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ABSTRACT. Fix a field $k$ of characteristic zero. If $a_1, \ldots, a_n$ $(n \geq 3)$ are positive integers, the integral domain $B_{a_1, \ldots, a_n} = k[X_1, \ldots, X_n]/\langle X_1^{a_1} + \cdots + X_n^{a_n} \rangle$ is called a Pham-Brieskorn ring. It is conjectured that if $a_i \geq 2$ for all $i$ and $a_i = 2$ for at most one $i$, then $B_{a_1, \ldots, a_n}$ is rigid. (A ring $B$ is said to be rigid if the only locally nilpotent derivation $D : B \to B$ is the zero derivation.) We give partial results towards the conjecture.

1. Introduction

If $B$ is a commutative ring of characteristic zero, a derivation $D : B \to B$ is locally nilpotent if for each $x \in B$ there exists $n > 0$ such that $D^n(x) = 0$. If the only locally nilpotent derivation $D : B \to B$ is the zero derivation, one says that $B$ is rigid. One says that $B$ is stably rigid if for any $N \geq 0$ and any locally nilpotent derivation $D : B[X_1, \ldots, X_N] \to B[X_1, \ldots, X_N]$ (where $B[X_1, \ldots, X_N]$ is the polynomial ring in $N$ variables over $B$), we have $D(B) = \{0\}$. Note that stable rigidity implies rigidity.

Fix a field $k$ of characteristic zero. If $a_1, \ldots, a_n$ $(n \geq 3)$ are positive integers, the integral domain $B_{a_1, \ldots, a_n} = k[X_1, \ldots, X_n]/\langle X_1^{a_1} + \cdots + X_n^{a_n} \rangle$ is called a Pham-Brieskorn ring. These rings and the corresponding varieties have been studied extensively and from several angles; paper [10] refers to [13] for a survey. It is interesting to ask which Pham-Brieskorn rings are rigid or stably rigid. Consider the set

$$T_n = \{ (a_1, \ldots, a_n) \in \mathbb{Z}^n \mid a_i \geq 2 \text{ for all } i \text{ and } a_i = 2 \text{ for at most one } i \}.$$  

It is known (and easy to see) that if $B_{a_1, \ldots, a_n}$ is rigid then $(a_1, \ldots, a_n) \in T_n$; so one wants to know if the converse is true. The case $n = 3$ is settled by:

1.1. Theorem. Let $a, b, c$ be positive integers.

(a) If $(a, b, c) \in T_3$ then $B_{a,b,c}$ is rigid.

(b) If $\frac{1}{a} + \frac{1}{b} + \frac{1}{c} \leq 1$ then $B_{a,b,c}$ is stably rigid.

This is [10, Theorem 7.1] (the case $k = \mathbb{C}$, with part (b) implicit, is [12, Lemma 4]).

For arbitrary $n \geq 3$, one has:

1.2. Theorem. If $\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{a_i} \leq \frac{1}{n-2}$ then $B_{a_1, \ldots, a_n}$ is rigid.

The case $k = \mathbb{C}$ of Theorem 1.2 is [9, Example 2.6]. The general case follows, because (as one can see) rigidity over $\mathbb{C}$ implies rigidity over any field of characteristic zero.

In the case $n = 4$, the following is known:

1.3. Theorem. Assume that $(a, b, c, d) \in T_4$. Then $B_{a,b,c,d}$ is rigid in each of the following cases:
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(a) \( \frac{1}{a} + \frac{1}{b} + \frac{1}{c} + \frac{1}{d} \leq \frac{1}{2} \)
(b) \( \gcd(abc, d) = 1 \)
(c) \( a = b = c = 3 \)
(d) \( a = 2, b, c, d \geq 3, b \) is even, \( \gcd(b, c) \geq 3 \) and \( \gcd(d, \operatorname{lcm}(b, c)) = 2 \)
(e) \( \text{cotype}(a, b, c, d) \geq 2 \).

Part (e) of Theorem 1.3 is Theorem 7.2(b) of \cite{5}, reformulated in terms of cotype (see Definition \ref{def:cotype} for the notion of cotype). Part (a) is the case \( n = 4 \) of Theorem 1.2. Parts (b–d) are stated in \cite{5} Theorem 7.1] but are proved in \cite{10} Theorem 8.1] and \cite{11} Corollary 1.9].

This article settles many cases not covered by Theorems 1.1, 1.3. In order to avoid giving too many definitions in the Introduction, we only present a subset of our results as Theorem 1.4. Other significant results appear in Section 4. The Pham-Brieskorn rings \( B_{a_1,\ldots,a_n} \) that appear in Theorem 1.4 are defined over an arbitrary field \( k \) of characteristic zero, and we always assume that \( n \geq 3 \).

1.4. Theorem.

(a) If \( a \geq n \geq 4 \) then \( B_{a_1,\ldots,a_n} \) is rigid.
(b) If \( \sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{1}{a_i} \leq \frac{1}{n-2} \) then \( B_{a_1,\ldots,a_n} \) is stably rigid.
(c) If \( \sum_{i \in I} \frac{1}{a_i} < \frac{1}{n-2} \) then \( B_{a_1,\ldots,a_n} \) is rigid, where \( I = \{ i \mid a_i \text{ divides } \operatorname{lcm}(a_1,\ldots,a_i,\ldots,a_n) \} \).
(d) If \( a, b, c, d \geq 1 \) satisfy \( a \nmid \operatorname{lcm}(b, c, d) \) and \( \frac{1}{a} + \frac{1}{b} + \frac{1}{c} + \frac{1}{d} < \frac{1}{2} \) then \( B_{a,b,c,d} \) is rigid.
(e) If \( (a_1,\ldots,a_n) \in T_n \) and \( \text{cotype}(a_1,\ldots,a_n) \geq n - 2 \), then \( B_{a_1,\ldots,a_n} \) is rigid.
(f) If \( k_1, k_2, k_3, k_4 \geq 1 \) are pairwise relatively prime and \( a \geq 3 \) then \( B_{ak_1,ak_2,ak_3,ak_4} \) is rigid.
(g) If \( k_1,\ldots,k_n \geq 1 \) are pairwise relatively prime and \( a \geq n \geq 4 \) then \( B_{ak_1,\ldots,ak_n} \) is rigid.
(h) If \( a_1,\ldots,a_m \geq 1 \) (\( m \geq 1 \)) satisfy \( a_i \nmid \operatorname{lcm}(a_1,\ldots,a_i,\ldots,a_m) \) for all \( i \in \{1,\ldots,m\} \), then \( B_{a_1,\ldots,a_m,3,3,3} \) is rigid.

Part (a) of Theorem 1.4 is Corollary 4.6; the fact that \( B_{a_1,\ldots,a_n} \) is rigid when \( n \leq a < n(n-2) \) appears to be a new result (if \( a \geq n(n-2) \) then \( B_{a_1,\ldots,a_n} \) is rigid by Theorem 1.2). Parts (b) and (c) are Corollary 6.8 and Proposition 4.12, respectively; these two results strengthen Theorem 1.2. Part (d) is the case \( "n = 4" \) of part (c). Part (e) is Corollary 4.16; it generalizes Theorem 1.3(e). Parts (f) and (g) are Corollary 4.10 and (h) is Example 4.17. Parts (f–h) are illustrations of stronger results that cannot be stated in the Introduction.

Let us say a few words about Section 3. It is known that if a \( k \)-domain \( B \) is not rigid then its field of fractions \( \operatorname{Frac}(B) \) is ruled over \( k \), i.e., there exists a field \( K \) such that \( k \subseteq K \subseteq \operatorname{Frac}(B) \) and \( \operatorname{Frac}(B) = K(t) \) where \( t \) is transcendental over \( K \). So, one technique for showing that \( B \) is rigid is to show that \( \operatorname{Frac}(B) \) is not ruled over \( k \). However, that technique is useless when \( B \) admits a nontrivial \( \mathbb{Z} \)-grading, because then \( \operatorname{Frac}(B) \) is always ruled over \( k \); we have \( \operatorname{Frac}(B) = K(t) \) where \( K = \operatorname{HFrac}(B) \) is the “homogeneous field of fractions” of \( B \). Section 3 shows that if \( B \) is a graded \( k \)-domain which is not rigid then, under certain additional hypotheses, \( \operatorname{HFrac}(B) \) itself is ruled over \( k \). So, to prove that a graded domain \( B \) satisfying certain assumptions is rigid, it suffices to show that \( \operatorname{HFrac}(B) \) is not ruled. It is this technique that allows us to prove part (a) of Theorem 1.4.
2. Preliminaries

Throughout this work, all rings are commutative and have a multiplicative identity 1. All ring homomorphisms map 1 to 1. If $B$ is a ring then $B^*$ denotes its group of units. If $b \in B$ then $\langle b \rangle$ is the ideal of $B$ generated by $b$, and we use the notation $B_b = S^{-1}B$ where $S = \{1, b, b^2, \ldots \}$. By a domain, we mean an integral domain. If $B$ is a domain, its fraction field is denoted $\text{Frac}(B)$. If $A \subseteq B$ are domains then $\text{trdeg}_A(B)$ denotes the transcendence degree of $\text{Frac}(B)$ over $\text{Frac}(A)$. A subring $A$ of a domain $B$ is factorial closed in $B$ if for all $x, y \in B \setminus \{0\}$ we have the implication $xy \in A \Rightarrow x, y \in A$. If $k$ is a field, then a $k$-domain is a domain that is also a $k$-algebra. An affine $k$-domain is a $k$-domain that is finitely generated as a $k$-algebra.

If $A$ is a subring of a ring $B$, we write $B = A^n$ to indicate that $B$ is isomorphic to the polynomial algebra in $n$ variables over $A$. If $K/k$ is a field extension, $K = k^{(n)}$ means that $K$ is purely transcendental over $k$, of transcendence degree $n$.

We write “$\subseteq$” for inclusion and “$\subset$” for proper inclusion.

Let $B$ be a ring and $D : B \to B$ a derivation. We say that $D$ is irreducible if the only principal ideal of $B$ containing $D(B)$ is $B$ itself. We say that $D$ is locally nilpotent if for each $b \in B$ there exists an $n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $D^n(b) = 0$. A slice of $D$ is an element $t \in B$ such that $D(t) = 1$. A preslice of $D$ is an element $t \in B$ such that $D(t) \neq 0$ and $D^2(t) = 0$.

2.1. Definition. If $B$ is a ring, the set of locally nilpotent derivations $D : B \to B$ is denoted $\text{LND}(B)$. If $\text{LND}(B) = \{0\}$, we say that $B$ is rigid.

2.2. Let $B$ be an integral domain of characteristic zero, let $D : B \to B$ be a derivation, and let $A = \ker D$. The following facts are well known (refer to [8], [11] or [3]).

(a) If $D$ is locally nilpotent, then $A$ is a factorial closed subring of $B$. Consequently, if $D$ is locally nilpotent and $k$ is a field included in $B$ then $D$ is a $k$-derivation.

(b) Assume that $\mathbb{Q} \subseteq B$. If $D \neq 0$ is locally nilpotent then $D$ has a preslice $t \in B$. For any such $t$, if we define $\alpha = D(t)$ then $B_\alpha = A_\alpha[t] = (A_\alpha)[t]$. Consequently, $\text{trdeg}_A(B) = 1$ and $\text{Frac}(B) = (\text{Frac}(A))[1]$.

(c) If $D \neq 0$ is locally nilpotent and $B$ satisfies the ascending chain condition for principal ideals, then there exists an irreducible locally nilpotent derivation $\delta : B \to B$ such that $D = a\delta$ for some $a \in A$.

(d) Let $S \subseteq B \setminus \{0\}$ be a multiplicative subset of $B$ containing 1. Then $S^{-1}D : S^{-1}B \to S^{-1}B$ defined by $(S^{-1}D)(\frac{b}{s}) = \frac{sD(b) - bD(s)}{s^2}$ is a derivation and the following hold:

(i) $S^{-1}D$ is locally nilpotent if and only if $D$ is locally nilpotent and $S \subseteq A$;

(ii) if $S \subseteq A$ then $\ker S^{-1}D = S^{-1}A$ and $S^{-1}A \cap B = A$.

2.3. Definition. Let $B$ be a ring of characteristic zero. If $D \in \text{LND}(B)$ then define $\text{deg}_D : B \to \mathbb{N} \cup \{-\infty\}$ by declaring that $\text{deg}_D(0) = -\infty$ and that $\text{deg}_D(x) = \max\{n \in \mathbb{N} \mid D^n(x) \neq 0\}$ for each $x \in B \setminus \{0\}$. Also define $|x|_B = \min\{\text{deg}_D(x) \mid D \in \text{LND}(B) \setminus \{0\}\}$ for each $x \in B \setminus \{0\}$, where we adopt the convention that $\min \emptyset = \infty$, so $|x|_B = \infty$ when $B$ is rigid.

3. Derivations of $G$-graded rings

3.1. Definition. Let $(G, +)$ be an abelian group. A $G$-grading of a ring $B$ is a family $\{B_g\}_{g \in G}$ of subgroups of $(B, +)$ such that $B = \bigoplus_{g \in G} B_g$ and $B_gB_h \subseteq B_{g+h}$ for all $g, h \in G$. A $G$-graded ring is a ring $B$ together with a $G$-grading (of $B$). In the special case where $G = \mathbb{Z}$ and $B_i = 0$ for all $i < 0$, we say that $B$ is $\mathbb{N}$-graded and write $B = \bigoplus_{i \in \mathbb{N}} B_i$. 
3.2. Definitions. Suppose that $G$ is an abelian group and that $B = \bigoplus_{i \in G} B_i$ is a $G$-graded ring.

- A derivation $D : B \to B$ is homogeneous if there exists an $h \in G$ such that $D(B_g) \subseteq B_{g+h}$ for all $g \in G$. If $D$ is homogeneous and $D \neq 0$ then $h$ is unique and we say that $D$ is homogeneous of degree $h$. The zero derivation is homogeneous of degree $-\infty$. The set of homogeneous locally nilpotent derivations of $B$ is denoted $HLND(B)$.

- A graded subring of $B$ is a subring $A$ of $B$ satisfying $A = \bigoplus_{g \in G} (A \cap B_g)$. If $A$ is a graded subring of $B$ then $A$ is a $G$-graded ring $(A = \bigoplus_{g \in G} A_g)$ is a $G$-grading of $A$, where we define $A_g = A \cap B_g$ for each $g \in G$). Note that if $D \in HLND(B)$ then $\ker D$ is a graded subring of $B$.

- If $A$ is a graded subring of $B$, define $G(A)$ to be the subgroup of $G$ generated by the set $\{ g \in G \mid A_g \neq 0 \}$.

3.3. Definition. Suppose that $G$ is an abelian group and that $B = \bigoplus_{i \in G} B_i$ is a $G$-graded integral domain. If $S$ is a multiplicatively closed subset of $\bigcup_{i \in G} (B_i \setminus \{0\})$ such that $1 \in S$ then the localized ring $S^{-1}B$ is a $G$-graded ring in a natural way, and if we write $S^{-1}B = R = \bigoplus_{i \in G} R_i$ then the subring $R_0$ of $S^{-1}B$ called the homogeneous localization of $B$ at $S$. Explicitly,

$$R_0 = \bigcup_{i \in G} \{ \frac{b}{s} \mid b \in B_i \text{ and } s \in B_i \cap S \}.$$  

We define $\text{HFrac}(B)$ to be the homogeneous localization of $B$ at $S = \bigcup_{i \in G} (B_i \setminus \{0\})$. It is clear that $\text{HFrac}(B)$ is a subfield of $\text{Frac}(B)$; we call $\text{HFrac}(B)$ the homogeneous field of fractions of $B$.

3.4. Example. If $B$ is an $\mathbb{N}$-graded integral domain such that $B \neq B_0$ then $\text{Proj} B$ and $\text{Spec} B$ are integral schemes, $\text{Frac}(B)$ is the function field of $\text{Spec} B$, $\text{HFrac}(B)$ is the function field of $\text{Proj} B$, and $\text{Frac}(B) = (\text{HFrac}(B))^{(1)}$. (If $B = B_0$ then $\text{Proj} B = \emptyset$ is not an integral scheme and hence does not have a function field. Note that $\text{Frac}(B) = \text{HFrac}(B)$ whenever $B = B_0$.)

3.5. Definition. A field extension $L/k$ is ruled if there exists a field $K$ such that $k \leq K \leq L$ and $L = K^{(1)}$.

3.6. Theorem. Let $G$ be an abelian group and $B$ a $G$-graded integral domain of characteristic zero. Let $D \in HLND(B) \setminus \{0\}$, let $A = \ker D$ and suppose that $G(A) = G(B)$.

(a) $\text{HFrac}(B) = (\text{HFrac}(A))^{(1)}$

(b) If $k$ is a field included in $B$ then $k \cap B_0$ is a field included in $\text{HFrac}(A)$.

(c) If $G$ is torsion-free and $k$ is a field included in $B$ then $k \subseteq \text{HFrac}(A)$ and consequently $\text{HFrac}(B)$ is ruled over $k$.

Proof. If $B = B_0$ then $\text{Frac}(B) = \text{HFrac}(B)$ and $\text{Frac}(A) = \text{HFrac}(A)$, so the Theorem follows from parts (a) and (b) of 3.2. So we may assume that $B \neq B_0$.

(a) Let $d = \text{deg} D$ and $S = \bigcup_{g \in G} (A_g \setminus \{0\})$. Then $S^{-1}D : S^{-1}B \to S^{-1}B$ is nonzero and locally nilpotent, and also homogeneous of degree $d$. Since $-d \in G(B)$ and $G(A) = G(B)$, there exist $a, s \in S$ such that the homogeneous element $\frac{a}{s} \in S^{-1}A$ has degree $-d$. Then $\frac{a}{s}S^{-1}D : S^{-1}B \to S^{-1}B$ is a homogeneous derivation of degree 0; since $\frac{a}{s} \in \ker(S^{-1}D)$ and $S^{-1}D$ is locally nilpotent, $\frac{a}{s}S^{-1}D$ is locally nilpotent. Let $B(S)$ denote the degree 0 subring of $S^{-1}B$ and let $D(S) : B(S) \to B(S)$ be the restriction of $\frac{a}{s}S^{-1}D$. Then $D(S)$ is a locally nilpotent derivation whose kernel is $B(S) \cap \ker (\frac{a}{s}S^{-1}D) = B(S) \cap S^{-1}A = A(S) = \text{HFrac}(A)$. 

We show that \( D_{(S)} \) is nonzero. It is straightforward to verify that \( D \) has a homogeneous preslice \( t \in B \). Since \( G(A) = G(B) \), there exist \( a', s' \in S \) such that \( \deg(a') = -\deg(t) \). Then \( \frac{a'}{s'} \in B_{(S)} \) and, since \( \frac{a'}{s'} \in \ker S^{-1}D \), \( D_{(S)}(\frac{a'}{s'}) = (\frac{a'}{s'}S^{-1}D)(\frac{a'}{s'}) = \frac{a'}{s'}S^{-1}D(t) \neq 0 \).

Since \( D_{(S)} \neq 0 \) and \( \ker D_{(S)} = \text{HFrac}(A) \) is a field, \( \text{2.2}[\text{ii}] \) implies that \( B_{(S)} = (\text{HFrac}(A))^{|1|} \).

Using \( G(A) = G(B) \) once again, we see that \( \text{HFrac}(B) \) is the field of fractions of \( B_{(S)} \); so \( \text{HFrac}(B) = (\text{HFrac}(A))^{|1|} \). This proves (a).

(b) If \( k \) is a field included in \( B \) then it is clear that \( k \cap B_0 \) is a field and \( \text{2.2}[\text{ii}] \) implies that \( k \subseteq A \), so \( k \cap B_0 \subseteq A \cap B_0 = A_0 \subseteq \text{HFrac}(A) \).

(c) It is well known that if \( G \) is a torsion-free abelian group and \( B \) is a \( G \)-graded domain then any field included in \( B \) is in fact included in \( B_0 \) (see \( \text{[2]} \) Lemma 2.4.7, for instance). So in the present situation we have \( k \subseteq B_0 \); then (b) implies that \( k \subseteq \text{HFrac}(A) \) and (a) implies that \( \text{HFrac}(B) \) is ruled over \( k \). \( \square \)

3.7. **Remark.** In the special case where the grading is an \( \mathbb{N} \)-grading and is nontrivial \( (B \neq B_0) \), Theorem\( \text{3.6}[\text{c}] \) asserts that the function field of \( \text{Proj} B \) is ruled over \( k \). (See Example\( \text{3.4} \)) The same remark applies to Proposition\( \text{3.10} \) below.

3.8 (Homogenization). Let \( k \) be a field of characteristic zero and \( B = \bigoplus_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} B_i \), a \( \mathbb{Z} \)-graded affine \( k \)-domain. One can show that if \( D \in \text{LND}(B) \) then the subset \( S_D \overset{\text{def}}{=} \{ \deg(Dx) - \deg(x) \mid x \in B \setminus \{0\} \} \) of \( \mathbb{Z} \cup \{-\infty\} \) has a greatest element (where \( \deg : B \to \mathbb{Z} \cup \{-\infty\} \) is the degree function determined by the grading of \( B \)); one defines \( \deg(D) = \max(S_D) \in \mathbb{Z} \cup \{-\infty\} \). Clearly, \( \deg(D) = -\infty \Leftrightarrow D = 0 \). Also, if \( D \) happens to be homogeneous then \( \deg(D) \) coincides with the usual degree of a homogeneous derivation (Definition\( \text{3.2} \)).

If \( D \in \text{LND}(B) \) then there is a natural way to define an element \( \tilde{D} \) of \( \text{HLND}(B) \) satisfying (in particular) \( \deg(\tilde{D}) = \deg(D) \). Indeed, if \( D = 0 \) then set \( \tilde{D} = 0 \). If \( D \in \text{LND}(B) \setminus \{0\} \) then let \( d = \deg(D) \in \mathbb{Z} \) and define (for each \( i \in \mathbb{Z} \)) a map \( \tilde{D}_i : B_i \to B_{i+d} \) by \( \tilde{D}_i(x) = p_{i+d}(Dx) \), where \( p_j : B \to B_j \) is the canonical projection; then if \( b = \sum_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} b_i \in B \) (\( b_i \in B_i \) for all \( i \), \( b_i = 0 \) for almost all \( i \)), define \( \tilde{D}(b) = \sum_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} \tilde{D}_i(b_i) \); one can check that \( \tilde{D} \in \text{HLND}(B) \setminus \{0\} \) and \( \deg(\tilde{D}) = \deg(D) \). Note in particular that \( D = 0 \implies \tilde{D} \neq 0 \). The derivation \( \tilde{D} \) is sometimes called the homogenization of \( D \). This is in fact a special case of the process of replacing \( D : B \to B \) by \( \text{Gr}(D) : \text{Gr}(B) \to \text{Gr}(B) \), so one can also call \( \tilde{D} \) the associated homogeneous derivation of \( D \).

Note the following consequence of the above discussion:

> Let \( k \) be a field of characteristic zero and \( B \) a \( \mathbb{Z} \)-graded affine \( k \)-domain. If \( B \) is not rigid then \( \text{HLND}(B) \neq \{0\} \).

Refer to\( \text{[4]} \) for proofs of the claims made in\( \text{3.8} \) and for an in-depth treatment of this topic.

3.9. **Definitions.** Let \( n \geq 2 \) and \( S = (a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_n) \in \mathbb{Z}^n \).

- Define\( \text{gcd}(S) = \text{gcd}(a_1, \ldots, a_n) \) and \( \text{lcm}(S) = \text{lcm}(a_1, \ldots, a_n) \).
- If \( \text{gcd}(S) = 1 \), we say that \( S \) is normal. If \( S \neq (0, \ldots, 0) \) then the tuple \( S' = (\frac{a_1}{d}, \ldots, \frac{a_n}{d}) \) (where \( d = \text{gcd}(S) \)) is normal, and is called the normalization of \( S \).
- For each \( j \in \{1, \ldots, n\} \), define \( S_j = (a_1, \ldots, \hat{a}_j, \ldots, a_n) \) (\( j \)-th component omitted). More generally, given a proper subset \( J \) of \( \{1, \ldots, n\} \) we define \( S_J = (a_{i_1}, \ldots, a_{i_k}) \), where \( i_1 < \cdots < i_k \) are the elements of \( \{1, \ldots, n\} \setminus J \).

\(^1\)By convention, \( \text{gcd}(S) \geq 0 \) and \( \text{lcm}(S) \geq 0 \).
• We define the sets 
\[ J^*(S) = \{ i \in \{1, \ldots, n\} \mid \gcd(S_i) \neq \gcd(S) \} = \{ i \in \{1, \ldots, n\} \mid \gcd(S_i) \nmid a_i \} \]
\[ J(S) = \{ i \in \{1, \ldots, n\} \mid \lcm(S_i) \neq \lcm(S) \} = \{ i \in \{1, \ldots, n\} \mid a_i \nmid \lcm(S_i) \} . \]

Then we define the type and the cotype of \( S \) by:
\[ \text{type}(S) = |J^*(S)| \quad \text{and} \quad \text{cotype}(S) = |J(S)|. \]

Note that type(\( S \)), cotype(\( S \)) \( \in \{0, 1, \ldots, n\} \) and that, if \( S' \) is the normalization of \( S \), then type(\( S \)) = type(\( S' \)) and cotype(\( S \)) = cotype(\( S' \)).

3.10. **Proposition.** Let \( k \) be a field of characteristic zero and \( B \) a \( \mathbb{Z} \)-graded \( k \)-domain. Suppose that there exist homogeneous prime elements \( x_1, \ldots, x_n \) (\( n \geq 2 \)) of \( B \) satisfying the following conditions, where \( d_i = \deg x_i \) for all \( i \):
- \( \langle d_1, \ldots, d_n \rangle = \mathbb{Z}(B) \) and type(\( d_1, \ldots, d_n \)) = 0
- for any choice of distinct \( i, j \), the elements \( x_i, x_j \) are not associates in \( B \).

Then the following hold.

(a) \( \mathbb{Z}(\ker D) = \mathbb{Z}(B) \) for all \( D \in \text{HLND}(B) \).

(b) If \( B \) is \textit{\( k \)-affine} and not rigid then HFrac(\( B \)) is ruled over \( k \).

**Proof.** The assumption \( \langle d_1, \ldots, d_n \rangle = \mathbb{Z}(B) \) and type(\( d_1, \ldots, d_n \)) = 0 is equivalent to:

for each subset \( I \subset \{1, \ldots, n\} \) of cardinality \( n - 1 \), \{ \deg(x_i) \mid i \in I \} generates \( \mathbb{Z}(B) \).

So assertion (a) is the special case \( G = \mathbb{Z} \) of [5, Corollary 4.2]. To prove (b), suppose that \( B \) is \textit{\( k \)-affine} and not rigid; then 3.5 implies that \( \text{HLND}(B) \setminus \{0\} \neq \emptyset \). Pick \( D \in \text{HLND}(B) \setminus \{0\} \), then \( \mathbb{Z}(\ker D) = \mathbb{Z}(B) \) by part (a), so Theorem 3.6(c) implies that HFrac(\( B \)) is ruled over \( k \).

4. **Rigidity of Pham-Brieskorn Rings**

Let \( k \) be a field of characteristic zero.

4.1. **Definition.** Given \( n \geq 3 \) and \( S = (a_1, \ldots, a_n) \in (\mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\})^n \), we use the notation
\[ B_S = B_{a_1, \ldots, a_n} = k[X_1, \ldots, X_n]/(X_1^{a_1} + \cdots + X_n^{a_n}). \]

The \( k \)-domain \( B_{a_1, \ldots, a_n} \) is called a \textit{Pham-Brieskorn ring}. We use the capital letters \( X_i \) to represent the variables in the polynomial ring, and define \( x_i = \pi(X_i) \in B_S \) where \( \pi : k[X_1, \ldots, X_n] \to B_S \) is the canonical quotient map. Thus \( B_S = k[x_1, \ldots, x_n] \). Let \( (d_1, \ldots, d_n) = \left( \frac{L}{a_1}, \ldots, \frac{L}{a_n} \right) \), where \( L = \lcm(S) \); then there is a unique \( \mathbb{N} \)-grading of \( B_S \) with the property that \( x_i \) is homogeneous of degree \( d_i \) for all \( i = 1, \ldots, n \). We call it the \textit{standard \( \mathbb{N} \)-grading} of \( B_S \).

4.2. **Lemma.** Given \( n \geq 2 \) and \( S = (a_1, \ldots, a_n) \in (\mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\})^n \), define \( \tilde{S} = \left( \frac{L}{a_1}, \ldots, \frac{L}{a_n} \right) \) where \( L = \lcm(S) \). Then the following hold.

(a) \( \tilde{S} \) is normal and \( \overline{S} \) is the normalization of \( S \).

(b) \( J^*(\tilde{S}) = J(S) \) and \( J^*(S) = J(\tilde{S}) \).

(c) type(\( \tilde{S} \)) = cotype(\( S \)) and \( \text{type}(S) = \text{cotype}(\tilde{S}) \).

The proof of Lemma 4.2 is left to the reader. We deduce the following useful triviality:

\[ \text{We mean that } B \text{ is finitely generated as a } k \text{-algebra.} \]
4.3. Lemma. Let $n \geq 4$ and $S = (a_1, \ldots, a_n) \in (\mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\})^n$, and consider $B_S$, $x_1, \ldots, x_n$ and $(d_1, \ldots, d_n)$ as in Definition 4.1:

(a) $\gcd(d_1, \ldots, d_n) = 1$ and $\text{type}(d_1, \ldots, d_n) = \text{cotype}(a_1, \ldots, a_n)$

(b) For each $i \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$, we have

$$\gcd(d_1, \ldots, d_i, \ldots, d_n) \neq 1 \iff \text{lcm}(a_1, \ldots, a_i, \ldots, a_n) \neq \text{lcm}(S) \iff i \in J(S).$$

(c) $x_1, \ldots, x_n$ are homogeneous prime elements of $B_S$ and are pairwise non-associates.

Proof. Since $(d_1, \ldots, d_n) = \hat{S}$, assertions (a) and (b) follow from Lemma 4.2. For each $i$, define $S_i$ as in Definition 3.9; then $B_S/\langle x_i \rangle \cong B_{S_i}$, which is a domain because $n \geq 4$. So $x_1, \ldots, x_n$ are homogeneous prime elements of $B_S$, and it is clear that they are pairwise non-associates. □

Recall that a $k$-variety $X$ is said to be ruled if the function field of $X$ is ruled over $k$, in the sense of Definition 3.5.

4.4. Theorem. Let $n \geq 4$, and let $S \in (\mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\})^n$ be such that $\text{cotype}(S) = 0$.

(a) We have $\mathbb{Z}(\ker D) = \mathbb{Z}$ for all $D \in \text{HLND}(B_S)$.

(b) If $B_S$ is not rigid, then the projective $k$-variety $\text{Proj} B_S$ is ruled over $k$.

Proof. By Example 3.4, the function field of $\text{Proj} B_S$ is $\text{HFrac}(B_S)$. Consider $x_1, \ldots, x_n$ and $(d_1, \ldots, d_n)$ as in Definition 4.1. By Lemma 4.3, $x_1, \ldots, x_n$ satisfy the hypothesis of Proposition 3.10 (in particular, $\text{type}(d_1, \ldots, d_n) = \text{cotype}(S) = 0$). So Proposition 3.10 implies that (a) and (b) hold. □

4.5. Remark. If $a \geq n \geq 4$ then the Fermat variety $F_{a,n} = \text{Proj} \left( k[X_1, \ldots, X_n]/(X_1^a + \cdots + X_n^a) \right)$ is not uniruled, hence not ruled. (Over a field of characteristic zero, a smooth hypersurface of degree $d$ in $\mathbb{P}^N$ is uniruled if and only if $d \leq N$.)

4.6. Corollary. If $S = (a, \ldots, a)$ satisfies $a \geq n \geq 4$, then $B_S$ is rigid.

Proof. Note that $\text{cotype}(S) = 0$. If $B_S$ is not rigid then (by Theorem 1.4) $\text{Proj} B_S = F_{a,n}$ is ruled, which is not the case by Remark 4.5. □

We shall now develop a different approach for proving that $B_S$ is rigid in certain cases. We need the following result, which is part (b) of Corollary 3.3 of [10]. See 2.3 for the definition of $|u|_A$.

4.7. Corollary. Suppose $R$ is a $\mathbb{Z}$-graded affine $k$-domain, $f \in R$ is homogeneous, and $n \geq 2$ is an integer not dividing $\deg f$. Set $g = \gcd(n, \deg f)$, define the rings

$$A = R[u]/(f + u^g) \quad \text{and} \quad B = R[z]/(f + z^n)$$

and assume that $B$ is a domain. Then $A$ is a domain and $B$ is rigid if and only if $|u|_A \geq 2$.

4.8. Definition. Let $n \geq 3$.

(a) Given $S = (a_1, \ldots, a_n) \in (\mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\})^n$ and $i \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$, define $g_i(S) = \gcd(a_i, \text{lcm}(S_i))$ (recalling the definition of $S_i$ from Definition 3.9).
(b) Let \( S = (a_1, \ldots, a_n) \) and \( S' = (a'_1, \ldots, a'_n) \) be elements of \((\mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\})^n\) and let \( i \in \{1, \ldots, n\} \). We write \( S \leq^i S' \) if and only if
\[
S_i = S'_i \quad \text{and} \quad g_i(S') \mid a_i \mid a'_i.
\]
We write \( S <^i S' \) if and only if \( S \leq^i S' \) and \( S \neq S' \).

Observe that \( \leq^i \) is a partial order on \((\mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\})^n\) (transitivity follows from the fact that if \( S \leq^i S' \) then \( g_i(S) = g_i(S') \)).

### 4.9. Proposition

Let \( n \geq 3 \).

(a) Suppose that \( S^*, S \in (\mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\})^n \) and \( i \in \{1, \ldots, n\} \) satisfy \( S^* \leq^i S \). If \( B_{S^*} \) is rigid then so is \( B_S \).

(b) Let \( S, S' \in (\mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\})^n \), and suppose that there exist \( i \in \{1, \ldots, n\} \) and \( S^* \in (\mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\})^n \) such that \( S^* <^i S \) and \( S^* <^i S' \). Then \( B_S \) is rigid if and only if \( B_{S'} \) is rigid.

**Proof.** (b) We may assume that \( i = n \). Consider \( S = (a_1, \ldots, a_n) \), \( S' = (a'_1, \ldots, a'_n) \) and \( S^* = (a^*_1, \ldots, a^*_n) \) satisfying \( S^* <^n S \) and \( S^* <^n S' \). The hypothesis implies that
\[
S_n = S^*_n = S'_n, \quad g \mid a^*_n \mid a_n \quad \text{and} \quad g \mid a^*_n \mid a'_n,
\]
where \( g = g_n(S) = g_n(S^*) = g_n(S') \). Let \( L = \text{lcm}(a_1, \ldots, a_{n-1}) \) and define an \( \mathbb{N} \)-grading on \( R = \mathbb{k}[X_1, \ldots, X_n] \) by declaring that (for each \( i = 1, \ldots, n-1 \)) \( X_i \) is homogeneous of degree \( \frac{a^*_i}{g} \cdot \frac{a_i}{g} \). Then \( f = X_1^{a_1} + \cdots + X_{n-1}^{a_{n-1}} \) is homogeneous of degree \( \frac{a}{g} \).

Consider the rings
\[
A = R[u]/(f + u^{a_n}), \quad B = R[z]/(f + z^{a_n}), \quad B' = R[w]/(f + w^{a_n}).
\]
Observe that \( A \cong B_{S^*}, B \cong B_S \) and \( B' \cong B_{S'} \). The reader may verify that \( a_n \nmid \deg f, a'_n \nmid \deg f \) and \( \gcd(a_n, \deg f) = a^*_n = \gcd(a'_n, \deg f) \); thus each one of the pairs \((A, B), (A, B')\) satisfies the hypothesis of Corollary 4.10. By that result, \( B \) is rigid \(\iff\) \( |u|_A \geq 2 \), so \(B'\) is rigid, so (b) is proved. It also follows that (a) is true, because if \( A \) is rigid then \( |u|_A = \infty \geq 2 \), so \( B \) is rigid. \(\square\)

### 4.10. Corollary

(a) If \( k_1, k_2, k_3, k_4 \) are pairwise relatively prime positive integers and \( a \geq 3 \) then \( B_{ak_1,ak_2,ak_3,ak_4} \) is rigid.

(b) If \( k_1, \ldots, k_n \) are pairwise relatively prime positive integers and \( a \geq n \geq 4 \) then \( B_{ak_1,\ldots,ak_n} \) is rigid.

**Proof.** Define \( S^0 = (a, a, a, a) \) to prove (a), and \( S^0 = (\underbrace{a, \ldots, a}_{n}) \) to prove (b). Note that \( B_{S^0} \) is rigid (by Theorem 1.3(c) if \( S^0 = (3, 3, 3, 3) \), by Corollary 4.6 in the other cases). Define \( S^1 = (ak_1, a, a, \ldots) \), \( S^2 = (ak_1, ak_2, a, a, \ldots) \), \ldots, \( S^{n-1} = (ak_1, \ldots, ak_{n-1}, a) \), \( S^n = (ak_1, \ldots, ak_n) \); then \( S^0 \leq S^1 \leq S^2 \leq \cdots \leq S^{n-1} \leq S^n \). Since \( B_{S^0} \) is rigid, so is \( B_{S^n} \) by Proposition 4.9. \(\square\)

### 4.11. Lemma

Given \( n \geq 3 \) and \( S = (a_1, \ldots, a_n) \in (\mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\})^n \),
\[
J(S) = \{ j \mid S \text{ is not minimal with respect to } <^j \}.
\]

**Proof.** If \( j \in J(S) \) then \( a_j \nmid \text{lcm}(S_j) \), so \( g_j(S) \neq a_j \) and hence
\[
(a_1, \ldots, a_{j-1}, g_j(S), a_{j+1}, \ldots, a_n) <^j S.
\]
Conversely, if \( (a'_1, \ldots, a'_{n}) <^j S \) then \( g_j(S) \mid a'_j \mid a_j \) and \( a'_j \neq a_j \), so \( j \in J(S) \). \(\square\)
4.12. Proposition. Let \( n \geq 3 \), \( S = (a_1, \ldots, a_n) \in (\mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\})^n \) and 
\[
I(S) = \{1, \ldots, n\} \setminus J(S) = \{ i \mid a_i \text{ divides } \text{lcm}(S_i) \}.
\]
If \( \sum_{i \in I(S)} \frac{1}{a_i} < \frac{1}{n-2} \) then \( B_S \) is rigid.

Proof. Let us write \( I = I(S) \) and \( J = J(S) \). If \( J = \emptyset \) then \( \sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{1}{a_i} < \frac{1}{n-2} \) so we are done by Theorem 1.2. Assume that \( J \neq \emptyset \) and let \( j_1 < \cdots < j_k \) be the elements of \( J \). Choose distinct primes \( p_{j_1}, \ldots, p_{j_k} \) such that \( \text{gcd}(\prod_{j \in J} p_j, \prod_{i=1}^{n} a_i) = 1 \). Choose positive integers \( e_{j_1}, \ldots, e_{j_k} \) such that \( \sum_{i \in I} \frac{1}{a_i} + \sum_{j \in J} \frac{1}{e_j} p_j < \frac{1}{n-2} \). We inductively define a sequence \( S^0, S^1, \ldots, S^k \) of elements of \((\mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\})^n\) by setting \( S^0 = S \) and, for each \( \nu = 1, \ldots, k \),
\[
S^\nu = \text{componentwise product } (1, \ldots, 1, p_{j_\nu}^{e_{j_\nu}}, 1, \ldots, 1) \cdot S^{\nu-1}
\]
where the \( p_{j_\nu}^{e_{j_\nu}} \) is in the \( j_\nu \)-th position. The reader can check that \( J(S^\nu) = J(S) = J \) for all \( \nu \) and that \( S^0 \leq_j S^1 \leq_j S^2 \leq_j \cdots \leq_j S^k \).

Let \( \nu \in \{1, \ldots, k\} \); since \( j_\nu \in J = (J(S^{\nu-1})) \), Lemma 4.11 implies that \( S^{\nu-1} \) is not minimal with respect to \( \leq_j \), i.e., there exists \( S^{\nu-1}_\nu \in (\mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\})^n \) satisfying \( S^{\nu-1}_\nu \leq_j S^{\nu-1} <_j S^{\nu} \); then Proposition 4.9(b) implies that \( B_{S^{\nu-1}} \) is rigid if and only if \( B_{S^\nu} \) is rigid. As this holds for all \( \nu \in \{1, \ldots, k\} \), \( B_S = B_{S^0} \) is rigid if and only if \( B_{S^k} \) is rigid. Now \( B_{S^k} \) is indeed rigid by Theorem 1.2 because if we write \( S^k = (a'_1, \ldots, a'_n) \) then \( \sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{1}{a'_i} = \sum_{i \in I} \frac{1}{a_i} + \sum_{j \in J} \frac{1}{a_j p_j} < \frac{1}{n-2} \). So \( B_S \) is rigid. \( \Box \)

Proposition 4.12 shows that many Pham-Brieskorn varieties that are not shown to be rigid by Theorems 1.1 and 1.3 are indeed rigid. In the case \( n = 4 \), the following is an immediate consequence of Proposition 4.12.

4.13. Corollary. If \( a, b, c, d \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\} \) satisfy \( a \mid \text{lcm}(b, c, d) \) and \( \frac{1}{b} + \frac{1}{c} + \frac{1}{d} < \frac{1}{2} \) then \( B_{a, b, c, d} \) is rigid.

We need the following:

4.14. Corollary. Let \( n \geq 4 \) and \( S \in (\mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\})^n \). Consider \( B_S = k[x_1, \ldots, x_n] \) with \( x_1, \ldots, x_n \) as in Definition 4.1. Then for every \( D \in \text{HLND}(B_S) \) the following conditions hold.

(a) If \( j \in J(S) \) then \( D^2(x_j) = 0 \).

(b) If \( j_1, j_2 \) are distinct elements of \( J(S) \) then \( D(x_{j_1}) = 0 \) or \( D(x_{j_2}) = 0 \).

Proof. In view of Lemma 4.3(b), this is a special case of Corollary 6.3 of \[. \]

4.15. Proposition. Let \( n \geq 4 \) and \( S \in (\mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\})^n \). Assume that \( J(S) \neq \emptyset \) and that 
\[
(*) \quad B_{S_J} \text{ is rigid for every subset } J \text{ of } J(S) \text{ satisfying } |J| = \min(|J(S)| - 1, n - 3).
\]
Then \( B_S \) is rigid.

Proof. If \( |J(S)| = 1 \) then \( \min(|J(S)| - 1, n - 3) = 0 \), so (*) reads “\( B_S \) is rigid,” so the Proposition is trivially true in this case. From now-on, we assume that \( |J(S)| > 1 \). By contradiction, assume that \( B_S \) is not rigid. Then \( \text{HLND}(B_S) \neq \emptyset \) by 3.8. Choose an irreducible \( D \in \text{HLND}(B_S) \setminus \{0\} \) (this is possible by 2.2(a)). By Corollary 4.14 we have \( D(x_{j_1}) = 0 \) or \( D(x_{j_2}) = 0 \) for every choice of distinct \( j_1, j_2 \in J(S) \). So there exists a subset \( J' \) of \( J(S) \) such that \( |J'| = |J(S)| - 1 \) and \( D(x_j) = 0 \) for all \( j \in J' \); hence there exists a \( J \subseteq J' \subset J(S) \) such that \( |J| = \min(|J(S)| - 1, n - 3) \) and \( D(x_j) = 0 \) for all \( j \in J \). We might as well assume that \( J = \{m + 1, m + 2, \ldots, n\} \) for some \( m \geq 3 \). For each \( i \) such that \( m \leq i \leq n \) we define \( P(i) \) to be the statement
there exists an irreducible $D_i \in \text{HLND}(B_{a_1, \ldots, a_n}) \setminus \{0\}$
	satisfying $D_i(x_j) = 0$ for all $j \in \{1, \ldots, i\} \cap J$
where $x_j$ denotes the image of $X_j$ in $B_{a_1, \ldots, a_n}$. Then $P(n)$ is true, with $D_n = D$. Assume that $i$ is such that $m < i \leq n$ and such that $P(i)$ is true. Note that $i \in J$, so $D_i(x_i) = 0$, so $D_i$ induces a homogeneous locally nilpotent derivation $\tilde{D}_i$ of the ring $B_{a_1, \ldots, a_i}/\langle x_i \rangle \cong B_{a_1, \ldots, a_{i-1}}$, and $\tilde{D}_i \neq 0$ because $D_i$ is irreducible. Moreover, $D_i(x_j) = 0$ for all $j \in \{1, \ldots, i - 1\} \cap J$. By Lemma 2.2(c), there exists an irreducible $D_{i-1} \in \text{HLND}(B_{a_1, \ldots, a_{i-1}}) \setminus \{0\}$ such that $\ker D_{i-1} = \ker \tilde{D}_i$, so $P(i - 1)$ is true. By descending induction, $P(n), P(n - 1), \ldots, P(m)$ are all true. Since $P(m)$ is true and $S_J = (a_1, \ldots, a_m)$, we have $D_m \in \text{HLND}(B_{S_j}) \setminus \{0\}$, so $B_{S_j}$ is not rigid, contradicting (*). 

We generalize Theorem 1.3(e):

4.16. Corollary. Let $n \geq 4$ and $S \in T_n$. If $\text{cotype}(S) \geq n - 2$, then $B_S$ is rigid.

Proof. We use the following notation:

If $a_1, \ldots, a_m \in (\mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\})^m (m \geq 1)$ satisfy $a_i \mid \text{lcm}(a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_i, \ldots, a_m)$ for all $i \in \{1, \ldots, m\}$, then $B_{a_1, \ldots, a_m} \in 3, 3, 3$ is rigid.

Indeed, let $S = (a_1, \ldots, a_m, 3, 3, 3)$, then $J(S) = \{1, \ldots, m\}$ and (by Theorem 1.3(c)) $B_{a_i, 3, 3, 3}$ is rigid for each $i \in J(S)$, so $B_S$ is rigid by Proposition 4.15. For instance, $B_{2, 5, 7, 3, 3, 3}$ is rigid.

4.18. Notation. Given $S = (a_1, \ldots, a_n) \in (\mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\})^n (n \geq 2)$ and a subset $M$ of $\{1, \ldots, n\}$, define a positive integer $\Delta_M(S)$ by $\Delta_M(S) = 1$ and

$$\Delta_M(S) = \frac{\text{lcm}(S)}{\text{gcd}\{\text{lcm}(S_j) \mid j \in M\}}$$

if $M \neq \emptyset$.

Observe that $\Delta_M(S) = \Delta_{J(S) \cap M}(S)$ and $\Delta_M(S) = 1 \iff M \cap J(S) = \emptyset$,

because $\text{lcm}(S_j) = \text{lcm}(S)$ for each $j \in \{1, \ldots, n\} \setminus J(S)$, and $\text{lcm}(S_j)$ is a proper divisor of $\text{lcm}(S)$ for each $j \in J(S)$.

4.19. Proposition. Let $n \geq 4$, $S \in (\mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\})^n$ and $M = \{j \in J(S) \mid B_{S_j} \text{ is rigid}\}$.

(a) $\mathbb{Z}(\ker D) \subseteq \Delta_M(S) \cdot \mathbb{Z}$ for all $D \in \text{HLND}(B_S) \setminus \{0\}$.

(b) $\Delta_M(S) = 1 \iff M = \emptyset$

Proof. We use the following notation: $S = (a_1, \ldots, a_n), \bar{S} = (d_1, \ldots, d_n), x_1, \ldots, x_n$ as in Definition 1.1. Let $L = \text{lcm}(S)$ and, for each $i \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$, $L_i = \text{lcm}(S_i)$ and $\delta_i = \text{gcd}(d_1, \ldots, \hat{d}_i \ldots, d_n)$. Then $\delta_i = \text{gcd}(\frac{L_a}{a_i}, \ldots, \frac{L_{a_n}}{a_i}) = \frac{L}{\delta_i} \text{gcd}(\frac{L_1}{a_i}, \ldots, \hat{L_i} \ldots, \frac{L_n}{a_i}) = \frac{L}{\delta_i}$ for each $i \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$, so $\text{lcm}(\delta_j : j \in M) = \text{lcm}(\frac{L_j}{\delta_j} : j \in M) = \frac{L_j}{\text{gcd}(L_j : j \in M)} = \Delta_M(S)$ and consequently $\bigcap_{j \in M} \delta_j \mathbb{Z} = \Delta_M(S) \cdot \mathbb{Z}$. So, to prove (a), it suffices to show that

(1) for each $D \in \text{HLND}(B_S) \setminus \{0\}$ and each $j \in M$, $\mathbb{Z}(\ker D) \subseteq \delta_j \mathbb{Z}$.

We prove this by contradiction: suppose that $D \in \text{HLND}(B_S) \setminus \{0\}$ and $j \in M$ satisfy $\mathbb{Z}(\ker D) \nsubseteq \delta_j \mathbb{Z}$. By Lemma 2.2(c), there exists an irreducible $D' \in \text{HLND}(B_S) \setminus \{0\}$ with $\ker(D') = \ker(D)$, so we
may choose $D$ irreducible. Then there exists a homogeneous element $h \in \ker(D) \setminus \{0\}$ such that deg$(h) \notin \delta_1 \mathbb{Z}$. We can write $h = \sum_{(i_1, \ldots, i_n) \in E} \lambda_{i_1, \ldots, i_n} x_1^{i_1} \cdots x_n^{i_n}$ for some finite set $E \subset \mathbb{N}^n$, where for each $(i_1, \ldots, i_n) \in E$ we have $\lambda_{i_1, \ldots, i_n} \in k^*$ and deg$(x_1^{i_1} \cdots x_n^{i_n}) = \deg(h) \notin \delta_1 \mathbb{Z}$. So for each $(i_1, \ldots, i_n) \in E$ we have deg$(x_j^{i_j}) \notin \delta_1 \mathbb{Z}$ and in particular $i_j > 0$. This shows that $x_j \mid h$ in $B_S$. Since ker$(D)$ is factorially closed in $B_S$, we get $x_j \in \ker(D)$. Then $D$ induces a locally nilpotent derivation $\bar{D}$ of the ring $B_S/(x_j) \cong B_{S_j}$, and $\bar{D} \neq 0$ because $D(B_S) \not\subset \langle x_j \rangle$ (since $D$ is irreducible).

So $B_{S_j}$ is not rigid, which contradicts $j \in M$. This proves (1), so assertion (a) is proved. Part (b) follows from the observation (made in [1,18]) that, for any subset $M$ of $\{1, \ldots, n\}$, we have $\Delta_M(S) = 1$ if and only if $M \cap J(S) = \emptyset$. 

It immediately follows:

4.20. Corollary. Let $n \geq 4$ and $S \in (\mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\})^n$. If some $D \in \text{HLND}(B_S) \setminus \{0\}$ satisfies $\mathbb{Z}(\ker D) = \mathbb{Z}$ then $B_{S_j}$ is non-rigid for every $j \in J(S)$.

Here is another consequence of Proposition 4.19 valid for $n = 4$:

4.21. Corollary. Let $S \in T_4$ be such that cotype$(S) > 0$ and define $\delta = \Delta_I(S) \in \mathbb{Z}$. Then

\[ \delta > 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbb{Z}(\ker D) \subseteq \delta \mathbb{Z} \quad \text{for all} \quad D \in \text{HLND}(B_S) \setminus \{0\}. \]

Proof. We have $J(S) \neq \emptyset$ because cotype$(S) > 0$. If $j \in J(S)$ then $S_j \in T_3$, so $B_{S_j}$ is rigid by Theorem [1,11]. So the set $M = \{ j \in J(S) \mid B_{S_j} \text{ is rigid} \}$ of Proposition 4.19 is equal to $J(S)$ (which is not empty). The desired conclusion follows from Proposition 4.19.

5. A remark about Proj$(B_S)$

As in the preceding section, we assume that $k$ is a field of characteristic zero.

5.1. Proposition (Exercise 9.5 in [7]). Let $R = R_0 \oplus R_1 \oplus R_2 \oplus \ldots$ be an $\mathbb{N}$-graded Noetherian ring, let $d > 0$ and let $R^{(d)} = R_0 \oplus R_d \oplus R_{2d} \oplus \ldots$. Then Proj$R \cong \text{Proj}R^{(d)}$.

5.2. Proposition. Let $S = (a_1, \ldots, a_n)$, $S' = (a'_1, \ldots, a'_n) \in (\mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\})^n (n \geq 3)$ and assume that $i \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$ is such that $S \leq_i S'$. Then $B_S \cong B_S^{(k)}$, where we define $k = a'_i/a_i \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}$. Consequently, Proj$B_S \cong \text{Proj}B_{S'}$.

Proof. We may assume that $i = 1$. Define $(d_1, \ldots, d_n) = \overline{S}$ and $(d'_1, \ldots, d'_n) = \overline{S'}$. Let us prove:

(2) \[ (d'_1, \ldots, d'_n) = (d_1, kd_2, \ldots, kd_n) \quad \text{and} \quad \gcd(d_1, k) = 1. \]

Let $L = \text{lcm}(S)$, $L' = \text{lcm}(S')$, and $L_1 = \text{lcm}(S_1) = \text{lcm}(S'_1)$. Let $g_1 = g_1(S') = g_1(S)$, i.e., $g_1 = \gcd(a'_1, L_1) = \gcd(a_1, L_1)$. We have $L = \text{lcm}(a_1, L_1) = a_1 L_1/g_1$ and $L' = \text{lcm}(a'_1, L_1) = a'_1 L_1/g_1$, so for each $j \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$, we have $d_j = L/a_j = \frac{a_1 L_1}{a_1 g_1}$ and $d'_j = L'/a'_j = \frac{a'_1 L_1}{a'_1 g_1}$. This gives $d'_1 = L_1/g_1 = d_1$ and, for $j \neq 1$, $d'_j = \frac{a'_1 L_1}{a_1 g_1} = \frac{a'_1 L_1}{a'_1 g_1} = k d_j$; this proves the first part of (2).

Since $\gcd(d_1, k)$ is a divisor of $\gcd(d_1, kd_2, \ldots, kd_n) = \gcd(d'_1, \ldots, d'_n) = 1$, (2) is proved. Now let $\Phi : k[X_1, \ldots, X_n] \to k[Y_1, \ldots, Y_n]$ be the $k$-homomorphism that sends $X_1$ to $Y_1^k$ and $X_j$ to $Y_j$ for $j > 1$. Noting that $Y_1^{a_1} + \cdots + Y_n^{a_n} = Y_1^{k a_1} + Y_2^{a_2} + \cdots + Y_n^{a_n}$, we see that $\Phi^{-1}(Y_1^{a_1} + \cdots + Y_n^{a_n}) = \langle X_1^{a_1} + \cdots + X_n^{a_n} \rangle$, so $\Phi$ induces an injective homomorphism

\[ \varphi : B_S = k[X_1, \ldots, X_n]/\langle X_1^{a_1} + \cdots + X_n^{a_n} \rangle \to B_{S'} = k[Y_1, \ldots, Y_n]/\langle Y_1^{a_1} + \cdots + Y_n^{a_n} \rangle. \]
Then $B_S \cong \varphi(B_S) = k[y_1^3, y_2, \ldots, y_n]$. Since $\deg(y_j) = d_j$ for all $j$, (2) implies that $B_S^{(k)} = k[y_1^3, y_2, \ldots, y_n]$ and that $\varphi$ is homogeneous (meaning $\varphi((B_S)_i) \subseteq (B_S')_{ki}$ for all $i \in \mathbb{N}$); so $B_S \cong B_S^{(k)}$ as graded rings. Then $\text{Proj } B_S \cong \text{Proj } B_S'$ follows from Proposition 5.1. □

5.3. Remark. It is interesting to observe that the geometry of $\text{Proj } B_S$ is in general not sufficient to determine whether or not $B_S$ is rigid (whereas the geometry of $\text{Spec } B_S$ is of course sufficient). For example, let $S = (2, 3, 3, 2)$, $S' = (2, 3, 3, 4)$ and $S'' = (10, 3, 3, 4)$. Since $S <^4 S' <^1 S''$, Proposition 5.2 implies that $\text{Proj } B_S \cong \text{Proj } B_{S'} \cong \text{Proj } B_{S''}$. However, $B_S = B_{2, 3, 3, 2}$ is not rigid because $(2, 3, 3, 2) \notin T_4$, and $B_{S''} = B_{10, 3, 3, 4}$ is rigid by Theorem 6.3(e). Interestingly, we don’t know whether $B_{S'}$ is rigid or not.

6. Stable Rigidity

6.1. Lemma. Let $E \subseteq F$ be a field extension, $m \geq 1$, $t_1, \ldots, t_m$ independent indeterminates over $F$ and $f, g \in E[t_1, \ldots, t_m] \subseteq F[t_1, \ldots, t_m]$. Then $f, g$ are relatively prime in $E[t_1, \ldots, t_m]$ if and only if they are relatively prime in $F[t_1, \ldots, t_m]$.

Verification of the above Lemma is left to the reader. We quote Theorem 3.1 of [6]:

6.2. Theorem. Let $m \geq 1$, $n \geq 3$, $g_1, \ldots, g_n \in \mathbb{C}[t_1, \ldots, t_m] = \mathbb{C}^{[m]}$ and $a_1, \ldots, a_n \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}$ be such that:

- $g_1^{a_1} + \cdots + g_n^{a_n} = 0$
- $g_1, \ldots, g_n$ are not all constant
- given any $1 \leq i_1 < \cdots < i_s \leq n$ such that $g_{i_1}^{a_{i_1}} + \cdots + g_{i_s}^{a_{i_s}} = 0$, we have $\gcd(g_{i_1}, \ldots, g_{i_s}) = 1$.

Then $\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{a_i} > \frac{1}{d-1}$ where $d$ is the dimension of the $\mathbb{C}$-vector space spanned by $g_1^{a_1}, \ldots, g_n^{a_n}$.

6.3. Corollary. Let $K$ be a field of characteristic zero, $m \geq 1$, $n \geq 3$, $g_1, \ldots, g_n \in K[t_1, \ldots, t_m] = K^{[m]}$ and $a_1, \ldots, a_n \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}$ be such that:

(i) $g_1^{a_1} + \cdots + g_n^{a_n} = 0$
(ii) $\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{a_i} \leq \frac{1}{n-2}$
(iii) $g_1, \ldots, g_n$ are pairwise relatively prime.

Then $g_1, \ldots, g_n \in K$.

Proof. First consider the case where $K = \mathbb{C}$. Let $d$ be the dimension of the $\mathbb{C}$-vector space spanned by $g_1^{a_1}, \ldots, g_n^{a_n}$. Note that $d < n$ by (i); if $d \leq 1$ then the conclusion ($g_1, \ldots, g_n \in K$) immediately follows from (iii), so we may assume that $1 < d < n$. Then $\frac{1}{d-1}$ is defined and $\frac{1}{d-1} \geq \frac{1}{n-2}$. So (ii) gives $\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{a_i} \leq \frac{1}{d-1}$ and Theorem 6.2 implies that $g_1, \ldots, g_n \in K$. So the case $K = \mathbb{C}$ of Corollary 6.3 is true.

Now let $K$ be arbitrary. Let $K_0 \subseteq K$ be the extension of $\mathbb{Q}$ generated by the coefficients of $g_1, \ldots, g_n$. Then $K_0$ can be embedded in $\mathbb{C}$; more precisely, if we choose a sufficiently large overfield $L$ of $K$ then we may find a copy of $\mathbb{C}$ in $L$ forming a diagram of fields as in the left part of: 

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
K_0 & \subsetneq & K \\
& \subsetneq \ & \subsetneq \\
& \subsetneq \ & \subsetneq \ & \subsetneq \\
K_0[t_1, \ldots, t_m] & \subsetneq \ & \subsetneq \\
& \subsetneq \ & \subsetneq \\
& \subsetneq \ & \subsetneq \\
\mathbb{C}[t_1, \ldots, t_m] & \subseteq \ & \subseteq \\
& \subseteq \ & \subseteq \\
& \subseteq \ & \subseteq \\
L[t_1, \ldots, t_m] & \subseteq \ & \subseteq \\
& \subseteq \ & \subseteq \\
& \subseteq \ & \subseteq \\
L & \subseteq \ & \subseteq \\
& \subseteq \ & \subseteq \\
& \subseteq \ & \subseteq \\
\end{array}
\]
Now $g_1, \ldots, g_n \in K_0[t_1, \ldots, t_m] \subseteq \mathbb{C}[t_1, \ldots, t_m]$ are pairwise relatively prime in $\mathbb{C}[t_1, \ldots, t_m]$ by Lemma 6.3. So $g_1, \ldots, g_n$ satisfy (i-iii) as elements of $\mathbb{C}[t_1, \ldots, t_m]$. By the case $K = \mathbb{C}$ of Corollary 6.3, we get $g_1, \ldots, g_n \in \mathbb{C}$, so $g_1, \ldots, g_n \in K$. □

We need the notion of relatively prime elements of an arbitrary domain.

6.4. Definition. Let $x, y \in B$ where $B$ is a domain. One says that $x, y$ are relatively prime in $B$ if the following hold:

(i) $xB \cap yB = xyB$
(ii) if $0 \in \{x, y\}$ then $\{x, y\} \cap B^* \neq \emptyset$.

Note that this agrees with the usual notion when $B$ is a UFD.

6.5. Remark. Let $x, y$ be relatively prime elements of a domain $B$.

(a) If $S$ is a multiplicative set of $B$ such that $0 \notin S$, then $x, y$ are relatively prime in $S^{-1}B$.
(b) If $A$ is a factorially closed subring of $B$ such that $x, y \in A$, then $x, y$ are relatively prime in $A$.
(c) If $B' = B^{[N]}$ for some $N \geq 0$ then $x, y$ are relatively prime in $B'$.

6.6. Definition. Let $B$ be a domain of characteristic zero.

(a) $\text{ML}(B) = \bigcap_{D \in \text{LND}(B)} \ker(D)$
(b) The rigid core of $B$ is defined as $\bigcap_{i=0}^{\infty} \text{ML}_i(B)$, where one defines $\text{ML}_0(B) = B$ and $\text{ML}_{i+1}(B) = \text{ML}(\text{ML}_i(B))$ for all $i$.

The next result generalizes Theorem 6.1(a) of [10].

6.7. Theorem. Let $B$ be a domain of characteristic zero, $n \geq 3$, $x_1, \ldots, x_n \in B$ and $a_1, \ldots, a_n \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}$. Assume that

(i) $x_1^{a_1} + \cdots + x_n^{a_n} = 0$
(ii) $\sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{1}{a_i} \leq \frac{1}{n-2}$
(iii) $x_1, \ldots, x_n$ are pairwise relatively prime in $B$.

Then $x_1, \ldots, x_n \in \text{ML}(R)$ in each of the following cases:

(a) $R$ is a factorially closed subring of $B$ satisfying $x_1, \ldots, x_n \in R$;
(b) $R = B^{[N]}$ for some $N$.

Moreover, $x_1, \ldots, x_n$ belong to the rigid core of $B$.

Proof. (a) Let $R$ be a factorially closed subring of $B$ satisfying $x_1, \ldots, x_n \in R$. Let $D \in \text{LND}(R)$ and let $A = \ker(D)$; we claim that $x_1, \ldots, x_n \in A$. To show this, we may assume that $D \neq 0$. Let $S = A \setminus \{0\}$, then $S^{-1}R = K^{[1]}$ where we set $K = \text{Frac}(A)$. Note that $x_1, \ldots, x_n$ are pairwise relatively prime in $R$ by Remark 6.5(b), so they are pairwise relatively prime in $S^{-1}R = K^{[1]}$ by Remark 6.5(a). Then $x_1, \ldots, x_n \in K$ by Corollary 6.3. As $A$ is factorially closed in $R$, we have $R \cap K = A$ and hence $x_1, \ldots, x_n \in A$. This argument shows that $x_1, \ldots, x_n \in \text{ML}(R)$, so case (a) is proved.

(b) Assume that $R = B^{[N]}$ for some $N$. Then $x_1, \ldots, x_n$ are pairwise relatively prime in $R$ by Remark 6.5(c). Applying part (a) to $x_1, \ldots, x_n \in R$ shows that $x_1, \ldots, x_n \in \text{ML}(R')$ for any factorially closed subring $R'$ of $R$ containing $x_1, \ldots, x_n$; in particular, $x_1, \ldots, x_n \in \text{ML}(R)$. So we are done in case (b).

Observe that $x_1, \ldots, x_n \in \text{ML}_0(B)$ and that if $i$ is such that $x_1, \ldots, x_n \in \text{ML}_i(B)$ then $x_1, \ldots, x_n \in \text{ML}_{i+1}(B)$ ($R = \text{ML}_i(B)$ is a factorially closed subring of $B$, so case (a) gives $x_1, \ldots, x_n \in \text{ML}(R)$). So $x_1, \ldots, x_n$ belong to the rigid core of $B$. □
One says that a ring $B$ of characteristic zero is stably rigid if $B \subseteq \text{ML}(R)$ for every over-ring $R$ of $B$ such that $R = B[N]$ for some $N$. In the following statement, we set $B_{a_1,\ldots,a_n} = k[X_1,\ldots,X_n]/(X_1^{a_1} + \cdots + X_n^{a_n})$ where $k$ is a field of characteristic zero.

6.8. Corollary. Let $n \geq 3$ and $(a_1,\ldots,a_n) \in (\mathbb{N}\setminus\{0\})^n$ be such that $\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{a_i} \leq \frac{1}{n-2}$. Then $B_{a_1,\ldots,a_n}$ is stably rigid.

Proof. The case $n = 3$ is known (Theorem 7.1(b) of [10]), so we may assume that $n \geq 4$. Write $B = B_{a_1,\ldots,a_n} = k[x_1,\ldots,x_n]$ where $x_i$ is the canonical image of $X_i$ in $B$. By Lemma 4.3, $x_1,\ldots,x_n$ are prime elements of $B$ and are pairwise relatively prime in $B$. Consider an overring $R = B[N]$ of $B$ for some $N$. Then $x_1,\ldots,x_n \in \text{ML}(R)$ by case (b) of Theorem 6.7 so $B$ is stably rigid. □
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