

REMARKS ON RETRACTS OF POLYNOMIAL RINGS IN THREE VARIABLES IN ANY CHARACTERISTIC

HIDEO KOJIMA, TAKANORI NAGAMINE, AND RIKO SASAGAWA

ABSTRACT. Let A be a retract of the polynomial ring in three variables over a field k . It is known that if $\text{char}(k) = 0$ or $\text{tr.deg}_k A \neq 2$ then A is a polynomial ring. In this paper, we give some sufficient conditions for A to be the polynomial ring in two variables over k when $\text{char}(k) > 0$ and $\text{tr.deg}_k A = 2$.

1. INTRODUCTION

Throughout the paper, k denotes a field. For an integral domain R and a positive integer n , $R^{[n]}$ denotes the polynomial ring in n variables over R . $Q(R)$ denotes the quotient field of R .

Let B be a k -algebra and A its k -subalgebra. We say that A is a *retract* of B if there exists an ideal I of B such that $B = A \oplus I$, where the sum is A -direct (cf. Definition 2.1). Several mathematicians have studied retracts of k -domains. See, e.g., Costa [5], Spilrain–Yu [20], Liu–Sun [16], [17], the second author [18], Chakraborty–Dasgupta–Dutta–Gupta [3], Gupta–the second author [10]. In particular, the study of retracts of polynomial rings has been done because it is closely related to the Zariski cancellation problem.

In [5], Costa posed the following problem.

Problem 1. *Is every retract of $k^{[n]}$ a polynomial ring?*

We note that Problem 1 includes the Zariski cancellation problem. Indeed, if a k -algebra A satisfies $A^{[1]} \cong k^{[n]}$ as k -algebras, then A can be regarded as a retract of $k^{[n]}$. So, if Problem 1 has an affirmative answer for fixed k and n , then we conclude that $A \cong k^{[n-1]}$.

Let A be a retract of $B := k^{[n]}$. We have the following results on Problem 1.

- (1) If $\text{tr.deg}_k A = 0$ (resp. $\text{tr.deg}_k A = n$), then $A = k$ (resp. $A = B$).

2020 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 13B25; Secondary 13N15, 13A50, 14R20.

Key words and phrases. Polynomial rings, Exponential maps, Retracts.

Research of the first author is supported by JSPS KAKENHI Grant Number JP 21K03200, and the second author by JSPS KAKENHI Grant Number JP 21K13782.

- (2) ([5, Theorem 3.5]) If $\text{tr.deg}_k A = 1$, then $A \cong k^{[1]}$. In particular, if $n = 2$, then A is a polynomial ring.
- (3) ([18, Theorem 2.5], [3, Theorem 5.8]) If $\text{char}(k) = 0$ and $\text{tr.deg}_k A = 2$, then $A \cong k^{[2]}$. In particular, if $n = 3$ and $\text{char}(k) = 0$, then A is a polynomial ring.
- (4) In the case $n \geq 3$ and $\text{char}(k) > 0$, Gupta [8], [9] proved that the Zariski cancellation problem does not hold for the affine n -space \mathbb{A}^n . So, Problem 1 has counter examples when $n \geq 4$ and $\text{char}(k) > 0$.

Therefore, Problem 1 remains open in the following cases:

- $n = 3$ and $\text{char}(k) > 0$.
- $n \geq 4$ and $\text{char}(k) = 0$.

Let A be a retract of $k^{[3]}$ with $\text{tr.deg}_k A = 2$. When $\text{char}(k) = 0$, $A \cong k^{[2]}$ by [18, Theorem 2.5] (or [3, Theorem 5.8]). Unfortunately, their proofs do not work in the case $\text{char}(k) > 0$. In fact, the second author [18] used the result [12, Theorem 1.1 (a)] in the proof of [18, Theorem 2.5], which does not hold true when $\text{char}(k) > 0$. In the proof of [3, Theorem 5.8], the authors used [3, Theorem 2.8], which cannot be used when $\text{char}(k) > 0$. Furthermore, they used the fact that $k^{[2]}$ over a field k of characteristic zero has no non-trivial forms (cf. [11, Theorem 3]), which does not hold true when $\text{char}(k) > 0$.

In this paper, we study the case where $n = 3$ and $\text{char}(k) > 0$. In Section 2, we recall some results on retracts and exponential maps and their rings of constants on integral domains. In Section 3, we give some sufficient conditions for a retract A of $k^{[3]}$ to be a polynomial ring in two variables over k when $\text{char}(k) > 0$ and $\text{tr.deg}_k A = 2$. More precisely, we prove that if one of the following conditions holds, then $A \cong k^{[2]}$:

- (1) A is a ring of constants of some exponential map (cf. Corollary 3.2).
- (2) $\text{ML}(A) \neq A$, that is, there exists a non-trivial exponential map on A (cf. Theorem 3.3).
- (3) k is algebraically closed and there exists a \mathbb{Z} -grading on A with $A_0 \neq A$ (cf. Theorem 3.7).

In Section 4, we give several examples of retracts of low-dimensional polynomial rings over k . These examples indicate they are polynomial rings.

2. PRELIMINARY RESULTS

Let R be an integral domain. In this section, all rings we consider are R -domains.

Definition 2.1. An R -subalgebra A of an R -algebra B is called a *retract* if it satisfies one of the following equivalent conditions:

- (1) There exists an idempotent R -algebra endomorphism φ of B , which is called a *retraction*, such that $\varphi(B) = A$.
- (2) There exists an R -algebra homomorphism $\varphi : B \rightarrow A$ such that $\varphi|_A = \text{id}_A$.
- (3) There exists an ideal I of B such that $B = A \oplus I$ as A -modules.

We recall some properties of retracts.

Lemma 2.2. *Let B be an R -domain and A a retract of B . Then the following assertions hold true.*

- (1) A is algebraically closed in B , namely, every algebraic element of B over A belongs to A . So $Q(A) \cap B = A$.
- (2) If B is finitely generated over R , then so is A .
- (3) If B is a UFD, then so is A .
- (4) If B is regular, then so is A .

Proof. (1) See [5, Lemma 1.3].

(2) Obvious.

(3) See [5, Proposition 1.8].

(4) See [5, Corollary 1.11]. □

Let B be an R -domain and let $\sigma : B \rightarrow B^{[1]}$ be an R -algebra homomorphism from B to $B^{[1]}$. For an indeterminate U over B , let σ_U denote the map $\sigma : B \rightarrow B[U]$. Then σ is called an *exponential map* on B if the following conditions hold.

- (i) $\epsilon_0 \circ \sigma_U = \text{id}_B$, where $\epsilon_0 : B[U] \rightarrow B$ is the evaluation at $U = 0$.
- (ii) For indeterminates U, V , we have $\sigma_V \circ \sigma_U = \sigma_{U+V}$, where $\sigma_V : B \rightarrow B[V]$ is extended to an R -algebra homomorphism $\sigma_V : B[U] \rightarrow B[U, V](= B^{[2]})$ by setting $\sigma_V(U) = U$.

For an exponential map $\sigma : B \rightarrow B^{[1]}$, we denote the ring of constants of σ by B^σ . Namely, $B^\sigma = \{x \in B \mid \sigma(x) = x\} = \sigma^{-1}(B)$. The exponential map σ is said to be *trivial* if $B^\sigma = B$. We note that the conditions (i) and (ii) as above is equivalent to the condition that σ is a co-action of the additive group scheme $\mathbb{G}_a = \text{Spec } R[U]$ on $\text{Spec } B$. If R is a field of char $(R) = 0$, then an exponential map $\sigma : B \rightarrow B^{[1]}$ is corresponding to a locally nilpotent R -derivation $D : B \rightarrow B$. In particular, $B^\sigma = \text{Ker } D$.

For each $b \in B$, we define $\deg_\sigma(b)$ (resp. $\text{lc}_\sigma(b)$) to be the degree of $\sigma(b)$ as a polynomial in the indeterminate over B (resp. the leading coefficient of $\sigma(b)$).

Assume that σ is non-trivial, i.e., $B^\sigma \neq B$. We call $s \in B$ a *local slice* of σ if $\deg_\sigma(s) = \min\{\deg_\sigma(b) \mid b \in B \setminus B^\sigma\}$. For a local slice $s \in B$ of σ , it is clear that $\text{lc}_\sigma(s) \in B^\sigma$. We recall the following well-known result.

Lemma 2.3. *Let σ be a non-trivial exponential map on an R -domain B . For a local slice $s \in B$ of σ , set $a = \text{lc}_\sigma(s)$. Then $B_a := B[\frac{1}{a}] = (B^\sigma)_a[s]$ and s is indeterminate over B^σ .*

Proof. See, e.g., [15, Corollary 2.4]. □

Let $\text{EXP}(B)$ denote the set of all exponential maps on B . Then the Makar-Limanov invariant of B , which is denoted by $\text{ML}(B)$, is defined as

$$\text{ML}(B) = \bigcap_{\sigma \in \text{EXP}(B)} B^\sigma.$$

The Makar-Limanov invariant $\text{ML}(B)$ of B is also called the AK invariant of B (the ring of absolute constants of B) and denoted by $\text{AK}(B)$.

Let A be a subring of B . Then A is said to be *factorially closed* in B if, for any two nonzero elements $b_1, b_2 \in B$, $b_1 b_2 \in A$ implies that $b_1, b_2 \in A$. In some papers, a factorially closed subring is called an *inert* subring. It is well known that B^σ is factorially closed in B for any $\sigma \in \text{EXP}(B)$ (see e.g., [13, Lemma 2.1 (1)]).

3. RETRACTS AND RINGS OF INVARIANTS OF EXPONENTIAL MAPS

In this section, we give some sufficient conditions for a retract A of $k^{[3]}$ to be a polynomial ring. Throughout this subsection, R denotes a domain.

3.1. Retracts and rings of constants of exponential maps. In this subsection, we consider retracts and rings of invariants of exponential maps on R -domains. The following result is a generalization of [3, Proposition 4.2] and [17, Theorem 2.5]. In fact, the proof of Theorem 3.1 is almost the same as that of [17, Theorem 2.5]. In Theorem 3.1, the implication (1) \implies (2) and the equivalence of (1) and (3) when B is a UFD follow from [3, Proposition 4.2]. Here, we use the technique given in the proof of [17, Theorem 2.5].

Theorem 3.1. *Let B be an R -domain and A an R -subalgebra of B . Then the following conditions are equivalent to each other:*

- (1) $B \cong A^{[1]}$ as an A -algebra.
- (2) A is a retract of B with $B = A \oplus Bh$ for some $h \in B \setminus \{0\}$ and $A = B^\sigma$ for some non-trivial exponential map σ on B .

Moreover, if B is a UFD, then the condition (1) is equivalent to the following condition (3).

- (3) A is a retract of B and $A = B^\sigma$ for some non-trivial exponential map σ on B .

Proof. The proof consists of three parts.

(1) \implies (2) and (1) \implies (3). By (1), $B = A[h]$, where h is an indeterminate. So A is a retract of B and $B = A \oplus Bh$. We have an R -algebra homomorphism $\sigma : B \rightarrow B^{[1]} = B[t]$ such that $\sigma(h) = h + t$ and $\sigma(a) = a$ for any $a \in A$. Then σ is an exponential map on B and $B^\sigma = A$. This proves (2) and (3).

(2) \implies (1). Let $\pi : B \rightarrow A = B^\sigma$ be the projection from B onto A regarding to the decomposition $B = A \oplus Bh$. We know that π is a retraction with $\text{Ker } \pi = Bh$. Then h is a local slice of σ . Indeed, for a local slice $s \in B$, $s' := s - \pi(s) \in Bh$, say $s' = bh$ for some $b \in B \setminus \{0\}$. Since $h \notin A = B^\sigma$, $\deg_\sigma(h) \geq \deg_\sigma(s)$. Moreover,

$$\deg_\sigma(s) = \deg_\sigma(s') = \deg_\sigma(b) + \deg_\sigma(h) \geq \deg_\sigma(h),$$

which implies $\deg_\sigma(h) = \deg_\sigma(s)$. Hence h is a local slice of σ .

By Lemma 2.3, $B_a = A_a[h]$, where $a = \text{lc}_\sigma(h) \in A$. Since A is algebraically closed in B and $h \notin A$, $A[h] \cong A^{[1]}$ as A -algebras. For any $f \in B$, there exists a positive integer m such that $a^m f \in A[h]$. We may assume that $a^m f \in M := A \oplus Ah \oplus \cdots \oplus Ah^r$ for some $r \geq 0$. Since

$$B = A \oplus Bh = A \oplus (A \oplus Bh)h = A \oplus Ah \oplus Bh^2,$$

we have $B = M \oplus Bh^{r+1}$. If $f = g + bh^{r+1}$ for some $g \in M$ and $b \in B$, then $a^m bh^{r+1} = a^m f - a^m g \in M \cap Bh^{r+1} = \{0\}$, hence $b = 0$. Therefore, $f = g \in M \subset A[h]$. This proves (1).

(3) \implies (2) in the case where B is a UFD. Let $\pi : B \rightarrow A$ be a retraction and set $I = \text{Ker } \pi$. Then $B = A \oplus I$. Take a local slice s of σ , which exists since σ is non-trivial. Since $s - \pi(s) \in I$ and $s - \pi(s)$ is a local slice of σ because $\pi(s) \in A = B^\sigma$, we may assume that $s \in I$. Let $s = p_1 \cdots p_\ell$ be the prime decomposition of s . Since $\deg_\sigma(s) = \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} \deg_\sigma(p_i)$ and $\deg_\sigma(p_i) = 0$ or $\geq \deg_\sigma(s)$ for $i = 1, \dots, \ell$, there exists unique i such that $\deg_\sigma(p_i) = \deg_\sigma(s)$, say $\deg_\sigma(p_1) = \deg_\sigma(s)$, and $\deg_\sigma(p_2) = \cdots = \deg_\sigma(p_\ell) = 0$. Namely, p_1 is a local slice of σ and $p_2, \dots, p_\ell \in A$. Set $a = \text{lc}_\sigma(p_1)$. By Lemma 2.3, $B_a = A_a[p_1]$ and p_1 is indeterminate over A . Since $s = p_1 p_2 \cdots p_\ell \in I$ and $p_2, \dots, p_\ell \in A$, $p_1 \in I$.

For any $u \in I$, there exist a positive integer $n(u)$ and some $a_0, a_1, \dots, a_n \in A$ such that

$$a^{n(u)}u = a_0 + a_1 p_1 + \cdots + a_n p_1^n.$$

Since $u, p_1 \in I$, $a_0 \in I \cap A$. Then $a_0 = 0$ and so $a^{n(u)}u \in p_1 B$. Since p_1 is a prime element of B , $u \in p_1 B$ or $a^{n(u)} \in p_1 B$. If $a^{n(u)} \in p_1 B$, then $vp_1 = a^{n(u)}$ for some $v \in B$. Since $a \in A = B^\sigma$ and A is factorially closed in B , $p_1 \in A$. This is a contradiction. Therefore, $I = p_1 B$ is a principal ideal. This proves (2). \square

By Theorem 3.1 and the cancellation theorem for the affine plane over a field, we have the following result.

Corollary 3.2. *Let k be a field and A a k -algebra. If A is a retract of $B = k^{[3]}$ and there exists a non-trivial exponential map σ on B such that $A = B^\sigma$, then $A \cong k^{[2]}$.*

Proof. By Theorem 3.1, $B \cong A^{[1]}$ as k -algebras. By the cancellation property of $k^{[2]}$ (see [2, Theorem 2.1], [15, Theorem 1.2] or [13, Theorem 3.4]), we have $A \cong k^{[2]}$. \square

3.2. Retracts of $k^{[3]}$ with non-trivial exponential maps. In this subsection, we prove the following result.

Theorem 3.3. *Let k be a field of $p := \text{char}(k) \geq 0$ and $B = k^{[3]}$ the polynomial ring in three variables over k . Let A be a retract of B with $\text{tr.deg}_k A = 2$. If $p = 0$ or $\text{ML}(A) \neq A$, then $A \cong k^{[2]}$ as k -algebras.*

Proof. If $p = 0$, then $A \cong k^{[2]}$ by [3, Theorem 5.8] or [18, Theorem 2.5]. From now on, assume that $p > 0$ and $\text{ML}(A) \neq A$. Since A is a retract of $B = k^{[3]}$ and B is finitely generated as a k -algebra, A is finitely generated as a k -algebra by Lemma 2.2 (2). Further, since B is a UFD, so is A by Lemma 2.2 (3). In particular, A is normal.

By $\text{ML}(A) \neq A$, there exists a non-trivial exponential map σ on A . Set $R = A^\sigma$.

Claim 1. $R \cong k^{[1]}$.

Proof. Since σ is a non-trivial exponential map on A , we have

$$\text{tr.deg}_k R = \text{tr.deg}_k A - 1 = 2 - 1 = 1.$$

Since A is a UFD, so is R by [13, Lemma 2.1 (1)]. Then we infer from [6, Theorem III] (or [1, Theorem (4.1)]) that $R \cong k^{[1]}$. \square

Claim 2. A is geometrically factorial over k , i.e., $A \otimes_k k'$ is a UFD for any algebraic extension field k' of k .

Proof. Let k' be an algebraic extension field of k . By [18, Lemma 1.2], $A \otimes_k k'$ is a retract of $B \otimes_k k'$ over k' . Since $B \otimes_k k' \cong k'^{[3]}$ is a UFD, so is $A \otimes_k k'$. This proves the assertion. \square

Claim 3. $A \cong k^{[2]}$.

Proof. By Claim 1, $R = k[f]$ for some $f \in A \setminus k$. By [13, Lemma 2.1 (3)], $Q(R) \cap A = R$. Hence, $k(f) \cap A = k[f]$. Set $S = k[f] \setminus \{0\}$. Then, by Lemma 2.3, we know that $S^{-1}A \cong k(f)^{[1]}$ because $R = k[f]$. By Claim 2, A

is geometrically factorial over k . Therefore, by virtue of Lemma 3.4 below, we know that $A \cong k[f]^{[1]} \cong k^{[2]}$. \square

Theorem 3.3 is thus verified. \square

Lemma 3.4. (Russell–Sathaye [19, Theorem 2.4.2]) *Let k be a field, A a finitely generated k -domain and $f \in A$. Set $S = k[f] \setminus \{0\}$. Assume that the following conditions (1)–(3) are satisfied:*

- (1) $S^{-1}A = k(f)^{[1]}$.
- (2) $k(f) \cap A = k[f]$.
- (3) A is geometrically factorial over k .

Then $A \cong k[f]^{[1]}$.

Proof. See [19, 2.4], where we consider L and F as k and f , respectively. \square

Let A be a k -subalgebra of $k^{[n]}$ and assume that A is factorially closed in $k^{[n]}$. We easily see that A is a polynomial ring if k is algebraically closed and $\text{tr.deg}_k A \in \{0, 1, n\}$. In particular, in [4, Theorem 1 (2)], Chakraborty, Gurjar and Miyanishi proved that if k is algebraically closed of characteristic zero, then every factorially closed subring of $k^{[3]}$ is a polynomial ring. By the argument of the proof of Theorem 3.3, we obtain the following result.

Proposition 3.5. *Let k be an algebraically closed field of $p := \text{char}(k) \geq 0$ and $B = k^{[3]}$ the polynomial ring in three variables over k . Let A be a factorially closed k -subalgebra of B with $\text{tr.deg}_k A = 2$. If $p = 0$ or $\text{ML}(A) \neq A$, then $A \cong k^{[2]}$ as k -algebras.*

Proof. If $p = 0$, then $A \cong k^{[2]}$ by [4, Theorem 1 (2)]. So we assume that $p > 0$ and $\text{ML}(A) \neq A$. Since A is algebraically closed in B , $A = Q(A) \cap B$. By $\text{tr.deg}_k A = 2 (< 3)$ and Zariski’s theorem in [21], we know that A is finitely generated over k . By $\text{ML}(A) \neq A$, there exists a non-trivial exponential map σ on A . Then the proof of Claim 1 in the proof of Theorem 3.3 works in our setting. So $R := A^\sigma \cong k^{[1]}$. Since A is factorially closed in B and B is a UFD, A is a UFD. In particular, A is geometrically factorial since k is algebraically closed. Finally, we easily see that the proof of Claim 3 in the proof of Theorem 3.3 works in our setting. This proves $A \cong k^{[2]}$. \square

3.3. Retracts of $k^{[3]}$ with \mathbb{Z} -gradings. In this subsection, we consider retracts having \mathbb{Z} -gradings. Let A be a finitely generated k -domain and $X = \text{Spec } A$. \mathbb{G}_m denotes the 1-dimensional algebraic torus over k . It is well known that a \mathbb{G}_m -action on X is corresponding to a \mathbb{Z} -grading on A , that is, $A = \bigoplus_{d \in \mathbb{Z}} A_d$, where A_d denotes the homogeneous elements of A of degree $d \in \mathbb{Z}$. A \mathbb{G}_m -action on X is said to be *effective* if $A \neq A_0$ with respect to the

corresponding \mathbb{Z} -grading on A . X is called an *affine \mathbb{G}_m -variety* if X has an effective \mathbb{G}_m -action. In [14], the first author proved that the following.

Theorem 3.6. ([14, Theorem 1.2]) *Let k be an algebraically closed field of any characteristic and $S = \text{Spec } A$ be an affine \mathbb{G}_m -surface over k . If S is smooth and A is a UFD with $A^* = k^*$, then $S \cong \mathbb{A}^2$. That is, $A \cong k^{[2]}$.*

In [3, Corollary 5.15], Chakraborty, Dasgupta, Dutta and Gupta proved that if A is a graded subalgebra of $B \cong k^{[n]}$ with the standard grading and there exists a retraction $\pi : B \rightarrow A$ such that $\pi(B_+) \subseteq B_+$, then A is a polynomial ring over k . The following theorem suggests that these assumptions are unnecessary when $n = 3$.

Theorem 3.7. *Let k be an algebraically closed field of any characteristic and A be a retract of $B \cong k^{[n]}$ for some $n \geq 2$ with $\text{tr.deg}_k A = 2$. If A has a \mathbb{Z} -grading with $A_0 \neq A$, then $A \cong k^{[2]}$. Therefore, every \mathbb{Z} -graded ring which is a retract of $k^{[3]}$ is a polynomial ring over k .*

Proof. Let $S := \text{Spec } A$. By the assumption S is an affine \mathbb{G}_m -surface. Since A is a retract of $B \cong k^{[n]}$, Lemma 2.2 implies that A is a regular UFD with $A^* = k^*$. In particular, S is smooth. Therefore, it follows from Theorem 3.6 that $A \cong k^{[2]}$. \square

4. EXAMPLES OF RETRACTS OF LOW-DIMENSIONAL POLYNOMIAL RINGS

In this section, we give some examples of retracts of polynomial rings in two or three variables and we determine their generators. Additionally, we check whether each retract is a polynomial ring or not.

Let k be a field and A a retract of $B = k^{[n]} = k[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ for a positive integer n . It is clear that, if $n = 1$, then either $A = B$ or $A = k$. If either $n = 2$ or $n = 3$ and $\text{char}(k) = 0$, then we know that A is a polynomial ring over k . Furthermore, $\text{tr.deg}_k A = 1$ (resp. $n = 3$, $\text{char}(k) = 0$ and $\text{tr.deg}_k A = 2$), then $A = k[f]$ (resp. $A = k[f_1, f_2]$) for some $f \in B \setminus k$ (resp. $f_1, f_2 \in B \setminus k$). When $n = 2$ and $\text{char}(k) = 0$, Spilrain–Yu [20] gave a characterization of all the retracts of B up to an automorphism, and gave several applications of this characterization to the 2-dimensional Jacobian conjecture. However, it is difficult to determine the retracts of B when $n \geq 2$.

Let φ be a retraction from B to A . Say, $A = \text{Im } \varphi$, where $\varphi : B \rightarrow B$ is a k -algebra endomorphism of B and $\varphi^2 = \varphi$. We set $f_i = \varphi(x_i)$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$. Since φ is a k -algebra homomorphism, we have

$$\varphi(g) = g(\varphi(x_1), \dots, \varphi(x_n)) = g(f_1, \dots, f_n)$$

for any polynomial $g \in B$. In particular,

$$(4.1) \quad f_i = \varphi(x_i) = \varphi(\varphi(x_i)) = \varphi(f_i) = f_i(f_1, \dots, f_n)$$

for each $i = 1, \dots, n$. Furthermore, $A = k[f_1, \dots, f_n]$.

Conversely, suppose $A = k[f_1, \dots, f_n]$ is a k -algebra of B generated by n polynomials f_1, \dots, f_n . We set the k -algebra homomorphism $\varphi : B \rightarrow B$ given by $\varphi(x_i) = f_i$ for each $i = 1, \dots, n$. If the f_i 's satisfy (4.1), then φ is a retraction. Thus we have the following lemma.

Lemma 4.1. *With the same notations as above, φ is a retraction if and only if the f_i 's satisfy (4.1).*

Now, we give some examples of retracts of polynomial rings by using Lemma 4.1. In this section, we consider the cases $n = 2, 3$ only. We note that some of the results of this section can be generalized. However, we do not give such a generalization since even in the low dimensional case has not been fully understood. We sometimes set $k^{[2]} = k[x, y]$ and $k^{[3]} = k[x, y, z]$.

In the following example, we determine the retracts of $B = k^{[n]}$ ($n = 2, 3$) generated by monomials. Here, we assume that a monomial is monic.

Example 4.2. Let f_1, \dots, f_n be n polynomials of $B = k^{[n]}$ that satisfy (4.1) and let $A = k[f_1, \dots, f_n]$. Assume that $A \neq k$ and every f_i ($i = 1, \dots, n$) is either 0 or a monomial. Then there exists a positive integer r such that $1 \leq r \leq n$ and f_{m_1}, \dots, f_{m_r} are non-zero monomials and $f_j = 0$ for $j \notin \{m_1, \dots, m_r\}$. For $1 \leq i \leq r$, let $f_{m_i} = x_1^{a_{m_i 1}} \cdots x_n^{a_{m_i n}}$ be a monomial, where $a_{m_i j} \geq 0$. Then the $r \times r$ matrix $(a_{m_i m_j})_{1 \leq i, j \leq r}$ is idempotent. Indeed, by (4.1), $a_{m_i j} = 0$ when $f_j = 0$, thus $f_{m_i} \in k[x_{m_1}, \dots, x_{m_r}]$. Therefore, (4.1) implies that $(a_{m_i m_j})_{1 \leq i, j \leq r}$ is an idempotent matrix. By simple calculation, the following assertions hold.

- (1) If $n = 2$, then f_1 and f_2 are as in the following table, where m is a non-negative integer.

f_1	f_2	$A = k[f_1, f_2]$
x	0	$k[x]$
0	y	$k[y]$
x	x^m	$k[x]$
x	y	$k[x, y]$
xy^m	1	$k[xy^m]$
y^m	y	$k[y]$
1	$x^m y$	$k[x^m y]$

- (2) If $n = 3$, then f_1, f_2 and f_3 are as in the following table, where m and l are non-negative integers.

f_1	f_2	f_3	$A = k[f_1, f_2, f_3]$
x	0	0	$k[x]$
0	y	0	$k[y]$
0	0	z	$k[z]$
x	x^m	0	$k[x]$
x	y	0	$k[x, y]$
xy^m	1	0	$k[xy^m]$
y^m	y	0	$k[y]$
1	$x^m y$	0	$k[x^m y]$
x	0	x^m	$k[x]$
x	0	z	$k[x, z]$
xz^m	0	1	$k[xz^m]$
z^m	0	z	$k[z]$
1	0	$x^m z$	$k[x^m z]$
0	y	y^m	$k[y]$
0	y	z	$k[y, z]$
0	yz^m	1	$k[yz^m]$
0	z^m	z	$k[z]$
0	1	$y^m z$	$k[y^m z]$
x	x^l	x^m	$k[x]$
y^l	y	y^m	$k[y]$
z^l	z^m	z	$k[z]$
x	y	$x^l y^m$	$k[x, y]$
$y^l z^m$	y	z	$k[y, z]$
x	$x^l y^m$	z	$k[x, z]$
x	y	z	$k[x, y, z]$
xy^l	1	$x^m y^{lm}$	$k[xy^l]$
xz^l	$x^m z^{lm}$	1	$k[xz^l]$
$y^l z^{lm}$	yz^m	1	$k[yz^m]$
$y^{lm} z^l$	1	$y^m z$	$k[y^m z]$
1	$x^l y$	$x^{lm} y^m$	$k[x^l y]$
1	$x^{lm} z^l$	$x^m z$	$k[x^m z]$
xy^l	1	$y^m z$	$k[xy^l, y^m z]$
xz^l	yz^m	1	$k[xz^l, yz^m]$
1	$x^l y$	$x^m z$	$k[x^l y, x^m z]$
$xy^l z^m$	1	1	$k[xy^l z^m]$
1	$x^l y z^m$	1	$k[x^l y z^m]$
1	1	$x^l y^m z$	$k[x^l y^m z]$

In these cases, A is a polynomial ring.

We give elementary results on sufficient conditions for a retract of $k^{[3]}$ to be a polynomial ring in Propositions 4.4 and 4.6. In their proofs, we use the following.

Lemma 4.3. *Let f_1, f_2, f_3 be three polynomials of $B = k^{[3]} = k[x_1, x_2, x_3]$ and let $A = k[f_1, f_2, f_3]$. Assume that f_1, f_2, f_3 satisfy (4.1) and one of the following conditions.*

- (1) f_1, f_2, f_3 are algebraically independent over k .
- (2) There exists $i \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ such that $f_i \in k$.
- (3) There exists $i \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ such that $f_i = x_i$.

Then A is a polynomial ring.

Proof. Suppose that the condition (1) holds. Then $\text{tr.deg}_k A = 3$, hence $A = B = k^{[3]}$.

Suppose that the condition (2) holds. We may assume that $f_3 \in k$. Then $A = k[f_1, f_2]$. If f_1 and f_2 are algebraically independent over k , then $\text{tr.deg}_k A = 2$ and hence $A \cong k^{[2]}$. Otherwise, since $\text{tr.deg}_k A \leq 1$, the assertion follows from [5, Theorem 3.5].

Suppose that the condition (3) holds. We may assume that $f_3 = x_3$. Let $R = k[x_3]$. Then $B = R[x_1, x_2] \cong R^{[2]}$, $A = R[f_1, f_2]$ and φ is a homomorphism of R -algebras. Thus, A is an R -algebra retract of $B \cong R^{[2]}$. Since R is a UFD, it follows from [5, Theorem 3.5] that $A \cong R^{[e]}$ for some $0 \leq e \leq 2$. Therefore, $A \cong k^{[e+1]}$. \square

Here we prove the following.

Proposition 4.4. *Let f_1, f_2, f_3 be three polynomials of $B = k^{[3]}$ that satisfy (4.1) and let $A = k[f_1, f_2, f_3]$. Assume that $A \neq k$ and at least one of f_1, f_2, f_3 is a monomial. Then A is a polynomial ring.*

Proof. We may assume that f_1 is a monomial. If at least one of f_1, f_2, f_3 is an element of k , then the assertion follows from Lemma 4.3. So we may assume that f_1, f_2, f_3 are non-constant. By the assumption, we set $f_1 = x^p y^q z^r$, where p, q, r are non-negative integers and $(p, q, r) \neq (0, 0, 0)$.

Assume that neither f_2 nor f_3 is a monomial. If $q \geq 1$, $f_1(f_1, f_2, f_3)$ is not a monomial because f_2 is not a monomial. So we have $f_1(f_1, f_2, f_3) \neq f_1$, which is a contradiction. Similarly, we derive a contradiction if $r \geq 1$. So $q = 0$ and $r = 0$. Then $f_1 = x^p$ and $f_1(f_1, f_2, f_3) = x^{p^2}$. Since f_1 satisfies the condition (4.1), we have $p = 1$ and $f_1 = x$. By Lemma 4.3, A is a polynomial ring.

Assume that f_2 is a monomial and f_3 is not a monomial. We set $f_2 = x^s y^t z^u$, where s, t, u are non-negative integers and $(s, t, u) \neq (0, 0, 0)$. By the same argument as above, we have $r = u = 0$. Then we have $(f_1, f_2) =$

$(x, x^m), (x, y), (y^m, y)$ by Example 4.2 (1). We know that A is a polynomial ring by Lemma 4.3. \square

In Proposition 4.4, we can determine the f_1, f_2, f_3 under some assumptions. See the list of Example 4.2 (2), where every f_i ($i = 1, 2, 3$) is either 0 or a monomial. In fact, we have the following.

Example 4.5. Let $f_1, \dots, f_n \in B \setminus k$ be n polynomials of $B = k^{[n]}$ that satisfy (4.1) and let $A = k[f_1, \dots, f_n]$. Assume further that the following conditions hold:

- (i) The constant term of f_i is equal to 0 for each $i = 1, \dots, n$.
- (ii) If $f_i \neq 0$, then its leading coefficient with respect to the lexicographical monomial order with $x > y > z$ is equal to 1.

In fact, for every retract of B , we can take its generator satisfying the conditions (i) and (ii) as above. By simple computation, we have:

- (1) In case $n = 2$, we assume that f_1 is a monomial and f_2 is not a monomial. Then f_1 and f_2 are as in the following table.

f_1	f_2	$A = k[f_1, f_2]$
x	$f_2 \in k[x]$	$k[x]$

- (2) In case $n = 3$, we assume both f_1 and f_2 are monomials and f_3 is not a monomial. Then f_1, f_2 and f_3 are as in the following table, where m is a non-negative integer and g is an element of B .

f_1	f_2	f_3	$A = k[f_1, f_2, f_3]$
x	x^m	$f_3 \in k[x]$	$k[x]$
x	x^m	$(x^m - y)g + z$	$k[x, f_3]$
x	y	$f_3 \in k[x, y]$	$k[x, y]$
y^m	y	$f_3 \in k[y]$	$k[y]$
y^m	y	$(x - y^m)g + z$	$k[y, f_3]$

In Proposition 4.4, we have not determined the f_1, f_2, f_3 when only one of them is a monomial. Of course, there are many such examples.

Finally, we give the following result.

Proposition 4.6. Let f_1, f_2, f_3 be three polynomials of $B = k^{[3]} = k[x_1, x_2, x_3]$ that satisfy (4.1) and let $A = k[f_1, f_2, f_3]$. Assume that $A \neq k$ and f_1, f_2, f_3 satisfy the conditions (i) and (ii) in Example 4.5. If there exists $i \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ such that f_i is a binomial and x_i is a term of f_i , then A is a polynomial ring.

Proof. We may assume that f_1 is a binomial and x_1 is a term of f_1 . We may set $f_1 = x_1 + \alpha x_1^p x_2^q x_3^r$, where $\alpha \in k \setminus \{0\}$, $p, q, r \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ and $(p, q, r) \neq (0, 0, 0)$.

If $q = 0$ and $r = 0$, then $f_1 = x_1 + \alpha x_1^p$. Since f_1 is a binomial and the constant term of f_1 is equal to 0 by the condition (i) in Example 4.5, we have $p \geq 2$. So we know that $f_1(f_1, f_2, f_3) = f_1 + \alpha f_1^p$. By (4.1), we have $\alpha f_1^p = 0$, which is a contradiction. Therefore, we have $q \neq 0$ or $r \neq 0$.

Now we know that $f_1(f_1, f_2, f_3) = f_1 + \alpha f_1^p f_2^q f_3^r$. By the same argument as above, we have $\alpha f_1^p f_2^q f_3^r = 0$. Since α and f_1 are not equal to 0 and $q \neq 0$ or $r \neq 0$, we have $f_2 = 0$ or $f_3 = 0$. Thus we know that A is a polynomial ring by Lemma 4.3. \square

REFERENCES

- [1] S. Abhyankar, P. Eakin and W. Heinzer, On the uniqueness of the coefficient ring in a polynomial ring, *J. Algebra*, **23** (1972), 310–342.
- [2] S. M. Bhatwadekar and N. Gupta, A note on the cancellation property of $k[X, Y]$, *J. Algebra Appl.*, **14** (2005), 1540007 (5 pages).
- [3] S. Chakraborty, N. Dasgupta, A. K. Dutta and N. Gupta, Some results on retracts of polynomial rings, *J. Algebra*, **567** (2021), 243–268.
- [4] S. Chakraborty, R. V. Gurjar and M. Miyanishi, Factorially closed subrings of commutative rings, *Algebra Number Theory*, **9** (2015), 1137–1158.
- [5] D. L. Costa, Retracts of polynomial rings, *J. Algebra*, **44** (1977), 492–502.
- [6] A. Evyatar and A. Zaks, Rings of polynomials, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, **25** (1970), 559–562.
- [7] G. Freudenburg, *Algebraic Theory of Locally Nilpotent Derivations* (second edition), *Encyclopaedia of Mathematical Sciences* vol. 136, *Invariant Theory and Algebraic Transformation Groups VII*, Springer-Verlag, 2017.
- [8] N. Gupta, On the cancellation problem for the affine space \mathbb{A}^3 in characteristic p , *Invent. Math.*, **195** (2014), 279–288.
- [9] N. Gupta, On Zariski’s cancellation problem in characteristic p , *Adv. Math.*, **264** (2014), 296–307.
- [10] N. Gupta and T. Nagamine, Retracts of Laurent polynomial rings, preprint (arXiv:2301.12681v3).
- [11] T. Kambayashi, On the absence of non-trivial separable forms of the affine plane, *J. Algebra*, **35** (1975), 449–456.
- [12] T. Kambayashi, On Fujita’s cancellation theorem for the affine plane, *J. Fac. Sci. Univ. Tokyo, Sect IA, Math.*, **27** (1980), 535–548.
- [13] H. Kojima, Notes on the kernels of locally finite iterative higher derivations in polynomial rings, *Comm. Algebra*, **44** (2016), 1924–1930.
- [14] H. Kojima, Smooth affine \mathbb{G}_m -surfaces with finite Picard groups and trivial units, *Tokyo J. Math.*, **46** (2023), 93–109.
- [15] S. Kuroda, A generalization of Nakai’s theorem on locally finite iterative higher derivations, *Osaka J. Math.*, **54** (2017), 335–341.
- [16] D. Liu and X. Sun, A class of retracts of polynomial rings, *J. Pure Appl. Algebra*, **222** (2018), 382–386.

- [17] D. Liu and X. Sun, Retracts that are kernels of locally nilpotent derivations, Czechoslovak Math. J., **72 (147)** (2021), 191–199.
- [18] T. Nagamine, A note on retracts of polynomial rings in three variables, J. Algebra, **534** (2019), 339–343.
- [19] P. Russell and A. Sathaye, On finding and cancelling variables in $k[X, Y, Z]$, J. Algebra **57** (1979), 151–166.
- [20] V. Spilrain and J.-T. Yu, Polynomial retracts and the Jacobian conjecture, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc., **352** (2000), 477–484.
- [21] O. Zariski, Interprétations algébriques-géométriques du quatorzième problème de Hilbert, Bull. Sci. Math., **78** (1954), 155–168.

(H. Kojima) DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, FACULTY OF SCIENCE, NIIGATA UNIVERSITY, 8050 IKARASHININOCHO, NISHI-KU, NIIGATA 950-2181, JAPAN

Email address: `kojima@math.sc.niigata-u.ac.jp`

(T. Nagamine) DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, COLLEGE OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY, NIHON UNIVERSITY, 1-8-14 KANDA-SURUGADAI, CHIYODA-KU, TOKYO 101-8308, JAPAN

Email address: `nagamine.takanori@nihon-u.ac.jp`

(R. Sasagawa) NIIGATA PREFECTURAL TOKAMACHI SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL, 1-203 HONCHO-NISHI, TOKAMACHI-SHI, NIIGATA, 948-0083, JAPAN