

On Shamsuddin derivations and the isotropy groups

Dan Yan *

MOE-LCSM,

School of Mathematics and Statistics,

Hunan Normal University, Changsha 410081, China

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

Abstract

In the paper, we give an affirmative answer to the conjecture in [1]. We prove that a Shamsuddin derivation D is simple if and only if $\text{Aut}(K[x, y_1, \dots, y_n])_D = \{id\}$. In addition, we calculate the isotropy groups of the Shamsuddin derivations $D = \partial_x + \sum_{j=1}^r (a(x)y_j + b_j(x))\partial_j$ of $K[x, y_1, \dots, y_r]$. We also prove that $\text{Im } D$ is a Mathieu-Zhao subspace if and only if $a(x) \in K$.

Keywords. Simple Shamsuddin Derivations, Isotropy Group, Mathieu-Zhao subspace

MSC(2010). 13N15; 14R10; 13P05.

1 Introduction

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

*The author is supported by the NSF of China (Grant No. 11871241; 11601146), the China Scholarship Council and the Construct Program of the Key Discipline in Hunan Province.

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

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

for any $a, b \in R$ and $D(c) = 0$ for any $c \in K$. The set of all K -derivations of R is denoted by $\text{Der}_K(R)$. An ideal I of R is called D -stable if $D(I) \subset I$. R is called D -simple if it has no proper nonzero D -stable ideal. The K -derivation D is called simple if R has no D -stable ideals other than 0 and R . For some examples of simple derivations, see [2], [4], [5], [7], [9].

Let $\text{Aut}(R)$ act on $\text{Der}_K(R)$ by:

$$(\rho, D) \rightarrow \rho^{-1} \circ D \circ \rho = \rho^{-1} D \rho.$$

The isotropy subgroup is defined to be:

$$\text{Aut}(R)_D := \{\rho \in \text{Aut}(R) | \rho D = D \rho\}.$$

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

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

with $a_i, b_{i,j} \in K[x]$ for every i and every (i, j) , $a_i \neq a_l$ for $i \neq l$. A derivation D of R is said to be locally finite if, for each $a \in R$, the K -subspace spanned by $D^i(a)$ ($i \geq 1$) is finite dimension over K .

The Mathieu-Zhao subspace was introduced by Zhao in [11] and [12], which is a natural generalization of ideals. We give the definition here for the polynomial rings. A K -subspace M of R is said to be a Mathieu-Zhao subspace if for any $a, b \in R$ with $a^m \in M$ for all $m \geq 1$, we have $ba^m \in M$ when $m \gg 0$.

In [1], L.N.Bertoncello and D.Levcovitz have proved that the isotropy group of simple Shamsuddin derivations is trivial. They also proposed the following conjecture.

Conjecture 1.1. *If D is a Shamsuddin derivation of $K[x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n]$, then D is simple if, and only if $\text{Aut}(K[x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n])_D = \{id\}$.*

In our paper, we give an affirmative answer to the conjecture. In addition, we calculate the isotropy groups of the Shamsuddin derivations $D = \partial_x + \sum_{j=1}^r (a(x)y_j + b_j(x))\partial_j$ of $K[x, y_1, \dots, y_r]$. In section 3, we also prove that $\text{Im } D$ is a Mathieu-Zhao subspace if and only if $a(x) \in K$.

2 Affirmative answer to the conjecture in [1]

Lemma 2.1. *Let $D = \partial_x + \sum_{j=1}^r b_j(x)\partial_j$ be a derivation of $K[x, y_1, \dots, y_r]$. Then $\text{Aut}(K[x, y_1, \dots, y_r])_D = \{(f, g_1, \dots, g_r)\}$, where $f = x + p(y_1 - h_1(x), \dots, y_r - h_r(x))$, $g_t = \sum_{k=0}^{m_t} \frac{1}{k+1} b_{t,k} f^{k+1} + q_t(y_1 - h_1(x), \dots, y_r - h_r(x))$, where $b_t(x) = \sum_{k=0}^{m_t} b_{t,k} x^k$, $h_t(x) = \int b_t(x) dx$ for all $1 \leq t \leq r$, $p \in K[y_1 - h_1(x), \dots, y_r - h_r(x)]$, (f, q_1, \dots, q_r) is any polynomial automorphism of $K[x, y_1, \dots, y_r]$.*

Proof. Let $\rho \in \text{Aut}(K[x, y_1, \dots, y_r])_D$ with $\rho(x) = f(x, y_1, \dots, y_r)$, $\rho(y_t) = g_t(x, y_1, \dots, y_r)$ for all $1 \leq t \leq r$. Then we have the following equations:

$$(2.1) \quad D(\rho(x)) = \rho(D(x))$$

$$(2.2) \quad D(\rho(y_t)) = \rho(D(y_t))$$

for all $1 \leq t \leq r$. That is,

$$(2.3) \quad f_x + \sum_{j=1}^r b_j(x) f_{y_j} = 1$$

$$(2.4) \quad g_{tx} + \sum_{j=1}^r b_j(x) g_{ty_j} = b_t(f)$$

for all $1 \leq t \leq r$. Let $\bar{x} = x$, $\bar{y}_j = y_j - h_j(x)$, where $h_j(x) = \int b_j(x) dx$ for all $1 \leq j \leq r$. Then it follows from equation (2.3) that $f_{\bar{x}} = 1$. Thus, we have $f = \bar{x} + p(\bar{y}_1, \dots, \bar{y}_r)$ for some $p \in K[\bar{y}_1, \dots, \bar{y}_r]$. That is, $f = x + p(y_1 - h_1(x), \dots, y_r - h_r(x))$. Since $b_t(x) = \sum_{k=0}^{m_t} b_{t,k} x^k$, it follows from equation (2.4) that $g_{t\bar{x}} = \sum_{k=0}^{m_t} b_{t,k} f^k$. Thus, we have

$$g_t = \sum_{k=0}^{m_t} \frac{1}{k+1} b_{t,k} f^{k+1} + q_t(\bar{y}_1, \dots, \bar{y}_r)$$

for some $q_t(\bar{y}_1, \dots, \bar{y}_r) \in K[\bar{y}_1, \dots, \bar{y}_r]$ and for all $1 \leq t \leq r$. Since $\rho \in \text{Aut}(K[x, y_1, \dots, y_r])_D$, we have that (f, q_1, \dots, q_r) is a polynomial automorphism of $K[x, y_1, \dots, y_r]$, which completes the proof. \square

Remark 2.2. Let $D = \partial_x + \sum_{j=1}^r (a(x)y_j + b_j(x))\partial_j$ be a derivation of $K[x, y_1, \dots, y_r]$. If there exists $j_0 \in \{1, 2, \dots, r\}$ such that $b_{j_0}(x) = 0$, then it is easy to verify that $(x, y_1, \dots, \tilde{c}y_{j_0}, \dots, y_r) \in \text{Aut}(K[x, y_1, \dots, y_r])_D$ for any $\tilde{c} \in K^*$. Thus, $\text{Aut}(K[x, y_1, \dots, y_r])_D \neq \{id\}$. If $a(x) = 0$, then let $(f, q_1, \dots, q_r) = (x, \tilde{c}_1(y_1 - \sum_{k=0}^{m_1} \frac{1}{k+1} b_{1,k} x^{k+1}), \dots, \tilde{c}_r(y_r - \sum_{k=0}^{m_r} \frac{1}{k+1} b_{r,k} x^{k+1}))$ in Lemma 2.1 with $\tilde{c}_1, \dots, \tilde{c}_r \in K^*$. We have $(x, \sum_{k=0}^{m_1} \frac{1}{k+1} b_{1,k} x^{k+1} + \tilde{c}_1(y_1 - \sum_{k=0}^{m_1} \frac{1}{k+1} b_{1,k} x^{k+1}), \dots, \sum_{k=0}^{m_r} \frac{1}{k+1} b_{r,k} x^{k+1} + \tilde{c}_r(y_r - \sum_{k=0}^{m_r} \frac{1}{k+1} b_{r,k} x^{k+1})) \in \text{Aut}(K[x, y_1, \dots, y_r])_D$ for any $\tilde{c}_1, \dots, \tilde{c}_r \in K^*$. Hence $\text{Aut}(K[x, y_1, \dots, y_r])_D \neq \{id\}$ in Lemma 2.1.

Theorem 2.3. *Let $D = \partial_x + \sum_{j=1}^r (a(x)y_j + b_j(x))\partial_j$ be a Shamsuddin derivation of $K[x, y_1, \dots, y_r]$. Then the following two statements are equivalent:*

- (1) D is a simple derivation;
- (2) $\text{Aut}(K[x, y_1, \dots, y_r])_D = \{id\}$.

Proof. (1) \Rightarrow (2) It follows from Theorem 3.2 in [1].

(2) \Rightarrow (1) It follows from Theorem 3.2 in [6] that D is a simple derivation if and only if $z' = a(x)z + \sum_{j=1}^r k_j b_j(x)$ does not have any solution in $K[x]$ for every $(k_1, \dots, k_r) \in K^r \setminus \{(0, \dots, 0)\}$. Thus, it suffices to prove that if $z' = a(x)z + \sum_{j=1}^r k_j b_j(x)$ has a solution in $K[x]$ for some $(k_1, \dots, k_r) \in K^r \setminus \{(0, \dots, 0)\}$, then $\text{Aut}(K[x, y_1, \dots, y_r])_D \neq \{id\}$. It follows from Lemma 2.1 and Remark 2.2 that we can assume that $a(x)b_1(x) \cdots b_r(x) \neq 0$. Let $\rho \in \text{Aut}(K[x, y_1, \dots, y_r])_D$ and $\rho(x) = f(x, y_1, \dots, y_r)$, $\rho(y_t) = g_t(x, y_1, \dots, y_r)$ for all $1 \leq t \leq r$; $f(x, y_1, \dots, y_r) = \sum_{|\alpha|=d} f_\alpha(x) y_1^{\alpha_1} \cdots y_r^{\alpha_r} + \sum_{|\alpha|<d} f_\alpha(x) y_1^{\alpha_1} \cdots y_r^{\alpha_r}$, $g_t(x, y_1, \dots, y_r) = \sum_{|\beta_t|=n_t} g_{t,\beta_t}(x) y_1^{\beta_{t1}} \cdots y_r^{\beta_{tr}} + \sum_{|\beta_t|<n_t} g_{t,\beta_t}(x) y_1^{\beta_{t1}} \cdots y_r^{\beta_{tr}}$ with $f_\alpha(x) \neq 0$, $g_{t,\beta_t}(x) \neq 0$ for some $|\alpha| = \alpha_1 + \cdots + \alpha_r$, $|\beta_t| = \beta_{t1} + \cdots + \beta_{tr}$ and for all $1 \leq t \leq r$. Then we have the following equations:

$$(2.5) \quad D(\rho(x)) = \rho(D(x))$$

$$(2.6) \quad D(\rho(y_t)) = \rho(D(y_t))$$

for all $1 \leq t \leq r$. It follows from equation (2.5) that

$$(2.7) \quad \sum_{|\alpha|=d} f'_\alpha(x) y_1^{\alpha_1} \cdots y_r^{\alpha_r} + \sum_{|\alpha|<d} f'_\alpha(x) y_1^{\alpha_1} \cdots y_r^{\alpha_r} + \sum_{j=1}^r (a(x)y_j + b_j(x)) \times \\ \left(\sum_{|\alpha|=d} \alpha_j f_\alpha(x) y_1^{\alpha_1} \cdots y_j^{\alpha_j-1} \cdots y_r^{\alpha_r} + \sum_{|\alpha|<d} \alpha_j f_\alpha(x) y_1^{\alpha_1} \cdots y_j^{\alpha_j-1} \cdots y_r^{\alpha_r} \right) = 1$$

We view the polynomials in $K[x][y_1, \dots, y_r]$ with coefficients in $K[x]$ when we compare the coefficients of $y_1^{\alpha_1} \cdots y_r^{\alpha_r}$. If $d \geq 1$, then we have

$$(2.8) \quad f'_\alpha(x) = -(\alpha_1 + \cdots + \alpha_r)a(x)f_\alpha(x)$$

by comparing the coefficients of $y_1^{\alpha_1} \cdots y_r^{\alpha_r}$ with $|\alpha| = d$ of equation (2.7). Thus, we have $f_\alpha(x) = 0$ for all $|\alpha| = d$ by comparing the degree of x of equation (2.8), which is a contradiction. Therefore, we have $d = 0$. That is, $f(x, y_1, \dots, y_r) = f_0(x)$. It follows from equation (2.3) that $f'_0(x) = 1$. Thus, we have $f_0(x) = x + c$ for some $c \in K$. That is, $f(x, y_1, \dots, y_r) = x + c$. It follows from equation (2.6) that

$$(2.9) \quad \sum_{|\beta_t|=n_t} g'_{t,\beta_t}(x) y_1^{\beta_{t1}} \cdots y_r^{\beta_{tr}} + \sum_{|\beta_t|<n_t} g'_{t,\beta_t}(x) y_1^{\beta_{t1}} \cdots y_r^{\beta_{tr}} + \sum_{j=1}^r (a(x)y_j + b_j(x)) \cdot \\ \left(\sum_{|\beta_t|=n_t} \beta_{tj} \cdot g_{t,\beta_t}(x) y_1^{\beta_{t1}} \cdots y_j^{\beta_{tj}-1} \cdots y_r^{\beta_{tr}} + \sum_{|\beta_t|<n_t} \beta_{tj} \cdot g_{t,\beta_t}(x) y_1^{\beta_{t1}} \cdots y_j^{\beta_{tj}-1} \cdots y_r^{\beta_{tr}} \right) \\ = a(x+c) \left(\sum_{|\beta_t|=n_t} g_{t,\beta_t}(x) y_1^{\beta_{t1}} \cdots y_r^{\beta_{tr}} + \sum_{|\beta_t|<n_t} g_{t,\beta_t}(x) y_1^{\beta_{t1}} \cdots y_r^{\beta_{tr}} \right) + b_t(x+c)$$

If $n_t \geq 1$, then we have

$$(2.10) \quad g'_{t,\beta_t}(x) = [a(x+c) - (\beta_{t1} + \cdots + \beta_{tr})a(x)]g_{t,\beta_t}(x)$$

by comparing the coefficients of $y_1^{\beta_{t1}} \cdots y_r^{\beta_{tr}}$ with $|\beta_t| = n_t$ of equation (2.9) for all $1 \leq t \leq r$. Thus, we have $g_{t,\beta_t}(x) \in K^*$ for all $|\beta_t| = n_t$ and

$$(2.11) \quad a(x+c) = (\beta_{t1} + \cdots + \beta_{tr})a(x)$$

by comparing the degree of x of equation (2.10). Thus, we have $|\beta_t| = 1$ by comparing the highest degree of x of equation (2.11) for all $1 \leq t \leq r$. Therefore, there exists $j_t \in \{1, 2, \dots, r\}$ such that $\beta_{tj_t} = 1$ and $\beta_{tj} = 0$ for all $j \neq j_t$ and for all $1 \leq t \leq r$. Therefore, we have

$$(2.12) \quad g_t = \sum_{j=1}^r c_{tj}y_j + g_{t,0}(x)$$

for some $c_{tj} \in K$, $\det(c_{tj})_{r \times r} \neq 0$ and for all $1 \leq t, j \leq r$.

(1) If $c \neq 0$, then $\text{Aut}(K[x, y_1, \dots, y_r])_D \neq \{id\}$ because $(x+c, g_1, \dots, g_r) \in \text{Aut}(K[x, y_1, \dots, y_r])_D$ for some $g_1, \dots, g_r \in K[x, y_1, \dots, y_r]$.

(2) If $c = 0$, then it follows from equation (2.9) that

$$(2.13) \quad g'_{t,0}(x) = a(x)g_{t,0}(x) + b_t(x) - \sum_{j=1}^r c_{tj}b_j(x)$$

for all $1 \leq t \leq r$.

Suppose that $Q(x) \in K[x]$ is a solution of $z' = a(x)z + \sum_{j=1}^r k_j b_j(x)$ for some $(k_1, \dots, k_r) \in K^r \setminus \{(0, \dots, 0)\}$. Without loss of generality, we can assume that $k_1 = 1$. Since equation (2.13) is satisfied by $g_{t,0}(x)$ for all $1 \leq t \leq r$, we can choose a t such that $t = 1$. Let $1 - c_{11} = e$, $c_{1j} = -e \cdot k_j$ for all $2 \leq j \leq r$. Then $g_{1,0}(x) = e \cdot Q(x)$ satisfies equation (2.13) for any $e \in K^*$. Thus, $g_1(x, y_1, \dots, y_r) = (1-e)y_1 - e \cdot \sum_{j=2}^r k_j y_j + e \cdot Q(x)$ for any $e \in K^*$. Therefore, we have $(x, (1-e)y_1 - e \cdot \sum_{j=2}^r k_j y_j + e \cdot Q(x), y_2, \dots, y_r) \in \text{Aut}(K[x, y_1, \dots, y_r])_D$ for any $e \in K^*$, $e \neq 1$. That is, $\text{Aut}(K[x, y_1, \dots, y_r])_D \neq \{id\}$, which completes the proof. \square

Corollary 2.4. *Let $D = \partial_x + \sum_{j=1}^r (a(x)y_j + b_j(x))\partial_j$ be a Shamsuddin derivation of $K[x, y_1, \dots, y_r]$ with $a(x) \neq 0$. Then $\text{Aut}(K[x, y_1, \dots, y_r])_D = \{(x+c, \sum_{j=1}^r c_{1j}y_j + g_{1,0}(x), \dots, \sum_{j=1}^r c_{rj}y_j + g_{r,0}(x)) \mid \det(c_{tj})_{r \times r} \neq 0 \text{ and } g'_{t,0}(x) = a(x) \cdot g_{t,0}(x) + b_t(x+c) - \sum_{j=1}^r c_{tj}b_j(x) \text{ for all } 1 \leq t \leq r\}$.*

Proof. The conclusion follows from the proof of Theorem 2.3. \square

Proposition 2.5. *Let $D = \partial_x + \sum_{j=1}^r (a(x)y_j + b_j(x))\partial_j$ be a Shamsuddin derivation of $K[x, y_1, \dots, y_r]$ with $a(x) \neq 0$. Then we have the following statements:*

(1) If $\deg a(x) \geq 1$, then $\text{Aut}(K[x, y_1, \dots, y_r])_D = \{(x, \sum_{j=1}^r c_{1j}y_j + g_{1,0}(x), \dots, \sum_{j=1}^r c_{rj}y_j + g_{r,0}(x)) \mid \det(c_{tj})_{r \times r} \neq 0 \text{ and } g'_{t,0}(x) = a(x)g_{t,0}(x) + b_t(x) - \sum_{j=1}^r c_{tj}b_j(x) \text{ for all } 1 \leq t \leq r\}$.

(2) If $a(x) \in K^*$, then $\text{Aut}(K[x, y_1, \dots, y_r])_D = \{(x+c, \sum_{j=1}^r c_{1j}y_j + g_{1,0}(x), \dots, \sum_{j=1}^r c_{rj}y_j + g_{r,0}(x)) \mid \det(c_{tj})_{r \times r} \neq 0 \text{ and } g_{t,0}(x) = \hat{c}e^{ax} + (\int f_t(x)e^{-ax}dx)e^{ax} \text{ for all } 1 \leq t \leq r\}$, where $a := a(x)$, $\hat{c} \in K$ and $f_t(x) = b_t(x+c) - \sum_{j=1}^r c_{tj}b_j(x)$ for $1 \leq t \leq r$.

Proof. It follows from Corollary 2.4 that $\text{Aut}(K[x, y_1, \dots, y_r])_D = \{(x+c, \sum_{j=1}^r c_{1j}y_j + g_{1,0}(x), \dots, \sum_{j=1}^r c_{rj}y_j + g_{r,0}(x)) \mid \det(c_{tj})_{r \times r} \neq 0 \text{ and } g'_{t,0}(x) = a(x)g_{t,0}(x) + b_t(x+c) - \sum_{j=1}^r c_{tj}b_j(x) \text{ for all } 1 \leq t \leq r\}$.

(1) It follows from equation (2.11) and the arguments in Theorem 2.3 that

$$(2.14) \quad a(x+c) = a(x).$$

If $\deg a(x) \geq 1$, then we have $c = 0$ by comparing the coefficients of the monomial $x^{\deg a(x)-1}$ of equation (2.14). Then the conclusion follows.

(2) If $a(x) \in K^*$, then let $a := a(x)$, it follows from equation (2.9) and the arguments in Theorem 2.3 that

$$(2.15) \quad g'_{t,0}(x) = ag_{t,0}(x) + b_t(x+c) - \sum_{j=1}^r c_{tj}b_j(x)$$

for all $1 \leq t \leq r$. Let $f_t(x) = b_t(x+c) - \sum_{j=1}^r c_{tj}b_j(x)$ for $1 \leq t \leq r$. Then it's easy to compute that $g_{t,0}(x) = \hat{c}e^{ax} + (\int f_t(x)e^{-ax}dx)e^{ax}$ for any $\hat{c} \in K$ for all $1 \leq t \leq r$. Then the conclusion follows. \square

Remark 2.6. If $a(x) \in K^*$ in Proposition 2.5, then it follows from Theorem 3.2 (a) in [6] that D is not simple. Since $f_1(x), \dots, f_r(x)$ in Proposition 2.5 are polynomials, we can see from Proposition 2.5 (2) that there are polynomials $g_{1,0}(x), \dots, g_{r,0}(x)$ such that $(x, \sum_{j=1}^r c_{1j}y_j + g_{1,0}(x), \dots, \sum_{j=1}^r c_{rj}y_j + g_{r,0}(x)) \in \text{Aut}(K[x, y_1, \dots, y_r])_D$ for any $\det(c_{tj})_{r \times r} \neq 0$.

Theorem 2.7. Let $D = \partial_x + \sum_{i=1}^s \sum_{j=1}^{r_i} (a_i(x)y_{i,j} + b_{i,j}(x))\partial_{i,j}$ be a Shamsuddin derivation of $K[x, y_{1,1}, \dots, y_{1,r_1}, \dots, y_{s,1}, \dots, y_{s,r_s}]$. If $A_1 = (x, g_{i_0,1}, \dots, g_{i_0,r_{i_0}}) \in \text{Aut}(K[x, y_{i_0,1}, \dots, y_{i_0,r_{i_0}}])_{D_{i_0}}$ for some $i_0 \in \{1, 2, \dots, s\}$, where $D_{i_0} = \partial_x + \sum_{j=1}^{r_{i_0}} (a_{i_0}(x)y_{i_0,j} + b_{i_0,j}(x))\partial_{i_0,j}$, then $A_2 = (x, y_{1,1}, \dots, y_{1,r_1}, \dots, y_{i_0-1,1}, \dots, y_{i_0-1,r_{i_0-1}}, g_{i_0,1}, \dots, g_{i_0,r_{i_0}}, y_{i_0+1,1}, \dots, y_{i_0+1,r_{i_0+1}}, \dots, y_{s,1}, \dots, y_{s,r_s}) \in \text{Aut}(K[x, y_1, \dots, y_n])_D$.

Proof. Without loss of generality, we can assume that $i_0 = 1$. Clearly, A_2 is a polynomial automorphism of $K[x, y_1, \dots, y_n]$. Let $\rho = A_2$. That is, $\rho(x) = x$, $\rho(y_{1,j}) = g_{1,j}$ and $\rho(y_{i,j}) = y_{i,j}$ for all $1 \leq j \leq r_i$, $2 \leq i \leq s$. It suffices to prove that $D(\rho(x)) = \rho(D(x))$ and $D(\rho(y_{i,j})) = \rho(D(y_{i,j}))$ for all $1 \leq j \leq r_i$,

$1 \leq i \leq s$. Since $A_1 \in \text{Aut}(K[x, y_{1,1}, \dots, y_{1,r_1}])_{D_1}$, we have $D_1(\rho(x)) = \rho(D_1(x))$ and $D_1(\rho(y_{1,j})) = \rho(D_1(y_{1,j}))$ for all $1 \leq j \leq r_1$. That is,

$$(2.16) \quad (g_{1,j})_x + \sum_{j=1}^{r_1} (a_1(x)y_{1,j} + b_{1,j}(x))(g_{1,j})_{y_{1,j}} = a_1(f)g_{1,j} + b_{1,j}(f)$$

for all $1 \leq j \leq r_1$. Since $D(\rho(x)) = 1$, $\rho(D(x)) = 1$, $D(\rho(y_{1,j})) = (g_{1,j})_x + \sum_{j=1}^{r_1} (a_1(x)y_{1,j} + b_{1,j}(x))(g_{1,j})_{y_{1,j}}$ and $\rho(D(y_{1,j})) = a_1(f)g_{1,j} + b_{1,j}(f)$, $D(\rho(y_{i,j})) = a_i y_{i,j} + b_{i,j} = \rho(D(y_{i,j}))$ for all $1 \leq j \leq r_i$, $2 \leq i \leq s$. It follows from equation (2.16) that $D(\rho(x)) = \rho(D(x))$ and $D(\rho(y_{i,j})) = \rho(D(y_{i,j}))$ for all $1 \leq j \leq r_i$, $1 \leq i \leq s$. That is, $A_2 \in \text{Aut}(K[x, y_1, \dots, y_n])_D$, which completes the proof. \square

Theorem 2.8. *Let $D = \partial_x + \sum_{i=1}^s \sum_{j=1}^{r_i} (a_i(x)y_{i,j} + b_{i,j}(x))\partial_{i,j}$ be a Shamsuddin derivation of $K[x, y_1, \dots, y_n]$. Then the following two statements are equivalent:*

- (1) *D is a simple derivation;*
- (2) $\text{Aut}(K[x, y_1, \dots, y_n])_D = \{id\}$.

Proof. (1) \Rightarrow (2) It follows from Theorem 3.2 in [1].

(2) \Rightarrow (1) It suffices to show that if D is not simple, then $\text{Aut}(K[x, y_1, \dots, y_n])_D \neq \{id\}$. Since D is not simple, it follows from Theorem 3.1 in [6] that D_{i_0} is not simple for some $i_0 \in \{1, 2, \dots, s\}$, where $D_{i_0} = \partial_x + \sum_{j=1}^{r_{i_0}} (a_{i_0}(x)y_{i_0,j} + b_{i_0,j}(x))\partial_{i_0,j}$. Without loss of generality, we can assume that $i_0 = 1$.

If $\deg a_1(x) \geq 1$, then it follows from Proposition 2.5 (1) and Theorem 2.3 that there exists $A_1 \in \text{Aut}(K[x, y_{1,1}, \dots, y_{1,r_1}])$ with $\rho(x) = x$ and $A_1 \neq id$ such that $A_1 \in \text{Aut}(K[x, y_{1,1}, \dots, y_{1,r_1}])_{D_1}$.

If $a_1(x) = 0$, then it follows from Remark 2.2 that there exists $A_1 \in \text{Aut}(K[x, y_{1,1}, \dots, y_{1,r_1}])$ with $\rho(x) = x$ and $A_1 \neq id$ such that $A_1 \in \text{Aut}(K[x, y_{1,1}, \dots, y_{1,r_1}])_{D_1}$.

If $a_1(x) \in K^*$, then it follows from Proposition 2.5 (2) and Remark 2.6 that there exists $A_1 \in \text{Aut}(K[x, y_{1,1}, \dots, y_{1,r_1}])$ with $\rho(x) = x$ and $A_1 \neq id$ such that $A_1 \in \text{Aut}(K[x, y_{1,1}, \dots, y_{1,r_1}])_{D_1}$.

It follows from Theorem 2.7 that $A_2 = (A_1, y_{2,1}, \dots, y_{2,r_2}, \dots, y_{s,1}, \dots, y_{s,r_s}) \in \text{Aut}(K[x, y_1, \dots, y_n])_D$. Since $A_1 \neq id$, we have $A_2 \neq id$. Then the conclusion follows. \square

Remark 2.9. In [3], the authors have proved Theorem 2.8 if $n = 1$ and $a_1(x) \neq 0$. We have proved Theorem 2.8 if $n = 1$ in [10].

3 Images of Shamsuddin derivations

Lemma 3.1. *Let $D = \partial_x + \sum_{j=1}^n (a_j(x)y_j + b_j(x, y_1, \dots, y_{j-1}))\partial_j$ be a derivation of $K[x, y_1, \dots, y_n]$. Then D is locally finite if and only if $a_j(x) \in K$ for all $1 \leq j \leq n$.*

Proof. “ \Leftarrow ” The conclusion follows from Example 9.3.2 in [8].

“ \Rightarrow ” It suffices to prove that if there exists $i_0 \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ such that $\deg a_{i_0}(x) \geq 1$, then D is not locally finite. Since $D(y_{i_0}) = a_{i_0}(x)y_{i_0} + b_{i_0}(x, y_1, \dots, y_{i_0-1})$, we have

$$D^2(y_{i_0}) = (a_{i_0}^2(x) + a'_{i_0}(x))y_{i_0} + \text{polynomial in } K[x, y_1, \dots, y_{i_0-1}].$$

Suppose that $D^{k-1}(y_{i_0}) = a_{i_0}^{k-1}(x)y_{i_0} + P_{k-1}(x)y_{i_0} + \text{polynomial in } K[x, y_1, \dots, y_{i_0-1}]$, where $P_{k-1}(x)$ is a polynomial in $K[x]$ and $\deg P_{k-1}(x) < (k-1)\deg a_{i_0}(x)$. Then we have

$$D^k(y_{i_0}) = D(D^{k-1}(y_{i_0})) = a_{i_0}^k(x)y_{i_0} + P_k(x)y_{i_0} + \text{polynomial in } K[x, y_1, \dots, y_{i_0-1}],$$

where $P_k(x)$ is a polynomial in $K[x]$ and $\deg P_k(x) < k\deg a_{i_0}(x)$. Let $S = \{D^i(y_{i_0}) | i \geq 1\}$. Then the vector space generated by S is infinite dimension over K . Thus, D is not locally finite, which completes the proof. \square

Theorem 3.2. *Let $D = \partial_x + \sum_{j=1}^n (a_j(x)y_j + b_j(x))\partial_j$ be a derivation of $K[x, y_1, \dots, y_n]$. If the equation $\sum_{i=1}^n \gamma_i a_i(x) = 0$ has no non-zero solutions in \mathbb{N}^n for $\gamma = (\gamma_1, \gamma_2, \dots, \gamma_n)$ and there exists $i_0 \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ such that $\deg a_{i_0}(x) \geq 1$, then $\text{Im } D$ is not a Mathieu-Zhao subspace.*

Proof. Since $1 \in \text{Im } D$, we have $\text{Im } D = K[x, y_1, \dots, y_n]$ if $\text{Im } D$ is a Mathieu-Zhao subspace. Without loss of generality, we assume that $i_0 = 1$. We claim that $y_1 \notin \text{Im } D$. Suppose that $y_1 \in \text{Im } D$. Then there exists $f(x, y_1, \dots, y_n) \in K[x, y_1, \dots, y_n]$ such that

$$(3.1) \quad D(f(x, y_1, \dots, y_n)) = y_1.$$

Let $f = f^{(d)} + f^{(d-1)} + \dots + f^{(1)} + f^{(0)}$ with $f^{(d)} \neq 0$, where $f^{(i)}$ is the homogeneous part of degree i with respect to y_1, \dots, y_n of f . It follows from equation (3.1) that

$$(3.2) \quad f_x + \sum_{j=1}^n (a_j(x)y_j + b_j(x))f_{y_j} = y_1.$$

If $d \geq 2$, then we have

$$(3.3) \quad f_x^{(d)} + \sum_{j=1}^n a_j(x)y_j f_{y_j}^{(d)} = 0.$$

by comparing the homogeneous part of degree d with respect to y_1, \dots, y_n of equation (3.2). Let $f^{(d)} = \sum_{l_1 + \dots + l_n = d} a_{l_1 \dots l_n}(x) y_1^{l_1} \dots y_n^{l_n}$ with $a_{l_1 \dots l_n} = a_{l_1 \dots l_n}(x) \in K[x]$. Then equation (3.3) has the following form

$$(3.4) \quad \sum_{l_1 + \dots + l_n = d} a'_{l_1 \dots l_n}(x) y_1^{l_1} \dots y_n^{l_n} + \sum_{j=1}^n l_j a_j(x) \cdot \sum_{l_1 + \dots + l_n = d} a_{l_1 \dots l_n}(x) y_1^{l_1} \dots y_n^{l_n} = 0.$$

We view the polynomials in $K[x][y_1, \dots, y_n]$ with coefficients in $K[x]$ when we comparing the coefficients of $y_1^{l_1} \cdots y_n^{l_n}$. Thus, we have

$$(3.5) \quad a'_{l_1 \dots l_n}(x) + \left(\sum_{j=1}^n l_j a_j(x) \right) a_{l_1 \dots l_n}(x) = 0$$

by comparing the coefficients of $y_1^{l_1} \cdots y_n^{l_n}$ of equation (3.4) with $l_1 + \cdots + l_n = d$. Since $(l_1, l_2, \dots, l_n) \in \mathbb{N}^n$ and $(l_1, l_2, \dots, l_n) \neq (0, 0, \dots, 0)$, we have $\sum_{j=1}^n l_j a_j(x) \neq 0$. Thus, we have $a_{l_1 \dots l_n}(x) = 0$ for all $l_1 + \cdots + l_n = d$ by comparing the degree of x of equation (3.5). That is, $f^{(d)} = 0$, which is a contradiction. Thus, we have $d \leq 1$.

If $d = 1$, then $f^{(1)} = c_1(x)y_1 + \cdots + c_n(x)y_n$ with $c_j(x) \in K[x]$ for $1 \leq j \leq n$. Thus, equation (3.2) has the following form

$$(3.6) \quad f_x^{(0)} + \sum_{j=1}^n c'_j(x)y_j + \sum_{j=1}^n (a_j(x)y_j + b_j(x))c_j(x) = y_1.$$

Hence, we have

$$(3.7) \quad c'_1(x) + a_1(x)c_1(x) = 1$$

by comparing the coefficients of y_1 of equation (3.6). Since $\deg a_1(x) \geq 1$, we have $c_1(x) = 0$ by comparing the degree of x of equation (3.7). Then equation (3.7) is $0 = 1$, which is a contradiction.

If $d = 0$, then $f_x^{(0)} = y_1$, which is a contradiction. Therefore, $y_1 \notin \text{Im } D$. Hence, the conclusion follows from the definition of Mathieu-Zhao subspace. \square

Corollary 3.3. *Let $D = \partial_x + \sum_{j=1}^n (a_j(x)y_j + b_j(x))\partial_j$ be a derivation of $K[x, y_1, \dots, y_n]$. If $a_1(x), \dots, a_n(x)$ are linearly independent and there exists $i_0 \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ such that $\deg a_{i_0}(x) \geq 1$, then $\text{Im } D$ is not a Mathieu-Zhao subspace.*

Proof. Since $a_1(x), \dots, a_n(x)$ are linearly independent, the equation $\sum_{i=1}^n \gamma_i a_i(x) = 0$ has no non-zero solutions in \mathbb{N}^n for $\gamma = (\gamma_1, \gamma_2, \dots, \gamma_n)$. Thus, the conclusion follows from Theorem 3.2. \square

Remark 3.4. If $n \geq 2$, then there exists $i_0 \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ such that $\deg a_{i_0}(x) \geq 1$ in the case that $a_1(x), \dots, a_n(x)$ are linearly independent over K . Thus, we can remove the condition that there exists $i_0 \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ such that $\deg a_{i_0}(x) \geq 1$ in Corollary 3.3 if $n \geq 2$.

Corollary 3.5. *Let $D = \partial_x + \sum_{j=1}^r (a_j(x)y_j + b_j(x))\partial_j$ be a derivation of $K[x, y_1, \dots, y_r]$. Then $\text{Im } D$ is a Mathieu-Zhao subspace if and only if $a(x) \in K$.*

Proof. “ \Leftarrow ” It follows from Lemma 3.1 that D is locally finite. Since $1 \in \text{Im } D$, the conclusion follows from Proposition 1.4 in [13].

“ \Rightarrow ” If $\deg a(x) \geq 1$, then the equation $(\sum_{j=1}^r \gamma_j) a(x) = 0$ has no non-zero solutions in \mathbb{N}^r for $\gamma = (\gamma_1, \gamma_2, \dots, \gamma_r)$. It follows from Theorem 3.2 that $\text{Im } D$ is not a Mathieu-Zhao subspace. Then the conclusion follows. \square

Corollary 3.6. *Let $D = \partial_x + \sum_{j=1}^r (a(x)y_j + b_j(x))\partial_j$ be a derivation of $K[x, y_1, \dots, y_r]$. Then $\text{Im } D$ is a Mathieu-Zhao subspace if and only if D is locally finite.*

Proof. The conclusion follows from Lemma 3.1 and Corollary 3.5. \square

Acknowledgement: The author is very grateful to professor Wenhua Zhao for personal communications about the Mathieu-Zhao spaces. She is also grateful to the Department of Mathematics of Illinois State University, where this paper was finished, for hospitality during her stay as a visiting scholar. The author is very grateful to the referee for some useful comments and suggestions.

References

- [1] L.N.Bertoncello, D.Levcovitz, *On the isotropy group of a simple derivation*, J. Pure Appl. Algebra 224(1)(2020) 33-41.
- [2] P. Brumatti, Y. Lequain and D. Levcovitz, *Differential simplicity in Polynomial Rings and Algebraic Independence of Power Series*, J. London Math. Soc. 68(2)(2003), 615-630.
- [3] L.G.Mendes, I. Pan, *On plane polynomial automorphisms commuting with simple derivations*, J. Pure Appl. Algebra 221(4)(2016)875-882.
- [4] D. A. Jordan, *Differentially simple rings with no invertible derivations*, the Quart. Jour. of Math. 32(1981) 417-424.
- [5] S. Kour, A.K. Maloo, *Simplicity of Some Derivations of $k[x, y]$* , Comm. in Algebra 41(4)(2013) 1417-1431.
- [6] Y. Lequain, *Simple Shamsuddin derivations of $K[X, Y_1, \dots, Y_n]$: An algorithmic characterization*, J. Pure Appl. Algebra 212(212)(2008) 801-807.
- [7] Y. Lequain, *Cyclic irreducible non-holonomic modules over the Weyl algebra: An algorithmic characterization*, J. Pure Appl. Algebra 215(4)(2011) 531-545.
- [8] A. Nowicki, *Polynomial derivations and their rings of constants*, Toruń: N. Copernicus Univ. Press, 1994.
- [9] D. Yan, *Simple derivations in two variables*, Comm. in Algebra 47(9)(2019) 3881–3888.
- [10] D. Yan, *On simple derivations and the group of polynomial automorphisms commuting with certain derivations*, arXiv:1808.07612v3.

- [11] Wenhua Zhao, *Generalizations of the image conjecture and Mathieu conjecture*, J. Pure Appl. Algebra 214(7)(2010) 1200-1216.
- [12] Wenhua Zhao, *Mathieu subspaces of associative algebras*, J. Algebra 350(2)(2012) 245-272.
- [13] Wenhua Zhao, *Idempotents in intersection of the kernel and the image of locally finite derivations and ε -derivations*, Eur. J. Math. 4 (2018) 1491-1504.