

ON THE NON-NEUTRAL COMPONENT OF OUTER FORMS OF THE ORTHOGONAL GROUP

URIYA A. FIRST*

Let A be a central simple algebra over a field F of characteristic not 2, and let $\sigma : A \rightarrow A$ be an orthogonal involution (see [10, Ch. I] for the definitions). Let $O(A, \sigma)$ denote the group of elements $u \in A$ with $u^\sigma u = 1$. The reduced norm map $\text{Nrd}_{A/F} : A \rightarrow F$ restricts to a group homomorphism, $\text{Nrd}_{A/F} : O(A, \sigma) \rightarrow \{\pm 1\}$; its kernel, $\text{SO}(A, \sigma)$, is the special orthogonal group of (A, σ) . Both $O(A, \sigma)$ and $\text{SO}(A, \sigma)$ can be regarded as the F -points of algebraic groups over F , denoted $\mathbf{O}(A, \sigma)$ and $\mathbf{SO}(A, \sigma)$, respectively.

The question of whether $O(A, \sigma)$ has elements of reduced norm -1 is equivalent to asking whether the non-neutral component of the algebraic group $\mathbf{O}(A, \sigma)$, which is an $\mathbf{SO}(A, \sigma)$ -torsor, has an F -point. It is well-known that such an F -point exists if and only if $[A]$, the Brauer class of A , is trivial in the Brauer group of F , denoted $\text{Br } F$; see [8, Lemma 2.6.1b], for instance.

In this note, we generalize this result to Azumaya algebras with orthogonal involutions over semilocal commutative rings. Given a commutative ring R , recall that an R -algebra A is called Azumaya if A is a finitely generated projective R -module and $A(\mathfrak{m}) := A \otimes_R (R/\mathfrak{m})$ is a central simple (R/\mathfrak{m}) -algebra for every maximal ideal $\mathfrak{m} \in \text{Max } R$. In this case, an R -linear involution $\sigma : A \rightarrow A$ is called orthogonal if its specialization $\sigma(\mathfrak{m}) := \sigma \otimes_R \text{id}_{R/\mathfrak{m}}$ is orthogonal for all $\mathfrak{m} \in \text{Max } R$. See [9, III.§5, III.§8] or [6] for an extensive discussion. Note also that $\text{Nrd}_{A/R}$ takes $O(A, \sigma)$ to $\mu_2(R) := \{\varepsilon \in R : \varepsilon^2 = 1\}$. We prove:

Theorem 1. *Let R be a commutative semilocal ring with $2 \in R^\times$, let A be an Azumaya R -algebra and let $\sigma : A \rightarrow A$ be an orthogonal involution. Then $O(A, \sigma)$ contains elements of reduced norm -1 if and only if $[A] = 0$ in $\text{Br } R$.*

In the process, we prove another result of independent interest:

Theorem 2. *Let R , A and σ be as in Theorem 1. Then the natural map*

$$\text{SO}(A, \sigma) \rightarrow \prod_{\mathfrak{m} \in \text{Max } R} \text{SO}(A(\mathfrak{m}), \sigma(\mathfrak{m}))$$

is surjective.

This was proved by Knebusch [7, Satz 0.4] when A is a matrix algebra over R . The surjectivity of $O(A, \sigma) \rightarrow \prod_{\mathfrak{m} \in \text{Max } R} O(A(\mathfrak{m}), \sigma(\mathfrak{m}))$ may fail under the same assumptions (Example 7).

Applications of both theorems to Witt groups of Azumaya algebras with involution appear in [5].

We show that the “if” part of Theorem 1 is false if R is not assumed to be semilocal, see Example 9. As for the “only if” part of Theorem 1, we ask:

*UNIVERSITY OF HAIFA
E-mail address: uriya.first@gmail.com.
Date: June 5, 2020.

Question 3. *Let R be a commutative ring with $2 \in R^\times$, let A be an Azumaya R -algebra, and let $\sigma : A \rightarrow A$ be an orthogonal involution. Suppose that $O(A, \sigma)$ contains elements of reduced norm -1 . Is it the case that $[A] = 0$?*

We expect that the answer is “yes”. By Theorem 1, a counterexample, if it exists, will have the remarkable property that $[A] \neq 0$ while $[A \otimes_R S] = 0$ in $\text{Br } S$ for every semilocal commutative R -algebra S . We do not know if Azumaya algebras with this property exist. (Ojanguren [11] gave an example having this property for any local S , but in his example, $[A \otimes_R S]$ remains nontrivial if S is taken to be the localization of R away from three particular prime ideals.) We further note that the answer to Question 3 is “yes” when R is a regular domain. Indeed, writing F for the fraction field of R , we observed that $[A \otimes_R F] = 0$ in $\text{Br } F$, and the map $\text{Br } R \rightarrow \text{Br } F$ is injective by the Auslander–Goldman theorem [1, Theorem 7.2].

1. PROOF OF THEOREM 2

We shall derive Theorem 2 from a more general theorem addressing semilocal rings with involution. Recall that a ring A is called semilocal if $A/\text{Jac } A$ is semisimple artinian, where $\text{Jac } A$ denotes the Jacobson radical of A .

Let (A, σ) be a ring with involution such that $2 \in A^\times$. We let $\text{Skew}(A, \sigma) = \{a \in A : a^\sigma = -a\}$. Given $y \in A$ and $a \in \text{Skew}(A, \sigma)$ such that $\frac{1}{2}y^\sigma y + a \in A^\times$, define

$$s_{y,a} = 1 - y(\frac{1}{2}y^\sigma y + a)^{-1}y^\sigma \in A.$$

Consider the $(\sigma, 1)$ -hermitian form $f_1 : A \times A \rightarrow A$ given by $f_1(x, y) = x^\sigma y$; here, A is viewed as a right module over itself. Identifying $\text{End}_A(A)$ with A via $\varphi \mapsto \varphi(1_A)$, one easily checks that the isometry group of f_1 is

$$U(A, \sigma) := \{u \in A : u^\sigma u = 1\}.$$

Moreover, the elements $s_{y,a}$ are precisely the 1-reflections of f_1 in the sense of [12, §1] or [4, §3]. Thus, $s_{y,a} \in U(A, \sigma)$ for all y and a as above ([12, Proposition 1.3] or [4, Proposition 3.3]). This can also be checked by computation.

Suppose that A is semisimple artinian. We define a subgroup $U^0(A, \sigma)$ of $U(A, \sigma)$ as follows: Assume first that A is simple artinian. By the Artin–Wedderburn theorem, $A \cong M_n(D)$, where D is a division ring with center K . We then define

$$U^0(A, \sigma) := \begin{cases} \text{SO}(A, \sigma) & D = K \text{ and } \sigma \text{ is orthogonal} \\ U(A, \sigma) & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Next, if A is not simple but (A, σ) is simple as a ring with involution, then there is a simple artinian ring B and an isomorphism $A \cong B \times B^{\text{op}}$ under which σ corresponds to $(x, y^{\text{op}}) \mapsto (y, x^{\text{op}})$ ($x, y \in B$). We then set

$$U^0(A, \sigma) := U(A, \sigma).$$

Finally, when A is an arbitrary semisimple artinian ring, there exists an essentially unique factorization $(A, \sigma) = \prod_{i=1}^t (A_i, \sigma_i)$ such that each factor (A_i, σ_i) fits into exactly one of the previous two cases (see [12, p. 486], for instance). We then define

$$U^0(A, \sigma) = \prod_{i=1}^t U^0(A_i, \sigma_i).$$

Example 4. Suppose that A is an Azumaya algebra over a finite product of fields $R = \prod_{i=1}^t K_i$ and $\sigma : A \rightarrow A$ is an orthogonal involution. Then $U^0(A, \sigma) = \text{SO}(A, \sigma)$. Indeed, writing $(A, \sigma) = \prod_i (A_i, \sigma_i)$ with A_i a central simple K_i -algebra, we reduce into checking that $U^0(A_i, \sigma_i) = \text{SO}(A_i, \sigma_i)$. This follows from the definition if $[A_i] = 0$ (in $\text{Br } K_i$), and from [8, Lemma 2.6.1b] if $[A_i] \neq 0$.

Theorem 5. *Let (A, σ) be a semisimple artinian ring with involution such that $2 \in A^\times$. Then the subgroup of $U(A, \sigma)$ generated by the elements $s_{y,a}$ with $y \in A$, $a \in \text{Skew}(A, \sigma)$ and $\frac{1}{2}y^\sigma y + a \in A^\times$ contains $U^0(A, \sigma)$.*

Proof. We observed above that the elements $s_{y,a}$ are precisely the reflections of a $(\sigma, 1)$ -hermitian form $f_1 : A \times A \rightarrow A$. The theorem is therefore a special case of [4, Theorem 5.8(ii)] (see also Remark 2.1 in that source). \square

Theorem 6. *Let (A, σ) be a semilocal ring with involution such that $2 \in A^\times$. Write $\overline{A} = A/\text{Jac } A$, denote the quotient map $A \rightarrow \overline{A}$ by $a \mapsto \overline{a}$ and let $\overline{\sigma} : \overline{A} \rightarrow \overline{A}$ be given by $\overline{a}^\sigma = \overline{a^\sigma}$. Then the image of the map*

$$u \mapsto \overline{u} : U(A, \sigma) \rightarrow U(\overline{A}, \overline{\sigma})$$

contains $U^0(\overline{A}, \overline{\sigma})$.

Proof. By Theorem 5, every element of $U^0(\overline{A}, \overline{\sigma})$ is a product of elements of the form $s_{\tilde{y}, \tilde{a}}$ with $\tilde{y} \in \overline{A}$, $\tilde{a} \in \text{Skew}(\overline{A}, \overline{\sigma})$, $\frac{1}{2}\tilde{y}^\sigma \tilde{y} + \tilde{a} \in \overline{A}^\times$. It is therefore enough to prove that there exists $u \in U(A, \sigma)$ with $\overline{u} = s_{\tilde{y}, \tilde{a}}$. Choose $y, a \in A$ with $\overline{y} = \tilde{y}$ and $\overline{a} = \tilde{a}$. Replacing a with $\frac{1}{2}(a - a^\sigma)$, we may assume that $a \in \text{Skew}(A, \sigma)$. Since $\frac{1}{2}y^\sigma y + a = \frac{1}{2}\tilde{y}^\sigma \tilde{y} + \tilde{a} \in (\overline{A})^\times$, we have $\frac{1}{2}y^\sigma y + a \in A^\times$. We may therefore take $u := s_{y,a}$, which clearly satisfies $\overline{u} = s_{\tilde{y}, \tilde{a}}$. \square

Now we can prove Theorem 2.

Proof of Theorem 2. Write $J = \text{Jac } R$. We first observe that $\text{Jac } A = JA$. Indeed, $A/JA \cong A \otimes (R/J)$ is Azumaya over R/J , which is a product of fields, so A/JA is semisimple artinian, meaning that $JA \supseteq \text{Jac } A$. On the other hand $JA \subseteq \text{Jac } A$ because A is finitely generated as an R -module [9, Ch. II, Corollary 4.2.4].

Now, using the notation of Theorem 6, $\overline{A} = A/\text{Jac } A \cong A \otimes (R/\text{Jac } R) = A \otimes \prod_{i=1}^t (R/\mathfrak{m}_i) \cong \prod_{i=1}^t A(\mathfrak{m}_i)$, so we may identify $\prod_{i=1}^t A(\mathfrak{m}_i)$ with \overline{A} . Under this identification, $\prod_i \sigma(\mathfrak{m}_i)$ corresponds to $\overline{\sigma}$, so we need to prove that the natural map $u \mapsto \overline{u} : \text{SO}(A, \sigma) \rightarrow \text{SO}(\overline{A}, \overline{\sigma})$ is surjective.

Let $v \in \text{SO}(\overline{A}, \overline{\sigma})$. By Theorem 6 and Example 4, there exists $u \in \text{O}(A, \sigma) = U(A, \sigma)$ such that $\overline{u} = v$. We claim that $u \in \text{SO}(A, \sigma)$. Indeed, write $\alpha = \text{Nrd}_{A/R}(u) \in R$. Then $\alpha^2 = 1$, and so $\frac{1}{2}(1 - \alpha)$ is an idempotent. Since $\text{Nrd}(v) = 1$ in R/J , the image of $\frac{1}{2}(1 - \alpha)$ in R/J is $\frac{1}{2}(1 - 1) = 0$. As J contains no nonzero idempotents, it follows that $\frac{1}{2}(1 - \alpha) = 0$, or rather, $\alpha = 1$. \square

Example 7. The assumptions of Theorem 2 do not guarantee that $\text{O}(A, \sigma) \rightarrow \prod_{\mathfrak{m} \in \text{Max } R} \text{O}(A(\mathfrak{m}), \sigma(\mathfrak{m}))$ is surjective in general. As a trivial counterexample one could take R to be any non-local semilocal domain and note that $\text{O}(R, \text{id}) = \{\pm 1\}$ while $|\prod_{\mathfrak{m} \in \text{Max } R} \text{O}(R(\mathfrak{m}), \text{id}_{R(\mathfrak{m})})| > 2$. A counterexample with local R can be constructed as follows. Take take R to be the localization of \mathbb{Z} at $5\mathbb{Z}$, let A be the quaternion Azumaya algebra $R\langle i, j \mid i^2 = j^2 = -1, ij = -ji \rangle$ and let $\sigma : A \rightarrow A$ be the orthogonal involution fixing i and j . Let $\mathfrak{m} = 5R$ denote the maximal ideal of R and let v be the image of $3i$ in $A(\mathfrak{m})$. One readily checks that $v \in \text{O}(A(\mathfrak{m}), \sigma(\mathfrak{m}))$ and $\text{Nrd}(v) = -1$. However, v cannot be lifted to an element of $\text{O}(A, \sigma)$. Indeed, if such a lift existed, it would have reduced norm -1 , but one can check directly that elements of A have non-negative reduced norms.

2. PROOF OF THEOREM 1

Lemma 8. *Let A be an Azumaya algebra of constant degree d over a semilocal ring R with $2 \in R^\times$ and let $\sigma : A \rightarrow A$ be an orthogonal involution. If $[A] = 0$, then there exists $u \in \text{O}(A, \sigma)$ with $u^2 = 1$ and reduced characteristic polynomial $(t+1)(t-1)^{d-1}$. In particular, $\text{Nrd}_{A/R}(u) = -1$.*

Proof. Since $[A] = 0$, we may assume that $A = \text{End}_R(Q)$ for some finitely generated projective R -module Q of rank d . By [13, Theorem 4.2a] (or, alternatively, [3, Proposition 4.6]), there exist $\delta \in \mu_2(R)$, a rank-1 projective R -module L , and a unimodular L -valued bilinear form $g : Q \times Q \rightarrow L$ satisfying $g(x, y) = \delta g(y, x)$ and $g(ax, y) = g(x, a^\sigma y)$ for all $x, y \in Q, a \in A$. (Here, unimodularity means that $x \mapsto g(x, -) : Q \rightarrow \text{Hom}_R(Q, L)$ is bijective.) Since R is semilocal and L has rank 1, $L \cong R$, so we may assume $L = R$. Moreover, $\delta = 1$ because σ is orthogonal; see [9, p. 170], for instance. Now, choose a vector $x \in Q$ with $g(x, x) \in R^\times$ — to see its existence, check it modulo $\text{Jac } R$ and take an arbitrary lift. Writing $P = \{y \in Q : g(x, y) = 0\}$, we have $Q = xR \oplus P$ and $\text{rank } P = d - 1$. The reflection $u := (-\text{id}_{xR}) \oplus \text{id}_P$ is the required element. \square

Proof of Theorem 1. By writing R as a product of connected semilocal commutative rings and working over each factor separately, we may assume that R is connected. Thus, $d := \deg A$ is constant on $\text{Spec } R$.

That $[A] = 0$ implies the surjectivity of $\text{Nrd}_{A/R} : \text{O}(A, \sigma) \rightarrow \{\pm 1\}$ has been verified in Lemma 8, so we turn to prove the converse.

Let $u \in \text{O}(A, \sigma)$ be an element with $\text{Nrd}_{A/R}(u) = -1$. We let $\mathfrak{m}_1, \dots, \mathfrak{m}_t$ denote the maximal ideals of R and set $A_i = A(\mathfrak{m}_i)$, $\sigma_i = \sigma(\mathfrak{m}_i)$. We further let u_i denote the image of u in A_i .

Since A carries an involution fixing R , we have $[A] = [A^{\text{op}}] = -[A]$. By a theorem of Saltman [14], we also have $d[A] = 0$ in $\text{Br } R$, so $[A] = 0$ if d is odd. We may therefore assume that d is even.

If there exists $1 \leq i \leq t$ such that $[A_i] \neq 0$ in $\text{Br}(R/\mathfrak{m}_i)$, then $\text{Nrd}(u_i) = 1$ by [8, Lemma 2.6.1b], which is impossible (because $2 \in R^\times$). Thus, $[A_i] = 0$ for all i . Now, by Lemma 8, for every $1 \leq i \leq t$, there is $v_i \in \text{O}(A_i, \sigma_i)$ with reduced characteristic polynomial equal to $(t+1)(t-1)^{d-1}$.

Observe that $\text{Nrd}(u_i^{-1}v_i) = 1$, hence $u_i^{-1}v_i \in \text{SO}(A_i, \sigma_i)$. By Theorem 2, there exists $w \in \text{SO}(A, \sigma)$ such that the image of w in A_i is $u_i^{-1}v_i$ for all i . Writing $v := uw \in \text{O}(A, \sigma)$, we see that the image of v in A_i is v_i for all i .

Let $f = f_v \in R[t]$ denote the reduced characteristic polynomial of v . Then

$$f \equiv (t+1)(t-1)^{d-1} \pmod{\mathfrak{m}_i}$$

for all $1 \leq i \leq t$. Note that $\sigma : A \rightarrow A$ preserves the reduced characteristic polynomial (use [9, III. §8.5] to see that there is a faithfully flat commutative R -algebra S such that $(A \otimes S, \sigma \otimes \text{id}_S)$ is isomorphic to $\text{M}_d(S)$ with the transpose involution). Since $v^{-1} = v^\sigma$, this means that $f_{v^{-1}} = f_{v^\sigma} = f$, so $f(0)^{-1}t^d f(t^{-1}) = f$ in $R[t, t^{-1}]$. Substituting $t = -1$ and noting that $f(0) = \text{Nrd}_{A/R}(v) = -1$ because d is even, we get $-f(-1) = f(-1)$, hence $f(-1) = 0$ and $t+1 \mid f$.

Write $f = (t+1)g$ and $g = (t+1)r + \alpha$, where $g, r \in R[t]$ and $\alpha = g(-1)$. Since $f \equiv (t+1)(t-1)^{d-1} \pmod{\mathfrak{m}_i}$, we have $g \equiv (t-1)^{d-1} \pmod{\mathfrak{m}_i}$ and $\alpha \equiv (-2)^{d-1} \pmod{\mathfrak{m}_i}$. As this holds for all i , we have $\alpha \in R^\times$. Thus,

$$\alpha^{-1}g - \alpha^{-1}(t+1)r = \alpha^{-1}\alpha = 1.$$

Put $e = \alpha^{-1}g(v)$ and $e' = -\alpha^{-1}(v+1)r(v)$. Then $e + e' = 1_A$ and $ee' = e'e = 0$ (because $(v+1)g(v) = f(v) = 0$). Thus, $e = e(e+e') = e^2$. Let e_i denote the image of e in A_i . Then $e_i = (-2)^{1-d}g(v_i) = (-2)^{1-d}(v_i-1)^{d-1}$ has rank one. This means that eAe is a projective R -algebra of rank 1, so $eAe \cong R$. Since $eAe \cong \text{End}_A(eA)$, we have $[A] = [eAe] = [R] = 0$ [9, Proposition III.5.3.1]. \square

Example 9. The “if” part of Theorem 1 is false if R is not assumed to be semilocal. Indeed, take R to be an integral domain with $2 \in R^\times$ admitting a non-principal

invertible fractional ideal L (we view L as a subset of the fraction field of R). Define

$$A = \begin{bmatrix} R & L^{-1} \\ L & R \end{bmatrix}$$

and let $\sigma : A \rightarrow A$ be the involution given by $\begin{bmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{bmatrix}^\sigma = \begin{bmatrix} d & b \\ c & a \end{bmatrix}$. To see that A is Azumaya over R and σ is orthogonal, observe that there is an isomorphism $A \cong \text{End}_R(R \oplus L)$ under which σ is the adjoint to the unimodular symmetric bilinear form $f : (R \oplus L) \times (R \oplus L) \rightarrow L$ given by $f(\begin{bmatrix} r_1 \\ \ell_1 \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} r_2 \\ \ell_2 \end{bmatrix}) = r_1 \ell_2 + r_2 \ell_1$. This also shows that $[A] = 0$ in $\text{Br } R$.

Straightforward computation shows that elements of $\text{O}(A, \sigma)$ of determinant -1 are of the form $\begin{bmatrix} 0 & x^{-1} \\ x & 0 \end{bmatrix}$, where $x \in L$. If such an element exists, then $x^{-1}R \subseteq L^{-1}$, or rather, $L \subseteq xR$. Since $x \in L$, this means that $L = xR$, contradicting our assumption that L is not principal. Thus, $\text{O}(A, \sigma) = \text{SO}(A, \sigma)$ and $\text{Nrd}_{A/R} : \text{O}(A, \sigma) \rightarrow \mu_2(R)$ is not surjective.

We remark that if $R \oplus L \cong M \oplus M$ for some invertible fractional ideal M , then we also have $A \cong \text{End}_R(M \oplus M) \cong M_2(R)$. Such examples exist, e.g., take R to be a Dedekind domain with class group containing an element $[M]$ of order 4 (use [2], for instance) and let $L = M^2$.

REFERENCES

- [1] Maurice Auslander and Oscar Goldman. The Brauer group of a commutative ring. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 97:367–409, 1960.
- [2] Paul Eakin and W. Heinzer. More noneuclidian PID's and Dedekind domains with prescribed class group. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 40:66–68, 1973.
- [3] Uriya A. First. Rings that are Morita equivalent to their opposites. *J. Algebra*, 430:26–61, 2015.
- [4] Uriya A. First. Witt's extension theorem for quadratic spaces over semiperfect rings. *J. Pure Appl. Algebra*, 219(12):5673–5696, 2015.
- [5] Uriya A. First. An 8-periodic exact sequence of Witt groups of Azumaya algebras with involution. 2019. Preprint.
- [6] Timothy J. Ford. *Separable algebras*, volume 183 of *Graduate Studies in Mathematics*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2017.
- [7] Manfred Knebusch. Isometrien über semilokalen Ringen. *Math. Z.*, 108:255–268, 1969.
- [8] M. Kneser. *Lectures on Galois cohomology of classical groups*. Tata Institute of Fundamental Research, Bombay, 1969. With an appendix by T. A. Springer, Notes by P. Jothilingam, Tata Institute of Fundamental Research Lectures on Mathematics, No. 47.
- [9] Max-Albert Knus. *Quadratic and Hermitian forms over rings*, volume 294 of *Grundlehren der Mathematischen Wissenschaften [Fundamental Principles of Mathematical Sciences]*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1991. With a foreword by I. Bertuccioni.
- [10] Max-Albert Knus, Alexander Merkurjev, Markus Rost, and Jean-Pierre Tignol. *The book of involutions*, volume 44 of *American Mathematical Society Colloquium Publications*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 1998. With a preface in French by J. Tits.
- [11] Manuel Ojanguren. A nontrivial locally trivial algebra. *J. Algebra*, 29:510–512, 1974.
- [12] Hans J. Reiter. Witt's theorem for noncommutative semilocal rings. *J. Algebra*, 35:483–499, 1975.
- [13] David J. Saltman. Azumaya algebras with involution. *J. Algebra*, 52(2):526–539, 1978.
- [14] David J. Saltman. The Brauer group is torsion. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 81(3):385–387, 1981.