F_1^1$ where

$$\begin{aligned} F_1^1 &= \left(X, Y + \frac{A_1^1(W)}{b/\tilde{\mathfrak{b}}}, W \right) \\ G^1 &= (X, Y, W + D^1((b/\tilde{\mathfrak{b}})Y)) \\ F_2^1 &= \left(X, Y + \frac{A_2^1(W)}{b/\tilde{\mathfrak{b}}}, W \right) \\ \text{and } A_1^1(W) &= \frac{A_1(dX + \tilde{\mathfrak{b}}W) - A_1(dX)}{\tilde{\mathfrak{b}}} \\ A_2^1(W) &= \frac{A_2(dX + \tilde{\mathfrak{b}}W + D(A_1(dX))) - A_2(dX + D(A_1(dX)))}{\tilde{\mathfrak{b}}} \\ D^1(Y) &= \frac{D(bY + A_1(dX)) - D(A_1(dX))}{\tilde{\mathfrak{b}}} \end{aligned}$$

with $A_1^1, A_2^1 \in R[X][W], D^1 \in R[X][Y]$. Clearly $b(F^1) = b/\tilde{\mathfrak{b}}$ and hence if b is not a unit in R then $s(F^1) < s(F)$. Then we are done by induction on $s(F)$. Notice that at the next stage of the induction the matrix A appearing in the proof will have entries from $R[X]$. This is why we need the hypothesis that $\text{SL}_2(R[X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n]) = \text{E}_2(R[X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n])$ for all n .

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author wishes to thank his advisor David Wright for all the guidance and stimulating discussions.

REFERENCES

- [Ber02] Joost Berson. Stably tame coordinates. *J. Pure Appl. Algebra*, 170(2-3):131–143, 2002.
- [BvdEW] Joost Berson, Arno van den Essen, and David Wright. Stable tameness of two-dimensional polynomial automorphisms over a regular ring. *Preprint, arXiv:0707.3151v5 [math.AC]*.
- [DY01] Vesselin Drensky and Jie-Tai Yu. Tame and wild coordinates of $K[z][x, y]$. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 353(2):519–537, 2001.
- [Edo05] Eric Edo. Totally stably tame variables. *J. Algebra*, 287(1):15–31, 2005.
- [EV01] Eric Edo and Stéphane Vénéreau. Length 2 variables of $A[x, y]$ and transfer. *Ann. Polon. Math.*, 76(1-2):67–76, 2001. Polynomial automorphisms and related topics (Kraków, 1999).
- [Jun42] Heinrich W. E. Jung. Über ganze birationale Transformationen der Ebene. *J. Reine Angew. Math.*, 184:161–174, 1942.
- [Nag72] Masayoshi Nagata. *On automorphism group of $k[x, y]$* . Kinokuniya Book-Store Co. Ltd., Tokyo, 1972. Department of Mathematics, Kyoto University, Lectures in Mathematics, No. 5.
- [Smi89] Martha K. Smith. Stably tame automorphisms. *J. Pure Appl. Algebra*, 58(2):209–212, 1989.
- [SU03] Ivan P. Shestakov and Ualbai U. Umirbaev. The Nagata automorphism is wild. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA*, 100(22):12561–12563 (electronic), 2003.
- [vdE00] Arno van den Essen. *Polynomial automorphisms and the Jacobian conjecture*, volume 190 of *Progress in Mathematics*. Birkhäuser Verlag, Basel, 2000.
- [vdK53] W. van der Kulk. On polynomial rings in two variables. *Nieuw Arch. Wiskunde (3)*, 1:33–41, 1953.
- [Wri] David Wright. Private communication.
- [Wri76] David Wright. The amalgamated free product structure of $GL_2(K[X_1, \dots, X_n])$. *Bull. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 82(5):724–726, 1976.

DEPARTMENT OF COMPUTER SCIENCE, WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY IN ST. LOUIS, MO-63112, USA

E-mail address: sooraj@cse.wustl.edu