

# Infinitesimal rational actions

Bianca Gouthier

**Abstract:** For any  $k$ -group scheme of finite type  $G$  acting rationally on a  $k$ -variety  $X$ , if the action is generically free then the dimension of  $\mathrm{Lie}(G)$  is upper bounded by the dimension of the variety. We show that this is the only obstruction when  $k$  is a perfect field of positive characteristic and  $G$  is infinitesimal commutative trigonalizable. We also give necessary conditions to have faithful rational actions of infinitesimal commutative trigonalizable group schemes on varieties.

## 1 Introduction

Let  $k$  be a field and  $X$  be a  $k$ -scheme. The automorphism group functor  $\mathrm{Aut}_X$  of  $X$  that associates to every  $k$ -scheme  $S$  the group of  $S$ -automorphisms  $\mathrm{Aut}_S(X \times_k S)$  is not representable in general. This object has been extensively studied: it is known for example that if  $X$  is proper then  $\mathrm{Aut}_X$  is a  $k$ -group scheme locally of finite type [MO67]. If  $K/k$  is a finite purely inseparable field extension, the automorphism group scheme  $\mathrm{Aut}_K$  has been studied for example by [Beg69] and [Cha72]. For  $G$  a  $k$ -group scheme, there is a bijection between  $G$ -actions  $G \times_k X \rightarrow X$  on  $X$  and group functor homomorphisms  $G \rightarrow \mathrm{Aut}_X$ . If the  $G$ -action is faithful, then  $G$  is a subgroup functor of  $\mathrm{Aut}_X$ . Studying faithful group scheme actions yields then information on representable subgroups of  $\mathrm{Aut}_X$ . When  $Y$  is the generic point of a variety  $X$  (separated, geometrically integral scheme of finite type) and  $G$  is a finite  $k$ -group scheme, to give a  $G$ -action on  $Y = \mathrm{Spec}(k(X))$  is equivalent to giving a rational  $G$ -action on  $X$ . Studying such faithful rational actions imparts then knowledge on the automorphism group functor  $\mathrm{Aut}_K$  of separable finitely generated extensions  $K/k$ . When  $K = k(t_1, \dots, t_n)$  is a purely transcendental extension of  $k$ , then  $\mathrm{Aut}_K(k)$  coincides with the Cremona group  $\mathrm{Cr}_n(k) = \mathrm{Bir}_k(\mathbb{P}_k^n)$  in dimension  $n$ , that is by definition the group of birational automorphisms of  $\mathbb{P}_k^n$ . The Cremona group has been deeply studied in characteristic zero, while it has been less investigated in positive characteristic (see for example the survey [Dol10]). Dolgachev made the following conjecture for the Cremona group over a field of positive characteristic.

**Conjecture 1.1.** If  $k$  is a field of characteristic  $p > 0$ , the Cremona group  $\mathrm{Cr}_n(k)$  does not contain elements of order  $p^s$  for  $s > n$  [Dol10, Conjecture 37].

The conjecture is true for  $n = 1$  since  $\mathrm{PGL}_2(k) \simeq \mathrm{Aut}_k(k(t))$  does not contain elements of order  $p^2$  if  $\mathrm{char}(k) = p > 0$ . Moreover, it was proven for  $n = 2$  [Dol09]. The conjecture can be rephrased in the following way: if there exists a faithful rational action of a finite commutative  $p$ -group  $G$  on  $\mathbb{P}_k^n$  then  $p_G^n = 0$ , where  $p$  is the multiplication by  $p_G$  morphism on  $G$ . In this paper we are interested in rational actions of infinitesimal group schemes. The analogue of Dolgachev's conjecture for infinitesimal commutative unipotent group schemes arises naturally in one of the following ways: if  $k$  is a field of characteristic  $p > 0$  and  $G$  is

an infinitesimal commutative unipotent  $k$ -group scheme, if there exists a faithful rational  $G$ -action on  $\mathbb{P}_k^n$ , then  $p_G^n = 0$  (or maybe  $V_G^n = 0$ , where  $V_G$  is the Verschiebung morphism of  $G$ ). Both options turn out not to be true. Indeed, for example any curve admits faithful rational actions of the  $p^n$ -torsion  $E[p^n]$  of a supersingular elliptic curve  $E$  (since in this case  $E[p^n]$  is an infinitesimal commutative unipotent  $k$ -group scheme with one-dimensional Lie algebra and thus Theorem 1.3 applies) but  $V_{E[p^n]} \neq 0$  and  $p_{E[p^n]} \neq 0$  if  $n > 1$ . What is indeed true is that if there exists a faithful rational  $G$ -action on a  $k$ -variety  $X$  of dimension  $n$ , then  $V_{\ker(F_G)}^n = 0$ . More precisely:

**Proposition 1.2.** *Let  $G$  be an infinitesimal  $k$ -group scheme with commutative trigonalizable Frobenius kernel  $\ker(F_G) \simeq \ker(F_G)^u \times_k \ker(F_G)^d$  and  $X$  be a  $k$ -variety of dimension  $n$ . If there exists a faithful rational  $G$ -action on  $X$ , then  $s = \dim_k(\mathrm{Lie}(\ker(F_G)^d)) \leq n$  and  $V_{\ker(F_G)^u}^{n-s} = 0$ .*

The inverse implication of Proposition 1.2 does not always hold true, see Example 6.6. In the diagonalizable case, these actions are well understood and the converse statement is known. We prove that the converse of Proposition 1.2 holds true over a perfect field for infinitesimal commutative unipotent  $k$ -group schemes of height one (Corollary 6.9). We are more precisely interested in rational actions which are generically free. Indeed in positive characteristic not all faithful actions admit an open dense subset  $U \subseteq X$  that is  $G$ -stable and such that the action of  $G$  on  $U$  is free. For any  $k$ -algebraic group scheme  $G$  acting rationally on a  $k$ -variety  $X$ , if the action is generically free then the dimension of  $\mathrm{Lie}(G)$  is upper bounded by the dimension of the variety. Our main result is the following Theorem, which proves that this bound is the only obstruction to the existence of generically free actions for infinitesimal commutative trigonalizable (see Remark 5.12) group schemes over a perfect field. If  $G$  is unipotent, we also show that any generically free rational action on  $X$  of (any power of) the Frobenius kernel of  $G$  extends to a generically free rational action of  $G$  on  $X$ . The proof we give is constructive and enables one to explicitly write such actions.

**Theorem 1.3.** *Let  $k$  be a perfect field of characteristic  $p > 0$  and  $G$  be an infinitesimal commutative unipotent  $k$ -group scheme with Lie algebra of dimension  $s$ . Then for every  $k$ -variety  $X$  of dimension  $\geq s$  there exist generically free rational actions of  $G$  on  $X$ . Moreover, for any  $r \geq 1$ , any generically free rational action of  $\ker(F_G^r)$  on  $X$  can be extended to a generically free rational action of  $G$  on  $X$ .*

The difficulty is to construct actions in low dimension, i.e. close to the dimension of  $\mathrm{Lie}(G)$ . Indeed, it is not so difficult to construct actions in high dimension for any infinitesimal trigonalizable group scheme (see Corollary 5.5). Fakhruddin proved that if  $G$  is infinitesimal and  $Y$  is a normal projective curve with a rational action of  $G$ , if there exists a normal projective variety  $X$  with an action of  $G$  and a  $G$ -equivariant dominant rational morphism  $X \dashrightarrow Y$ , then the rational action of  $G$  on  $Y$  extends uniquely to an action of  $G$  on  $X$  [Fak20, Proposition 2.2]. In particular, in the above situation, if  $Y$  is the projective line and the action is faithful, then  $G$  is a subgroup scheme of  $\mathrm{PGL}_{2,k}$ . Most unipotent infinitesimal group schemes with one-dimensional Lie algebra are not contained in  $\mathrm{PGL}_{2,k}$ , but for all of them there exist generically free rational actions on the projective line. Therefore, most of these rational actions on the projective line are not induced by actions, defined everywhere, on projective normal varieties of higher dimension.

Combining Theorem 1.3 and the diagonalizable case treated by Brion in [Bri22, Section 3] the the converse of Proposition 1.2 is true, over a perfect field, for infinitesimal commutative trigonalizable  $k$ -group schemes with Lie algebra of dimension upper bounded by

the dimension of the variety (see Remark 5.12). Notice that if an infinitesimal commutative unipotent  $k$ -group scheme  $G$  with Lie algebra of dimension  $n$  can be embedded in a smooth connected  $n$ -dimensional algebraic group  $\mathcal{G}$ , then  $G$  acts generically freely on it (by multiplication). Brion asked if, already in the one-dimensional case, there are examples different from these that arise [Bri22] and moreover if these group schemes are always commutative (see also [Fak20, Remark 2.10]). Examples 5.13 and 5.14 answer to these questions. The former shows that there are generically free rational actions on curves of infinitesimal commutative unipotent group schemes that are not subgroups of a smooth connected one-dimensional algebraic group. The latter shows that there exist generically free rational actions of non-commutative infinitesimal group schemes on varieties.

We conclude this introduction by making the link between this work and the notion of essential dimension. Informally speaking, the *essential dimension* of an algebraic object is an integer that measures its complexity. This notion was introduced by Buhler and Reichstein in [BR97] for finite groups and was then extended by Merkurjev for functors from the category of field extensions of a fixed base field  $k$  to the category of sets [BF03]. For a  $k$ -group scheme  $G$ , its essential dimension  $\text{ed}_k(G)$  computes, roughly speaking, the number of parameters needed to define all  $G$ -torsors over all schemes over  $k$ . Tossici conjectured that if  $k$  is a field of positive characteristic and  $G$  is a finite commutative unipotent  $k$ -group scheme, then  $\text{ed}_k(G) \geq n_V(G)$  where  $n_V(G)$  is the order of nilpotency of the Verschiebung morphism of  $G$  [Tos19, Conjecture 1.4]. The conjecture is known to be true for  $n_V(G) = 2$  after Fakhruddin [Fak20, Theorem 1.1]. Our hopes are that Theorem 1.3 might lead to further progress in the proof of this conjecture in the infinitesimal case.

**Outline of the paper.** In Section 2 we recall some notions and results around finite (commutative) group schemes and we introduce the *socle* of a finite group scheme. Moreover, we prove Proposition 2.25 giving a description of the Hopf algebra of an infinitesimal commutative unipotent group scheme over a perfect field, which plays a central role for the main Theorem 1.3. In Section 3 we recall the main definitions and results around (rational) actions of finite group schemes on varieties and on their algebraic counterpart given by module algebra structures. In Section 4 we focus on nilpotent derivations, an object that plays a central role when studying actions of infinitesimal commutative unipotent group schemes. Moreover, we study  $p$ -basis of finite field extensions and we prove Corollary 4.7 describing when some systems of differential equations admit a solution. In the first part of Section 5 we prove the existence part of Theorem 1.3 in the case of commutative trigonalizable group schemes of height one (Proposition 5.4). We then proceed with the proof of the general case. We conclude in Section 6 dealing with faithful rational actions: in Proposition 6.7 we show how to extend naturally a generically free rational action of an infinitesimal commutative unipotent  $k$ -group scheme  $G$  on a variety  $X$  to a faithful rational  $G^\ell$ -action on  $X$  for  $\ell \geq 1$  and Proposition 6.10 proves that this construction is not always possible for arbitrary products. We finish the paper with an example that illustrates our results about faithful rational actions in the case of the connected part of the  $p$ -torsion of abelian varieties.

**Acknowledgments.** I am deeply grateful to my supervisor Dajano Tossici for his guidance and constant support. I would also like to thank Michel Brion for engaging discussions and valuable comments on the initial version of this work. I am thankful to Xavier Caruso for his keen interest in the project and for offering a distinct perspective that proved helpful in various aspects. Additionally, I thank Damien Robert for providing valuable inputs.

## 2 Finite group schemes

Throughout the whole work,  $k$  will denote a ground field of characteristic  $p > 0$  and  $\bar{k}$  an algebraic closure of  $k$ . Moreover, for every  $k$ -algebra  $R$  and  $k$ -scheme  $X$ , we will denote by  $X_R$  the  $R$ -scheme  $X \times_{\text{Spec}(k)} \text{Spec}(R)$ . By  $k$ -algebraic scheme we will mean a  $k$ -scheme of finite type and we will call  $k$ -algebraic group a  $k$ -algebraic group scheme. All the group schemes we will consider will be algebraic groups. By  $k$ -variety we will mean a separated, geometrically integral  $k$ -scheme of finite type and we will call *curve* any  $k$ -variety of dimension 1. If  $X$  is a  $k$ -variety of dimension  $n$ , then its function field  $K = k(X)$  is a separable, finitely generated extension of  $k$  of transcendence degree  $n$ . For  $G = \text{Spec}(A)$  an affine  $k$ -group scheme represented by the Hopf algebra  $A$ , we will denote by  $\Delta: A \rightarrow A \otimes_k A$  its comultiplication and by  $\varepsilon: A \rightarrow k$  its counit. For  $G$  an affine  $k$ -group scheme, we will also denote by  $k[G]$  the Hopf algebra representing it.

**Definition 2.1** (Absolute Frobenius). Let  $X$  be a  $k$ -scheme and  $f: k \rightarrow k, c \mapsto c^p$  be the Frobenius morphism of  $k$ . The *absolute Frobenius morphism*  $\sigma_X: X \rightarrow X$  acts as the identity map on the underlying topological space  $|X|$  while on the sections of  $\mathcal{O}_X$  over an open subset  $U \subseteq X$  it acts as the map

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{O}_X(U) &\rightarrow \mathcal{O}_X(U), \\ a &\mapsto a^p. \end{aligned}$$

**Definition 2.2** (Relative Frobenius). Let  $X$  be a  $k$ -scheme and  $X^{(p)} = X \times_{k,f} \text{Spec}(k)$  be the base change with respect to the Frobenius morphism  $f$  of  $k$ . The *relative Frobenius morphism*  $F_X: X \rightarrow X^{(p)}$  is defined by the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} & & & \sigma_X & \\ & & & \curvearrowright & \\ X & & & & X \\ & \searrow^{F_X} & & & \downarrow \\ & X^{(p)} & \xrightarrow{\quad} & X & \\ & \downarrow & & \downarrow & \\ & \text{Spec}(k) & \xrightarrow{\sigma_{\text{Spec}(k)}} & \text{Spec}(k) & \end{array}$$

We will refer to the relative Frobenius morphism just as the *Frobenius morphism*.

**Remark 2.3.**

1. The assignment  $X \mapsto F_X$  is functorial, compatible with fiber products and commutes with extension of the base field.
2. If  $X$  is a scheme over  $\mathbb{F}_p$ , then  $X^{(p)} = X$  and the relative Frobenius  $F_X$  coincides with the absolute Frobenius  $\sigma_X$ . Moreover, for any extension  $k \supseteq \mathbb{F}_p$  we have that  $X_k^{(p)} \simeq X_k$  and  $F_{X_k} = \sigma_X \times \text{id}_k$ .
3. When  $G$  is a  $k$ -group scheme, then  $G^{(p)}$  is also a  $k$ -group scheme and the Frobenius morphism  $F_G: G \rightarrow G^{(p)}$  is a homomorphism of group schemes [DG70, II.§7, 1]. If  $F_G^n = 0$  for some  $n \geq 1$ , then  $G$  is said to have *height*  $\leq n$ .

**Proposition 2.4.** For any  $k$ -variety  $X$ ,  $X^{(p)}$  is geometrically integral. Moreover the relative Frobenius  $F_X: X \rightarrow X^{(p)}$  induces a finite field extension of function fields  $k(X)/k(X^{(p)})$  of degree  $p^{\dim(X)}$  and an isomorphism of  $k(X^{(p)})$  with the composite of the fields  $k$  and  $(k(X))^p$ .

*Proof.* See [Liu02, Chapter 3, Corollary 2.27].  $\square$

**Definition 2.5** (Lie algebra). Let  $G$  be an affine  $k$ -group scheme and denote by  $I_G = \ker(\varepsilon)$  its augmentation ideal (where  $\varepsilon$  is the co-identity map  $\varepsilon: k[G] \rightarrow k$ ). We define the *Lie algebra* of  $G$  to be  $\text{Lie}(G) = \text{Hom}_k(I_G/I_G^2, k)$ . As a  $k$ -vector space  $\text{Lie}(G)$  is isomorphic to the tangent space of  $G$  at the identity and it has an additional structure of Lie algebra (see for example [DG70, II.§4, 4]).

**Remark 2.6.** Let  $G$  be a  $k$ -group scheme and  $F_G: G \rightarrow G^{(p)}$  its Frobenius morphism. Then  $\text{Lie}(G) = \text{Lie}(\ker(F_G))$  (see [DG70, II.§7, 1.4]).

**Definition 2.7** (Infinitesimal group scheme). A  $k$ -group scheme  $G = \text{Spec}(A)$  is said to be *infinitesimal* if its augmentation ideal  $I_G = \ker(\varepsilon: A \rightarrow k)$  is nilpotent.

Notice that non-trivial infinitesimal group schemes exist only over fields of positive characteristic: indeed, by Cartier's Theorem, in characteristic zero all algebraic groups are smooth.

## 2.1 Finite commutative group schemes

Let  $G = \text{Spec}(A)$  be an affine commutative  $k$ -group scheme and

$$F_A: A^{(p)} = A \otimes_{k,f} k \rightarrow A, \quad a \otimes x \mapsto xa^p$$

be the relative Frobenius morphism of  $A$ , where  $f$  denotes the Frobenius morphism of  $k$ . For any  $k$ -vector space  $V$ , consider the  $k$ -vector space of symmetric tensors of order  $p$ ,  $(V^{\otimes p})^{S_p} \subseteq V^{\otimes p}$ . Notice that, since  $G$  is commutative,  $A$  is cocommutative and thus we have that the map given by the comultiplication  $A \rightarrow A^{\otimes p}$  factors via  $(A^{\otimes p})^{S_p}$ :

$$\begin{array}{ccc} A & \longrightarrow & A^{\otimes p} \\ \downarrow & \nearrow & \\ (A^{\otimes p})^{S_p} & & \end{array}$$

**Definition 2.8** (Verschiebung). The *Verschiebung morphism*  $V_A$  of  $A$  is by definition the composite

$$A \longrightarrow (A^{\otimes p})^{S_p} \xrightarrow{\lambda_A} A \otimes_{k,f} k = A^{(p)}$$

where  $\lambda_A$  is the unique  $k$ -linear map sending  $x \cdot (a \otimes \cdots \otimes a) \mapsto a \otimes x$  for any  $x \in k$  and  $a \in A$ . The *Verschiebung morphism*  $V_G: G^{(p)} \rightarrow G$  is the homomorphism of group schemes induced by  $V_A$ .

The assignment  $G \mapsto V_G$  is functorial, compatible with fiber products and commutes with extension of the base field.

**Remark 2.9.** For any  $k$ -algebra  $B$  the multiplication morphism  $(B^{\otimes p})^{S_p} \rightarrow B$  is given by the composite

$$(B^{\otimes p})^{S_p} \xrightarrow{\lambda_B} B^{(p)} \xrightarrow{F_B} B$$

and for any  $k$ -linear morphism  $\varphi: B \rightarrow C$  we have the commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} (B^{\otimes p})^{S_p} & \xrightarrow{\lambda_B} & B^{(p)} \\ \downarrow \varphi^{\otimes p} & & \downarrow \varphi^{(p)} \\ (C^{\otimes p})^{S_p} & \xrightarrow{\lambda_C} & C^{(p)}. \end{array}$$

For more details see [DG70, IV.§3, 4]: here the second fact is stated for morphisms of  $k$ -algebras but can actually be generalized for any  $k$ -linear morphism.

**Remark 2.10.** Let  $(A, \Delta, \varepsilon)$  and  $(B, m, u)$  be respectively a coalgebra and an algebra over  $k$ . Then  $\text{Hom}_k(A, B)$  has a  $k$ -algebra structure with multiplication given by

$$\phi \otimes \chi \mapsto m \circ \phi \otimes \chi \circ \Delta$$

and unit

$$k \rightarrow \text{Hom}_k(A, B), x \mapsto (c \mapsto \varepsilon(c)u(x)).$$

**Lemma 2.11.** Let  $G = \text{Spec}(A)$  be an affine commutative  $k$ -group scheme,  $B$  be a  $k$ -algebra and let  $C$  denote the  $k$ -algebra of  $k$ -linear morphisms  $\text{Hom}_k(A, B)$ . For every element  $g \in C^{(p)}$ , it holds that

$$F_C(g) = F_B \circ g \circ V_A.$$

*Proof.* Since  $F_C$  is a morphism of  $k$ -algebras, it is enough to show the result for  $g$  of the form  $f \otimes 1 = f^{(p)}$  with  $f \in C = \text{Hom}_k(A, B)$ . We then have that  $F_C(f \otimes 1) = f^p$  and we thus wish to show that

$$f^p = F_B \circ f^{(p)} \circ V_A.$$

Using the definition of multiplication of the algebra  $C$  one sees that

$$f^p: A \xrightarrow{\text{comult}} (A^{\otimes p})^{S_p} \xrightarrow{f^{\otimes p}} (B^{\otimes p})^{S_p} \xrightarrow{\text{mult}} B.$$

By Remark 2.9 we obtain the commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} A & \xrightarrow{\text{comult}} & (A^{\otimes p})^{S_p} & \xrightarrow{f^{\otimes p}} & (B^{\otimes p})^{S_p} & \xrightarrow{\text{mult}} & B \\ & \searrow V_A & \downarrow \lambda_A & & \downarrow \lambda_B & \nearrow F_B & \\ & & A^{(p)} & \xrightarrow{f^{(p)}} & B^{(p)} & & \end{array}$$

and thus the statement.  $\square$

Recall that a finite  $k$ -group scheme is a  $k$ -group scheme that is finite as a  $k$ -scheme and that the category of finite commutative group schemes over a field  $k$  is abelian.

**Lemma 2.12.** Let  $G = \text{Spec}(A)$  be a finite (commutative)  $k$ -group scheme. Then

$$A^\vee = \text{Hom}_k(A, k)$$

is a finite dimensional (commutative)  $k$ -Hopf algebra.

*Proof.* [DG70, V.§1.2.10]  $\square$

**Definition 2.13** (Cartier dual). Let  $G$  be a finite commutative  $k$ -group scheme. We call *Cartier dual* of  $G$  the finite commutative  $k$ -group scheme

$$G^\vee = \text{Spec}(A^\vee).$$

**Remark 2.14.** When  $G$  is a finite commutative  $k$ -group scheme one can verify that the Verschiebung morphism  $V_G: G^{(p)} \rightarrow G$  coincides with the dual of the Frobenius morphism  $F_{G^\vee}: (G^\vee)^{(p)} \simeq (G^{(p)})^\vee \rightarrow G^\vee$  of the Cartier dual  $G^\vee$ .

## 2.2 The socle of a finite group scheme

The following definition generalizes to finite group schemes the classical definition of the *socle* of a finite abstract group.

**Definition 2.15.** For  $G$  a finite  $k$ -group scheme, we define the *socle* of  $G$ , denoted  $\text{soc}(G)$ , to be the closed  $k$ -subgroup scheme generated by the non-trivial minimal normal closed  $k$ -subgroup schemes of  $G$ .

**Lemma 2.16.** *Let  $G$  be a finite  $k$ -group scheme.*

1.  $G$  is non-trivial if and only if  $\text{soc}(G)$  is non-trivial.
2.  $\text{soc}(G)$  is a normal closed  $k$ -subgroup scheme of  $G$ .
3.  $\text{soc}(G) \times_G H$  is non-trivial for any non-trivial normal  $k$ -subgroup scheme  $H$  of  $G$ .
4. If  $G$  is commutative,  $\text{soc}(H) = \text{soc}(G) \times_G H$  for any  $k$ -subgroup scheme  $H \subseteq G$ , in particular  $\text{soc}(\text{soc}(G)) = \text{soc}(G)$ .
5. If  $G$  is infinitesimal, then  $\text{soc}(G) \subseteq \text{soc}(\ker(F_G))$ . If in addition  $G$  is commutative, then  $\text{soc}(G) = \text{soc}(\ker(F_G))$ .
6. If  $G_1$  and  $G_2$  are finite commutative  $k$ -group schemes, then

$$\text{soc}(G_1 \times_k G_2) = \text{soc}(G_1) \times_k \text{soc}(G_2).$$

7. For any morphism of finite commutative  $k$ -group schemes  $G_1 \rightarrow G_2$ , the induced morphism  $\text{soc}(G_1) \rightarrow G_2$  factors via  $\text{soc}(G_2)$ .

*Proof.*

1. Since  $G$  is normal in itself and it is finite, there exist non-trivial minimal normal closed subgroup schemes.
2. Clear by definition since the socle is generated by non-trivial normal closed subgroup schemes.
3. Since  $G$  is finite we may suppose that  $H$  is minimal, henceforth  $\text{soc}(G) \times_G H = H$ .
4. Notice that since  $G$  is commutative any of its closed subgroup schemes is normal. A non-trivial minimal closed  $k$ -subgroup scheme of  $H$  is also a minimal closed  $k$ -subgroup scheme of  $G$ . Therefore  $\text{soc}(H) \subseteq \text{soc}(G) \times_G H$ . Let  $N$  be a non-trivial minimal closed  $k$ -subgroup scheme of  $G$ . By minimality, either  $N$  is a closed  $k$ -subgroup scheme of  $H$  or  $N \times_G H$  is trivial. Suppose the former. Then  $N$  is also a minimal closed  $k$ -subgroup scheme of  $H$ . Therefore the equality.
5. Let  $N$  be a non-trivial minimal normal closed  $k$ -subgroup scheme of  $G$ . Since  $G$  is infinitesimal, then  $N \times_G \ker(F_G)$  is a non-trivial normal closed  $k$ -subgroup scheme of  $G$ . Therefore, by minimality,  $N$  is a closed  $k$ -subgroup scheme of  $\ker(F_G)$ . Hence  $\text{soc}(G) \subseteq \text{soc}(\ker(F_G))$ . If  $G$  is commutative, by the previous point also the other inclusion holds.

6. Clearly  $\text{soc}(G_1 \times_k G_2)$  is contained in  $\text{soc}(G_1) \times_k \text{soc}(G_2)$ . Take now  $N_1 \times_k N_2$  with  $N_i$  non-trivial minimal closed  $k$ -subgroup scheme of  $G_i$ . Then  $N_i$  is also a minimal closed  $k$ -subgroup scheme of  $G_1 \times_k G_2$  (notice that again we are using the assumption that the  $G_i$ 's are commutative). Henceforth, by definition of the socle subgroup scheme,  $N_1 \times_k N_2 \subseteq \text{soc}(G_1 \times_k G_2)$  and thus also the inverse inclusion holds true.
7. Let  $N$  be a non-trivial minimal closed  $k$ -subgroup scheme of  $G_1$ , then  $N$  is mapped to a minimal closed  $k$ -subgroup scheme of  $G_2$ .

□

### 2.3 Trigonalizable group schemes

**Definition 2.17** (Unipotent group scheme). A  $k$ -algebraic group  $G$  is said to be *unipotent* if it is isomorphic to an algebraic subgroup of the  $k$ -algebraic group of upper triangular unipotent matrices  $U_n$  for some  $n \geq 1$ .

We denote by  $W_n$  the  $k$ -group scheme of Witt vectors of length  $\leq n$  and by  $W_n^m$  the kernel of the morphism  $F^m: W_n \rightarrow W_n$ . Notice that if we want to consider  $r$  copies of  $W_n$  we will use the notation  $(W_n)^r$  with the parenthesis. Recall that  $W_n^m$  is the Cartier dual of  $W_m^n$  for every  $n, m \geq 1$ .

**Proposition 2.18.** *If  $k$  is perfect, then every infinitesimal commutative unipotent  $k$ -group scheme  $G$  can be embedded in  $(W_n^m)^r$  for some  $n, m, r \geq 1$ .*

*Proof.* See [DG70, V.§1, Proposition 2.5].

□

**Remark 2.19.** A finite commutative  $k$ -group scheme is infinitesimal unipotent if and only if its Frobenius and Verschiebung morphisms are both nilpotent (see [DG70, IV.§3, 5.3]). In particular, in Proposition 2.18 one can take  $m$  and  $n$  to be respectively their nilpotency indexes (this is a direct consequence of the functoriality of the Frobenius and Verschiebung morphism).

**Lemma 2.20.** *Let  $G$  be an infinitesimal unipotent  $k$ -group scheme and  $r$  be the maximal natural number such that  $\alpha_p^r \subseteq G$ . Then the following facts hold:*

1. *if there is a closed immersion  $G \subseteq (W_n^m)^s$ , then  $s \geq r$  and there exists a projection  $(W_n^m)^s \rightarrow (W_n^m)^r$ , which forgets  $s - r$  copies of  $W_n^m$ , inducing an immersion of  $G$  in  $(W_n^m)^r$ ;*
2.  *$\dim_k(\text{Lie}(G)) = r$  if and only if  $\ker(F_G) = \alpha_p^r$ .*

*Proof.*

1. Suppose that  $G \subseteq (W_n^m)^s$  for some  $s \geq 1$ . Notice that since  $\alpha_p^r \subseteq G$  is annihilated both by the Frobenius and the Verschiebung, then

$$\alpha_p^r \subseteq (W_1^1)^s = \alpha_p^s$$

and thus  $s \geq r$ . If  $s = r$  it is okay. Suppose that  $s > r$ , then there exists a projection  $(W_n^m)^s \rightarrow (W_n^m)^{s-1}$  which induces an immersion  $G \hookrightarrow (W_n^m)^{s-1}$ . Indeed, suppose that all the projections

$$\pi_i: G \rightarrow (W_n^m)^{s-1}$$



have non-trivial kernel  $\ker(\pi_i)$ . Then  $\ker(\pi_i)$  is a non-trivial  $k$ -subgroup scheme of  $G$  for every  $i = 1, \dots, s$  and thus it contains a copy of  $\alpha_p$ . So for every  $i = 1, \dots, s$  we have a different copy of  $\alpha_p$  contained in  $G$ , since each  $\ker(\pi_i)$  lies in a different copy of  $W_n^m$ . Therefore  $\alpha_p^s \subseteq G$ , which contradicts the maximality of  $r$ . Now again, if  $s - 1 = r$  we are done, otherwise we repeat the same reasoning until reaching  $r$ .

2. Clearly if  $\ker(F_G) = \alpha_p^r$  then  $\dim_k(\text{Lie}(G)) = r$ . Now, by assumption we have that  $\alpha_p^r \subseteq G$ , so in particular  $\alpha_p^r \subseteq \ker(F_G)$ , and the equality must hold since they have the same order.

□

**Definition 2.21.** A  $k$ -group scheme  $G$  is said to be *trigonalizable* if it is affine and it has a closed normal unipotent subgroup  $G^u$  such that  $G/G^u$  is diagonalizable (see for example [DG70, IV.§2, Definition 3.1]).

Let us recall the Theorem of decomposition of commutative affine  $k$ -group schemes.

**Theorem 2.22.** *Let  $G$  be a commutative affine  $k$ -group scheme. Then:*

- (i)  $G$  has a maximal  $k$ -subgroup scheme  $G^m$  of multiplicative type,  $G^m$  is normal in  $G$  and  $G/G^m$  is unipotent;
- (ii) if  $k$  is perfect,  $G$  has a maximal unipotent  $k$ -subgroup scheme  $G^u$  and  $G \simeq G^u \times_k G^m$ . In particular, if  $G$  is trigonalizable then  $G^m$  is diagonalizable.

*Proof.* See [DG70, IV.§3, Theorem 1.1].

□

**Lemma 2.23.** *Let  $G$  be an infinitesimal commutative  $k$ -group scheme.*

1. If  $\ker(F_G)$  is diagonalizable, then  $\text{soc}(G) = \ker(F_G) = \mu_p^n$ , where  $n$  is the maximal natural number such that  $\mu_p^n \subseteq G$ .
2. If  $G$  is unipotent, then  $\text{soc}(G) = \alpha_p^r$  where  $r$  is the maximal natural number such that  $\alpha_p^r \subseteq G$ . In particular,  $\text{soc}(G)$  is the maximal  $k$ -subgroup scheme of  $\ker(F_G)$  with trivial Verschiebung.

Moreover, if  $k$  is perfect and  $G$  is trigonalizable:

3.  $\text{soc}(G) = \alpha_p^r \times_k \mu_p^n$ , where  $n$  and  $r$  are respectively the maximal natural numbers such that  $\alpha_p^r \times_k \mu_p^n \subseteq G$ . In particular,

$$\text{soc}(G) = (\ker(F_G) \times_G \ker(V_{G(1/p)})) \times_k \ker(F_{G/G^u}).$$

4.  $\text{soc}(G) \times_k K = \text{soc}(G_K)$  for any field extension  $K/k$ .

*Proof.*

1. By assumption  $\ker(F_G) = \mu_p^n$  where  $n$  is the maximal natural number such that  $\mu_p^n \subseteq G$ . Then, by Lemma 2.16,  $\text{soc}(G) = \text{soc}(\ker(F_G)) = \mu_p^n$ .
2. Let  $r$  be the maximal natural number such that  $\alpha_p^r \subseteq G$ . Then  $G$  contains  $r$  distinct copies of  $\alpha_p$ , which are minimal normal  $k$ -subgroup schemes of  $G$ . Therefore

$$\alpha_p^r \subseteq \text{soc}(G) = \text{soc}(\ker(F_G)).$$

On the other hand, all the minimal normal subgroups of  $\ker(F_G)$  are copies of  $\alpha_p$ , henceforth  $\text{soc}(\ker(F_G)) = \alpha_p^s$  for some  $s \geq 1$ . Combining the previous inclusion and the maximality of  $r$  we obtain the equality. Suppose that  $H$  is a  $k$ -subgroup scheme of  $\ker(F_G)$  with trivial Verschiebung. Then  $H \subseteq \mathbb{G}_a^{s'}$  for some  $s' \geq 1$  (see [DG70, IV.§3, Theorem 6.6]) and by the first point of Lemma 2.20 we can suppose that  $s'$  is the maximal natural number such that  $\alpha_p^{s'} \subseteq H$ . Since  $H \subseteq \ker(F_G)$ , then  $H = \ker(F_H)$ . Moreover  $\dim_k(\text{Lie}(H)) = s$  and thus by order reasons we have that  $H = \ker(F_H) = \alpha_p^{s'}$ . By maximality of  $r$ ,  $H \subseteq \text{soc}(G) = \alpha_p^r$ .

3. Since  $k$  is perfect, then  $G \simeq G^u \times_k G/G^u$  and by Lemma 2.16

$$\text{soc}(G) \simeq \text{soc}(G^u) \times_k \text{soc}(G/G^u).$$

Therefore the first part of the statement follows by 1. and 2. We have already proved that  $\text{soc}(G/G^u) = \ker(F_{G/G^u})$ . It is then enough to prove that

$$\alpha_p^r = \text{soc}(G^u) = \ker(F_G) \times_G \ker(V_{G^{(1/p)}}).$$

The left to right inclusion is clear. By Lemma 2.20,  $G^u \subseteq (W_n^m)^r$ . Hence,

$$\ker(F_G) \times_G \ker(V_{G^{(1/p)}}) \subseteq (W_n^1)^r \times_{(W_n^m)^r} (W_1^m)^r = (W_1^1)^r = \alpha_p^r.$$

The claimed equality then holds.

4. If  $K$  is perfect, the statement is a direct consequence of the good behaviour of Frobenius and Verschiebung kernels with respect to base change. For the general case, clearly  $\text{soc}(G) \times_k K \subseteq \text{soc}(G_K)$ . Let  $K^{\text{perf}}$  be the perfect closure of  $K$ . Then we have

$$\text{soc}(G) \times_k K^{\text{perf}} \hookrightarrow \text{soc}(G_K) \times_K K^{\text{perf}} \hookrightarrow \text{soc}(G_{K^{\text{perf}}})$$

and the first and last term coincide. Therefore  $\text{soc}(G) \times_k K^{\text{perf}} \simeq \text{soc}(G_K) \times_k K^{\text{perf}}$  and so the inclusion  $\text{soc}(G) \times_k K \subseteq \text{soc}(G_K)$  is in fact an equality. □

### Example 2.24.

1.  $\text{soc}((W_n^m)^s) = \alpha_p^s$  for all  $n, m, s \geq 1$  and  $\text{soc}(G) = \alpha_p$  for any non-trivial  $G \subseteq W_n^m$ .
2. Let  $k$  be algebraically closed and  $A$  be an abelian variety of dimension  $g$  defined over  $k$ . The  $p$ -torsion  $A[p]$  is a finite commutative  $k$ -group scheme annihilated by  $p$  with rank  $p^{2g}$ . The  $p$ -rank of  $A$  is

$$f = \dim_{\mathbb{F}_p}(\text{Hom}(\mu_p, A[p])).$$

The  $a$ -number of  $A$  is

$$a = \dim_k(\text{Hom}(\alpha_p, A[p])).$$

Let  $A[p]^0$  be the identity component of  $A[p]$  and  $A[p]^{0,u}$  its unipotent part. It is known that

$$A[p] = A[p]^{0,u} \times_k \mu_p^f \times_k (\mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z})^f$$

(see for example [Mum08, p. III.15]). Then  $\text{soc}(A[p]) = \alpha_p^a \times_k \mu_p^f \times (\mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z})^f$  and the  $a$ -number of  $A$  coincides with  $\dim_k(\text{Lie}(\text{soc}(A[p]^{0,u})))$  or equivalently it is the maximal natural number  $a$  such that  $\alpha_p^a \subseteq A[p]$ .

### 2.3.1 Young diagrams for commutative unipotent group schemes of height one

Let  $k$  be perfect and  $G$  be a commutative unipotent  $k$ -group scheme of height one, then  $G \simeq \prod_{i=1}^s W_{n_i}^1$  for some  $s, n_i \geq 1$  (see [DG70, IV.§2, 2.14]). Moreover, we may suppose that  $n_1 \geq \dots \geq n_s$ . We can then identify any such group scheme with a Young diagram, namely the one of shape  $\tau(G) = (n_1, \dots, n_s)$ . For example we will have

$$\tau(\alpha_p) = \begin{array}{|c|} \hline \square \\ \hline \end{array}, \quad \tau(W_3^1 \times_k \alpha_p) = \begin{array}{|c|c|c|} \hline \square & \square & \square \\ \hline \square & & \\ \hline \end{array}, \quad \tau(W_2^1 \times_k W_2^1) = \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline \square & \square \\ \hline \square & \square \\ \hline \end{array}.$$

Notice that two commutative unipotent  $k$ -group schemes of height one are isomorphic if and only if their Young diagrams coincide. Moreover, the first column of  $\tau(G)$  represents  $\text{soc}(G)$ . Similarly, the first  $n$  columns represent  $\ker(V_G^n)$  and the length of the  $n$ th column corresponds to the number of copies of  $W_n^1$  contained in  $G$ . Finally, the dimension of the Lie algebra of  $G$  coincides with the number of boxes of  $\tau(G)$ . Given  $G_1, \dots, G_l$  commutative unipotent  $k$ -group schemes of height one, the smallest commutative unipotent  $k$ -group scheme  $G$  of height one containing all of them corresponds to the smallest Young diagram containing  $\tau(G_i)$  for all  $i$ . Explicitly, if  $\tau(G_i) = (n_{1i}, \dots, n_{s_i i})$  for some  $s_i \geq 1$  for every  $i = 1, \dots, l$  then  $\tau(G) = (n_1, \dots, n_s)$  where  $s = \max\{s_1, \dots, s_l\}$  and  $n_j = \max\{n_{j1}, \dots, n_{jl}\}$  for every  $j = 1, \dots, s$ . For example, if we take  $G_1 = W_3^1 \times_k \alpha_p$  and  $G_2 = W_2^1 \times_k W_2^1$ , then

$$\tau(G) = \begin{array}{|c|c|c|} \hline \square & \square & \square \\ \hline \square & \square & \\ \hline \end{array}.$$

### 2.3.2 Algebraic description of infinitesimal commutative unipotent group schemes

In the last part of this section we give a description of the Hopf algebra of an infinitesimal commutative unipotent group scheme over a perfect field, useful for the proof of the main Theorem 1.3. Let  $k$  be perfect and  $G$  be a commutative unipotent  $k$ -algebraic group. Then  $V_G^n = 0$  for some nilpotency index  $n \geq 1$ . We then have the cofiltration

$$G = G/\text{Im}(V_G^n) \rightarrow G/\text{Im}(V_G^{n-1}) \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow G/\text{Im}(V_G) \rightarrow 0.$$

We call  $G_i$  the  $k$ -group scheme  $G/\text{Im}(V_G^i)$  and  $H_i$  the kernel of the map  $G_i \rightarrow G_{i-1}$ . Notice that then  $H_i = \text{Im}(V_G^{i-1})/\text{Im}(V_G^i)$  and thus is killed by the Verschiebung. If  $G$  is infinitesimal, then  $H_i \simeq \prod_{j=1}^r \alpha_{p^{l_j}}$  for some  $r \geq 1$  and  $l_1, \dots, l_r \geq 1$ . Moreover, there are epimorphisms  $H_i^{(p)} \rightarrow H_{i+1}$  induced by  $V_G$ :  $(\text{Im}(V_G^{i-1}))^{(p)} \rightarrow \text{Im}(V_G^i)$ . In particular, the order and the dimension of the Lie algebra of the  $H_i$ 's are decreasing (the latter is given by [BM11, Proposition 2.5]). The following Proposition will be crucial for the proof of the main Theorem.

**Proposition 2.25.** *Let  $k$  be perfect,  $G$  be an infinitesimal commutative unipotent  $k$ -group scheme,  $n$  be the nilpotency index of  $V_G$ ,  $H_n = \text{Im}(V_G^{n-1}) \simeq \prod_{j=1}^r \alpha_{p^{l_j}}$  for some  $r \geq 1$  and  $l_1, \dots, l_r \geq 1$ ,  $G_{n-1} = G/\text{Im}(V_G^{n-1})$ . Then we endow  $k[G_{n-1}][T_1, \dots, T_r]$  with a structure of  $k$ -Hopf algebra such that  $\Delta(T_j) = T_j \otimes 1 + 1 \otimes T_j + R_j$  where  $R_j$  is an element of  $k[G_{n-1}] \otimes_k k[G_{n-1}]$ . Moreover,*

$$k[G] = k[G_{n-1}][T_1, \dots, T_r]/(P_1, \dots, P_r)$$

where for every  $j = 1, \dots, r$  the polynomials  $P_j$  are primitive elements of  $k[G_{n-1}][T_1, \dots, T_r]$  congruent to  $T_j^{p^{l_j}}$  modulo the augmentation ideal of  $k[G_{n-1}]$ .

*Proof.* By Proposition 2.18,  $G \subseteq (W_n)^s$  for some  $s \geq 1$ . We then have the following commutative diagram with vertical maps that are closed immersions

$$\begin{array}{ccccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & H_{n-1} & \longrightarrow & G & \longrightarrow & G_{n-1} & \longrightarrow & 0 \\ & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & \mathbb{G}_a^s & \longrightarrow & (W_n)^s & \xrightarrow{\pi} & (W_{n-1})^s & \longrightarrow & 0. \end{array}$$

Now,

$$H_{n-1} = \text{Im}(V_G^{n-1}) \simeq \prod_{j=1}^r \alpha_{p^j} \subseteq \mathbb{G}_a^r$$

for some  $1 \leq r \leq s$  and  $l_1, \dots, l_r \geq 1$ . By Lemma 2.20 there exists a projection

$$\rho : (W_n)^s \twoheadrightarrow (W_n)^r$$

such that the composite

$$H_{n-1} \hookrightarrow (W_n)^s \twoheadrightarrow (W_n)^r$$

is a monomorphism and thus  $H_{n-1} \hookrightarrow \mathbb{G}_a^r$ . Consider the commutative diagram given by the schematic images of  $\rho$ :

$$\begin{array}{ccccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & H_{n-1} & \longrightarrow & \rho(G) & \longrightarrow & \rho(G_{n-1}) & \longrightarrow & 0 \\ & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & \mathbb{G}_a^r & \longrightarrow & (W_n)^r & \xrightarrow{\pi} & (W_{n-1})^r & \longrightarrow & 0. \end{array}$$

Its vertical maps are closed immersions and they factor in the following way

$$\begin{array}{ccccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & H_{n-1} & \longrightarrow & \rho(G) & \longrightarrow & \rho(G_{n-1}) & \longrightarrow & 0 \\ & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & \mathbb{G}_a^r & \longrightarrow & \pi^{-1}(\rho(G_{n-1})) & \xrightarrow{\pi} & \rho(G_{n-1}) & \longrightarrow & 0. \end{array}$$

Notice that

$$k[\pi^{-1}(\rho(G_{n-1}))] = k[\rho(G_{n-1})][T_1, \dots, T_r]$$

with Hopf algebra structure given by Witt vectors, that is  $\Delta(T_j) = T_j \otimes 1 + 1 \otimes T_j + R_j$  with  $R_j \in k[\rho(G_{n-1})] \otimes_k k[\rho(G_{n-1})]$  for every  $j = 1, \dots, r$ . By the Snake Lemma we have the short exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow \rho(G) \rightarrow \pi^{-1}(\rho(G_{n-1})) \rightarrow \mathbb{G}_a^r/H_{n-1} \simeq \mathbb{G}_a^r \rightarrow 0$$

corresponding to

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} 0 \rightarrow (S_1, \dots, S_r) \rightarrow k[\rho(G_{n-1})][T_1, \dots, T_r] \rightarrow k[\rho(G)] \rightarrow 0 \\ S_i \mapsto P_i \end{array}$$

where  $k[\mathbb{G}_a^r/H_{n-1}] = k[S_1, \dots, S_r]$ . Therefore

$$k[\rho(G)] = k[\rho(G_{n-1})][T_1, \dots, T_r]/(P_1, \dots, P_r)$$

with  $P_i$ 's primitive elements of  $k[\rho(G_{n-1})][T_1, \dots, T_r]$ . Notice moreover that

$$P_i = T_i^{p^{l_i}} \pmod{I_{\rho(G_{n-1})}}$$

(where  $I_{\rho(G_{n-1})}$  is the augmentation ideal of  $k[\rho(G_{n-1})]$ ) by the short exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow I_{\rho(G_{n-1})} \rightarrow k[\rho(G_{n-1})][T_1, \dots, T_r] \rightarrow k[T_1, \dots, T_r] \rightarrow 0$$

$$P_i \mapsto T_i^{p^i}.$$

Since  $\rho(G) \rightarrow \rho(G_{n-1})$  and  $G \rightarrow G_{n-1}$  are both  $H_{n-1}$ -torsors and  $G \rightarrow \rho(G)$  is  $H_{n-1}$ -equivariant, the commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} G & \longrightarrow & G_{n-1} \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \rho(G) & \longrightarrow & \rho(G_{n-1}) \end{array}$$

is indeed a pull-back diagram. Therefore,

$$G = G_{n-1} \times_{\rho(G_{n-1})} \rho(G)$$

and thus

$$\begin{aligned} k[G] &= k[G_{n-1}] \otimes_{k[\rho(G_{n-1})]} k[\rho(G)] \\ &= k[G_{n-1}] \otimes_{k[\rho(G_{n-1})]} k[\rho(G_{n-1})][T_1, \dots, T_r]/(P_1, \dots, P_r) \\ &= k[G_{n-1}][T_1, \dots, T_r]/(P_1, \dots, P_r) \end{aligned}$$

as wished. Notice that  $P_i = T_i^{p^i} \bmod I_{G_{n-1}}$  since  $I_{\rho(G_{n-1})} \subseteq I_{G_{n-1}}$  by the fact that  $k[\rho(G_{n-1})]$  is a  $k$ -Hopf subalgebra of  $k[G_{n-1}]$ .  $\square$

### 3 Actions of finite group schemes

The first part of this section is devoted to recalling the main definitions around (rational) actions of finite group schemes on varieties, with a focus on faithful and (generically) free actions. The second part is centered on their algebraic counterpart which is given by module algebra structures (see Definition 3.15).

#### 3.1 Actions and rational actions

Let  $G$  be a  $k$ -group scheme,  $X$  be a  $k$ -scheme equipped with a  $G$ -action  $G \times_k X \rightarrow X$  and  $\rho: G \rightarrow \text{Aut}_X$  be the corresponding group functor homomorphism.

**Definition 3.1** (Centralizer). For any closed  $k$ -subscheme  $Y$  of  $X$ , the *centralizer*  $C_G(Y)$  of  $Y$  in  $G$  is the subgroup functor that associates to any  $k$ -scheme  $S$  the set of  $g \in G(S)$  which induce the identity on  $Y \times_k S$ . The kernel of  $\rho$  is the centralizer of  $X$  in  $G$ .

**Definition 3.2** (Faithful action). Let  $G$  be a  $k$ -group scheme,  $X$  be a  $k$ -scheme equipped with a  $G$ -action  $\rho: G \rightarrow \text{Aut}_X$ . The  $G$ -action is said to be *faithful* if its kernel is trivial.

**Theorem 3.3.** *Let  $G$  be a  $k$ -group scheme acting on a  $k$ -variety  $X$ . The centralizer  $C_G(Y)$  of any closed  $k$ -subscheme  $Y$  of  $X$  is represented by a closed  $k$ -subgroup scheme of  $G$ .*

*Proof.* See [SGA3, VI<sub>B</sub>, Example 6.2.4.e)].  $\square$

**Lemma 3.4.** *Let  $G$  be a  $k$ -group scheme and  $X$  be a  $k$ -variety endowed with a  $G$ -action. The  $G$ -action is faithful if and only if the induced  $G_{\bar{k}}$ -action on  $X_{\bar{k}}$  is faithful.*

*Proof.* The  $G_{\bar{k}}$ -action on  $X_{\bar{k}}$  is faithful if and only if  $C_{G_{\bar{k}}}(X_{\bar{k}}) \simeq C_G(X)_{\bar{k}}$  is trivial and this holds true if and only if  $C_G(X)$  is trivial.  $\square$

**Definition 3.5** (Free action). Let  $G$  be a finite  $k$ -group scheme and  $X$  be a  $k$ -scheme equipped with a  $G$ -action  $\rho: G \times_k X \rightarrow X$ . Let  $x: \text{Spec}(k(x)) \rightarrow X$  be a point of  $X$  and consider the composite  $G \times_k \text{Spec}(k(x)) \xrightarrow{\text{id} \times x} G \times_k X \xrightarrow{\rho \times \text{id}} X \times_k X$ . The *stabilizer*  $\text{Stab}_G(x)$  of the point  $x$  is the pull-back of the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \text{Stab}_G(x) & \dashrightarrow & G_{k(x)} \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \text{Spec}(k(x)) & \xrightarrow{\text{diag}} & X \times_k X \end{array}$$

where the bottom arrow is the diagonal morphism. The  $G$ -action is said to be *free at*  $x \in X$  if  $\text{Stab}_G(x)$  is trivial. The  $G$ -action is said to be *free* if it is free at any point. We denote by  $X_{fr}$  the subset of free points of  $X$ , which is an open  $G$ -stable subset of  $X$ .

**Remark 3.6.** Notice that, by universal property of pull-backs, if  $H$  is a  $k$ -subgroup scheme of  $G$ , then

$$\text{Stab}_H(x) = \text{Stab}_G(x) \times_{G_{k(x)}} H_{k(x)}.$$

**Proposition 3.7.** *Let  $G$  be a finite  $k$ -group scheme and  $X$  be an irreducible  $k$ -scheme with a  $G$ -action. The following are equivalent:*

1.  $X_{fr} \neq \emptyset$ ;
2. the generic point  $\eta$  of  $X$  belongs to  $X_{fr}$ ;
3.  $X_{fr}$  is dense in  $X$ .

*Proof.* As we recalled above,  $X_{fr}$  is an open  $G$ -stable subset of  $X$ . The statement is a direct consequence of this and of the fact that  $X$  is irreducible.  $\square$

**Definition 3.8** (Generically free action). Let  $G$  be a finite  $k$ -group scheme and  $X$  be an irreducible  $k$ -scheme with a  $G$ -action. We say that the action is *generically free* if it satisfies one of the above equivalent conditions.

**Remark 3.9.** When  $G$  is a finite constant group acting on a variety, if the action is faithful then it is automatically generically free. This fails in general for  $G$  a finite  $k$ -group scheme. For example the action  $\alpha_p^2 \times_k \mathbb{A}_k^1 \rightarrow \mathbb{A}_k^1$  given by  $(a, b) \cdot x \mapsto x + ax^p + b$  is faithful (there is no non-trivial  $k$ -subgroup of  $\alpha_p^2$  acting trivially) but not generically free, in fact the stabilizer of the generic point  $\eta$  is  $\text{Stab}_G(\eta) = \text{Spec}(k(x)[S, T]/(x^p S + T, S^p, T^p))$ . The result is known to be true for diagonalizable  $k$ -group schemes (we also give a proof in Corollary 6.2). Moreover we show that it holds, for instance, for infinitesimal commutative unipotent subgroup schemes of the  $k$ -group scheme of Witt vectors (see Remark 6.3).

**Proposition 3.10.** *Let  $G$  be a  $k$ -group scheme and  $X$  be a  $k$ -variety with a  $G$ -action. The  $G$ -action is generically free if and only if the induced  $G_{\bar{k}}$ -action on  $X_{\bar{k}}$  is generically free.*

*Proof.* Let  $\eta: \text{Spec}(k(\eta)) \rightarrow X$  be the generic point of  $X$ . Since  $X$  is geometrically integral, then the generic point of  $X_{\bar{k}}$  is the base change  $\bar{\eta}: \text{Spec}(k(\eta) \otimes_k \bar{k}) \rightarrow X_{\bar{k}}$  (see for example [Liu02, Chapter 3, Corollary 2.14]). Therefore, by general properties of the base change, we have that the stabilizer of  $\bar{\eta}$  is

$$\text{Stab}_{G_{\bar{k}}}(\bar{\eta}) \simeq \text{Stab}_G(\eta)_{\bar{k}} \simeq \text{Stab}_G(\eta) \times_{\text{Spec}(k(\eta))} \text{Spec}(k(\eta) \otimes_k \bar{k})$$

where  $\text{Stab}_G(\eta)$  is the stabilizer of  $\eta$ . Now, since  $k(\eta) \hookrightarrow k(\eta) \otimes_k \bar{k}$  is faithfully flat (it is a field extension since  $X$  is geometrically integral), then  $\text{Stab}_{G_{\bar{k}}}(\bar{\eta})$  is trivial (i.e. isomorphic to  $\text{Spec}(k(\eta) \otimes_k \bar{k})$ ) if and only if  $\text{Stab}_G(\eta)$  is trivial (i.e. isomorphic to  $\text{Spec}(k(\eta))$ ), as wished.  $\square$

**Definition 3.11** (Rational action). Let  $G$  be a finite  $k$ -group scheme and  $X$  a  $k$ -scheme. A *rational action* of  $G$  on  $X$  is a rational map  $\rho: G \times_k X \dashrightarrow X$  such that:

- (i) the rational map  $(\pi_1, \rho): G \times_k X \dashrightarrow G \times_k X$  is birational;
- (ii) the following diagram commutes

$$\begin{array}{ccc} G \times_k G \times_k X & \xrightarrow{m \times \text{id}_X} & G \times_k X \\ \downarrow \text{id}_G \times \rho & & \downarrow \rho \\ G \times_k X & \xrightarrow{\rho} & X \end{array}$$

where  $m: G \times_k G \rightarrow G$  denotes the multiplication morphism of  $G$ .

**Remark 3.12.** Let  $X$  be a  $k$ -variety. There is a bijection between rational actions of  $G$  on  $X$  and  $G$ -actions on the generic point of  $X$  (see [Bri22, Corollary 3.4]).

**Definition 3.13** (Faithful rational action). Let  $G$  be a finite  $k$ -group scheme and  $X$  be a  $k$ -variety equipped with a rational action  $\rho: G \times_k X \dashrightarrow X$ . We say that it is a *faithful rational action* if the corresponding action on the generic point of  $X$  is faithful.

The following is a known result (see for example [TV13, Section 2]), we include the proof for sake of completeness. The proof we give can be deduced by [Bri22, Lemma 5.3] where the case of curves is treated.

**Proposition 3.14.** *Let  $G$  be a finite  $k$ -group scheme and  $X$  be a  $k$ -variety endowed with a generically free rational  $G$ -action. Then*

$$\dim_k(\text{Lie}(G)) \leq \dim(X).$$

*Proof.* Let  $U$  be an open subset of  $X$  on which the action is defined. Suppose first that  $\text{char}(k) = 0$ , then  $G$  is smooth and thus

$$0 = \dim_k(\text{Lie}(G)) = \dim(G).$$

Now, since the  $G$ -action on  $U$  is generically free, we have that  $\dim(G) \leq \dim(U) = \dim(X)$  and thus the statement. Suppose then that  $\text{char}(k) = p > 0$  and let  $G_1$  be the kernel of the Frobenius morphism  $F_G: G \rightarrow G^{(p)}$ . Then  $G_1$  is an infinitesimal  $k$ -subgroup scheme of  $G$  and  $\text{Lie}(G) = \text{Lie}(G_1)$ . If the  $G$ -action on  $U$  is generically free, then the same holds for  $G_1$ . We can thus suppose that  $G = G_1$  and, by Proposition 3.10, that  $k$  is algebraically closed. By Proposition 3.7, the  $G$ -action is generically free if and only if  $X_{f_r}$  is dense in  $X$  and thus there exists (since  $X$  is geometrically integral and  $k = \bar{k}$ ) a smooth closed point  $x \in U$  with trivial stabilizer  $\text{Stab}_G(x)$ . Since  $G$  is infinitesimal, then also  $\text{Stab}_G(x)$  is such, henceforth  $\text{Stab}_G(x)$  is trivial if and only if  $\text{Lie}(\text{Stab}_G(x))$  is trivial. Now,  $\text{Lie}(\text{Stab}_G(x))$  is the kernel of the natural map  $\text{Lie}(G) \rightarrow T_x U$  (see [DG70, III. §2, 2.6]) and therefore if the action is generically free this map is an injection and thus the statement.  $\square$

### 3.2 Actions of finite group schemes and module algebras

Some references for this part are [Swe69, Chapter VII] and [Mon93, Chapter 4].

**Definition 3.15** (Module algebra). Let  $A$  be a  $k$ -Hopf algebra, not necessarily commutative. We say that a  $k$ -algebra  $B$  is a (left)  $A$ -module algebra if:

1.  $B$  is a (left)  $A$ -module via  $\psi: A \otimes_k B \rightarrow B, a \otimes b \mapsto a \cdot b$ ;
2. the morphism  $\eta: B \rightarrow \text{Hom}_k(A, B), b \mapsto (a \mapsto a \cdot b)$  is a (unital) morphism of  $k$ -algebras.

One can give the same definition on the right as well.

**Remark 3.16** (Compatibility with products property). Notice that the first request of the above definition is equivalent to giving a map

$$v: A \rightarrow \text{End}_k(B), a \mapsto (b \mapsto a \cdot b)$$

which is a morphism of  $k$ -algebras, while the second request corresponds to asking that  $v$  satisfies the following properties:

$$\begin{cases} a \cdot 1 = \varepsilon(a) \\ v(a)(fg) = m_B(v \otimes v \circ \Delta(a))(f \otimes g) \end{cases} \quad (1)$$

for any  $a \in A$  and  $f, g \in B$ . Here  $\varepsilon$  denotes the counit of  $A$ ,  $\Delta$  its comultiplication and  $m_B$  the multiplication of  $B$ . We will also refer to (1) as the *compatibility with products property*. The first statement is straightforward by the definition of  $A$ -module. For the second one, we just use the  $k$ -algebra structure of  $\text{Hom}_k(A, B)$ , recalled in Remark 2.10, and the fact that  $\eta(b)(a) = v(a)(b)$ . Indeed,  $\eta$  is a morphism of (unital)  $k$ -algebras if and only if

$$\eta(fg) = m_B \circ \eta(f) \otimes \eta(g) \circ \Delta \quad \text{and} \quad \eta(1) = 1_{\text{Hom}_k(A, B)}$$

for all  $f, g \in B$  if and only if

$$v(a)(fg) = \eta(fg)(a) = m_B \circ \eta(f) \otimes \eta(g) \circ \Delta(a) = m_B(v \otimes v \circ \Delta(a))(f \otimes g)$$

and

$$a \cdot 1 = v(a)(1) = \eta(1)(a) = \varepsilon(a)$$

for any  $a \in A$ . Finally, notice that, if we denote by  $I := \ker(\varepsilon)$  the augmentation ideal of  $A$ , then by what we just showed it holds that  $a \cdot 1 = 0$  for any  $a \in I$ .

Module algebras are very useful when studying the actions of finite  $k$ -group schemes, thanks to the following result.

**Proposition 3.17.** *Let  $G = \text{Spec}(A)$  be a finite  $k$ -group scheme and  $X = \text{Spec}(B)$  be an affine  $k$ -scheme. There is a bijection between the set of right actions of  $G$  on  $X$  and the set of left  $A^\vee$ -module algebra structures on  $B$ .*

*Proof.* The bijection is obtained associating to any coaction  $\rho: B \rightarrow B \otimes_k A$  the  $A^\vee$ -module algebra structure

$$\begin{aligned} v: A^\vee &\rightarrow \text{End}_k(B) \\ \alpha &\mapsto (B \xrightarrow{\rho} B \otimes_k A \xrightarrow{\text{id}_B \otimes \alpha} B \otimes_k k \simeq B). \end{aligned}$$

For more details see for example [Mon93, §4.1]. □



When dealing with infinitesimal group schemes, one can specialize Proposition 3.17 and prove that to give an action of these group schemes amounts to exhibiting a certain number of differential operators (see [DG70, II.§4, 5] for a definition of the algebra of differential operators on a scheme) respecting some relations. For  $B$  a  $k$ -algebra, we denote by  $\text{Diff}_k^+(B)$  the  $k$ -algebra of differential operators  $D$  such that  $D(1) = 0$ .

**Proposition 3.18.** *Let  $G = \text{Spec}(A)$  be an infinitesimal  $k$ -group scheme and  $X = \text{Spec}(B)$  be an affine  $k$ -scheme. There is a bijection between the set of right actions of  $G$  on  $X$  and the set of homomorphisms of  $k$ -algebras  $v: A^\vee \rightarrow \text{Diff}_k^+(B)$  such that*

$$v(\mu)(fg) = \sum_i (v(\mu_i)(f))(v(\nu_i)(g)) = m_B(v \otimes v \circ \Delta(\mu))(f \otimes g) \quad (2)$$

for  $\mu \in A^\vee$ ,  $\Delta\mu = \sum_i \mu_i \otimes \nu_i$ , and  $f, g \in B$ , where  $m_B$  denotes the multiplication morphism of  $B$ .

*Proof.* See [DG70, II.§4, Proposition 7.2]. □

**Example 3.19.**

1. Consider the auto-dual infinitesimal  $k$ -group scheme  $\alpha_p = \text{Spec}(k[T]/(T^p))$  whose group structure is given by

$$\Delta(T) = T \otimes 1 + 1 \otimes T.$$

To give an action of  $\alpha_p$  on a  $k$ -scheme  $X = \text{Spec}(B)$  is equivalent to giving a  $k$ -linear derivation  $\partial: B \rightarrow B$  such that  $\partial^p = 0$ .

2. Consider the purely transcendental extension  $k(t)/k$ . The algebra of differential operators  $\text{Diff}_k(k(t))$  is a  $k(t)$ -vector space with basis given by  $\{\frac{\partial}{\partial t^i}\}$  where

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t^i}(t^r) = \begin{cases} \binom{r}{i} t^{r-i} & \text{if } r \geq i \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

If  $k$  has characteristic zero, then  $\frac{\partial}{\partial t^i} = \frac{1}{i!} \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial t}\right)^i$ . On the other hand, if  $k$  has characteristic  $p > 0$  this does not make sense for  $i = 0 \pmod p$ . In this case if  $i = jp^s$  for some  $s \geq 0$  with  $j \not\equiv 0 \pmod p$ , then

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t^i} = \frac{\partial}{\partial t^{jp^s}} = \frac{1}{j!} \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial t^{p^s}}\right)^j.$$

We will denote by  $\partial_{p^s}$  the differential operator  $\frac{\partial}{\partial t^{p^s}}$ .

## 4 Nilpotent derivations and $p$ -basis

This part will be devoted to nilpotent derivations, which are often encountered when studying actions of infinitesimal group schemes, as seen for example in 3.19. Some of the results appearing here might be known to experts, we have included their proof for lack of a reference. Proposition 4.6 and Corollary 4.7 will play an important role in the proof of the main Theorem. A background reference for  $p$ -basis is [Bou90, V.§13]. For  $K$  a field and  $D$  a derivation on  $K$ , we will denote by  $K^D$  the subfield of elements of  $K$  annihilated by  $D$ , that is

$$K^D := \{x \in K \mid D(x) = 0\}.$$

We begin by recalling a fundamental result showing that nilpotent derivations on fields appear only in characteristic  $p > 0$  and that nilpotency indexes are always  $p$ -powers.

**Theorem 4.1.** *Let  $D$  be a non-zero nilpotent derivation of index  $r$  on a field  $K$ . Then  $K$  has characteristic  $p \neq 0$  and  $r = p^t$ .*

*Proof.* See [Smi68, Theorem 2]. □

**Definition 4.2.** Let  $D$  be a derivation on a field  $K$ . We say that  $D$  has *order*  $r$  if it is nilpotent of index  $r$ .

By Theorem 4.1 we have that, if  $p$  is a prime number and  $t \geq 1$ , a derivation  $D$  on a field  $K$  has order  $p^t$  if and only if  $D^{p^{t-1}} \neq 0$  and  $D^{p^t} = 0$ . From now on  $K$  will be a field of characteristic  $p > 0$  such that  $K/K^p$  is finite.

**Lemma 4.3.** *Let  $D$  be a derivation on  $K$  of order  $p^n$ . Then the field extension  $K/K^D$  has order  $p^n$ , there exists  $t \in K$  such that  $D(t) = 1$  and  $\text{Im}(D^i) = \ker(D^{p^n-i})$  for any  $i = 1, \dots, p^n$ .*

*Proof.* We have that  $D$  is a nilpotent  $K^D$ -linear map with one-dimensional kernel generated by 1. Therefore there is a unique block in the normal Jordan form of  $D$  of size  $p^n$ , computed with respect to a basis, which we can suppose that contains 1. This implies that  $\dim_{K^D} K = p^n$  and there exists  $t$  such that  $D(t) = 1$ . Moreover, when there is only one nilpotent Jordan block, it is clear that  $\text{Im}(D^i) = \ker D^{p^n-i}$  for any  $i = 1, \dots, p^n$ . □

**Definition 4.4** ( $p$ -basis). Let  $K/L$  be a finite field extension such that  $K^p \subseteq L$ . A  $p$ -basis of  $K/L$  is a sequence  $(t_1, \dots, t_n) \in K^n$  such that the monomials  $t_1^{m_1} \dots t_n^{m_n}$  with  $0 \leq m_1, \dots, m_n \leq p-1$  form an  $L$ -basis of  $K$ .

**Remark 4.5.**

1. Notice that for any  $p$ -basis  $(t_1, \dots, t_n)$  of  $K/L$ , a derivation  $D$  in  $\text{Der}_L(K)$  is zero if and only if  $D(t_i) = 0$  for all  $i = 1, \dots, n$ .
2. A sequence  $(t_1, \dots, t_n)$  is a  $p$ -basis of  $K/L$  if and only if  $\{dt_1, \dots, dt_n\}$  is a basis of the  $K$ -vector space of Kähler differentials  $\Omega_{K/L}^1$  [Bou90, V.§13, Theorem 1]. Consider the dual basis  $\{\partial_1, \dots, \partial_n\}$ , which gives a basis of the  $K$ -vector space of derivations  $\text{Der}_L(K) = \text{Hom}_K(\Omega_{K/L}^1, K)$ . The  $\partial_i$ 's commute pairwise and satisfy  $\partial_i^p = 0$  for all  $i = 1, \dots, n$ . Moreover  $\partial_i(t_j) = \delta_{ij}$ .

In the following, we construct special  $p$ -basis that can be obtained any time we have a generically free rational action of an infinitesimal commutative unipotent group scheme of height one on a variety.

**Proposition 4.6.** *Let  $D_1, \dots, D_n$  be derivations on  $K$  commuting pairwise such that  $D_i$  has order  $p$  on  $K_{i-1}$  for all  $i = 1, \dots, n$  where  $K_0 = K$  and  $K_j = K^{D_1, \dots, D_j}$  for all  $j = 1, \dots, n$ . Then*

1.  $\{D_1, \dots, D_n\}$  is a basis of  $\text{Der}_{K_n}(K)$ , and
2. there exists a  $p$ -basis  $(t_1, \dots, t_n)$  of  $K/K_n$  such that  $D_i(t_i) = 1$  and  $D_i(t_j) = 0$  for all  $j < i$ . Moreover,  $D_i(t_j)$  belongs to  $K_j$  for all  $i$  and  $j$ .

*Proof.*

1. Applying recursively Lemma 4.3, we see that  $[K : K_n] = p^n$ . As remarked above,  $\text{Der}_{K_n}(K)$  has then dimension  $n$  over  $K$ , henceforth it is enough to show that  $D_1, \dots, D_n$  are  $K$ -linearly independent. Suppose that they are not and take  $a_1, \dots, a_n$  in  $K$  such that

$$a_1 D_1 + \dots + a_n D_n = 0.$$

Let  $i_0 = \max\{i = 1, \dots, n \mid a_i \neq 0\}$ . Then

$$0 = (a_1 D_1 + \dots + a_n D_n)|_{K_{i_0-1}} = a_{i_0} D_{i_0}|_{K_{i_0-1}}.$$

By assumption  $D_{i_0}$  has order  $p$  on  $K_{i_0-1}$ , so in particular it is different from zero. Thus  $a_{i_0} = 0$ , which gives a contradiction.

2. Consider the tower of extensions

$$K_n \subseteq K_{n-1} \subseteq K_{n-2} \subseteq \dots \subseteq K_1 \subseteq K.$$

By Lemma 4.3, for every  $i = 1, \dots, n$  the extension  $K_i \subseteq K_{i-1}$  has degree  $p$  and there exists  $t_i \in K_{i-1}$  such that  $D_i(t_i) = 1$ , so by degree reasons  $K_{i-1} = K_i(t_i)$ . Therefore the first statement follows. The second statement is a direct consequence of the first one together with the commutativity hypothesis. Indeed, for every  $i, j$  and  $h \leq j$  we have that

$$D_h(D_i(t_j)) = D_i(D_h(t_j)) = D_i(\delta_{hj}) = 0$$

where  $\delta_{hj}$  is the Kronecker delta. Henceforth  $D_i(t_j)$  belongs to  $K_j$  as claimed. □

We introduce some notation in order to prove the following Corollary that gives necessary and sufficient conditions for some systems of differential equations to have solution. It will play a crucial role for the existence of the generically free actions of Theorem 1.3. Let  $D_1, \dots, D_m$  be differential operators on  $K$  commuting pairwise and  $a_1, \dots, a_m$  be elements of  $K$  such that

$$D_i(a_j) = D_j(a_i)$$

for all  $i, j = 1, \dots, m$ . Consider moreover a polynomial  $F \in (X_1, \dots, X_m)k[X_1, \dots, X_m]$  and write

$$F = X_1 Q_1 + \dots + X_m Q_m.$$

We define the element of  $\text{Diff}(K)$

$$\tilde{F}(a_1, \dots, a_m) := \sum_{i=1}^m Q_i(D_1, \dots, D_m) a_i.$$

Notice that it does not depend on the choice of the  $Q_i$ 's since  $D_i(a_j) = D_j(a_i)$  for every  $i, j$ .

**Corollary 4.7.** *In the above setting, suppose moreover that  $D_i$  is a derivation of order  $p^i$  on  $K_{i-1}$  for any  $i = 1, \dots, m$  where  $K_0 = K$  and  $K_j = K^{D_1, \dots, D_j}$  for any  $j = 1, \dots, m$  and that*

$$D_i^{p^i} = F_i(D_1, \dots, D_m)$$

for some polynomial  $F_i \in (X_1, \dots, X_m)k[X_1, \dots, X_m]$ . Then the system

$$\begin{cases} D_1(x) = a_1 \\ \dots \\ D_m(x) = a_m \end{cases}$$

admits a solution in  $K$ , which is unique modulo  $K_m$ , if and only if

$$D_i^{p^i-1}(a_i) = \tilde{F}_i(a_1, \dots, a_m)$$

for every  $i = 1, \dots, m$ .

*Proof.* Suppose that there exists  $z \in K$  solution of the above system: then

$$D_i^{p^i-1}(a_i) = D_i^{p^i}(z) = F_i(D_1, \dots, D_m)(z) = \tilde{F}_i(a_1, \dots, a_m)$$

for every  $i = 1, \dots, m$ . For the other way around, notice that the uniqueness modulo  $K_m$  of the solution is clear by the linearity of differential operators: if  $x$  and  $y$  are both solutions to the system, then  $0 = D_i(x) - D_i(y) = D_i(x - y)$  for all  $i = 1, \dots, m$ , meaning that the two solutions differ by an element of  $K_m$ . Let us prove its existence by recursion. Let  $S_i$  be the system given by just the first  $i$  lines for any  $i = 1, \dots, n$ . Let us show that if  $S_i$  has a solution  $x_i$ , for  $i = 1, \dots, m$ , then  $S_{i+1}$  has a solution. Any solution of  $S_i$  is of the form  $x_i + y_i$  with  $y_i \in K_i$ , therefore we wish to find such an element satisfying

$$D_{i+1}(x_i + y_i) = a_{i+1}.$$

This equation is satisfied if and only if

$$D_{i+1}(y_i) = a_{i+1} - D_{i+1}(x_i).$$

For every  $j = 1, \dots, i$  we have that

$$D_j(D_{i+1}(x_i)) = D_{i+1}(D_j(x_i)) = D_{i+1}(a_j) = D_j(a_{i+1}),$$

that is  $a_{i+1} - D_{i+1}(x_i)$  lies in  $K_i$ . Moreover,

$$\begin{aligned} D_{i+1}^{p^{i+1}-1}(a_{i+1} - D_{i+1}(x_i)) &= D_{i+1}^{p^{i+1}-1}(a_{i+1}) - D_{i+1}^{p^{i+1}}(x_i) = \\ &= \tilde{F}_{i+1}(a_1, \dots, a_m) - D_{i+1}^{p^{i+1}}(x_i) = 0 \end{aligned}$$

and thus by Lemma 4.3 there exists the solution  $y_i$  in  $K_i$  we were looking for.  $\square$

## 5 Generically free rational actions

We begin this section with a useful criterion in order to determine when an action of an infinitesimal group scheme is generically free.

**Proposition 5.1.** *Let  $G$  be an infinitesimal  $k$ -group scheme and  $X$  an irreducible  $k$ -scheme endowed with a  $G$ -action. Then:*

1. *the  $G$ -action is generically free if and only if the induced  $\ker(F_G)$ -action is generically free;*

2. if in addition  $k$  is perfect and  $G$  is commutative, the  $G$ -action is generically free if and only if the induced action of  $\text{soc}(G)$  is generically free.

*Proof.*

1. Clearly if the  $G$ -action is generically free then also the induced  $\ker(F_G)$ -action is generically free. Suppose that the  $G$ -action on  $X$  is not generically free. Let  $\eta$  be the generic point of  $X$  and  $K = k(\eta)$ . Then  $\text{Stab}_G(\eta)$  is a non-trivial subgroup scheme of  $G_K$  and thus

$$\ker(F_{G_K}) \times_{G_K} \text{Stab}_G(\eta) = \ker(F_G)_K \times_{G_K} \text{Stab}_G(\eta) \stackrel{3.6}{=} \text{Stab}_{\ker(F_G)}(\eta)$$

is non-trivial. Henceforth the action of  $\ker(F_G)$  on  $X$  is not generically free.

2. Clearly if the  $G$ -action is generically free then also the induced  $\text{soc}(G)$ -action is generically free. For the other way around, by Proposition 3.10 and Lemma 2.23 we may suppose that  $k = \bar{k}$ . Then  $G$  is trigonalizable. Suppose by contradiction that the  $G$ -action on  $X$  is not generically free. Let  $\eta$  be the generic point of  $X$  and  $K = k(\eta)$ . Then  $\text{Stab}_G(\eta)$  is a non-trivial subgroup scheme of  $G_K$  and thus

$$\begin{aligned} \text{soc}(\text{Stab}_G(\eta)) &\stackrel{2.16}{=} \text{soc}(G_K) \times_{G_K} \text{Stab}_G(\eta) \stackrel{2.23}{=} \\ &\text{soc}(G)_K \times_{G_K} \text{Stab}_G(\eta) \stackrel{3.6}{=} \text{Stab}_{\text{soc}(G)}(\eta) \end{aligned}$$

is non-trivial by Lemma 2.16. Henceforth the action of  $\text{soc}(G)$  on  $X$  is not generically free which gives a contradiction. □

Recall the following definition.

**Definition 5.2.** A  $k$ -group scheme  $G$  is said to be  $k$ -solvable if it is affine and it admits a composition series with quotients isomorphic either to  $\mathbb{G}_{a,k}$  or to  $\mathbb{G}_{m,k}$  (see for example [DG70, IV.§4, Definition 3.1]).

**Proposition 5.3.** *Let  $G$  be a  $k$ -group scheme.*

1. *If  $G$  is  $k$ -solvable, then  $G$  is trigonalizable and its maximal unipotent  $k$ -subgroup scheme  $G^u$  is  $k$ -solvable. Moreover  $G$  is isomorphic as a  $k$ -scheme to  $\mathbb{G}_{m,k}^{n-r} \times_k \mathbb{G}_{a,k}^r$  where  $n = \dim(G)$  and  $r = \dim(G^u)$ .*
2. *If  $k$  is perfect and  $G$  is trigonalizable, smooth and connected, then  $G$  is  $k$ -solvable.*

*Proof.* See for example [DG70, IV.§4, Proposition 3.4 and Corollary 3.8]. □

The following Proposition proves the existence part of Theorem 1.3 in the case of commutative trigonalizable group schemes of height one.

**Proposition 5.4.** *Let  $\mathcal{G}$  be a  $k$ -solvable group scheme of dimension  $n$ ,  $G = \ker(F^s : \mathcal{G} \rightarrow \mathcal{G})$  for some  $s \geq 1$  and  $X$  be a  $k$ -variety of dimension  $\ell$ . Then there exist generically free rational actions of  $G$  on  $X$  if and only if  $n \leq \ell$ . In particular, if  $k$  is perfect, every commutative trigonalizable  $k$ -group scheme of height one is the Frobenius kernel of a  $k$ -solvable group scheme, and thus the statement applies with  $n = \dim_k(\text{Lie}(G))$ .*

*Proof.* Suppose that there exists a generically free rational action of  $G$  on  $X$ . Then, by Proposition 3.14,

$$n = \dim(\mathcal{G}) = \dim_k(\mathrm{Lie}(G)) \leq \dim(X) = \ell.$$

For the converse, let us start by proving that any variety  $X$  of dimension  $\ell$  admits a generically free rational action of  $G$  if  $n = \ell$ . By Proposition 5.3,  $G$  is a subscheme of

$$\mathbb{G}_{m,k}^{n-r} \times_k \mathbb{G}_{a,k}^r$$

where  $r = \dim(\mathcal{G}^u)$  and thus acts generically freely on it by multiplication. We then have the  $G$ -torsor given by the Frobenius

$$F^s: \mathbb{G}_{m,k}^{n-r} \times_k \mathbb{G}_{a,k}^r \rightarrow \mathbb{G}_{m,k}^{n-r} \times_k \mathbb{G}_{a,k}^r.$$

Let  $K = k(X)$  and take any point  $x \in \left( \mathbb{G}_{m,k}^{n-r} \times_k \mathbb{G}_{a,k}^r \right) (kK^{p^s})$ ,

$$x = (x_1, \dots, x_n): \mathrm{Spec}(kK^{p^s}) \rightarrow \mathbb{G}_{m,k}^{n-r} \times_k \mathbb{G}_{a,k}^r.$$

Then we have a  $G$ -torsor

$$Y_x = \mathrm{Spec} \left( kK^{p^s}[T_1, \dots, T_n] / (T_i^{p^s} - x_i)_{i=1, \dots, n} \right) \longrightarrow \mathrm{Spec}(kK^{p^s})$$

given by the pull-back diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} Y_x & \longrightarrow & \mathrm{Spec}(kK^{p^s}) \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow x \\ \mathbb{G}_{m,k}^{n-r} \times_k \mathbb{G}_{a,k}^r & \xrightarrow{F^s} & \mathbb{G}_{m,k}^{n-r} \times_k \mathbb{G}_{a,k}^r. \end{array}$$

Let  $\{y_1, \dots, y_n\}$  be a  $p$ -basis for  $K/kK^p$  and  $x = (x_1, \dots, x_n) \in \mathbb{G}_{m,k}^{n-r} \times_k \mathbb{G}_{a,k}^r (kK^{p^s})$  be the point of coordinates  $x_i = y_i^{p^s}$  for  $i = 1, \dots, n$ . Let us show that

$$kK^{p^s}[T_1, \dots, T_n] / (T_i^{p^s} - x_i)_{i=1, \dots, n} \simeq K = kK^{p^s}(y_1, \dots, y_n).$$

First of all, let us see that  $kK^{p^s}[T_1, \dots, T_n] / (T_i^{p^s} - x_i)_{i=1, \dots, n}$  is a field. We can see this by induction on  $n$ : in fact,

$$kK^{p^s}[T_1] / (T_1^{p^s} - x_1)$$

is a field since  $T_1^{p^s} - x_1$  is irreducible in  $kK^{p^s}[T_1]$  since  $y_1 \notin kK^p$ . Without loss of generality we can then suppose by induction that

$$F = kK^{p^s}[T_1, \dots, T_{n-1}] / (T_i^{p^s} - x_i)_{i=1, \dots, n-1}$$

is a field and consider

$$F[T_n] / (T_n^{p^s} - x_n).$$

The polynomial  $T_n^{p^s} - x_n$  is irreducible in  $F[T_n]$  since  $y_n \notin kK^p$  and thus the claim. Consider the morphism of rings

$$\begin{aligned} kK^{p^s}[T_1, \dots, T_n] / (T_i^{p^s} - x_i)_{i=1, \dots, n} &\rightarrow K = kK^{p^s}(y_1, \dots, y_n) \\ T_i &\mapsto y_i, \end{aligned}$$

then since the objects are fields it is an injection and since the two fields have the same degree over  $kK^{p^s}$  they are isomorphic, as wished. Therefore we constructed a  $G$ -torsor  $\text{Spec}(K) \rightarrow \text{Spec}(kK^{p^s})$ , that is there exists a generically free rational action of  $G$  on  $X$ , as claimed. For the general case, consider

$$H = \ker(F^s: \mathcal{G} \times_k \mathbb{G}_a^{\ell-n} \rightarrow \mathcal{G} \times_k \mathbb{G}_a^{\ell-n}).$$

By what we have just proved there exists a generically free rational action of  $H$  on  $X$ , since

$$\dim(\mathcal{G} \times_k \mathbb{G}_a^{\ell-n}) = \ell = \dim(X).$$

Notice that  $G = \ker(F^s: \mathcal{G} \rightarrow \mathcal{G})$  is a  $k$ -subgroup scheme of  $H$ , indeed it is the kernel of the projection

$$\pi_2: H \rightarrow \mathbb{G}_a^{\ell-n}.$$

Therefore the same holds for  $G$ , that is there exists a generically free rational action of  $G$  on  $X$ , as wished. If  $k$  is perfect and  $G$  is a commutative trigonalizable  $k$ -group scheme of height one, then

$$G \simeq \prod_{i=1}^t W_{n_i}^1 \times_k \mu_p^l = \ker \left( F: \prod_{i=1}^t W_{n_i} \times_k \mathbb{G}_m^l \rightarrow \prod_{i=1}^t W_{n_i} \times_k \mathbb{G}_m^l \right)$$

for some  $t, l, n_i \geq 1$  (see for example [DG70, IV.§2, 2.14]) and  $\prod_{i=1}^t W_{n_i} \times_k \mathbb{G}_m^l$  is a  $k$ -solvable group scheme of dimension equal to  $\dim_k(\text{Lie}(G))$ .  $\square$

The following is an asymptotic result for the dimension of varieties endowed with generically free rational actions of infinitesimal unipotent group schemes. This result will be made more precise in the commutative case and over a perfect field with the main Theorem.

**Corollary 5.5.** *For every infinitesimal trigonalizable  $k$ -group scheme  $G$  there exists an integer  $r > 0$  such that for every variety  $X$  of dimension  $\geq r$  there exist generically free rational actions of  $G$  on  $X$ .*

*Proof.* Any trigonalizable  $k$ -group scheme  $G$  has a closed immersion in the smooth  $k$ -algebraic group  $T_n$  of trigonalizable matrices for some  $n$ . This  $k$ -group scheme is  $k$ -solvable. Moreover, if  $G$  is infinitesimal, it is contained in the kernel of some power of the Frobenius of  $T_n$ . Therefore, by the previous Proposition, any variety of dimension greater or equal to the dimension of  $T_n$  admits a generically free  $G$ -action.  $\square$

**Remark 5.6.** Notice that, as a consequence of the above Proposition 5.4, we have that for every variety  $X$  of dimension  $n$  and for any  $j \leq n$ , there exists a nilpotent  $k$ -linear derivation  $D$  on  $K = k(X)$  of order  $p^j$ . Indeed, consider a generically free rational action of  $W_j^1$  on  $X$  which corresponds to a module algebra structure

$$\begin{aligned} k[T]/(T^{p^j}) &\rightarrow \text{Der}_k(K) \\ T &\mapsto D \end{aligned}$$

where  $k[T]/(T^{p^j})$  represents  $\alpha_{p^j}$ , the Cartier dual of  $W_j^1$ . Then  $D^{p^j} = 0$  and, by [DG70, III.§2, Corollary 2.7],  $D, D^p, \dots, D^{p^{j-1}}$  are  $K$ -linearly independent, hence  $D$  has order  $j$ .

## 5.1 Proof of the main Theorem

We begin this part with three technical results that are the building blocks for the construction of generically free rational actions done in the proof of Theorem 1.3: the main idea of the proof is to show that for  $G$  an infinitesimal commutative unipotent  $k$ -group scheme with  $n$  nilpotency index of  $F_G$ , a generically free rational action of  $G_{n-1} = \ker(F_G^{n-1})$  on a variety  $X$  can be extended to a rational action of  $G$ . Lemma 5.7 tells us that if  $G_{n-1}$  acts on  $X$ , then  $G$  acts already on  $X^{(p)}$ . Lemma 5.9 shows that to extend a rational action of  $G_{n-1}$ , it is enough to define it on a  $p$ -basis of the fraction field  $K = k(X)/kK^p$ . Lemma 5.10 shows that under certain commutativity assumptions, some commutators are indeed derivations on  $K$ .

**Lemma 5.7.** *Let  $G$  be an infinitesimal  $k$ -group scheme and  $n$  be the nilpotency index of  $F_G$  and let us denote  $G_i := \ker(F_G^i)$  for all  $i = 1, \dots, n-1$ . Any action of  $G_{n-1}$  on a  $k$ -variety  $X$  induces naturally an action of  $G/G_i$  on  $X^{(p^i)}$ . Moreover, if the  $G_{n-1}$ -action on  $X$  is faithful, the same holds true for the induced  $G/G_i$ -action on  $X^{(p^i)}$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $G_{n-1} \times_k X \rightarrow X$  be a faithful action of  $G_{n-1}$  on  $X$ . Then we have a naturally induced faithful action  $G_{n-1}^{(p^i)} \times_k X^{(p^i)} \rightarrow X^{(p^i)}$  of  $G_{n-1}^{(p^i)}$  on  $X^{(p^i)}$  and therefore also of

$$G/G_i \simeq \text{Im}(F_G^i) \subseteq G_{n-1}^{(p^i)}$$

on  $X^{(p^i)}$ . □

**Remark 5.8.**

- In the above setting, the composite

$$G \times_k X^{(p)} \rightarrow G/\ker(F_G) \times_k X^{(p)} \rightarrow X^{(p)}$$

provides us naturally with an action of  $G$  on  $X^{(p)}$ .

- Algebraically, this means that if we have a module algebra structure

$$k[G_{n-1}^\vee] \rightarrow \text{End}_k(B)$$

this induces a module algebra structure

$$v: k[G^\vee] \rightarrow \text{End}_k(\text{Im}(F_B)).$$

Let  $\eta: \text{Im}(F_B) \rightarrow \text{Hom}_k(k[G^\vee], \text{Im}(F_B))$  be the corresponding morphism of algebras. Explicitly we then have that for every  $a \in k[G^\vee]$  and  $\beta \in B^{(p)}$  it holds that

$$\eta(F_B(\beta))(a) = \left( F_{\text{Hom}_k(A,B)} \circ \eta^{(p)}(\beta) \right) (a) = F_B \circ \eta^{(p)}(\beta) \circ V_A(a) = F_B(v^{(p)}(V_A(a))(\beta))$$

where the first equality holds by functoriality of the Frobenius and the second one by Lemma 2.11.

Let  $G$  be an infinitesimal commutative unipotent  $k$ -group scheme and  $n$  be the nilpotency index of  $F_G$ . With the same construction as in the proof of Proposition 2.25, for any  $r \leq \dim_k(\text{Lie}(\text{Im}(V_{G^\vee}^{n-1})))$ , we obtain the commutative  $k$ -Hopf algebra  $k[G_{n-1}^\vee][T_1, \dots, T_r]$  with comultiplication given by Witt vectors. One can then consider the underlying non-commutative  $k$ -Hopf algebra  $k[G_{n-1}^\vee]\langle T_1, \dots, T_r \rangle$  where the variables  $T_i$  don't commute



neither among them nor with the commutative subalgebra  $k[G_{n-1}^\vee]$ . The  $k$ -Hopf algebra  $k[G_{n-1}^\vee]\langle T_1, \dots, T_r \rangle$  is constructed as follows: one first takes the non-commutative free algebra  $\Gamma$  over  $k$  in all the needed variables. We define  $\Delta : \Gamma \rightarrow \Gamma \otimes_k \Gamma$ , sending each of them to the element of  $\Gamma \otimes_k \Gamma$  given by the comultiplication of commutative Witt vectors and then extending this map to a morphism of algebras. Finally we quotient  $\Gamma$  by the bilateral ideal given by the commutators of the variables involved in  $k[G_{n-1}^\vee]$  and by the bilateral ideal defining  $k[G_{n-1}^\vee]$ . In this way,  $\Delta$  defines a comultiplication on  $k[G_{n-1}^\vee]\langle T_1, \dots, T_r \rangle$  (before taking the quotient  $\Delta$  was not a priori coassociative). In this setting, we have the following results.

**Lemma 5.9.** *Let  $X$  be a  $k$ -variety of dimension  $s$  with fraction field  $K$  and  $p$ -basis  $(t_1, \dots, t_s)$  of  $K/kK^p$ . Then for any set  $\{x_{ih} \mid i = 1, \dots, r, h = 1, \dots, s\}$  of elements of  $K$  and any module algebra structure*

$$\tilde{v} : k[G_{n-1}^\vee] \rightarrow \text{Diff}_k^+(K)$$

there exists a unique module algebra structure

$$v : k[G_{n-1}^\vee]\langle T_1, \dots, T_r \rangle \rightarrow \text{Diff}_k^+(K)$$

extending  $\tilde{v}$  and such that  $v(T_i)(t_h) = x_{ih}$  for every  $i$  and  $h$ .

*Proof.* Let us begin with the existence. Since  $v|_{k[G_{n-1}^\vee]} = \tilde{v}$ , it is enough to show that we can define  $D_i = v(T_i)$  that respect the compatibility with products property and such that  $D_i(t_h) = x_{ih}$  for every  $i$  and  $h$ . By Proposition 2.25 we have that

$$\Delta(T_i) = T_i \otimes 1 + 1 \otimes T_i + \sum_j \alpha_{ij} \otimes \beta_{ij}$$

with  $\alpha_{ij}$  and  $\beta_{ij}$  lying in  $k[G_{n-1}^\vee]$  for all  $i, j$ . Therefore we need to define  $D_i$  in such a way that

$$D_i(fg) = D_i(f)g + fD_i(g) + \sum_j v(\alpha_{ij})(f)v(\beta_{ij})(g)$$

for all  $f, g \in K$ . Recall that for  $(t_1, \dots, t_s)$  to be a  $p$ -basis of  $K/kK^p$  means that

$$\{t_1^{m_1} \dots t_s^{m_s} \mid 0 \leq m_1, \dots, m_s \leq p-1\}$$

is a basis of  $K$  as  $kK^p$ -vector space. By Lemma 5.7 the differential  $D_i := v(T_i)$  is defined on  $kK^p$  for every  $i = 1, \dots, r$ . We then define

$$D_i(at_h) = D_i(a)t_h + ax_{ih} + \sum_j v(\alpha_{ij})(a)v(\beta_{ij})(t_h)$$

and

$$D_i(t_h t_l) = x_{ih} t_l + t_h x_{il} + \sum_j v(\alpha_{ij})(t_h)v(\beta_{ij})(t_l)$$

for every  $a \in kK^p$  and  $h \leq l = 1, \dots, s$ . Applying recursively the formula

$$D_i(fg) = D_i(f)g + fD_i(g) + \sum_j v(\alpha_{ij})(f)v(\beta_{ij})(g)$$

we define  $D_i$  on all the monomials of the form  $at_1^{m_1} \dots t_s^{m_s}$  with  $a \in kK^p$  and  $0 \leq m_1, \dots, m_s \leq p-1$  and extend it by linearity to every element of  $K$ . The fact that

$D_i$  is well defined is a consequence of the coassociativity and cocommutativity of the Hopf algebra structure on  $k[G_{n-1}^\vee]\langle T_1, \dots, T_r \rangle$ . The uniqueness of the module algebra structure comes by construction.  $\square$

Given two strings of natural numbers  $I = (i_1, \dots, i_n)$  and  $J = (j_1, \dots, j_n)$ , we say that  $I$  is smaller than  $J$  with respect to the lexicographic order, and we write  $I <_{LEX} J$ , if there exists  $k \in \{1, \dots, n\}$  such that  $(i_1, \dots, i_{k-1}) = (j_1, \dots, j_{k-1})$  and  $i_k < j_k$ .

**Lemma 5.10.** *Let  $A := k[G_{n-1}^\vee]\langle T_{n_1}, \dots, T_{n_{r_n}} \rangle$  be as above. Moreover, write*

$$k[G_j^\vee] = k[G_{j-1}^\vee][T_{j_1}, \dots, T_{j_{r_j}}]/(P_{j_1}, \dots, P_{j_{r_j}})$$

as in Proposition 2.25 for every  $j \leq n-1$ . Let

$$v: A \rightarrow \text{End}_k(B)$$

be an  $A$ -module algebra structure on a  $k$ -algebra  $B$  and let  $D_{jh} := v(T_{jh})$  for every  $j = 1, \dots, n$  and  $h = 1, \dots, r_j$ . It holds that for any  $h = 1, \dots, r_n$  and  $(s, t) <_{LEX} (n, h)$ , if  $D_{nh}$  commutes with every element of  $v(k[G_{s-1}])$  then  $D_{nh}D_{st} - D_{st}D_{nh}$  is a derivation.

*Proof.* Recall that, by Proposition 2.25, for every  $j = 1, \dots, n$  and  $h = 1, \dots, r_j$

$$\Delta(T_{jh}) = T_{jh} \otimes 1 + 1 \otimes T_{jh} + \sum_q \alpha_{jh}^q \otimes \beta_{jh}^q$$

where  $\alpha_{jh}^q$  and  $\beta_{jh}^q$  lie in  $k[G_{j-1}^\vee]$  for all  $q$ . Now

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta(T_{nh}T_{st}) &= \Delta(T_{nh})\Delta(T_{st}) = \\ & T_{nh}T_{st} \otimes 1 + 1 \otimes T_{nh}T_{st} + T_{nh} \otimes T_{st} + T_{st} \otimes T_{nh} + \\ & \sum_q \alpha_{nh}^q T_{st} \otimes \beta_{nh}^q + \sum_q \alpha_{nh}^q \otimes \beta_{nh}^q T_{st} + \sum_{q'} T_{nh} \alpha_{st}^{q'} \otimes \beta_{st}^{q'} + \sum_{q'} \alpha_{st}^{q'} \otimes T_{nh} \beta_{st}^{q'} + \sum_{q, q'} \alpha_{nh}^q \alpha_{st}^{q'} \otimes \beta_{nh}^q \beta_{st}^{q'} \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta(T_{st}T_{nh}) &= \Delta(T_{st})\Delta(T_{nh}) = \\ & T_{st}T_{nh} \otimes 1 + 1 \otimes T_{st}T_{nh} + T_{nh} \otimes T_{st} + T_{st} \otimes T_{nh} + \\ & \sum_q T_{st} \alpha_{nh}^q \otimes \beta_{nh}^q + \sum_q \alpha_{nh}^q \otimes T_{st} \beta_{nh}^q + \sum_{q'} \alpha_{st}^{q'} T_{nh} \otimes \beta_{st}^{q'} + \sum_{q'} \alpha_{st}^{q'} \otimes \beta_{st}^{q'} T_{nh} + \sum_{q, q'} \alpha_{st}^{q'} \alpha_{nh}^q \otimes \beta_{st}^{q'} \beta_{nh}^q. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta(T_{nh}T_{st} - T_{st}T_{nh}) &= \\ & (T_{nh}T_{st} - T_{st}T_{nh}) \otimes 1 + 1 \otimes (T_{nh}T_{st} - T_{st}T_{nh}) + \\ & \sum_q \alpha_{nh}^q T_{st} \otimes \beta_{nh}^q + \sum_q \alpha_{nh}^q \otimes \beta_{nh}^q T_{st} + \sum_{q'} T_{nh} \alpha_{st}^{q'} \otimes \beta_{st}^{q'} + \sum_{q'} \alpha_{st}^{q'} \otimes T_{nh} \beta_{st}^{q'} \\ & - \sum_q T_{st} \alpha_{nh}^q \otimes \beta_{nh}^q - \sum_q \alpha_{nh}^q \otimes T_{st} \beta_{nh}^q - \sum_{q'} \alpha_{st}^{q'} T_{nh} \otimes \beta_{st}^{q'} - \sum_{q'} \alpha_{st}^{q'} \otimes \beta_{st}^{q'} T_{nh}. \end{aligned}$$

If  $(s, t) <_{LEX} (n, h)$ , using the hypothesis that  $D_{nh}$  commutes with every element of  $v(k[G_{s-1}])$  we obtain that

$$(D_{nh}D_{st} - D_{st}D_{nh})(fg) = m \circ (v \otimes v \circ \Delta(T_{nh}T_{st} - T_{st}T_{nh}))(f \otimes g) =$$

$$m \circ (v \otimes v \circ (T_{nh}T_{st} - T_{st}T_{nh}) \otimes 1 + 1 \otimes (T_{nh}T_{st} - T_{st}T_{nh}))(f \otimes g)$$

for every  $f, g \in B$ . Hence the statement.  $\square$

We give now an example, showing how to construct explicitly generically free rational actions of the  $p^m$ -torsion of a supersingular elliptic curve on any curve. The aim is that the understanding of this baby case will help in getting through the proof of the main Theorem.

**Example 5.11.** Take the autodual infinitesimal commutative unipotent  $k$ -group scheme

$$G = \ker(F - V : W_n^n \rightarrow W_n^n) = \text{Spec}(k[T_1, \dots, T_n]/(T_1^p, T_2^p - T_1, \dots, T_n^p - T_{n-1})).$$

If  $k$  is algebraically closed, and  $n = 2m$ ,  $G$  is the  $p^m$ -torsion of any supersingular elliptic curve over  $k$ . This is well known for  $n = 2$ . It is maybe also known in the general case but we do not have a reference. We provide a proof of this in a subsequent paper [Gou]. Let  $X$  be any curve over  $k$  and  $K = kK^p(t)$  be its function field. Since  $G$  is autodual, to give a rational  $G$ -action on  $X$  is equivalent to giving a module algebra structure

$$v : \text{Spec}(k[U_1, \dots, U_n]/(U_1^p, U_2^p - U_1, \dots, U_n^p - U_{n-1})) \rightarrow \text{Diff}_k^+(K).$$

We know that there exist generically free rational actions of the Frobenius kernel

$$\ker(F_G) = \text{Spec}(k[T_n]/(T_n^p)) \simeq \alpha_p$$

on  $X$ . In particular, any such action corresponds to choosing a non-zero derivation  $D_1$  on  $K$  of order  $p$  or, equivalently, to giving a module algebra structure

$$v : \text{Spec}(k[U_1]/(U_1^p)) \rightarrow \text{Diff}_k^+(K).$$

We want to show that any such action can be extended to a generically free rational action of  $G$  on  $X$ . To do so we show that for any  $i = 2, \dots, n$  any generically free rational action of  $\ker(F_G^{i-1})$  on  $X$  extends to a generically free rational action of  $\ker(F_G^i)$ . Notice that

$$\ker(F_G^i) = \text{Spec}(k[T_{n-i+1}, \dots, T_n]/(T_{n-i+1}^p, T_{n-i+2}^p - T_{n-i+1}, \dots, T_n^p - T_{n-1}))$$

and that to give a rational action of  $\ker(F_G^i)$  on  $X$  is equivalent to defining a module algebra structure

$$v : \text{Spec}(k[U_1, \dots, U_i]/(U_1^p, U_2^p - U_1, \dots, U_i^p - U_{i-1})) \rightarrow \text{Diff}_k^+(K).$$

Suppose then that we have a generically free rational action of  $\ker(F_G^{i-1})$  given by differentials  $D_1, \dots, D_{i-1}$  where  $D_j = v(T_j)$  for every  $j = 1, \dots, i-1$ . To extend it to a rational action of  $\ker(F_G^i)$  is equivalent to defining a differential  $D_i = v(T_i)$  such that:

1.  $D_i$  respects the compatibility with products property;
2.  $D_i$  commutes with  $D_j$  for every  $j = 1, \dots, i-1$ ;
3.  $D_i^p = D_{i-1}$ .

By Lemma 5.7,  $D_i$  is defined on  $kK^p$ . In particular,

$$D_i(\beta^p) = v(T_i)(\beta^p) = (v(V(T_i))(\beta))^p = (D_{i-1}(\beta))^p$$

for every  $\beta \in K$ . By Lemma 5.9, we then have that  $D_i$  is defined using property 1 up to choosing  $x = D_i(t)$ . Therefore, the first property is respected by definition and we need to show that there exists  $x$  such that also properties 2 and 3 are satisfied. By Lemma 5.10 and the fact that  $T_i^p - T_{i-1}$  is a primitive element, we have that  $D_i D_j - D_j D_i$  and  $D_i^p - D_{i-1}$  are derivations for every  $j = 1, \dots, i-1$ . Applying Remark 4.5, we obtain that  $D_i$  commutes with  $D_j$  for every  $j = 1, \dots, i-1$  and  $D_i^p = D_{i-1}$  if and only if the system

$$\begin{cases} D_j(x) = D_i D_j(t) & j = 1, \dots, i-1 \\ D_i^{p-1}(x) = D_{i-1}(t) \end{cases}$$

admits a solution  $x = D(t)$ . Notice first of all that the system is well defined, that is  $D_i$  is defined on  $D_j(t)$ . In fact, by Corollary 4.3 we can suppose that  $D_1(t) = 1$ , therefore  $D_1 D_j(t) = D_j D_1(t) = D_j(1) = 0$ , that is  $D_j(t)$  belongs to  $kK^p$ , on which  $D_i$  is defined. Let  $a_j := D_i D_j(t)$  for  $j = 1, \dots, i-1$ . By induction, the set  $\{D_1, \dots, D_{i-1}\}$  is an ordered set of differential operators commuting pairwise and such that  $D_j$  is a derivation of order  $p$  on the subfield  $K^{D_1, \dots, D_{j-1}}$ . Moreover,

$$D_j(a_l) = D_l(a_j)$$

for all  $j, l = 1, \dots, i-1$ , indeed by induction

$$D_j D_l(t) = D_l D_j(t)$$

and thus

$$D_j(a_l) = D_j D_i D_l(t) = D_i D_j D_l(t) = D_i D_l D_j(t) = D_l D_i D_j(t) = D_l(a_j)$$

as wished (we used the fact that  $D_i$  respects properties 2 and 3 on  $kK^p$ ). Moreover,  $D_j^p = D_{j-1}$ . By Corollary 4.7 we then know that a solution of the system

$$S = \left\{ D_j(x) = a_j, \quad j = 1, \dots, i-1 \right.$$

exists if and only if

$$D_j^{p-1}(a_j) = a_{j-1}$$

for all  $j = 1, \dots, i-1$ . The relation indeed holds true, in fact

$$D_j^{p-1}(a_j) = D_j^{p-1} D_i D_j(t) = D_i D_j^p(t) = D_i D_{j-1}(t) = a_{j-1}$$

where again we used the fact that  $D_j(t) \in kK^p$  and that  $D_i$  commutes with the other differentials on  $kK^p$ . We are left to find a solution of  $S$  which satisfies also the last equation

$$D_i^{p-1}(x) = D_{i-1}(t).$$

Let then  $z$  be a solution of  $S$ : we are looking for another solution of  $S$  of the form  $x = z + y$  with  $y \in K^{D_1, \dots, D_{i-1}}$ . Therefore  $x$  is solution of

$$D_i^{p-1}(x) = D_{i-1}(t)$$

if and only if

$$D_i^{p-1}(y) = D_{i-1}(t) - D_i^{p-1}(z).$$

Notice that the right hand side belongs to  $K^{D_1, \dots, D_{i-1}} \subseteq kK^p$  on which  $D_i$  is a derivation of order  $p$ . Indeed, for every  $j = 1, \dots, i-1$  it holds that

$$D_j D_i^{p-1}(z) = D_i^{p-1} D_j(z) = D_i^{p-1} D_i D_j(t) = D_i^p D_j(t) = D_{i-1} D_j(t) = D_j D_{i-1}(t)$$

as wished. Therefore, by Lemma 4.3,  $y$  exists if and only if  $D_i(D_{i-1}(t) - D_i^{p-1}(z)) = 0$  which is satisfied since

$$D_i^p(z) = D_{i-1}(z) = D_i D_{i-1}(t).$$

Notice that the action constructed is generically free since it extends the generically free action of  $\text{soc}(G)$  (see Proposition 5.1).

We are now ready to prove our main result.

**Theorem 1.3.** *Let  $k$  be a perfect field of characteristic  $p > 0$  and  $G$  be an infinitesimal commutative unipotent  $k$ -group scheme with Lie algebra of dimension  $s$ . Then for every  $k$ -variety  $X$  of dimension  $\geq s$  there exist generically free rational actions of  $G$  on  $X$ . Moreover, for any  $r \geq 1$ , any generically free rational action of  $\ker(F_G^r)$  on  $X$  can be extended to a generically free rational action of  $G$  on  $X$ .*

*Proof.* We begin by proving that if  $X$  is a  $k$ -variety of dimension  $s = \dim_k(\text{Lie}(G))$ , then  $X$  admits a generically free rational action of  $G$ . By Proposition 5.4, there exists a generically free rational action of  $\ker(F_G)$  on  $X$ . Consider the filtration

$$G_1 \subseteq G_2 \subseteq \dots \subseteq G_{n-1} \subseteq G_n = G$$

where  $G_i := \ker(F_G^i)$  and  $n$  is the nilpotency index of  $F_G$ .

First recursion (on  $i$ ):

To show that there exists a generically free rational action of  $G$  on  $X$ , we will prove that for every  $i = 2, \dots, n$  any generically free rational action of  $G_{i-1}$  on  $X$  extends to a generically free rational action of  $G_i$  on  $X$ . Moreover, we will consider any possible extension. Henceforth the second part of the statement will be satisfied by construction. Let  $K = k(X)$  be the function field of  $X$ . By Proposition 3.18, to give a rational action of  $G_i$  on  $X$  is equivalent to endowing  $K$  of a  $k[G_i^\vee]$ -module algebra structure, where  $G_i^\vee$  is the Cartier dual of  $G_i$ . By Proposition 2.25,

$$k[G_i^\vee] = k[G_{i-1}^\vee][T_{i1}, \dots, T_{ir_i}] / (P_{i1}, \dots, P_{ir_i})$$

where

$$G_{i-1}^\vee = \text{coker}(V_{G^\vee}^{i-1}) = (\ker(F_G^{i-1}))^\vee,$$

$r_i = \dim_k(\text{Lie}(H_i))$  with  $H_i = \text{Im}(V_{G^\vee}^{i-1}) / \text{Im}(V_{G^\vee}^i)$ ,  $P_{ij} = T_{ij}^{p^{m_{ij}}} - Q_{ij}$  are primitive elements of  $k[G_{i-1}^\vee][T_{i1}, \dots, T_{ir_i}]$ ,  $Q_{ij}$  are polynomials with coefficients in the augmentation ideal of  $k[G_{i-1}^\vee]$  and

$$\Delta(T_{ij}) = T_{ij} \otimes 1 + 1 \otimes T_{ij} + R_{ij}$$

where  $R_{ij}$  is an element of  $k[G_{i-1}^\vee] \otimes_k k[G_{i-1}^\vee]$  for every  $j = 1, \dots, r_i$ . We then want to show that a  $k[G_{i-1}^\vee]$ -module algebra structure on  $K$  extends to a  $k[G_i^\vee]$ -module algebra structure on  $K$ . A  $k[G_{i-1}^\vee]$ -module structure on  $K$  is given by a morphism of algebras

$$v: k[G_{i-1}^\vee] \rightarrow \text{Diff}_k^+(K)$$

respecting the compatibility with products property (see Proposition 3.18). If we want to

extend  $v$  to

$$k[G_i^\vee] = k[G_{i-1}^\vee][T_{i1}, \dots, T_{ir_i}]/(T_{i1}^{p^{m_{i1}}} - Q_{i1}, \dots, T_{ir_i}^{p^{m_{ir_i}}} - Q_{ir_i}) \rightarrow \text{Diff}_k^+(k(X))$$

we need to define  $v(T_{ij}) = D_{ij}$  for every  $j = 1, \dots, r_i$  in such a way that the above map is a  $k[G_i^\vee]$ -module algebra structure on  $K$ , that is the following properties are satisfied for every  $j = 1, \dots, r_i$ :

1.  $D_{ij}$  respects the compatibility with products property;
2.  $D_{ij}$  commutes with  $D_{kl}$  for every  $(k, l) <_{LEX} (i, j)$ ;
3.  $D_{ij}^{p^{m_{ij}}} = v(Q_{ij})$ .

Notice that

$$\ker(F_G) \simeq \prod_{j \in I} W_{m_{1j}}^1$$

where  $I$  is a finite set and  $\sum_{j \in I} m_{1j} = s$ . Then

$$(\ker(F_G))^\vee \simeq \prod_{j \in I} \alpha_p^{m_{1j}}$$

and thus, by [DG70, III.§2, Corollary 2.7], to give a generically free rational action of  $\ker(F_G)$  on  $X$  corresponds to giving a set of derivations  $\{D_{1j}\}_{j \in I}$  on  $K$  commuting pairwise and with  $D_{1j}$  of order  $p^{m_{1j}}$  for every  $j \in I$ , such that all the  $p$ -powers of these derivations are  $K$ -linearly independent. Let  $\{E_1, \dots, E_s\}$  be the ordered set  $\{D_{1j}^{p^{k_j}} \mid 0 \leq k_j < m_{1j}, j \in I\}$ . This family satisfies the hypothesis of Proposition 4.6 and therefore there exists a  $p$ -basis  $\{t_1, \dots, t_s\}$  of  $K/kK^p$  such that  $E_i(t_i) = 1$  and  $E_i(t_j) = 0$  for all  $j < i$  and  $i = 1, \dots, s$ . By Lemma 5.7, the rational action of  $G_i$  is defined on  $X^{(p)} \simeq X/\ker(F_G)$ . In particular

$$D_{ij}(F_K(\beta)) = v(T_{ij})(F_K(\beta)) = F_K(v(V_{G_i^\vee}(T_{ij}))(\beta))$$

for every  $\beta \in kK^p$ . By Lemma 5.9, for any  $j = 1, \dots, r_i$ , we then have that  $D_{ij}$  is defined using property 1, up to choosing  $x_h^{ij} = D_{ij}(t_h)$  for  $h = 1, \dots, s$ . Therefore the first property is respected by definition. We will show that we can choose  $x_h^{ij}$  for every  $h$  and  $j$  in such a way that also properties 2 and 3 are satisfied.

*Second recursion (on  $j$ ):*

We show that if  $D_{kl}$  is defined for all  $(k, l) <_{LEX} (i, j)$  then we can define  $D_{ij}$ . Recall that for the moment  $D_{ij}$  is defined on  $kK^p$  which is the fraction field of  $X/\ker(F_G)$ , so we have that the rational action of  $G_i$  is defined on  $X/\ker(F_G)$  and we want to extend it to a rational action on  $X$ .

*Third recursion (on  $h$ ):*

We will show that if  $\overline{D_{ij}}$  is defined on  $kK^p(t_1, \dots, t_{h-1})$ , then we can extend its definition to  $kK^p(t_1, \dots, t_h)^1$ . The base step is satisfied since  $D_{ij}$  is defined on  $kK^p$ . We will show

---

<sup>1</sup>Geometrically here we are taking a filtration of  $\ker(F_G)$  with successive quotients isomorphic to  $\alpha_p$  and considering subquotients of  $X$ . For example, in the case in which  $\ker(F_G) \simeq W_s^1$  with generically free rational action on  $X$  given by a derivation  $D_1$  of order  $p^s$ , we have the tower

$$K^{D_1} \subseteq K^{D_1^p} = K^{D_1}(t_1) \subseteq \dots \subseteq K^{D_1^{p^{s-1}}} = K^{D_1}(t_1, \dots, t_{s-1}) \subseteq K = K^{D_1}(t_1, \dots, t_s)$$

that if  $D_{ij}$  is defined on  $kK^p(t_1, \dots, t_{h-1})$  then the system

$$\begin{cases} D_{kl}D_{ij}(t_h) = D_{ij}D_{kl}(t_h), & (k, l) <_{LEX} (ij) \\ D_{ij}^{p^{m_{ij}}}(t_h) = Q_{ij}(D_{k'l'})(k', l') <_{LEX} (k, l)(t_h) \end{cases}$$

has solution where the unknown is  $x_h^{ij} = D_{ij}(t_h)$ . Remark that, for the system to admit a solution is equivalent to having properties 2 and 3 satisfied on  $kK^p(t_1, \dots, t_h)$ . Indeed, by Lemma 5.10 and the fact that  $P_{ij} = T_{ij}^{p^{m_{ij}}} - Q_{ij}$  is a primitive element, we have that  $D_{kl}D_{ij} - D_{ij}D_{kl}$  and  $D_{ij}^{p^{m_{ij}}} - Q_{ij}(D_{k'l'})(k', l') <_{LEX} (k, l)$  are derivations. Applying then Remark 4.5, we obtain that  $D_{ij}$  commutes with  $D_{kl}$  for every  $(k, l) <_{LEX} (i, j)$  and that  $D_{ij}^{p^{m_{ij}}} = v(Q_{ij})$  as claimed. Notice that, in particular,  $x_{h'}^{kl} = D_{kl}(t_{h'})$  is a solution of the analogue system for every  $(k, l, h') <_{LEX} (i, j, h)$  by the assumption that  $D_{kl}$  is defined on  $K$  for all  $(k, l) <_{LEX} (i, j)$  and that  $D_{ij}$  is defined on  $kK^p(t_1, \dots, t_{h-1})$ . We will first show that the system

$$S_h = \left\{ D_{kl}D_{ij}(t_h) = D_{ij}D_{kl}(t_h), \quad (k, l) <_{LEX} (ij) \right.$$

obtained removing the last equation has solution and then prove that there exists a solution of it which is also solution of the last equation. Remark that, for the system to admit a solution is equivalent to having property 2 satisfied on  $kK^p(t_1, \dots, t_h)$ . First of all, notice that the system  $S_h$  is well defined, that is that  $D_{ij}$  is defined on  $D_{kl}(t_h)$  for  $(k, l) <_{LEX} (ij)$ : indeed

$$E_i D_{kl}(t_h) = D_{kl} E_i(t_h) = 0$$

for every  $i \geq h$ , and thus, by Proposition 4.6,  $D_{kl}(t_h)$  belongs to  $kK^p(t_1, \dots, t_{h-1})$  on which  $D_{ij}$  is defined. Let  $a_{kl} := D_{ij}D_{kl}(t_h)$ , therefore we are looking for a solution of the system

$$S_h = \left\{ D_{kl}(x) = a_{kl}, \quad (k, l) <_{LEX} (ij) \right.$$

By induction the set  $\{D_{kl} \mid (k, l) <_{LEX} (i, j)\}$  is an ordered set of differential operators commuting pairwise and such that  $D_{kl}$  is a derivation of order  $p^{m_{kl}}$  on the subfield

$$\{a \in K \mid D_{k'l'}(a) = 0 \quad \forall (k', l') <_{LEX} (k, l)\}$$

by Lemma 5.7. Moreover,

$$D_{kl}(a_{k'l'}) = D_{k'l'}(a_{kl})$$

for all  $(k, l), (k', l') <_{LEX} (i, j)$ , indeed by induction

$$D_{kl}D_{k'l'}(t_h) = D_{k'l'}D_{kl}(t_h)$$

and thus

$$D_{kl}(a_{k'l'}) = D_{kl}D_{ij}D_{k'l'}(t_h) = D_{ij}D_{kl}D_{k'l'}(t_h) =$$

---

corresponding to

$$X \twoheadrightarrow X/\alpha_p \twoheadrightarrow X/W_2^1 \twoheadrightarrow \dots \twoheadrightarrow X/W_{s-1}^1 \twoheadrightarrow X/W_s^1$$

and

$$\alpha_p = \text{soc}(\ker(F_G)) \subseteq W_2^1 = \ker(F_G) \times_k \ker(V_G^2) \subseteq \dots \subseteq W_{s-1}^1 = \ker(F_G) \times_k \ker(V_G^{s-1}) \subseteq W_s^1 = \ker(F_G).$$

Notice that this phenomenon did not occur in Example 5.11 since there the Frobenius kernel was just  $\alpha_p$ .

$$D_{ij}D_{k'l'}D_{kl}(t_h) = D_{k'l'}D_{ij}D_{kl}(t_h) = D_{k'l'}(a_{kl})$$

as wished. Notice that we used the fact that  $D_{kl}(t_h)$  lies in  $kK^p(t_1, \dots, t_{h-1})$  and that, by induction, on this subfield  $D_{ij}$  commutes with the previous (LEX-order wise) differentials. In addition,  $D_{kl}^{p^{m_{kl}}} = Q_{kl}(D_{k'l'})_{(k',l') <_{LEX}(k,l)}$  where

$$Q_{kl} \in (T_{k'l'})_{(k',l') <_{LEX}(k,l)} k[T_{k'l'}]_{(k',l') <_{LEX}(k,l)}.$$

By Corollary 4.7, we then know that a solution of the system  $S_h$  exists if and only if

$$D_{kl}^{p^{m_{kl}}-1}(a_{kl}) = \tilde{Q}_{kl}(a_{k'l'})_{(k',l') <_{LEX}(k,l)}$$

for all  $(k, l) <_{LEX} (i, j)$ . Write the polynomial  $Q_{kl}$  as

$$Q_{kl}(T_{k'l'})_{(k',l') <_{LEX}(k,l)} = \sum_{(\alpha,\beta) <_{LEX}(k,l)} \rho_{\alpha\beta}(T_{k'l'})_{(k',l') <_{LEX}(k,l)} T_{\alpha\beta}.$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{Q}_{kl}(a_{k'l'})_{(k',l') <_{LEX}(k,l)} &= \sum_{(\alpha,\beta) <_{LEX}(k,l)} \rho_{\alpha\beta}(D_{k'l'})_{(k',l') <_{LEX}(k,l)} a_{\alpha\beta} = \\ &= \sum_{(\alpha,\beta) <_{LEX}(k,l)} \rho_{\alpha\beta}(D_{k'l'})_{(k',l') <_{LEX}(k,l)} D_{ij} D_{\alpha\beta}(t_h) = \\ D_{ij} \sum_{(\alpha,\beta) <_{LEX}(k,l)} \rho_{\alpha\beta}(D_{k'l'})_{(k',l') <_{LEX}(k,l)} D_{\alpha\beta}(t_h) &= D_{ij} Q_{kl}(D_{k'l'})_{(k',l') <_{LEX}(k,l)}(t_h) = \\ D_{ij} D_{kl}^{p^{m_{kl}}} (t_h) &= D_{kl}^{p^{m_{kl}}-1} D_{ij} D_{kl}(t_h) = D_{kl}^{p^{m_{kl}}-1}(a_{kl}) \end{aligned}$$

as needed. We are left to show that there exists a solution that satisfies also the equation

$$D_{ij}^{p^{m_{ij}}-1}(z) = Q_{ij}(D_{k'l'})_{(k',l') <_{LEX}(i,j)}(t_h).$$

Notice that we are looking for a solution of the form

$$x_h^{ij} = x + y$$

with  $y$  in

$$K^{\{D_{kl} | (k,l) <_{LEX}(i,j)\}} = \{a \in K \mid D_{kl}(a) = 0 \quad \forall (k,l) <_{LEX}(i,j)\}$$

and  $x$  a solution of  $S_h$ . Moreover, notice that  $x$  lies in  $kK^p(t_1, \dots, t_{h-1})$ , indeed we remarked that if  $S_h$  has solution then  $D_{ij}$  commutes with  $D_{kl}$  for every  $(k, l) <_{LEX} (i, j)$  on  $kK^p(t_1, \dots, t_h)$ , so in particular it commutes with  $E_1, \dots, E_s$  which, we recall, are the  $p$ -powers of the derivations  $D_{1j}$ ,  $j \in I$ . Henceforth

$$E_\eta(x) = E_\eta D_{ij}(t_h) = D_{ij} E_\eta(t_h) = 0$$

for all  $\eta \geq h$ . Therefore  $x + y$  is a solution of the equation if and only if

$$D_{ij}^{p^{m_{ij}}-1}(y) = Q_{ij}(D_{k'l'})_{(k',l') <_{LEX}(i,j)}(t_h) - D_{ij}^{p^{m_{ij}}-1}(x).$$

Let us show that the term on the right hand side lies in  $K^{\{D_{kl} | (k,l) <_{LEX}(i,j)\}}$ . Indeed, for



any  $(k, l) <_{LEX} (i, j)$  it holds that

$$D_{kl} D_{ij}^{p^{m_{ij}-1}}(x) = D_{ij}^{p^{m_{ij}-1}} D_{kl}(x) = D_{ij}^{p^{m_{ij}-1}} D_{ij} D_{kl}(t_h) = D_{ij}^{p^{m_{ij}}} D_{kl}(t_h) =$$

$$Q_{ij}(D_{k'l'})(k', l') <_{LEX} (i, j) D_{kl}(t_h) = D_{kl} Q_{ij}(D_{k'l'})(k', l') <_{LEX} (i, j)(t_h)$$

where we used the fact that  $x, D_{kl}(t_h) \in kK^p(t_1, \dots, t_{h-1})$  and that  $x$  is a solution of the system  $S_h$ . Notice that  $K^{\{D_{kl}|(k,l) <_{LEX} (i,j)\}}$  is a subfield of  $kK^p = K^{\{D_{1j}|j \in I\}}$  and that  $D_{ij}$  is a derivation of order  $p^{m_{ij}}$  on  $K^{\{D_{kl}|(k,l) <_{LEX} (i,j)\}}$ . Therefore, by Lemma 4.3,  $y$  exists if and only if

$$D_{ij} \left( Q_{ij}(D_{k'l'})(k', l') <_{LEX} (i, j)(t_h) - D_{ij}^{p^{m_{ij}-1}}(x) \right) = 0$$

which is satisfied since

$$D_{ij}^{p^{m_{ij}}}(x) = Q_{ij}(D_{k'l'})(k', l') <_{LEX} (i, j)(x) = \sum_{(\alpha, \beta) <_{LEX} (i, j)} \rho_{\alpha\beta}(D_{k'l'})(k', l') <_{LEX} (i, j) D_{\alpha\beta}(x)$$

$$\sum_{(\alpha, \beta) <_{LEX} (i, j)} \rho_{\alpha\beta}(D_{k'l'})(k', l') <_{LEX} (i, j) D_{ij} D_{\alpha\beta}(t_h) = D_{ij} Q_{ij}(D_{k'l'})(k', l') <_{LEX} (i, j)(t_h)$$

as wished. Notice that the action constructed is generically free since it extends the generically free action of  $\text{soc}(G)$  (see Proposition 5.1). For the general case consider the infinitesimal commutative unipotent  $k$ -group scheme  $G \times_k \alpha_p^{\ell-s}$  where  $s = \dim_k(\text{Lie}(G))$  and  $\ell = \dim(X)$ . Then  $\dim_k(\text{Lie}(G \times_k \alpha_p^{\ell-s})) = \ell$  and thus by what we just proved  $X$  admits a generically free rational action of  $G \times_k \alpha_p^{\ell-s}$ . In particular, it admits a generically free rational action of its subgroup  $G$ . Moreover, any generically free rational action of  $\ker(F_G^r)$  on  $X$  extends to a generically free rational action of  $\ker(F_G^r) \times_k \alpha_p^{\ell-s}$  in the following way: consider the set of derivations  $\{E_1, \dots, E_s\}$  defining the action of  $\ker(F_G)$  on  $K = L(t_1, \dots, t_s)$  where  $L = k(X/\ker(F_G))$  as described in the first part and complete it to a basis  $\{E_1, \dots, E_s, \partial_{s+1}, \dots, \partial_\ell\}$  where the  $\partial_i$ 's are as in Remark 4.5. One checks easily that the elements of this basis commute pairwise and that this implies that the  $\partial_i$ 's commute with every differential operators defining the rational action of  $\ker(F_G^r)$  on  $X$ . By the case treated previously, the rational action of  $\ker(F_G^r) \times_k \alpha_p^{\ell-s}$  extends to a generically free rational action of  $G \times_k \alpha_p^{\ell-s}$  and thus, in particular, to a generically free rational action of  $G$ .  $\square$

**Remark 5.12.** Brion shows that for any  $l, n \geq 1$  there exist generically free rational actions of  $\mu_{p^l}^n$  on any variety  $X$  of dimension  $\geq n$  [Bri22, Remark 3.8]. Putting together Brion's result and Theorem 1.3 one can prove that if  $k$  is perfect and  $G$  is an infinitesimal commutative trigonalizable  $k$ -group scheme with Lie algebra of dimension  $s$ , then for every  $k$ -variety  $X$  of dimension  $\geq s$  there exist generically free rational actions of  $G$  on  $X$ . Briefly, one considers a set of derivations  $\{E_1, \dots, E_{s_1}\}$  defining a generically free rational action of  $\ker(F_{G^u})$  on  $K = L(t_1, \dots, t_{s_1})$  where  $L = k(X/\ker(F_{G^u}))$  as described in the first part of the proof of the Theorem and complete it to a  $K$ -linearly independent set  $\{E_1, \dots, E_{s_1}, t_{s_1+1} \partial_{s_1+1}, \dots, t_{s_1+s_2} \partial_{s_1+s_2}\}$ , with  $\partial_i$ 's as in Remark 4.5. One checks easily that the elements of this basis commute pairwise and they thus define a generically free rational action of  $\ker(F_G)$ . Moreover, we can extend it as before to a generically free rational action of  $\ker(F_G^r)$  (and so also of  $G$ ) on  $X$  for any  $r \geq 1$ .

We conclude this section with two examples answering to some questions of Brion [Bri22] and Fakhruddin [Fak20]. Notice that if an infinitesimal commutative unipotent  $k$ -group scheme  $G$  with  $n$ -dimensional Lie algebra can be embedded in a smooth connected  $n$ -

dimensional algebraic group  $\mathcal{G}$ , then  $G$  acts generically freely on it (by multiplication). Brion asked if there are examples of generically free rational actions on curves of infinitesimal commutative unipotent group schemes that are not subgroups of a smooth connected one-dimensional algebraic group. Recall that if  $\mathcal{G}$  is a smooth connected one-dimensional  $k$ -algebraic group, then either  $\mathcal{G}$  is affine and  $\mathcal{G}_{\bar{k}} \simeq \mathbb{G}_{m,\bar{k}}$  or  $\mathcal{G}_{\bar{k}} \simeq \mathbb{G}_{a,\bar{k}}$  or  $\mathcal{G}$  is an elliptic curve.

**Example 5.13.** Any infinitesimal commutative unipotent group scheme  $G$  with one-dimensional Lie algebra, of order  $> p^2$ , with non-trivial Verschiebung and  $p = 0$  works. Indeed, the fact that it has one-dimensional Lie algebra implies that there exist generically free rational  $G$ -actions on any curve, by Theorem 1.3. Moreover such a  $G$  cannot be contained in a smooth connected one-dimensional algebraic group. Indeed if it was the case, then it would be true also over  $\bar{k}$  and thus since  $G$  is unipotent and with non-trivial Verschiebung,  $G_{\bar{k}}$  cannot be a subgroup of  $\mathbb{G}_{m,\bar{k}}$  and  $\mathbb{G}_{a,\bar{k}}$ . It then has to be contained in an elliptic curve  $E$  and, in particular, since  $p = 0$ , in its  $p$ -torsion  $E[p]$ , but this cannot happen since  $E[p]$  has order  $p^2$ . A concrete example is given by the infinitesimal commutative unipotent  $k$ -group scheme

$$G = \ker (F^2 - V : W_3^3 \rightarrow W_3^3) = \text{Spec} \left( k[T_0, T_1] / (T_0^p, T_1^{p^2} - T_0) \right)$$

which has one-dimensional Lie algebra, non-trivial Verschiebung,  $p = V_G F_G = F_G^3 = 0$  and order  $p^3$ .

The following example goes in the direction of studying also non-commutative group schemes with generically free rational actions on curves. Indeed, the question arises if all infinitesimal unipotent group schemes with one-dimensional Lie algebra are commutative (see both [Fak20] and [Bri22]). The following example shows that it is not the case.

**Example 5.14.** Consider the infinitesimal unipotent non-commutative  $k$ -group scheme  $G = \text{Spec}(A)$  where

$$A = k[T_0, T_1] / \left( T_0^{p^n}, T_1^p - T_0 \right)$$

with  $n \geq 2$  an integer and comultiplication given by

$$\Delta(T_0) = T_0 \otimes 1 + 1 \otimes T_0$$

and

$$\Delta(T_1) = T_1 \otimes 1 + 1 \otimes T_1 + T_0^{p^{n-1}} \otimes T_0^{p^{n-2}}.$$

In this case

$$A^\vee = k\langle U_0, \dots, U_n \rangle / (U_0^p, \dots, U_n^p, U_i U_j - U_j U_i, U_n U_{n-1} - U_{n-1} U_n - U_0)_{i,j=0,\dots,n, (i,j), (j,i) \neq (n,n-1)}$$

where  $U_0(T_1) = 1$  and  $U_i(T_0^{p^{i-1}}) = 1$  and zero elsewhere.  $A^\vee$  is a non-commutative Hopf algebra: the only non-commutative relation is given by  $U_n U_{n-1} - U_{n-1} U_n = U_0$ , while its comultiplication is defined on the  $U_i$ 's as for the Witt vectors (notice that this makes sense since  $U_0, \dots, U_{n-1}$  commute). Let  $X/k$  be a curve and  $K = k(X) = kK^p(t)$  be its function field, for  $t$  a  $p$ -generator of  $K$  over  $kK^p$ . A generically free rational action of  $G$  on  $X$  is given by defining an  $A^\vee$ -module algebra structure on  $K$  taking  $v(U_i) = D_i = \partial_{p^i}$  for  $i = 0, \dots, n-1$  and  $v(U_n) = D_n = \partial_{p^n} - t^{p^{n-1}} \partial_1$ . Notice that  $\partial_{p^n}(t^{p^{n-1}}) = 0$  and thus

$\partial_{p^n}$  commutes with  $t^{p^{n-1}}\partial_1$ . Therefore

$$D_n^p = \partial_{p^n}^p - (t^{p^{n-1}}\partial_1)^p = \partial_{p^n}^p - t^{p^n}\partial_1^p = 0$$

where for the second equality we used that also  $\partial_1(t^{p^{n-1}}) = 0$  and for the last that  $\partial_{p^n}^p = \partial_1^p = 0$ . Of course this rational action can be extended to a generically free rational action of  $G$  on any variety of positive dimension. These examples arise as closed subgroup schemes of non-commutative extensions of  $\mathbb{G}_a$  by itself (see [DG70, II.§3, 4]) and there are many of them.

## 6 Faithful rational actions

This last section is devoted to Dolgachev's conjecture revisited for infinitesimal group schemes.

**Proposition 6.1.** *Let  $G$  be a finite  $k$ -group scheme and  $X$  an irreducible  $k$ -scheme endowed with a  $G$ -action. The action is faithful if and only if the induced action of  $\text{soc}(G)$  is faithful.*

*Proof.* The  $G$ -action is faithful if and only if the centralizer  $C_G(X)$  is trivial. By Lemma 2.16, since  $C_G(X)$  is a normal  $k$ -subgroup scheme of  $G$ , the centralizer is trivial if and only if  $\text{soc}(G) \times_G C_G(X) = C_{\text{soc}(G)}(X)$  is trivial, that is if and only if the induced  $\text{soc}(G)$ -action is faithful.  $\square$

The following result generalizes [Bri22, Lemma 5.3].

**Corollary 6.2.** *Let  $G$  be an infinitesimal commutative  $k$ -group scheme, acting rationally on a  $k$ -variety  $X$ . Then the rational  $G$ -action is generically free if and only if it is faithful and the induced action of  $\text{soc}((G_{\bar{k}})^u)$  is generically free, where  $(G_{\bar{k}})^u$  is the maximal unipotent subgroup scheme contained in  $G_{\bar{k}}$ . In particular, if  $\text{soc}((G_{\bar{k}})^u) \subseteq \alpha_p$ , then the  $G$ -action is faithful if and only if it is generically free.*

*Proof.* By Lemma 3.4 and Proposition 3.10, we may suppose  $k = \bar{k}$ . The *only if* part is clear. We prove the other implication. We first prove the case  $G$  diagonalizable. In this case, we have to prove that if the  $G$ -action is faithful then it is generically free. By the equivalence of categories between diagonalizable group schemes and abelian groups, if the stabilizer of the generic point  $\text{Spec}(K)$  of  $X$  is not trivial over  $K$ , then it comes from a non-trivial subgroup of  $G$  over  $k$ , which then acts trivially, meaning that the action is not faithful.

Now we pass to the general case. Since  $k = \bar{k}$  then  $G$  is isomorphic to  $G^u \times_k G^d$ , where  $G^d$  is diagonalizable. Since the  $\text{soc}(G^u)$ -action is generically free, the stabilizer at the generic point should be contained in  $G_K^d$ , but this is not possible since the  $G^d$ -action is generically free by the diagonalizable case. For the last sentence we observe that if  $\text{soc}(G^u)$  is a subgroup scheme of  $\alpha_p$  and the  $G$ -action is faithful, then the  $\text{soc}(G^u)$ -action is generically free. So we can apply the first part of the corollary.  $\square$

**Remark 6.3.** The above Corollary applies, for instance, to any infinitesimal subgroup scheme  $G$  of  $W_n$ , for some  $n$ : indeed in this case  $\text{soc}(G) = \alpha_p$  (see Example 2.24).

In the following corollary we essentially get the second part of [Bri22, Lemma 3.7]

**Corollary 6.4.** *Let  $G$  be an infinitesimal  $k$ -group scheme acting faithfully on a  $k$ -variety of dimension  $r$ . If  $H$  is a normal  $k$ -subgroup scheme of  $G$  of multiplicative type such that  $\dim_k(\text{Lie}(H)) = r$ , then  $G$  is of multiplicative type and  $\dim_k(\text{Lie}(G)) = r$ .*

*Proof.* By [DG70, IV, §1, Corollary 4.4] we have that  $H$  is central in  $G$ . Now we can suppose that  $k$  is algebraically closed, then  $H$  is diagonalizable. If  $G$  is not diagonalizable then  $G$  contains a  $k$ -subgroup scheme isomorphic to  $\alpha_p$  ([DG70, IV §3, Lemma 3.7]). Then  $H' = H \times_k \alpha_p$  is contained in  $G$  since  $H$  is central. Now  $H'$  is commutative,  $\text{soc}(H') = \ker F_H \times_k \alpha_p$  and  $\text{soc}((H')^u) = \alpha_p$ . Therefore, by Corollary 6.2, the action of  $H'$  is generically free, but this is impossible since  $\dim_k(\text{Lie}(H')) > r$ . So  $G$  is diagonalizable, its action is generically free (again by Corollary 6.2), and  $\dim_k(\text{Lie}(G))$  can not be bigger than  $r$ .  $\square$

**Example 6.5.** The condition on the normality of  $H$  is crucial. Consider for example the  $k$ -group scheme  $G = \alpha_p \rtimes \mu_p$  and the action on the affine line  $G \times_k \mathbb{A}_k^1 \rightarrow \mathbb{A}_k^1$  given by  $(a, b) \cdot x \mapsto ax + b$ . The  $G$ -action is faithful but not generically free. In fact, the stabilizer of the generic point  $\eta$  is

$$\text{Stab}_G(\eta) = \text{Spec}(k(x)[T, 1/T, S]/(xT + S - x, T^p - 1, S^p))$$

with comultiplication given by  $\Delta(T) = T \otimes T$  and  $\Delta(S) = S \otimes 1 + T \otimes S$ . This is also a counterexample to Corollary 6.2 in the non-commutative case. Indeed  $\text{soc}(G) = \alpha_p$  and  $\alpha_p$  acts freely. It is then necessary, in the non-commutative case, to look at the action of  $\ker(F_G)$ , as seen in the first statement of Proposition 5.1.

**Proposition 1.2.** Let  $G$  be an infinitesimal  $k$ -group scheme with commutative trigonalizable Frobenius kernel  $\ker(F_G) \simeq \ker(F_G)^u \times_k \ker(F_G)^d$  and  $X$  be a  $k$ -variety of dimension  $n$ . If there exists a faithful rational  $G$ -action on  $X$ , then  $s = \dim_k(\text{Lie}(\ker(F_G)^d)) \leq n$  and  $V_{\ker(F_G)^u}^{n-s} = 0$ .

*Proof.* We may suppose that  $G$  has height one and that  $k$  is algebraically closed. Then

$$G \simeq G^u \times_k G^d = \prod_{i \in I} W_{n_i}^1 \times_k \mu_p^s.$$

Clearly  $s = \dim_k(\text{Lie}(G^d)) \leq n$  since a faithful rational  $\mu_p^s$ -action is generically free. Let  $l = \max_{i \in I} \{n_i\}$ . By Corollary 6.2 the induced faithful rational action of  $W_l^1 \times_k \mu_p^s$  on  $X$  is generically free. Henceforth  $l + s \leq n$  and thus  $V_{G^u}^{n-s} = 0$ .  $\square$

Notice that if  $k$  is a perfect field, then the above Proposition tells us that if  $G$  is an infinitesimal commutative trigonalizable  $k$ -group scheme such that there exists a faithful rational  $G$ -action on a  $k$ -variety of dimension  $n$ , then  $\ker(F_G)^u \subseteq (W_{n-s}^1)^l$  for some  $l \geq 1$  where  $s = \dim_k(\text{Lie}(G^d))$ . In particular, if there exists a faithful rational  $G$ -action on a curve, then  $\ker(F_G)^u \subseteq \alpha_p^l$  for some  $l \geq 1$ . The inverse implication of Proposition 1.2 does not always hold true. In the diagonalizable case, these actions are well understood and the converse statement is known. Notice that by Remark 5.12 this holds as well, over a perfect field, for infinitesimal commutative trigonalizable  $k$ -group schemes with Lie algebra of dimension upper bounded by the dimension of  $X$ . In particular, if  $s = \dim_k(\text{Lie}(\ker(F_G)^d))$  and  $\dim_k(\text{Lie}(G)) \leq n$ , then  $V_{\ker(F_G)^u}^{n-s} = 0$ . We will now give a counterexample and then investigate other cases in which it holds.

**Example 6.6.** Consider the  $k$ -subgroup scheme  $G$  of  $W_2 \times_k W_2$  represented by the Hopf algebra

$$A = k[T_0, T_1, U_0, U_1]/(T_0^p, U_0^p, T_1^p - U_0, U_1^p - T_0).$$

One can see that  $G$  is autodual setting  $\tilde{T}_0 = T_1^*$ ,  $\tilde{T}_1 = U_0^*$ ,  $\tilde{U}_0 = U_1^*$ ,  $\tilde{U}_1 = T_0^*$  where  $T_i^*$ ,  $U_j^*$  denote the functionals  $A \rightarrow k$  corresponding to the elements  $T_i, U_j$  of  $A$  for  $i, j = 0, 1$ .

In the following, we will then identify  $A^\vee$  with  $A$ . Moreover,  $\dim_k(\mathrm{Lie}(G)) = 2$  and  $n_{V_{\ker(F_G)}} = 1$ . Therefore, by Proposition 3.14, we know that there is no generically free rational  $G$ -action on any curve. Let us show that moreover there is no faithful rational  $G$ -action on any curve either. Let  $X$  be a curve and  $k(X) = kK^p(x)$  be its fraction field. Suppose that there exists a faithful rational  $G$ -action on  $X$  defined by the module algebra structure

$$v : k[T_0, T_1, U_0, U_1]/(T_0^p, U_0^p, T_1^p - U_0, U_1^p - T_0) \rightarrow \mathrm{Diff}_k(k(X)).$$

Without loss of generality we can suppose that  $v(T_0) = \partial_x$ , the only  $k$ -linear derivation on  $kK^p(x)$  such that  $\partial_x(x) = 1$ . Then  $v(U_0) = f_1\partial_x$  with  $f_1$  lying in  $k(x^p)$  since the  $v(T_0)$  and  $v(U_0)$  commute, and non-constant since the action is faithful. Now,  $v(T_1)(x) = x_1$  for some  $x_1 \in k(x^p)$ , since  $v(T_1)$  commutes with  $\partial_x$ . Moreover  $v(T_1)|_{kK^p}$  is a derivation of order  $p$  and  $v(T_1)(x^p) = (v(T_0)(x))^p = 1$  (see Remark 5.8). The differential operator  $v(T_1)$  commutes also with  $v(U_0) = f_1\partial_x$ , henceforth

$$v(T_1)(f_1) = f_1\partial_x(x_1) = 0$$

that is  $f_1$  must lie in  $k(x^{p^2})$ . Moreover,  $x_1$  is such that

$$v(T_1^p)(x) = v(T_1)^{p-1}(x_1) = f_1.$$

Consider now  $v(U_1)$ : as before,  $v(U_1)(x) = x_2$  for some  $x_2 \in k(x^p)$  because of the commutativity with  $\partial_x$ ,  $v(U_1)|_{kK^p}$  is a derivation of order  $p$  and by Remark 5.8 we have that  $v(U_1)(x^p) = (v(U_0)(x))^p = f_1^p$ . Henceforth  $v(U_1)|_{kK^p} = f_1^p v(T_1)|_{kK^p}$ . This differential operator commutes also with  $v(T_1)$ , thus

$$v(T_1)(x_2) = v(T_1)v(U_1)(x) = v(U_1)v(T_1)(x) = v(U_1)(x_1) = f_1^p v(T_1)(x_1) = v(T_1)(f_1^p x_1)$$

and since  $v(T_1)|_{kK^p}$  is a derivation of order  $p$ , by Lemma 4.3 this holds true if and only if

$$x_2 = f_1^p x_1 + g(x^{p^2}).$$

Finally,

$$\begin{aligned} 1 &= \partial_x(x) = v(U_1^p)(x) = (f_1^p)^{p-1} v(T_1)^{p-1}(x_2) = \\ &= (f_1^p)^{p-1} v(T_1)^{p-1}(f_1^p x_1) = f_1^{p^2} v(T_1)^{p-1}(x_1) = f_1^{p^2+1} \end{aligned}$$

and this condition contradicts the fact that  $f_1$  had to be non constant. Therefore there is no faithful rational  $G$ -action on any curve. If we pass to dimension 2, we know by Theorem 1.3 that we can find a generically free rational action of  $G$  on any surface  $X$ , say with function field  $k(X) := K = kK^p(x, y)$ , and an example of such an action is for instance given by

$$\begin{aligned} T_0 &\mapsto \partial_x, \\ U_0 &\mapsto \partial_y, \\ T_1 &\mapsto \partial_{x^p} - (x^p)^{p-1} \partial_y, \\ U_1 &\mapsto \partial_{y^p} - (y^p)^{p-1} \partial_x. \end{aligned}$$

The following Proposition generalizes a result of Brion [Bri22, Lemma 3.6] stating that every variety of positive dimension  $X$  admits a faithful rational action of  $\alpha_p^l$  for any  $l \geq 1$ .

**Proposition 6.7.** *Let  $k$  be perfect,  $G$  be an infinitesimal commutative unipotent  $k$ -group*

scheme and  $X$  be a  $k$ -variety of dimension  $n$ . If  $\dim_k(\mathrm{Lie}(G)) \leq n$ , then for every  $\ell \geq 1$  there exists a faithful rational  $G^\ell$ -action on  $X$ .

*Proof.* Let  $s = \dim_k(\mathrm{Lie}(G))$  and  $K = k(X)$  be the fraction field of  $X$ . Then  $\ker(F_G)$  corresponds to a certain Young diagram  $(m_1, \dots, m_h)$  for some  $h \geq 1$ ,  $\sum_{i=1}^h m_i = s$  (see 2.3.1) and  $\ker(F_G)^\vee \simeq \prod_{i=1}^h \alpha_{p^{m_i}}$ . We know (Proposition 5.4) that there exist generically free rational actions of  $\ker(F_G)$  on  $X$ . By [DG70, III.§2, Corollary 2.7], to give a generically free rational action of  $\ker(F_G)$  on  $X$  corresponds to giving a set of derivations  $\{D_1, \dots, D_h\}$  on  $K$  commuting pairwise, with  $D_i$  of order  $p^{m_i}$  for every  $i = 1, \dots, h$  and such that all the  $p$ -powers of these derivations are  $K$ -linearly independent. Let  $L$  be the fraction field of  $X/\ker(F_G)$ . Take  $k$ -linearly independent elements

$$\{f_{i1}, \dots, f_{ih} \mid i = 1, \dots, l\}$$

in  $L$ . Then  $\{f_{i1}D_1, \dots, f_{ih}D_h\}$  is still a set of derivations defining a generically free rational action of  $\ker(F_G)$  on  $X$ . By Theorem 1.3, this action extends to a generically free rational action of  $G$  on  $X$ . Consider then the induced rational action of  $G^\ell$  on  $X$  and notice that it is faithful by Proposition 6.1. Indeed the rational action of  $\ker(F_{G^\ell}) = \ker(F_G)^\ell$  is given by the set of derivations

$$\{f_{i1}D_1, \dots, f_{ih}D_h \mid i = 1, \dots, l\}$$

whose  $p$ -powers are  $k$ -linearly independent and thus it is faithful.  $\square$

**Remark 6.8.** In the proof we prove something more. Indeed we construct a faithful rational action of  $G^\ell$  such that the induced action of any copy of  $G$  is generically free.

As a direct consequence we have that the converse of Proposition 1.2 holds true over a perfect field for infinitesimal commutative unipotent  $k$ -group schemes of height one.

**Corollary 6.9.** *Let  $k$  be perfect,  $G$  be an infinitesimal commutative unipotent  $k$ -group scheme of height one and  $X$  be a  $k$ -variety of dimension  $n$ . If  $V_G^n = 0$  then there exists a faithful rational  $G$ -action on  $X$ .*

*Proof.* Notice that if  $G$  has height one and is killed by  $V_G^n$ , then  $G$  corresponds to a Young diagram  $(m_1, \dots, m_s)$  for some  $s \geq 1$  and with  $m_i \leq n$  for all  $i = 1, \dots, s$ . By Proposition 6.7, there exists a faithful rational action of  $(W_n^1)^s$  on  $X$ . Since  $G$  is a  $k$ -subgroup scheme of  $(W_n^1)^s$  the statement follows.  $\square$

We also have a sort of converse of Proposition 6.7 in the case of group schemes of height one. The following Proposition shows that if  $G_1, \dots, G_l$  are commutative unipotent group schemes of height one such that  $G_1 \times_k \dots \times_k G_l$  acts on a variety  $X$  and the action restricted to every  $G_i$  is generically free, then there exists a generically free action on  $X$  of the smallest commutative unipotent group scheme  $G$  of height one containing all of them.

**Proposition 6.10.** *Let  $k$  be perfect,  $H = \prod_{i=1}^l G_i$  be an infinitesimal commutative unipotent  $k$ -group scheme of height one and  $X$  be a  $k$ -variety of dimension  $n$ . Then there exists a faithful rational  $H$ -action on  $X$  which induces generically free  $G_i$ -actions for every  $i = 1, \dots, l$  if and only if each  $G_i$  is isomorphic to a subgroup of an infinitesimal commutative unipotent  $k$ -group scheme  $G$  of height one such that  $\dim_k(\mathrm{Lie}(G)) \leq n$ .*

*Proof.* One implication is clear by Remark 6.8. Suppose now that there exists a faithful rational  $H$ -action on  $X$  which induces generically free  $G_i$ -actions for every  $i = 1, \dots, l$  and let  $K$  denote the fraction field of  $X$ . By assumption, every  $G_i$  is of height one and

thus corresponds to a Young diagram  $\tau(G_i) = (n_{1i}, \dots, n_{s_i i})$  for some  $s_i \geq 1$  and  $n_{s_i i} \neq 0$ . We observe that  $s_i$  corresponds to the length of the first column of  $\tau(G_i)$ , that is  $\dim_k(\text{Lie}(\text{soc}(G_i)))$ . The  $H$ -action is determined by a set of derivations  $D_{ji}$ , with  $i = 1, \dots, l$  and  $j = 1, \dots, s_i$ , such that they commute pairwise and  $D_{ji}^{p^{n_{ji}}} = 0$ . The fact that each  $G_i$ -action is generically free is equivalent to the fact that  $S_i = \{D_{ji}^{p^{n_{ji}-1}} \mid j = 1, \dots, s_i\}$  is linearly independent over  $K$  for any  $i = 1, \dots, l$ . Indeed  $S_i$  represents the action induced by  $\text{soc}(G_i)$ . Let  $G$  be the smallest infinitesimal commutative unipotent group scheme of height one containing  $G_i$  for all  $i$ . Then  $\tau(G) = (n_1, \dots, n_s)$  where  $s = \max\{s_1, \dots, s_l\}$  and  $n_j = \max\{n_{j1}, \dots, n_{jl}\}$  for every  $j = 1, \dots, s$ . We also fix a function  $f : \{1, \dots, s\} \mapsto \{1, \dots, l\}$  such that  $n_j = n_{j f(j)}$ . This means that for the  $j$ -th line of the Young diagram of  $G$  we are choosing the  $j$ -th line of  $G_{f(j)}$ . Now we want to construct an action of  $G$  on  $X$ , or equivalently a set of derivations  $E_i$  which commute each other and such that  $E_i^{p^{n_i}} = 0$  for any  $i = 1, \dots, s$ . We define  $E_1 := D_{1f(1)}$ . Now suppose we have defined  $E_r$ , with  $1 \leq r \leq s-1$ , such that the set  $C_r = \{E_k^{p^{n_k-1}} \mid k = 1, \dots, r\}$  is linearly independent over  $K$ , then we define  $E_{r+1}$  in such way that it does not belong to the space generated by  $C_r$ . We remark that  $\tau(G_{f(r+1)})$  has at least  $r+1$  lines which have at least  $n_{r+1}$  squares. Now  $\{D_{kf(r+1)}^{p^{n_k-1}} \mid k = 1, \dots, r+1\}$  is a set of  $r+1$   $K$ -linearly independent derivations, therefore there is at least one  $D_{k_0 f(r+1)}^{p^{n_{k_0}-1}}$  of them which is not in the  $K$ -vector space generated by  $C_r$ . We define  $E_{r+1} := D_{k_0 f(r+1)}^{p^{n_{k_0}-p^{n_{r+1}}}}$ . Its order is  $p^{n_{r+1}}$ .

Therefore we have constructed an action of  $G$  on  $X$ . By construction we have that the set  $\{E_i^{p^{n_i-1}} \mid i = 1, \dots, s\}$  is  $K$ -linearly independent. This set corresponds to the induced action of the socle of  $G$ . Therefore the action of the socle of  $G$  is generically free, hence the same is true for the action of  $G$ , by Proposition 5.1. This implies, by Proposition 3.14, that  $\dim_k \text{Lie}(G) \leq n$ , as wanted.  $\square$

**Remark 6.11.** Notice that actually in the above proof we never used the fact that the  $H$ -action was faithful. Moreover we remark that the condition on the existence of such actions is purely combinatorial and it is equivalent to ask, using notation of the proof, that  $\dim_k(\text{Lie}(G)) = \sum_{j=1}^s n_j \leq n$ . For example, if we take  $G_1$  and  $G_2$  corresponding respectively to

$$\begin{array}{|c|c|c|} \hline \square & \square & \square \\ \hline \square & & \\ \hline \end{array} \quad \text{and} \quad \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline \square & \square \\ \hline \square & \square \\ \hline \end{array}$$

then

$$G = \begin{array}{|c|c|c|} \hline \square & \square & \square \\ \hline \square & \square & \\ \hline \end{array}$$

and the Proposition implies that even if there exist generically free actions of  $G_i$  on every variety of dimension 4, there is no action of  $G_1 \times_k G_2$  on a variety of dimension 4 which is generically free when restricted to  $G_i$  for  $i = 1, 2$ . On the other hand, there exist such actions on every variety of dimension  $\geq 5$ .

We finish the paper illustrating the above results in the case of the connected part of the  $p$ -torsion of abelian varieties.

**Example 6.12.** Let  $k$  be algebraically closed and  $A$  be an abelian variety defined over  $k$  of dimension  $g$ ,  $p$ -rank  $f$  and  $a$ -number  $a$ . If there exists a faithful rational action of  $A[p]^0$  on a curve, then by Proposition 1.2,  $f \leq 1$  and either  $A[p]^{0,u}$  is trivial (if  $f = 1$ )

or  $V_{\ker(F_{A[p]^0, u})} = 0$  (if  $f = 0$ ). In either case, it holds that  $\text{soc}(A[p]^0) = \ker(F_{A[p]})$ . As a consequence one has that  $a + f = g$ . We then have the following two cases.

- If  $f = 1$ , then  $f = 1 = g$ , that is  $A$  is an ordinary elliptic curve and faithful rational actions of  $A[p]^0 = \mu_p$  on curves always exist.
- If  $f = 0$ , then  $a = g$  that is  $A$  is a superspecial abelian variety. Superspecial abelian varieties are always isomorphic to a product of supersingular elliptic curves [Oor75, Theorem 2]. Then, by Proposition 6.7, there exist always faithful rational actions of  $A[p]$ , for  $A$  superspecial, on curves.

More generally, if there exists a faithful rational action of  $A[p]^0$  on a variety of dimension  $n$ , then  $0 \leq g - f \leq a(n - f)$ . Indeed, by Proposition 1.2, we have that  $f \leq n$  and  $V_{\ker(F_{A[p]^0, u})}^{n-f} = 0$ . This means that

$$\ker(F_{A[p]}) \simeq \prod_{i \in I} W_{n_i}^1 \times_k \mu_p^f$$

where  $n_i \leq n - f$  for every  $i \in I$ . As a consequence,  $g - f = \sum_{i \in I} n_i \leq a(n - f)$ . Notice that if  $g \leq n$  we don't get any interesting information and moreover by Remark 5.12 there exist always generically free rational actions of  $A[p]^0$  on varieties of dimension  $n$ . As explained above, such faithful rational actions may occur even when  $g > n$ . Notice that the numerical condition given holds true for any  $G \simeq G^u \times_k G^d$  infinitesimal commutative trigonalizable  $k$ -group scheme with a faithful rational action on a variety of dimension  $n$ , with  $a = \dim_k(\text{Lie}(\text{soc}(G^u)))$ ,  $f = \dim_k(\text{Lie}(\text{soc}(G^s)))$  and  $g = \dim_k(\text{Lie}(G))$ .

## References

- [Beg69] Lucile Begueri. “Schéma d’automorphismes. Application à l’étude d’extensions finies radicielles”. In: *Bull. Sci. Math. (2)* 93 (1969), pp. 89–111.
- [BF03] Grégory Berhuy and Giordano Favi. “Essential dimension: a functorial point of view (after A. Merkurjev)”. In: *Doc. Math.* 8 (2003), pp. 279–330.
- [BM11] Sylvain Brochard and Ariane Mézard. “About de Smit’s question on flatness”. In: *Math. Z.* 267.1-2 (2011), pp. 385–401.
- [Bou90] N. Bourbaki. *Algebra. II. Chapters 4–7*. Elements of Mathematics (Berlin). Translated from the French by P. M. Cohn and J. Howie. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1990.
- [BR97] J. Buhler and Z. Reichstein. “On the essential dimension of a finite group”. In: *Compositio Math.* 106.2 (1997), pp. 159–179.
- [Bri22] Michel Brion. *Actions of finite group schemes on curves*. 2022. arXiv: 2207.08209 [math.AG].
- [Cha72] Stephen U. Chase. “On the automorphism scheme of a purely inseparable field extension”. In: *Ring theory (Proc. Conf., Park City, Utah, 1971)*. Academic Press, New York-London, 1972, pp. 75–106.
- [DG70] Michel Demazure and Pierre Gabriel. *Groupes algébriques. Tome I: Géométrie algébrique, généralités, groupes commutatifs*. Avec un appendice *Corps de classes local* par Michiel Hazewinkel. Masson & Cie, Éditeurs, Paris and North-Holland Publishing Co., Amsterdam, 1970, pp. xxvi+700.



- [Dol09] I. V. Dolgachev. “On elements of order  $p^s$  in the plane Cremona group over a field of characteristic  $p$ ”. In: *Tr. Mat. Inst. Steklova* 264. Mnogomernaya Algebraicheskaya Geometriya (2009), pp. 55–62.
- [Dol10] Igor V. Dolgachev. “Finite subgroups of the plane Cremona group”. In: *Algebraic geometry in East Asia—Seoul 2008*. Vol. 60. Adv. Stud. Pure Math. Math. Soc. Japan, Tokyo, 2010, pp. 1–49.
- [Fak20] Najmuddin Fakhruddin. “Finite group schemes of essential dimension one”. In: *Doc. Math.* 25 (2020), pp. 55–64.
- [Gou] Bianca Gouthier. *Infinitesimal commutative group schemes with one-dimensional Lie algebra*. In preparation.
- [Liu02] Qing Liu. *Algebraic geometry and arithmetic curves*. Vol. 6. Oxford Graduate Texts in Mathematics. Translated from the French by Reinie Ern e, Oxford Science Publications. Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2002.
- [MO67] Hideyuki Matsumura and Frans Oort. “Representability of group functors, and automorphisms of algebraic schemes”. In: *Invent. Math.* 4 (1967), pp. 1–25.
- [Mon93] Susan Montgomery. *Hopf algebras and their actions on rings*. Vol. 82. CBMS Regional Conference Series in Mathematics. Published for the Conference Board of the Mathematical Sciences, Washington, DC; by the American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 1993, pp. xiv+238.
- [Mum08] David Mumford. *Abelian varieties*. Vol. 5. Tata Institute of Fundamental Research Studies in Mathematics. With appendices by C. P. Ramanujam and Yuri Manin, Corrected reprint of the second (1974) edition. Tata Institute of Fundamental Research, Bombay; by Hindustan Book Agency, New Delhi, 2008.
- [Oor75] Frans Oort. “Which abelian surfaces are products of elliptic curves?” In: *Math. Ann.* 214 (1975), pp. 35–47.
- [SGA3] Michael Artin, Jean-Etienne Bertin, Michel Demazure, Alexander Grothendieck, Pierre Gabriel, Michel Raynaud, and Jean-Pierre Serre. *Sch emas en groupes*. S eminaire de G eom etrie Alg ebrique de l’Institut des Hautes  tudes Scientifiques. Paris: Institut des Hautes  tudes Scientifiques, 1963/1966.
- [Smi68] T. H. M. Smits. “Nilpotent  $S$ -derivations”. In: *Indag. Math.* 30 (1968). Nederl. Akad. Wetensch. Proc. Ser. A 71, pp. 72–86.
- [Swe69] Moss E. Sweedler. *Hopf algebras*. W. A. Benjamin, Inc., New York, 1969.
- [Tos19] Dajano Tossici. “Essential dimension of infinitesimal commutative unipotent group schemes”. In: *Boll. Unione Mat. Ital.* 12.4 (2019), pp. 575–581.
- [TV13] Dajano Tossici and Angelo Vistoli. “On the essential dimension of infinitesimal group schemes”. In: *Amer. J. Math.* 135.1 (2013), pp. 103–114.

INSTITUT DE MATH EMATIQUES DE BORDEAUX, 351 COURS DE LA LIB ERATION, 33405  
TALENCE, FRANCE

*Email Address:* [bianca.gouthier@math.u-bordeaux.fr](mailto:bianca.gouthier@math.u-bordeaux.fr)