

The images of some simple derivations

Dan Yan *

MOE-LCSM,

School of Mathematics and Statistics,

Hunan Normal University, Changsha 410081, China

E-mail: yan-dan-hi@163.com

Abstract

In the paper, we study the relation between the images of polynomial derivations and their simplicity. We prove that the images of simple Shamsuddin derivations are not Mathieu-Zhao spaces. In addition, we also show that the images of some simple derivations in dimension three are not Mathieu-Zhao spaces. Thus, we conjecture that the images of simple derivations in dimension greater than one are not Mathieu-Zhao spaces. We also prove that locally nilpotent derivations are not simple in dimension greater than one.

Keywords. Simple Shamsuddin Derivations, Mathieu-Zhao spaces, Locally Nilpotent Derivations

MSC(2020). 13N15; 13C99.

1 Introduction

Throughout this paper, we will write \mathbb{N} for the non-negative integers, K for any field with characteristic zero and $R := K[x, y_1, \dots, y_n]$ for the polynomial algebra over K in $n + 1$ indeterminates x, y_1, \dots, y_n . ∂_x, ∂_i will denote the derivations $\frac{\partial}{\partial x}, \frac{\partial}{\partial y_i}$ of R for all $1 \leq i \leq n$, respectively. More generally, if $s, r_1, \dots, r_s \geq 1$ are integers and $\{x\} \cup \{y_{i,j} : i = 1, \dots, s, j = 1, \dots, r_i\}$ are indeterminates over K , $\partial_{i,j}$ will denote the derivation $\frac{\partial}{\partial y_{i,j}}$ of $K[x, \bigcup_{i=1}^s \{y_{i,1}, \dots, y_{i,r_i}\}]$. We abbreviate $\frac{\partial g_i}{\partial y_j}$ as g_{tyj} . For element f of $K[x]$, we shall often use f' instead of f_x .

*The author is supported by Scientific Research Fund of Hunan Provincial Education Department (Grant No. 21A0056), the NSF of China (Grant No. 11871241; 11601146) and the Construct Program of the Key Discipline in Hunan Province.

A K -derivation $D : R \rightarrow R$ of R is a K -linear map such that

$$D(ab) = D(a)b + aD(b)$$

for any $a, b \in R$ and $D(c) = 0$ for any $c \in K$. The set of all K -derivations of R is denoted by $\text{Der}_K(R)$. An ideal I of R is called D -stable if $D(I) \subset I$. R is called D -simple if it has no proper nonzero D -stable ideal. The K -derivation D is called simple if R has no D -stable ideals other than 0 and R . For some examples of simple derivations, see [1], [2], [3], [8].

A derivation D of R is said to be a Shamsuddin derivation if $D = \partial_x + \sum_{i=1}^n (a_i y_i + b_i) \partial_i$ with $a_i, b_i \in K[x]$ for all $1 \leq i \leq n$. Observe that if D is such a Shamsuddin derivation of R , then grouping the terms that have the same a_i and renaming the indeterminates y_i and the polynomials a_i, b_i if necessary, we can write D in the following form:

$$D = \partial_x + \sum_{i=1}^s \sum_{j=1}^{r_i} (a_i y_{i,j} + b_{i,j}) \partial_{i,j}$$

with $a_i, b_{i,j} \in K[x]$ for every i and every (i, j) , $a_i \neq a_l$ for $i \neq l$. A derivation D of R is said to be locally nilpotent if, for each $a \in R$, there exists $m \in \mathbb{N}^*$ such that $D^m(a) = 0$.

The Mathieu-Zhao space was introduced by Zhao in [10] and [11], which is a natural generalization of ideals. We give the definition here for the polynomial rings. A K -subspace M of R is said to be a Mathieu-Zhao space if for any $a, b \in R$ with $a^m \in M$ for all $m \geq 1$, we have $ba^m \in M$ when $m \gg 0$.

In our paper, we prove that the images of simple Shamsuddin derivations are not Mathieu-Zhao spaces in section 2. In addition, we give a necessary and sufficient condition for D to be a Mathieu-Zhao spaces, where $D = \partial_x + \sum_{i=1}^s (a(x)y_i + b_i(x))\partial_i + \sum_{j=s+1}^n b_j(x)\partial_j$. In section 3, we prove that the images of some simple derivations in dimension three are not Mathieu-Zhao spaces and locally nilpotent derivations are not simple in dimension greater than one. According to our conclusions, we make the following conjecture:

Conjecture 1.1. *If D is a simple derivation of $K[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ and $n \geq 2$, then $\text{Im } D$ is not a Mathieu-Zhao space.*

2 The images of simple Shamsuddin derivations

Lemma 2.1. *Let $D = \partial_x + \sum_{i=1}^s \sum_{j=1}^{r_i} (a_i y_{i,j} + b_{i,j}) \partial_{i,j}$ be a derivation of $K[x, y_{1,1}, \dots, y_{s,r_s}]$ with $a_i, b_{i,j} \in K[x]$. If D is simple, then $\deg a_i \geq 1$ for all $1 \leq i \leq s$.*

Proof. It follows from Theorem 3.1 in [4] that $D_i = \partial_x + \sum_{j=1}^{r_i} (a_i y_{i,j} + b_{i,j}) \partial_{i,j}$ is simple for all $1 \leq i \leq s$. If $a_i \in K$, then it's easy to see that the equation

$z' = a_i z + \sum_{j=1}^{r_i} k_j b_{i,j}$ has solution in $K[x]$ for any $(k_1, \dots, k_{r_i}) \in K^{r_i}$. It follows from Theorem 3.2 in [4] that D_i is not simple, a contradiction. Hence $\deg a_i \geq 1$ for all $1 \leq i \leq s$. \square

Theorem 2.2. *Let $D = \partial_x + \sum_{i=1}^s \sum_{j=1}^{r_i} (a_i y_{i,j} + b_{i,j}) \partial_{i,j}$ be a derivation of $K[x, y_{1,1}, \dots, y_{s,r_s}]$ with $a_i, b_{i,j} \in K[x]$. If D is simple, then $\text{Im } D$ is not a Mathieu-Zhao space of $K[x, y_{1,1}, \dots, y_{s,r_s}]$.*

Proof. Note that $1 \in \text{Im } D$. If $\text{Im } D$ is a Mathieu-Zhao space of $K[x, y_{1,1}, \dots, y_{s,r_s}]$, then we have $\text{Im } D = K[x, y_{1,1}, \dots, y_{s,r_s}]$. We claim that $y_{1,1} \notin \text{Im } D$. Suppose that $y_{1,1} \in \text{Im } D$. Then there exists $f \in K[x, y_{1,1}, \dots, y_{s,r_s}]$ such that

$$(2.1) \quad y_{1,1} = D(f).$$

Let $f = f^{(d)} + f^{(d-1)} + \dots + f^{(1)} + f^{(0)}$, where $f^{(j)}$ is a polynomial of degree j with respect to $y_{1,1}, \dots, y_{s,r_s}$ for $0 \leq j \leq d$. Suppose that

$$f^{(d)} = \sum_{l_1 + \dots + l_s = d} c_{l_1, \dots, l_s} y_1^{l_1} \cdots y_s^{l_s}$$

with $c_{l_1, \dots, l_s} \in K[x]$, $y_i = (y_{i,1}, \dots, y_{i,r_i})$, $l_i = l_{i,1} + \dots + l_{i,r_i}$ for $1 \leq i \leq s$. If the equation $a_1(x)\gamma_1 + \dots + a_s(x)\gamma_s = 0$ has no positive integral solution, then the conclusion follows from Lemma 2.1 and Theorem 3.2 in [9]. Otherwise, we can assume that $\sum_{i=1}^s |m_i^{(u)}| a_i(x) = 0$ with $(m_1^{(u)}, \dots, m_s^{(u)}) = 1$ and $m_i^{(u)} = (m_{i,1}^{(u)}, \dots, m_{i,r_i}^{(u)})$ for all $1 \leq i \leq s$, $1 \leq u \leq t$ for some $t \in \{1, 2, \dots, s\}$, $|m_i^{(u)}| = m_{i,1}^{(u)} + \dots + m_{i,r_i}^{(u)}$ and the vectors $m^{(1)} := (m_1^{(1)}, \dots, m_s^{(1)}), \dots, m^{(t)} := (m_1^{(t)}, \dots, m_s^{(t)})$ are linearly independent. We view the polynomials as in $K[x, y_{1,1}, \dots, y_{s,r_s}]$ with coefficients in $K[x]$ when we comparing the coefficients of monomials on $y_{1,1}, \dots, y_{s,r_s}$.

(1) If $d \geq 2$, then we have

$$(2.2) \quad c'_{l_1, \dots, l_s} + (l_1 a_1(x) + \dots + l_s a_s(x)) c_{l_1, \dots, l_s} = 0$$

by comparing the coefficients of $y_1^{l_1} \cdots y_s^{l_s}$ with $l_1 + \dots + l_s = d$ of equation (2.1). If $l_1 a_1(x) + \dots + l_s a_s(x) \neq 0$, then it follows from equation (2.2) that $c_{l_1, \dots, l_s} = 0$. If $l_1 a_1(x) + \dots + l_s a_s(x) = 0$, then $c_{l_1, \dots, l_s} \in K$. Thus, we have

$$f^{(d)} = c_{k_1} (y_1^{m_1^{(1)}} \cdots y_s^{m_s^{(1)}})^{k_1} + \dots + c_{k_t} (y_1^{m_1^{(t)}} \cdots y_s^{m_s^{(t)}})^{k_t}$$

with $c_{k_1} \neq 0$, where $\sum_{i=1}^s k_u |m_i^{(u)}| = d$ for all $1 \leq u \leq t$. Suppose that $f^{(d-1)} = \sum_{l_1 + \dots + l_s = d-1} \tilde{c}_{l_1, \dots, l_s} y_1^{l_1} \cdots y_s^{l_s}$ with $\tilde{c}_{l_1, \dots, l_s} \in K[x]$, $y_i = (y_{i,1}, \dots, y_{i,r_i})$, $l_i = l_{i,1} + \dots + l_{i,r_i}$ for $1 \leq i \leq s$. Note that $(k_u m_{1,1}^{(u)}, \dots, k_u m_{i,j}^{(u)} - 1, \dots, k_u m_{s,r_s}^{(u)}) \neq (k_v m_{1,1}^{(v)}, \dots, k_v m_{\tilde{i},j}^{(v)} - 1, \dots, k_v m_{s,r_s}^{(v)})$ for $i \neq \tilde{i}$, $1 \leq u, v \leq t$. Otherwise, $a_i(x) = a_{\tilde{i}}(x)$, a contradiction.

If $d \geq 3$, then comparing the coefficients of $y_{1,1}^{k_1 m_{1,1}^{(1)} - 1} \cdots y_{1,r_1}^{k_1 m_{1,r_1}^{(1)}} \cdots y_{s,1}^{k_1 m_{s,1}^{(1)}} \cdots y_{s,r_s}^{k_1 m_{s,r_s}^{(1)}}$, $y_{1,1}^{k_1 m_{1,1}^{(1)}} y_{1,2}^{k_1 m_{1,2}^{(1)} - 1} \cdots y_{s,r_s}^{k_1 m_{s,r_s}^{(1)}}$, \dots , $y_{1,1}^{k_1 m_{1,1}^{(1)}} y_{1,2}^{k_1 m_{1,2}^{(1)}} \cdots y_{s,r_s}^{k_1 m_{s,r_s}^{(1)} - 1}$ of equation

(2.1), at least one of $\tilde{c}_{l_1, \dots, l_s}$ satisfies the equation $z' = a_{i_0}z + \sum_{j=1}^{r_{i_0}} \hat{k}_j b_{i_0, j}$ for some $i_0 \in \{1, 2, \dots, s\}$, $(\hat{k}_1, \dots, \hat{k}_{r_{i_0}}) \in K^{r_{i_0}} / \{(0, \dots, 0)\}$; $l_1 + \dots + l_s = d - 1$. Since D is simple, it follows from Theorem 3.1 in [4] that $D_i = \partial_x + \sum_{j=1}^{r_i} (a_i y_{i, j} + b_{i, j}) \partial_{i, j}$ is simple for all $1 \leq i \leq s$. It follows from Theorem 3.2 in [4] that the equation $z' = a_{i_0}z + \sum_{j=1}^{r_{i_0}} \tilde{k}_j b_{i_0, j}$ does not have any solution in $K[x]$ for any $(\tilde{k}_1, \dots, \tilde{k}_{r_{i_0}}) \in K^{r_{i_0}} / \{(0, \dots, 0)\}$, a contradiction.

If $d = 2$, then $f^{(2)} = c_{k_1} y_{i_1, j_1} y_{\tilde{i}_1, \tilde{j}_1} + \dots + c_{k_t} y_{i_t, j_t} y_{\tilde{i}_t, \tilde{j}_t}$ with $c_{k_1} \neq 0$, $i_u \neq \tilde{i}_u$, $1 \leq u \leq t$. Let $f^{(1)} = \sum_{i=1}^s \sum_{j=1}^{r_i} C_{i, j} y_{i, j}$ with $C_{i, j} \in K[x]$ for $1 \leq j \leq r_i$, $1 \leq i \leq s$. If $y_{1,1} \notin \{y_{i_1, j_1}, \dots, y_{i_t, j_t}, y_{\tilde{i}_1, \tilde{j}_1}, \dots, y_{\tilde{i}_t, \tilde{j}_t}\}$, then we have

$$(2.3) \quad C'_{1,1} + a_1(x)C_{1,1} = 1$$

by comparing the coefficients of $y_{1,1}$ of equation (2.1). It follows from Lemma 2.1 that $\deg a_1(x) \geq 1$. Then we have $C_{1,1} = 0$ by comparing the degree of x of equation (2.3), which contradicts equation (2.3). If $y_{1,1} \in \{y_{i_1, j_1}, \dots, y_{i_t, j_t}, y_{\tilde{i}_1, \tilde{j}_1}, \dots, y_{\tilde{i}_t, \tilde{j}_t}\}$, then we can assume that

$$f^{(2)} = c_{k_1} y_{1,1} y_{i_1, j_1} + \dots + c_{k_t} y_{i_t, j_t} y_{\tilde{i}_t, \tilde{j}_t}.$$

Hence

$$(2.4) \quad C'_{i_1, j_1} - a_1(x)C_{i_1, j_1} + c_{k_1} b_{1,1} + c_{k_2} b_{1,2} + \dots + c_{k_{\tilde{t}_1}} b_{1, \tilde{t}_1} = 0$$

by comparing the coefficients of y_{i_1, j_1} of equation (2.1), where $1 \leq \tilde{t}_1 \leq \min\{t, r_1\}$. Since D is simple, it follows from the arguments of $d = 3$ that $C'_{i_1, j_1} - a_1(x)C_{i_1, j_1} + c_{k_1} b_{1,1} + c_{k_2} b_{1,2} + \dots + c_{k_{\tilde{t}_1}} b_{1, \tilde{t}_1} \neq 0$, a contradiction.

(2) If $d = 1$, then we can assume that $f^{(1)} = \sum_{i=1}^s \sum_{j=1}^{r_i} C_{i, j} y_{i, j}$ with $C_{i, j} \in K[x]$ for $1 \leq j \leq r_i$, $1 \leq i \leq s$. Thus, we have

$$(2.5) \quad C'_{1,1} + a_1(x)C_{1,1} = 1$$

by comparing the coefficients of $y_{1,1}$ of equation (2.1). Since $\deg a_1(x) \geq 1$, we have $C_{1,1} = 0$ by comparing the degree of x of equation (2.5), which contradicts equation (2.5).

(3) If $d = 0$, then $D(f) \in K[x]$. Clearly, $y_{1,1} \notin \text{Im } D$. Thus, the conclusion follows. \square

Corollary 2.3. *Let $D = \partial_x + \sum_{i=1}^s \sum_{j=1}^{r_i} (a_i(x)y_{i, j} + b_{i, j}) \partial_{i, j}$ be a derivation of $K[x, y_{1,1}, \dots, y_{s, r_s}]$ with $a_i, b_{i, j} \in K[x]$. If $\deg a_i > \deg b_{i, j}$ and $b_{i,1}, \dots, b_{i, r_i}$ are linearly independent over K for every $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, s\}$ and every $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, r_i\}$, then $\text{Im } D$ is not a Mathieu-Zhao space of $K[x, y_{1,1}, \dots, y_{s, r_s}]$.*

Proof. It follows from Corollary 3.3 in [4] that D is simple. Then the conclusion follows from Theorem 2.2. \square

Proposition 2.4. *Let $D = \partial_x + \sum_{i=1}^k (a(x)y_i + b_i(x))\partial_i + \sum_{j=k+1}^n b_j(x)\partial_j$ be a derivation of $K[x, y_1, \dots, y_n]$ with $a(x), b_i(x) \in K[x]$ for all $1 \leq i \leq n$, $k \geq 1$. Then $\text{Im } D$ is a Mathieu-Zhao space of $K[x, y_1, \dots, y_n]$ iff $a(x) \in K$.*

Proof. “ \Leftarrow ” If $a(x) \in K$, then it follows from Example 9.3.2 in [7] that D is locally finite. Since $1 \in \text{Im } D$, it follows from Proposition 1.4 in [12] that $\text{Im } D$ is a Mathieu-Zhao space of $K[x, y_1, \dots, y_n]$.

“ \Rightarrow ” Since $1 \in \text{Im } D$ and $\text{Im } D$ is a Mathieu-Zhao space of $K[x, y_1, \dots, y_n]$, we have $\text{Im } D = K[x, y_1, \dots, y_n]$. Suppose that $\deg a(x) \geq 1$. We claim $y_1 \notin \text{Im } D$. If $y_1 \in \text{Im } D$, then there exists $f \in K[x, y_1, \dots, y_n]$ such that

$$(2.6) \quad y_1 = D(f).$$

Let $f = f^{(d)} + \dots + f^{(1)} + f^{(0)}$, where $f^{(\tilde{k})}$ is a polynomial of degree k with respect to y_1, \dots, y_n for $0 \leq \tilde{k} \leq d$. Suppose that $f^{(d)} = \sum_{l_1 + \dots + l_n = d} c_{l_1, \dots, l_n}^{(0)} y_1^{l_1} \cdots y_n^{l_n}$ with $c_{l_1, \dots, l_n}^{(0)} \in K[x]$.

If $d \geq 2$, then we have

$$(2.7) \quad c_{l_1, \dots, l_n}^{(0)'} + (l_1 + \dots + l_k)a(x)c_{l_1, \dots, l_n}^{(0)} = 0$$

by comparing the coefficients of $y_1^{l_1} \cdots y_n^{l_n}$ with $l_1 + \dots + l_n = d$ of equation (2.6). If $l_1 + \dots + l_k \neq 0$, then $c_{l_1, \dots, l_n}^{(0)} = 0$ for all $l_1 + \dots + l_n = d$ by comparing the degree of x of equation (2.7). Thus,

$$f^{(d)} = \sum_{l_{k+1} + \dots + l_n = d} c_{l_{k+1}, \dots, l_n}^{(0)} y_{k+1}^{l_{k+1}} \cdots y_n^{l_n}.$$

Let $f^{(d-1)} = \sum_{l_1 + \dots + l_n = d-1} c_{l_1, \dots, l_n}^{(1)} y_1^{l_1} \cdots y_n^{l_n}$ with $c_{l_1, \dots, l_n}^{(1)} \in K[x]$. If $d-1 \geq 2$, then we have

$$(2.8) \quad \sum_{l_1 + \dots + l_n = d-1} [c_{l_1, \dots, l_n}^{(1)'} + (l_1 + \dots + l_k)a(x)c_{l_1, \dots, l_n}^{(1)}] y_1^{l_1} \cdots y_n^{l_n} + \sum_{l_{k+1} + \dots + l_n = d} \sum_{j=k+1}^n l_j b_j c_{l_{k+1}, \dots, l_n}^{(0)} y_{k+1}^{l_{k+1}} \cdots y_j^{l_j-1} \cdots y_n^{l_n} = 0$$

by considering the part of degree $d-1$ of equation (2.6) with respect to y_1, \dots, y_n . If $l_1 + \dots + l_k \neq 0$, then we have

$$(2.9) \quad c_{l_1, \dots, l_n}^{(1)'} + (l_1 + \dots + l_k)a(x)c_{l_1, \dots, l_n}^{(1)} = 0$$

by comparing the coefficients of $y_1^{l_1} \cdots y_n^{l_n}$ with $l_1 + \dots + l_n = d-1$ of equation (2.8). Thus, we have $c_{l_1, \dots, l_n}^{(1)} = 0$ for all $l_1 + \dots + l_k \neq 0$ by comparing the degree of x of equation (2.9). That is,

$$f^{(d-1)} = \sum_{l_{k+1} + \dots + l_n = d-1} c_{l_{k+1}, \dots, l_n}^{(1)} y_{k+1}^{l_{k+1}} \cdots y_n^{l_n}.$$

Hence we have $f^{(t)} = \sum_{l_{k+1}+\dots+l_n=t} c_{l_{k+1},\dots,l_n}^{(d-t)} y_{k+1}^{l_{k+1}} \cdots y_n^{l_n}$ by considering the part of degree t of equation (2.6) with respect to y_1, \dots, y_n for all $2 \leq t \leq d$. Suppose that $f^{(1)} = c_1(x)y_1 + \cdots + c_n(x)y_n$. Then we have

$$(2.10) \quad c_1'(x) + a(x)c_1(x) = 1$$

by comparing the coefficients of y_1 of equation (2.6). Since $\deg a(x) \geq 1$, we have $c_1(x) = 0$ by comparing the degree of x of equation (2.10), which contradicts equation (2.10). \square

Lemma 2.5. *Let $D = \partial_x + \sum_{j=1}^{r_i} (a_i(x)y_{i,j} + b_{i,j}(x))\partial_{i,j} + \sum_{l \neq i, l=1}^s \sum_{j=1}^{r_l} (a_l(x)y_{l,j})\partial_{l,j}$ be a derivation of $K[x, y_{1,1}, \dots, y_{s,r_s}]$ and $D_i = \partial_x + \sum_{j=1}^{r_i} (a_i(x)y_{i,j} + b_{i,j}(x))\partial_{i,j}$ a derivation of $K[x, y_{i,1}, \dots, y_{i,r_i}]$ with $a_i(x), a_l(x), b_{i,j}(x) \in K[x]$ for $1 \leq i \leq s$. If $\text{Im } D$ is a Mathieu-Zhao space of $K[x, y_{1,1}, \dots, y_{s,r_s}]$, then $\text{Im } D_i$ is a Mathieu-Zhao space of $K[x, y_{i,1}, \dots, y_{i,r_i}]$ for $1 \leq i \leq s$.*

Proof. Since $1 \in \text{Im } D$ and $\text{Im } D$ is a Mathieu-Zhao space of $K[x, y_{1,1}, \dots, y_{s,r_s}]$, we have $\text{Im } D = K[x, y_{1,1}, \dots, y_{s,r_s}]$. Thus, for any $x^{q_0} y_{i,1}^{q_1} \cdots y_{i,r_i}^{q_i} \in K[x, y_{i,1}, \dots, y_{i,r_i}]$, there exists $g_{q_0, \dots, q_i} \in K[x, y_{1,1}, \dots, y_{s,r_s}]$ such that

$$(2.11) \quad x^{q_0} y_{i,1}^{q_1} \cdots y_{i,r_i}^{q_i} = D(g_{q_0, \dots, q_i}).$$

Let $y_{l,j} = 0$ for all $1 \leq j \leq r_l$, $1 \leq l \leq s$, $l \neq i$. Then equation (2.11) has the following form:

$$x^{q_0} y_{i,1}^{q_1} \cdots y_{i,r_i}^{q_i} = D_i(g_{q_0, \dots, q_i}(x, 0, \dots, 0, y_{i,1}, \dots, y_{i,r_i}, 0, \dots, 0)).$$

Hence we have $\text{Im } D_i = K[x, y_{i,1}, \dots, y_{i,r_i}]$. That is, $\text{Im } D_i$ is a Mathieu-Zhao space of $K[x, y_{i,1}, \dots, y_{i,r_i}]$ for $1 \leq i \leq s$. \square

Corollary 2.6. *Let $D = \partial_x + \sum_{j=1}^{r_i} (a_i(x)y_{i,j} + b_{i,j}(x))\partial_{i,j} + \sum_{l \neq i, l=1}^s \sum_{j=1}^{r_l} (a_l(x)y_{l,j})\partial_{l,j}$ be a derivation of $K[x, y_{1,1}, \dots, y_{s,r_s}]$ with $a_i(x), a_l(x), b_{i,j}(x) \in K[x]$. If $\text{Im } D$ is a Mathieu-Zhao space of $K[x, y_{1,1}, \dots, y_{s,r_s}]$, then $a_i(x) \in K$.*

Proof. The conclusion follows from Lemma 2.5 and Corollary 3.5 in [9]. \square

3 Images of some simple derivations

Proposition 3.1. *Let $D = \partial_{x_1} + \sum_{i=2}^n (a_i x_i + b_i)\partial_{x_i}$ be a derivation of $K[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ with $a_i, b_i \in K[x_1, \dots, x_{i-1}]$. Then we have the following statements:*

- (1) *If $\deg_{x_{n-1}} a_n \geq 1$, then $\text{Im } D$ is not a Mathieu-Zhao space of $K[x_1, \dots, x_n]$.*
- (2) *If $\deg_{x_{n-1}} a_n = 0$ and $\deg_{x_{n-2}} (n_1 a_{n-1} + n_2 a_n) \geq 1$ for any $(n_1, n_2) \in \mathbb{N}^2 \setminus \{(0, 0)\}$, then $\text{Im } D$ is not a Mathieu-Zhao space of $K[x_1, \dots, x_n]$.*

Proof. Note that $1 \in \text{Im } D$. If $\text{Im } D$ is a Mathieu-Zhao space of $K[x_1, \dots, x_n]$, then we have $\text{Im } D = K[x_1, \dots, x_n]$. We claim $x_n \notin \text{Im } D$. If $x_n \in \text{Im } D$, then there exists $f \in K[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ such that

$$(3.1) \quad x_n = D(f).$$

We view the polynomials as in $K[x_1, \dots, x_i]$ with coefficients in $K[x_1, \dots, x_{i-1}]$ when we comparing the coefficients of monomials on x_i in the following arguments for $i \in \{2, \dots, n\}$. Let $f = f_d x_n^d + \dots + f_1 x_n + f_0$ with $f_d \neq 0$, $f_j \in K[x_1, \dots, x_{n-1}]$ for $0 \leq j \leq d$. If $d \geq 1$, then we have

$$(3.2) \quad f_{dx_1} + \sum_{i=2}^{n-1} (a_i x_i + b_i) f_{dx_i} + da_n f_d = c$$

by comparing the coefficients of x_n^d of equation (3.1), where $c = 0$ or 1 .

(1) If $\deg_{x_{n-1}} a_n \geq 1$, then we have $f_d = 0$ by comparing the degree of x_{n-1} of equation (3.2), which is a contradiction. Thus, we have $d = 0$. Since $D(f) \in K[x_1, \dots, x_{n-1}]$, we have $x_n \notin \text{Im } D$. Thus, $\text{Im } D$ is not a Mathieu-Zhao space of $K[x_1, \dots, x_n]$.

(2) If $\deg_{x_{n-1}} a_n = 0$, then we assume that $f_d = f_d^{(m)} x_{n-1}^m + \dots + f_d^{(1)} x_{n-1} + f_d^{(0)}$ with $f_d^{(m)} \neq 0$, $f_d^{(l)} \in K[x_1, \dots, x_{n-2}]$ for $0 \leq l \leq m$, we have

$$(3.3) \quad f_{dx_1}^{(m)} + \sum_{i=2}^{n-2} (a_i x_i + b_i) f_{dx_i}^{(m)} + ma_{n-1} f_d^{(m)} + da_n f_d^{(m)} = c$$

by comparing the coefficients of x_{n-1}^m of equation (3.2), where $c = 0$ or 1 . Since $d \geq 1$ and $\deg_{x_{n-2}} (ma_{n-1} + da_n) \geq 1$, we have $f_d^{(m)} = 0$ by comparing the degree of x_{n-1} of equation (3.3), which is a contradiction. Hence we have $x_n \notin \text{Im } D$. Then the conclusion follows. \square

Corollary 3.2. *Let $D = \partial_{x_1} + \sum_{i=2}^n (a_i x_i + b_i) \partial_{x_i}$ be a derivation of $K[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ with $a_i, b_i \in K[x_1, \dots, x_{i-1}]$. If D is simple, then $\deg a_2 \geq 1$.*

Proof. Let $\tilde{D} = \partial_{x_1} + (a_2 x_2 + b_2) \partial_{x_2}$. Then \tilde{D} is simple. Hence the conclusion follows from Lemma 2.1. \square

Proposition 3.3. *Let $D = \partial_{x_1} + \sum_{i=2}^3 (a_i x_i + b_i) \partial_{x_i}$ be a derivation of $K[x_1, x_2, x_3]$ with $a_i, b_i \in K[x_1, \dots, x_{i-1}]$ and $a_3 = 0$. If D is simple, then $\text{Im } D$ is not a Mathieu-Zhao space of $K[x_1, x_2, x_3]$.*

Proof. Note that $1 \in \text{Im } D$. If $\text{Im } D$ is a Mathieu-Zhao space of $K[x_1, x_2, x_3]$, then $\text{Im } D = K[x_1, x_2, x_3]$. Suppose that $\deg_{x_2} b_3 = u$. We claim $x_2^{u+1} \notin \text{Im } D$ if D is simple. Suppose that $x_2^{u+1} \in \text{Im } D$. Then there exists $f \in K[x_1, x_2, x_3]$ such that

$$(3.4) \quad x_2^{u+1} = D(f)$$

We view the polynomials as in $K[x_1, \dots, x_i]$ with coefficients in $K[x_1, \dots, x_{i-1}]$ for $i \in \{2, 3\}$ when we comparing the coefficients of monomials on x_i in the following arguments. Let $f = f_d x_3^d + \dots + f_1 x_3 + f_0$ with $f_d \neq 0$, $f_j \in K[x_1, x_2]$ for $0 \leq j \leq d$. If $d \geq 1$, then we have

$$f_{dx_1} + (a_2 x_2 + b_2) f_{dx_2} = 0$$

by comparing the coefficients of x_3^d of equation (3.4). That is, $D(f_d) = 0$. Since D is simple, we have $f_d \in K^*$. If $d \geq 2$, then we have

$$f_{(d-1)x_1} + (a_2 x_2 + b_2) f_{(d-1)x_2} + b_3 \cdot df_d = 0$$

by comparing the coefficients of x_3^{d-1} of equation (3.4). Then $-(df_d)^{-1} f_{d-1}$ is a solution of $\tilde{D}(z) = b_3$, where $\tilde{D} = \partial_{x_1} + (a_2 x_2 + b_2) \partial_{x_2}$, which contradicts that D is simple. Hence we have $d \leq 1$.

(1) If $d = 1$, then we have $f = f_1 x_3 + f_0$ with $f_1 \in K^*$ and equation (3.4) has the following form

$$(3.5) \quad f_{0x_1} + (a_2 x_2 + b_2) f_{0x_2} + f_1 \cdot b_3 = x_2^{u+1}$$

Since $\deg_{x_2} b_3 = u$, we have $\deg_{x_2} f_0 \geq u + 1$. Let $f_0 = f_0^{(t)} x_2^t + \dots + f_0^{(1)} x_2 + f_0^{(0)}$ with $f_0^{(t)} \neq 0$, $f_0^{(j)} \in K[x_1]$ for $0 \leq j \leq t$. If $t > u + 1 \geq 1$, then we have

$$(3.6) \quad f_0^{(t)'} + t a_2 f_0^{(t)} = 0$$

by comparing the coefficients of x_2^t of equation (3.5). It follows from Corollary 3.2 that $\deg a_2 \geq 1$. Then we have $f_0^{(t)} = 0$ by comparing the degree of x_1 of equation (3.6), which is a contradiction. Hence we have $t = u + 1$. Then we have

$$(3.7) \quad f_0^{(u+1)'} + t a_2 f_0^{(u+1)} = 1$$

by comparing the coefficients of x_2^{u+1} of equation (3.5). We have a contradiction by comparing the degree of x_1 of equation (3.7).

(2) If $d = 0$, then we have $f = f_0$ and equation (3.4) has the following form:

$$(3.8) \quad f_{0x_1} + (a_2 x_2 + b_2) f_{0x_2} = x_2^{u+1}$$

We have a contradiction by following the arguments of case (1). Thus, we have $x_2^{u+1} \notin \text{Im } D$. Hence $\text{Im } D$ is not a Mathieu-Zhao space of $K[x_1, x_2, x_3]$. \square

Theorem 3.4. *Let $D = \partial_{x_1} + \sum_{i=2}^3 (a_i x_i + b_i) \partial_{x_i}$ be a derivation of $K[x_1, x_2, x_3]$ with $a_i, b_i \in K[x_1, \dots, x_{i-1}]$. If D is simple, then $\text{Im } D$ is not a Mathieu-Zhao space of $K[x_1, x_2, x_3]$.*

Proof. If $a_3 = 0$, then it follows from Proposition 3.3 that $\text{Im } D$ is not a Mathieu-Zhao space of $K[x_1, x_2, x_3]$. If $\deg_{x_2} a_3 \geq 1$, then it follows from Proposition 3.1

that $\text{Im } D$ is not a Mathieu-Zhao space of $K[x_1, x_2, x_3]$. Hence we can assume that $a_3 \neq 0$ and $\deg_{x_2} a_3 = 0$. Note that $1 \in \text{Im } D$. If $\text{Im } D$ is a Mathieu-Zhao space of $K[x_1, x_2, x_3]$, then we have $\text{Im } D = K[x_1, x_2, x_3]$. We claim $x_2 \notin \text{Im } D$ if D is simple. If $x_2 \in \text{Im } D$, then there exists $f \in K[x_1, x_2, x_3]$ such that

$$(3.9) \quad x_2 = D(f).$$

We view the polynomials as in $K[x_1, \dots, x_i]$ with coefficients in $K[x_1, \dots, x_{i-1}]$ for $i \in \{2, 3\}$ when we comparing the coefficients of monomials on x_i in the following arguments. Let $f = f_d x_3^d + \dots + f_1 x_3 + f_0$ with $f_d \neq 0$, $f_j \in K[x_1, x_2]$ for $0 \leq j \leq d$.

If $d \geq 1$, then we have

$$(3.10) \quad f_{dx_1} + (a_2 x_2 + b_2) f_{dx_2} + df_d \cdot a_3 = 0$$

by comparing the coefficients of x_3^d of equation (3.9). Let $f_d = f_d^{(m)} x_2^m + \dots + f_d^{(1)} x_2 + f_d^{(0)}$ with $f_d^{(m)} \neq 0$, $f_d^{(k)} \in K[x_1]$ for $0 \leq k \leq d$. Then we have

$$(3.11) \quad f_{dx_1}^{(m)} + (ma_2 + da_3) f_d^{(m)} = 0$$

by comparing the coefficients of x_2^m of equation (3.10). Then we have $f_d^{(m)} \in K^*$ and $da_3 = -ma_2$ by comparing the degree of x_1 of equation (3.11).

If $m \geq 1$, then we have

$$f_{dx_1}^{(m-1)} + m f_d^{(m)} b_2 + (m-1) f_d^{(m-1)} a_2 + da_3 \cdot f_d^{(m-1)} = 0$$

by comparing the coefficients of x_2^{m-1} of equation (3.10). That is,

$$f_d^{(m-1)'} = a_2 f_d^{(m-1)} - m f_d^{(m)} b_2.$$

Thus, $-(m f_d^{(m)})^{-1} f_d^{(m-1)}$ is a solution of the equation $z' = a_2 z + b_2$. Let $\tilde{D} = \partial_{x_1} + (a_2 x_2 + b_2) \partial_{x_2}$. Then it follows from Theorem 13.2.1 in [7] that \tilde{D} is not simple. Hence D is not simple, which is a contradiction. Whence we have $m = 0$. That is, $f_d = f_d^{(0)}$. Then equation (3.11) has the following form:

$$f_d^{(0)'} + da_3 f_d^{(0)} = 0.$$

Since $a_3 \neq 0$, we have $f_d^{(0)} = 0$ by comparing the degree of x_1 of the above equation, which is a contradiction. Hence we have $d = 0$. Then equation (3.9) has the following form:

$$(3.12) \quad f_{0x_1} + (a_2 x_2 + b_2) f_{0x_2} = x_2.$$

Let $f_0 = f_0^{(t)} x_2^t + \dots + f_0^{(1)} x_2 + f_0^{(0)}$ with $f_0^{(k)} \in K[x_1]$ for $0 \leq k \leq t$. Then we have $t = 1$ and

$$(3.13) \quad f_0^{(1)'} + a_2 f_0^{(1)} = 1$$

by comparing the coefficients of x_2 of equation (3.12). Since $\deg a_2 \geq 1$, we have a contradiction by comparing the degree of x_1 of equation (3.13). Hence we have $x_2 \notin \text{Im } D$, Whence $\text{Im } D$ is not a Mathieu-Zhao space of $K[x_1, x_2, x_3]$. \square

Proposition 3.5. *Let $D = \partial_{x_1} + (a_2x_2 + b_2)\partial_{x_2} + b_3\partial_{x_3}$ be a derivation of $K[x_1, x_2, x_3]$ with $a_2, b_2 \in K[x_1]$ and $b_3 = b_3^{(v)}x_2^v + \cdots + b_3^{(1)}x_2 + b_3^{(0)}$ with $b_3^{(v)} \neq 0$, $b_3^{(j)} \in K[x_1]$ for $0 \leq j \leq v$. If $\deg a_2 > \deg b_3^{(v)}$, then $\text{Im } D$ is not a Mathieu-Zhao space of $K[x_1, x_2, x_3]$.*

Proof. Note that $1 \in \text{Im } D$. If $\text{Im } D$ is a Mathieu-Zhao space of $K[x_1, x_2, x_3]$, then we have $\text{Im } D = K[x_1, x_2, x_3]$. We claim $x_2^{v+1} \notin \text{Im } D$ if $\deg a_2 > \deg b_3^{(v)}$. Suppose that $x_2^{v+1} \in \text{Im } D$. Then there exists $f \in K[x_1, x_2, x_3]$ such that

$$(3.14) \quad x_2^{v+1} = D(f).$$

We view the polynomials as in $K[x_1, \dots, x_i]$ with coefficients in $K[x_1, \dots, x_{i-1}]$ when we comparing the coefficients of monomials on x_i for $i \in \{2, 3\}$ in the following arguments. Let $f = f_dx_3^d + \cdots + f_1x_3 + f_0$ with $f_d \neq 0$, $f_j \in K[x_1, x_2]$ for $0 \leq j \leq d$. If $d \geq 1$, then we have the following equations:

$$(3.15) \quad f_{dx_1} + (a_2x_2 + b_2)f_{dx_2} = 0$$

by comparing the coefficients of x_3^d of equation (3.14). Let $f_d = f_d^{(t)}x_2^t + \cdots + f_d^{(1)}x_2 + f_d^{(0)}$ with $f_d^{(t)} \neq 0$, $f_d^{(j)} \in K[x_1]$ for $0 \leq j \leq t$. If $t \geq 1$, then we have

$$(3.16) \quad f_d^{(t)'} + ta_2f_d^{(t)} = 0$$

by comparing the coefficients of x_2^t of equation (3.15). Since $\deg a_2 \geq 1$, we have $f_d^{(t)} = 0$ by comparing the degree of x_1 of equation (3.16), which is a contradiction. Hence we have $t = 0$. It follows from equation (3.15) that $f_d^{(0)'} = 0$. That is, $f_d = f_d^{(0)} \in K^*$.

If $d \geq 2$, then we have

$$(3.17) \quad f_{(d-1)x_1} + (a_2x_2 + b_2)f_{(d-1)x_2} + df_d \cdot b_3 = 0$$

by comparing the coefficients of x_3^{d-1} of equation (3.14). If $v = 0$, then it follows from Proposition 2.4 that $\text{Im } D$ is not a Mathieu-Zhao space of $K[x_1, x_2, x_3]$. We can assume that $v \geq 1$. Let $f_{d-1} = f_{d-1}^{(s)}x_2^s + \cdots + f_{d-1}^{(1)}x_2 + f_{d-1}^{(0)}$ with $f_{d-1}^{(s)} \neq 0$, $f_{d-1}^{(j)} \in K[x_1]$ for $0 \leq j \leq s$. It follows from equation (3.17) that $s \geq v$. If $s > v$, then we have

$$(3.18) \quad f_{d-1}^{(s)'} + sa_2f_{d-1}^{(s)} = 0$$

by comparing the coefficients of x_3^{d-1} of equation (3.17). Since $\deg a_2 \geq 1$, we have $f_{d-1}^{(s)} = 0$ by comparing the degree of x_1 of equation (3.18), which is a contradiction. Hence we have $s = v$. Then we have

$$(3.19) \quad f_{d-1}^{(v)'} + sa_2f_{d-1}^{(v)} + df_d \cdot b_3^{(v)} = 0$$

by comparing the coefficients of x_2^v of equation (3.17). Since $\deg a_2 > \deg b_3^{(v)}$, we have a contradiction by comparing the degree of x_1 of equation (3.19). Thus, we

have $d \leq 1$. That is, $f = f_1x_3 + f_0$ with $f_1 \in K$, $f_0 \in K[x_1, x_2]$. Then equation (3.14) has the following form:

$$(3.20) \quad f_{0x_1} + (a_2x_2 + b_2)f_{0x_2} + f_1 \cdot b_3 = x_2^{v+1}.$$

We have a contradiction by following the arguments of case (1) of Proposition 3.3. Hence we have $x_2^{v+1} \notin \text{Im } D$. That is, $\text{Im } D$ is not a Mathieu-Zhao space of $K[x_1, x_2, x_3]$. \square

Corollary 3.6. *Let $D = \partial_{x_1} + (a_2x_2 + b_2)\partial_{x_2} + b_3\partial_{x_3}$ be a derivation of $K[x_1, x_2, x_3]$ with $a_2, b_2 \in K[x_1]$ and $b_3 = b_3^{(v)}x_2^v + \cdots + b_3^{(1)}x_2 + b_3^{(0)}$ with $b_3^{(v)} \in K^*$, $b_3^{(j)} \in K[x_1]$ for $0 \leq j \leq v$. Then $\text{Im } D$ is a Mathieu-Zhao space of $K[x_1, x_2, x_3]$ iff $a_2 \in K$.*

Proof. “ \Leftarrow ” If $a_2 \in K$, then D is locally finite. Since $1 \in \text{Im } D$, the conclusion follows from Proposition 1.4 in [12].

“ \Rightarrow ” If $\deg a_2 \geq 1$, then $\deg a_2 > \deg b_3^{(v)}$. It follows from Proposition 3.5 that $\text{Im } D$ is not a Mathieu-Zhao space of $K[x_1, x_2, x_3]$. Then the conclusion follows. \square

Proposition 3.7. *Let D be a derivation of $K[x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n]$ for $n \geq 2$. If D is locally nilpotent, then D is not simple.*

Proof. If $K[x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n]^D \neq K$, then $K[x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n]^D$ is a D -stable ideal. If $K[x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n]^D = (1)$, then $D = 0$. Clearly, D is not simple. If $K[x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n]^D \neq (1)$, then $K[x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n]^D$ is a proper D -stable ideal. Thus, D is not simple. We can assume that $K[x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n]^D = K$. It follows from Lemma 8 in [5] or Theorem 2.1 in [6] that $D(f) = c \cdot J(f_1, \dots, f_{n-1}, f)$ for some $c \in K^*$, where $J(f_1, \dots, f_{n-1}, f)$ is the Jacobian of f_1, \dots, f_{n-1}, f . Note that $\deg f_i \geq 1$ for all $1 \leq i \leq n-1$. Otherwise, $D = 0$. Clearly, D is not simple. Then we have $D(f_1) = 0$. That is, the ideal (f_1) is a proper D -stable ideal. Hence D is not simple. \square

References

- [1] P. Brumatti, Y. Lequain and D. Levcovitz, *Differential simplicity in Polynomial Rings and Algebraic Independence of Power Series*, J. London Math. Soc. 68(2)(2003), 615-630.
- [2] D. A. Jordan, *Differentially simple rings with no invertible derivations*, the Quart. Jour. of Math. 32(1981) 417-424.
- [3] S. Kour, A.K. Maloo, *Simplicity of Some Derivations of $k[x, y]$* , Comm. in Algebra 41(4)(2013) 1417-1431.

- [4] Y. Lequain, *Simple Shamsuddin derivations of $K[X, Y_1, \dots, Y_n]$: An algorithmic characterization*, J. Pure Appl. Algebra 212(212)(2008) 801-807.
- [5] L. Makar-Limanov, *Locally nilpotent derivations, a new ring invariant and applications*, Lecture notes, Bar-Han Univesity, 1998. Avail. <http://www.math.wayne.edu/~lml/>.
- [6] L. Makar-Limanov, *Locally nilpotent derivations of affine domains*, MPIM Preprint Series 2004-92. Avail. at www.math.mpim-bonn.mpg.de.
- [7] A. Nowicki, *Polynomial derivations and their rings of constants*, Toruń: N. Copernicus Univ. Press, 1994.
- [8] D. Yan, *Simple derivations in two variables*, Comm. in Algebra 47(9)(2019) 3881–3888.
- [9] D. Yan, *On Shamsuddin derivations and the isotropy groups*, arXiv:2002.00330v3.
- [10] W. Zhao, *Generalizations of the image conjecture and Mathieu conjecture*, J. Pure Appl. Algebra 214(7)(2010) 1200-1216.
- [11] W. Zhao, *Mathieu subspaces of associative algebras*, J. Algebra 350(2)(2012) 245-272.
- [12] W. Zhao, *Idempotents in intersection of the kernel and the image of locally fnite derivations and ε -derivations*, Eur. J. Math. 4 (2018) 1491-1504.