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Abstract

In the paper, we prove that the derivation $D = y\partial_x + (a_2(x)y^2 + a_1(x)y + a_0(x))\partial_y$ of $K[x, y]$ with $a_2(x), a_1(x), a_0(x) \in K[x]$ is simple iff the following conditions hold: (1) $a_0(x) \in K^*$, (2) $\deg a_1(x) \geq 1$ or $\deg a_2(x) \geq 1$, (3) there exist no $l \in K^*$ such that $a_2(x) = la_1(x) - l^2a_0(x)$. In addition, we prove that the image of the derivation $D = \partial_x + \sum_{i=1}^n \gamma_i(x)y_i^{k_i}\partial_i$ is a Mathieu-Zhao space iff $D$ is locally finite. Moreover, we prove that the image of the derivation $D = \sum_{i=1}^n \gamma_i y_i^{k_i}\partial_i$ of $K[y_1, \ldots, y_n]$ is a Mathieu-Zhao space iff $k_i \leq 1$ for all $1 \leq i \leq n$, $n \geq 2$.
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1 Introduction

Throughout this paper, we will write $K$ for any field with characteristic zero, $K^*$ for the set of all elements satisfy that $a \in K$ and $a \neq 0$, $\mathbb{N}$ for the set of all natural
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numbers including zero and \( R := K[x, y_1, \ldots, y_n] \) for the polynomial algebra over \( K \) in \( n+1 \) indeterminates \( x, y_1, \ldots, y_n \). \( \partial_x, \partial_{y_i} \) will denote the derivations \( \frac{\partial}{\partial x}, \frac{\partial}{\partial y_i} \) of \( R \) for all \( 1 \leq i \leq n \), respectively. For an element \( f \) of \( K[z] \), we often use \( f' \) instead of \( f_z \), where \( z \) is an indeterminate over \( K \) and \( z \in \{ x, y_1, \ldots, y_n \} \).

A \( K \)-derivation \( D : R \to R \) 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 \( c \in K \). 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 ideal other than 0 and \( R \). For some examples of simple derivations, see [1], [6], [7], [9], [12].

A polynomial \( F \in K[x, y] \) is said to be a Darboux polynomial of \( D \) if \( F \notin K \) and \( D(F) = \Lambda F \) for some \( \Lambda \in K[x, y] \). We define \( \deg 0 = -\infty \).

Let \( D \) be any \( K \)-derivation of \( R \). Then \( D \) is said to be locally finite if for every \( a \in R \) the \( K \)-vector space spanned by the elements \( D^i a(i \geq 1) \) is finite dimensional.

The Mathieu-Zhao spaces were introduced by Zhao in [14]. We give the definition here for the polynomial rings. A \( K \)-subspace \( M \) of \( R \) is said to be a Mathieu-Zhao space if \( a \in R \) such that \( a^m \in M \) for all large \( m \), then for every \( b \in R \), we have \( ba^m \in M \) for all large \( m \).

Simple derivations are useful to construct simple noncommutative rings which are not fields([4]). If \( n \geq 1 \), then only some examples of simple derivations of \( R \) are known. A. Nowicki in [10] or A. Shamsuddin in [11] gave an algorithm to decide whether a \( K \)-derivation of \( K[x, y] \) of the form \( D = \partial_x + (a(x)y + b(x))\partial_y \), where \( a(x), b(x) \in K[x] \), is simple or not. In [8], Y. Lequin has characterized the property “\( D \) is simple of \( R \)” in terms of certain properties of \( D \) that one can effectively check for whether it is satisfied or not. In [3], S. Kour has shown that \( D = y^r \partial_y + (xy^s + g)\partial_y \), where \( 0 \leq r < s \) are integers, \( g \in K[y] \), is a simple derivation of \( K[x, y] \). In [12], the second author proved that \( D = y\partial_x + (2a y^2 + a_1(x)y + a_0(x))\partial_y \) with \( a_2 \in K \), \( a_1(x), a_0(x) \in K[x] \) is simple iff \( a_0(x) \in K^* \) and \( \deg a_1(x) \geq 1 \).

In our paper, we give a necessary and sufficient condition for a derivation to be simple and study the images of some derivations. In section 2, we prove that \( D = y \partial_x + (a_2(x)y^2 + a_0(x))\partial_y \) with \( a_2(x), a_0(x) \in K[x] \) is simple iff \( a_0(x) \in K^*, \deg a_2(x) \geq 1 \). In section 3, we prove some lemmas which we need in section 4. In section 4, we prove that \( D = y \partial_x + (a_2(x)y^2 + a_1(x)y + a_0(x))\partial_y \) with \( a_2(x), a_1(x), a_0(x) \in K[x] \) is simple iff (1) \( a_0(x) \in K^*, (2) \deg a_1(x) \geq 1 \) or \( \deg a_2(x) \geq 1 \), (3) there exist no \( l \in K^* \) such that \( a_2(x) = la_1(x) - l^2 a_0(x) \). Finally we prove that the image of the derivation \( D = \partial_x + \sum_{i=1}^n \gamma_i(x)y_i^k \partial_i \), where \( k_i \geq 1, \gamma_i(x) \in K[x] \) for all \( 1 \leq i \leq n \), is a Mathieu-Zhao space iff \( D \) is locally finite. In addition, we show that the image of the derivation \( D = \sum_{i=1}^n \gamma_i(x)y_i^k \partial_i \),
where \( n \geq 2 \) and \( \gamma_i \in K^* \) for all \( 1 \leq i \leq n \), is a Mathieu-Zhao space iff \( k_i \leq 1 \) for all \( 1 \leq i \leq n \). Base on the conclusions of section 2 to section 4, we give a conjecture in section 6.

2 The case \( D = y\partial_x + (a_2(x)y^2 + a_0(x))\partial_y \)

**Theorem 2.1.** Let \( D = y\partial_x + (a_2(x)y^2 + a_0(x))\partial_y \) be a derivation of \( K[x,y] \) with \( a_2(x), a_0(x) \in K[x] \). Then \( D \) is simple if and only if \( a_0(x) \in K^* \) and \( \deg a_2(x) \geq 1 \).

**Proof.** “\( \Rightarrow \) ” If \( a_0(x) \notin K^* \), then \( I = (y, a_0(x)) \) is a \( D \)-stable ideal. Thus, \( D \) is not simple. Hence we have \( a_0(x) \in K^* \). If \( \deg a_2(x) \leq 0 \), then \( a_2(x) \in K \). If \( a_2(x) \in K^* \), then \( I = (y^2 + \frac{a_0(x)}{a_2(x)}) \) is a \( D \)-stable ideal. Thus, \( D \) is not simple. If \( a_2(x) = 0 \), then \( I = (\frac{1}{2}y^2 - xa_0(x)) \) is a \( D \)-stable ideal. Thus, \( D \) is not simple. Hence we have \( \deg a_2(x) \geq 1 \).

“\( \Leftarrow \) ” It follows from Proposition 2.1 in \([5]\) that it suffices to prove that \((y, a_2(x)y^2 + a_0(x)) = (1) \) and \( D \) has no Darboux polynomial. Clearly, \((y, a_2(x)y^2 + a_0(x)) = (a_0(x)) = (1) \). Suppose that \( F(x,y) \in K[x,y] \) is a Darboux polynomial of \( D \) and \( F(x,y) = \sum_{i=0}^{n} c_i(x)y^i \notin K \) with \( c_n(x) \neq 0 \), \( c_i(x) \in K[x] \) for \( 0 \leq i \leq n \). Then we have \( D(F(x,y)) = \Lambda(x,y)F(x,y) \) for some \( \Lambda(x,y) \in K[x,y] \).

If \( n = 0 \), then \( F(x,y) = c_0(x), yc_0'(x) = \Lambda(x,y)c_0(x) \). Thus, we have \( c_0(x) \in K \), which is a contradiction. Hence we have \( n \geq 1 \). It follows from the equation \( D(F(x,y)) = \Lambda(x,y)F(x,y) \) that

\[
(y(\sum_{i=0}^{n} c_i'(x)y^i) + (a_2(x)y^2 + a_0(x))\sum_{i=1}^{n} ic_i(x)y^{i-1}) = \Lambda(x,y)\sum_{i=0}^{n} c_i(x)y^i.
\]

Comparing the highest degree of \( y \) of equation (2.1), we have \( \deg_y \Lambda(x,y) \leq 1 \). Let \( \Lambda(x,y) = d_1(x)y + d_0(x) \) with \( d_1(x), d_0(x) \in K[x] \). Then equation (2.1) has the following form:

\[
y(\sum_{i=0}^{n} c_i'(x)y^i) + (a_2(x)y^2 + a_0(x))\sum_{i=1}^{n} ic_i(x)y^{i-1}) = (d_1(x)y + d_0(x))\sum_{i=0}^{n} c_i(x)y^i.
\]

We view the polynomials as in \( K[x][y] \) with coefficients in \( K[x] \) when we comparing the coefficients of monomials on \( y \). Comparing the coefficients of \( y^{n+1} \) of equation (2.2), we have

\[
c_n'(x) + na_2(x)c_n(x) = d_1(x)c_n(x).
\]

Thus, we have \( c_n(x) \in K^* \) and \( d_1(x) = na_2(x) \) by comparing the highest degree of \( x \) of the above equation. If \( n \geq 2 \), comparing the coefficients of monomials
on $y$ of equation (2.2), then we have the following equations:

\begin{align}
(2.4) & \quad c'_{n-1}(x) = a_2(x)c_{n-1}(x) + d_0(x)c_n(x), \\
(2.5) & \quad (i+1)a_0(x)c_{i+1}(x) = (n-i+1)a_2(x)c_{i-1}(x) + d_0(x)c_i(x) - c'_{i-1}(x), \\
(2.6) & \quad a_0(x)c_1(x) = d_0(x)c_0(x)
\end{align}

for $1 \leq i \leq n - 1$.

If $n = 1$, comparing the coefficients of monomials on $y$ of equation (2.2), then we have equations (2.4), (2.6).

Claim 1: $d_0(x) \neq 0$.

Suppose that $d_0(x) = 0$. It follows from equation (2.4) that $a_2(x)c_{n-1}(x) = c'_{n-1}(x) = 0$. Thus, we have $c_{n-1}(x) = 0$ by comparing the degree of $x$ of equation (2.4). If $n = 1$, then we have $c_0(x) = 0$. It follows from equation (2.6) that $a_0(x)c_1(x) = 0$, which is a contradiction. If $n \geq 2$, then it follows from equation (2.5) $(i = n - 1)$ that $na_0(x)c_{n}(x) = 2a_2(x)c_{n-2}(x) - c'_{n-2}(x)$. Since $\deg a_2(x) \geq 1$ and $na_0(x)c_{n}(x) \in \mathbb{K}^*$, we have a contradiction by comparing the degree of $x$ of equation (2.5) $(i = n - 1)$. Hence we have $d_0(x) \neq 0$.

It follows from equation (2.4) that $c_{n-1}(x) \neq 0$. Otherwise, we have $d_0(x)c_n(x) = 0$, which is a contradiction. Thus, it follows from equation (2.4) that

\begin{equation}
\deg d_0(x) = \deg a_2(x) + \deg c_{n-1}(x) \geq 1.
\end{equation}

If $n \geq 2$, then it follows from equation (2.5) $(i = n - 1)$ that $c_{n-2}(x) \neq 0$. Otherwise, $na_0(x)c_{n}(x) = c_{n-1}(x)d_0(x)$. Then we have a contradiction by comparing the degree of $x$ of equation (2.5) $(i = n - 1)$. Thus, it follows from equation (2.5) $(i = n - 1)$ that $\deg c_{n-2}(x) + \deg a_2(x) = \deg c_{n-1}(x) + \deg \deg d_0(x)$. It follows from equation (2.7) that $\deg c_{n-2}(x) = 2\deg c_{n-1}(x)$.

Claim 2: $c_{n-i}(x) \neq 0$ and $\deg c_{n-i}(x) = i\deg c_{n-1}(x)$ for all $1 \leq i \leq n$.

Suppose that $c_{n-l}(x) \neq 0$ and $\deg c_{n-l}(x) = l\deg c_{n-1}(x)$ for all $1 \leq l \leq k - 1, k \in \{2, 3, \ldots, n\}$. Next we show that $c_{n-k}(x) \neq 0$ and $\deg c_{n-k}(x) = k\deg c_{n-1}(x)$.

If $c_{n-k}(x) = 0$, then it follows from equation (2.5) $(i = n - k + 1)$ that

\begin{equation}
(n - k + 2)a_0(x)c_{n-k+2}(x) = d_0(x)c_{n-k+1}(x).
\end{equation}

It follows from equation (2.8) that

\begin{equation}
\deg c_{n-k+2}(x) = \deg d_0(x) + \deg c_{n-k+1}(x).
\end{equation}

By induction hypothesis, we have $\deg c_{n-k+2}(x) = (k - 2)\deg c_{n-1}(x)$ and $\deg c_{n-k+1}(x) = (k - 1)\deg c_{n-1}(x)$. Then equation (2.9) has the following form: $\deg d_0(x) + \deg c_{n-1}(x) = 0$, which contradicts equation (2.7). Hence we have $c_{n-k}(x) \neq 0$. It follows from equation (2.5) $(i = n - k + 1)$ that

\begin{equation}
\deg a_2(x) + \deg c_{n-k}(x) = \deg d_0(x) + \deg c_{n-k+1}(x).
\end{equation}
Then we have \( \deg c_{n-k}(x) = k \deg c_{n-1}(x) \). Thus, we have \( c_{n-i}(x) \neq 0 \) and \( \deg c_{n-i}(x) = i \deg c_{n-1}(x) \) for all \( 1 \leq i \leq n \).

It follows from equation (2.12) that \( \deg c_1(x) = \deg d_0(x) + \deg c_0(x) \). It follows from equation (2.7) and Claim 2 that \( \deg a_2(x) + 2 \deg c_{n-1}(x) = 0 \), which contradicts that \( \deg a_2(x) \geq 1 \).

If \( n = 1 \), then it follows from equation (2.12) that \( \deg c_1(x) = \deg d_0(x) + \deg c_0(x) \). Hence \( \deg d_0(x) = 0 \), which contradicts equation (2.7). Thus, \( D \) has no Darboux polynomial. Whence \( D \) is simple. \( \square \)

**Proposition 2.2.** Let \( D = y\partial_x + (a_1(x)y + a_0(x))\partial_y \) be a derivation of \( K[x, y] \) with \( a_1(x), a_0(x) \in K[x] \). If \( D \) is simple, then \( \text{Im } D \) is not a Mathieu-Zhao space of \( K[x, y] \).

**Proof.** It follows from Theorem 2.1 in [12] that \( a_0(x) \in K^* \), \( \deg a_1(x) \geq 1 \). Let \( a_0 := a_0(x) \in K^* \). Note that \( 1 = a_0^{-1}D(y - \int a_1(x)dx) \). Then we have \( 1 \in \text{Im } D \). If \( \text{Im } D \) is a Mathieu-Zhao space, then \( \text{Im } D = K[x, y] \).

Claim: \( x \notin \text{Im } D \).

Suppose that \( x \in \text{Im } D \). Then there exists \( G(x, y) \in K[x, y] \) such that

\[
yG_x + (a_1(x)y + a_0(x))G_y = x.
\]

Let \( G(x, y) = \sum_{i=0}^{t} b_i(x)y^i \) with \( b_i(x) \neq 0, b_i(x) \in K[x] \) for \( 0 \leq i \leq t \). If \( t = 0 \), then \( D(G(x, y)) = yb_0(x) \neq x \). Thus, we have \( t \geq 1 \). Then equation (2.11) has the following form:

\[
y\left(\sum_{i=0}^{t} b_i'(x)y^i\right) + (a_1(x)y + a_0(x))\left(\sum_{i=1}^{t} ib_i(x)y^{i-1}\right) = x.
\]

We view the polynomials as in \( K[x][y] \) with coefficients in \( K[x] \) when we compare the coefficients of monomials on \( y \). Comparing the coefficients of \( y^{i+1} \) of equation (2.12), we have

\[
b_i'(x) = 0.
\]

Thus, we have \( b_i := b_i(x) \in K^* \). Then we have the following equations:

\[
\begin{align*}
b_{i-1}'(x) + ta_1(x)b_i &= 0 \\
b_{i-1}'(x) + ia_1(x)b_i + (i + 1)a_0b_{i+1}(x) &= 0 \\
a_0b_i(x) &= x
\end{align*}
\]

by comparing the coefficients of monomials on \( y \) of equation (2.12) for \( 1 \leq i \leq t - 1 \).

If \( t \geq 2 \), then it follows from equations (2.14) that \( \deg b_{t-1}(x) = i(\deg a_1(x) + 1) \) for \( 1 \leq i \leq t \). Thus, \( \deg b_1(x) = (t - 1)(\deg a_1(x) + 1) \geq 2 \), which contradicts that \( \deg b_1(x) = 1 \). If \( t = 1 \), then it follows from the third equation of equations (2.14) that \( \deg b_1(x) = 1 \), which contradicts the fact that \( b_1(x) \in K^* \). Hence we have \( x \notin \text{Im } D \). Therefore, \( \text{Im } D \) is not a Mathieu-Zhao space of \( K[x, y] \). \( \square \)
Corollary 2.3. Let \( D = y\partial_x + (a_1(x)y + a_0)\partial_y \) be a derivation of \( K[x, y] \) with \( a_1(x) \in K[x], a_0 \in K \). Then \( D \) is simple iff \( \text{Im} \ D \) is not a Mathieu-Zhao space of \( K[x, y] \).

**Proof.** “\( \Rightarrow \)” It follows from Proposition 2.2.

“\( \Leftarrow \)” It suffices to prove that if \( \text{Im} \ D \) is not a Mathieu-Zhao space of \( K[x, y] \), then \( \deg a_1(x) \geq 1, a_0 \in K^* \). Next we prove that if \( \deg a_1(x) \leq 0, a_0 \in K^* \) or \( a_0 = 0 \), then \( \text{Im} \ D \) is a Mathieu-Zhao space. If \( a_0 = 0 \), let \( D_1 := \partial_x + a_1(x)\partial_y \), then \( \text{Im} \ D_1 = K[x, y] \). Hence \( \text{Im} \ D = (y) \). In particular, \( \text{Im} \ D \) is a Mathieu-Zhao space of \( K[x, y] \). If \( \deg a_1(x) \leq 0, a_0 \in K^* \), let \( a_1 := a_1(x) \in K \), then \( D = y\partial_x + (a_1y + a_0)\partial_y \) is locally finite. It follows from Theorem 3.1 in [3] that \( \text{Im} \ D \) is a Mathieu-Zhao space of \( K[x, y] \). Then the conclusion follows. \( \square \)

### 3 Some lemmas

In this section, we prove some lemmas which we need in section 4.

**Lemma 3.1.** Let \( D = y\partial_x + (a_2(x)y^2 + a_1(x)y + a_0)\partial_y \) be a derivation of \( K[x, y] \) with \( a_2(x) \in K[x], \deg a_2(x) \geq 1 \) and \( a_0 \in K^*, a_1(x) \in K[x]\{0\} \). If \( D \) has a Darboux polynomial \( F(x, y) = \sum_{i=0}^n c_i(x)y^i \notin K \) with \( c_n(x) \neq 0, c_i(x) \in K[x] \) for \( 0 \leq i \leq n \) such that \( D(F(x, y)) = \Lambda(x, y)F(x, y) \) for some \( \Lambda(x, y) \in K[x, y] \), then we have

1. \( n \geq 1, c_n(x) \in K^*, \Lambda(x, y) = d_1(x)y + d_0(x) \) with \( d_1(x) = na_2(x) \) and \( d_0(x) \in K[x] \).

2. \( c_{n-1}^\prime(x) = a_2(x)c_{n-1}(x) + (d_0(x) - na_1(x))c_n(x) \), \( c_n(x) \neq 0 \) for \( 1 \leq i \leq n-1 \) and \( n \geq 2 \).

3. \( c_{n-1}^\prime(x) = a_2(x)c_{n-1}(x) + (d_0(x) - na_1(x))c_n(x), c_{n-1}(x) \neq 0 \) for \( n \geq 2 \).

In particular, if \( \deg a_1(x) = 0 \) and \( n \geq 2 \), then we have \( \deg d_0(x) \geq 1 \) and \( c_1(x)c_0(x) \neq 0 \).

**Proof.** If \( n = 0 \), then \( F(x, y) = c_0(x), yc_0^\prime(x) = \Lambda(x, y)c_0(x) \). Thus, we have \( c_0(x) \in K \), which is a contradiction. Hence we have \( n \geq 1 \).

It follows from the equation \( D(F(x, y)) = \Lambda(x, y)F(x, y) \) that

\[ y \sum_{i=0}^n c_i^\prime(x)y^i + (a_2(x)y^2 + a_1(x)y + a_0) \sum_{i=1}^n ic_i(x)y^{i-1} = \Lambda(x, y) \sum_{i=0}^n c_i(x)y^i. \] (3.4)
Comparing the highest degree of $y$ of equation (3.4), we have $\deg_y \Lambda(x, y) \leq 1$. Let $\Lambda(x, y) = d_1(x)y + d_0(x)$ with $d_1(x), d_0(x) \in K[x]$. Then equation (3.4) has the following form:

\begin{equation}
(3.5) \quad y \sum_{i=0}^{n} c_i'(x)y^i + (a_2(x)y^2 + a_1(x)y + a_0) \sum_{i=1}^{n} ic_i(x)y^{i-1} = (d_1(x)y + d_0(x)) \sum_{i=0}^{n} c_i(x)y^i.
\end{equation}

We view the polynomials as in $K[x][y]$ with coefficients in $K[x]$ when we comparing the coefficients of monomials on $y$. Comparing the coefficients of $y^{n+1}$ of equation (3.5), we have

\begin{equation}
(3.6) \quad c'_n(x) + na_2(x)c_n(x) = d_1(x)c_n(x).
\end{equation}

Thus, we have $c_n(x) \in K^*$ and $d_1(x) = na_2(x)$ by comparing the degree of $x$ of the above equation. Comparing the the coefficients of monomials on $y$ of equation (3.5), we have the following equations:

\begin{align}
(3.7) & \quad c'_{n-1}(x) = a_2(x)c_{n-1}(x) + (d_0(x) - na_1(x))c_n(x), \\
(3.8) & \quad (i + 1)a_0c_{i+1}(x) = (n - i + 1)a_2(x)c_{i-1}(x) + (d_0(x) - ia_1(x))c_i(x) - c'_{i-1}(x), \\
(3.9) & \quad a_0c_1(x) = d_0(x)c_0(x)
\end{align}

for $1 \leq i \leq n - 1$ and $n \geq 2$. If $n = 1$, then we have equations (3.7), (3.9).

Suppose that $d_0(x) - na_1(x) = 0$. Then it follows from equation (3.7) that $c_{n-1}(x) = 0$. It follows from equation (3.8) \((i = n - 1)\) that $na_0c_n(x) = -c'_{n-2}(x) + 2a_2(x)c_{n-2}(x)$. If $c_{n-2}(x) = 0$, then it follows from equation (3.8) \((i = n - 1)\) that $c_n(x) = 0$, which is a contradiction. If $c_{n-2}(x) \neq 0$, then we have a contradiction by comparing the degree of $x$ of equation (3.8) \((i = n - 1)\). Hence $d_0(x) - na_1(x) \neq 0$.

Suppose that $d_0(x) - na_1(x) \in K^*$. Then we have a contradiction by comparing the degree of $x$ of equation (3.7). Thus, we have $d_0(x) - na_1(x) \notin K$. It follows from equation (3.7) that $c_{n-1}(x) \neq 0$.

If $\deg_a1(x) = 0$ and $c_1(x) = 0$, then it follows from equation (3.9) that $c_0(x) = 0$. It follows from equation (3.8) that $c_i(x) = 0$ for $2 \leq i \leq n$. This contradicts the fact that $c_i(x) \in K^*$. Analogously, we have $c_0(x) \neq 0$.

If $\deg_a1(x) = 0$ and $d_0(x) \in K$, then $d_0(x) - na_1(x) \in K$, a contradiction. Hence $\deg d_0(x) \geq 1$.

In order to prove Lemma 3.3, we first give the following lemma.

**Lemma 3.2.** If $c_i(x) \in K[x]$ satisfies the equations (3.2), (3.3) for $0 \leq i \leq n$ and $n \geq 2$, where $\deg a_1(x) > \deg a_2(x) \geq 1$, $\deg c_n(x) = 0$, $c_0(x)c_1(x)c_{n-1}(x) \neq 0$ and $a_0 \in K^*$, then $d_0(x) \neq ja_1(x)$ for all $1 \leq j \leq n - 1$. 

\[ \square \]
Proof. Suppose that $d_0(x) = a_1(x)$. If $n = 2$, then we have a contradiction by comparing the degree of $x$ of equation (3.2) $(i = 1)$. If $n \geq 3$, then substituting equations (3.3), (3.2) $(i = 1)$ into equation (3.2) $(i = 2)$, we have

$$3a_0c_3(x) = \left(\frac{n}{2} - 1\right) \frac{a_1(x)a_2(x)c_0(x)}{a_0} - \frac{a'_1(x)c_0(x)}{a_0} - \frac{a_1(x)c'_0(x)}{2a_0}. \tag{3.10}$$

It follows from equation (3.2) $(i = 1)$ that $\deg c_2(x) = \deg a_2(x) + \deg c_0(x)$. Then it follows from equation (3.10) that $\deg c_3(x) = \deg a_1(x) + \deg c_2(x) > \deg c_2(x) \geq 1$. If $n \geq 4$, then it follows from equation (3.2) $(i = n - 1)$ that $\deg c_{n-2}(x) + \deg a_2(x) = \deg c_{n-1}(x) + \deg a_1(x)$. Then we have $\deg c_{n-2}(x) > \deg c_{n-1}(x)$. Continuing in this way we arrive at $\deg c_2(x) > \deg c_3(x)$, which is a contradiction. If $n = 3$, then we have $\deg c_3(x) = 0$, which is a contradiction.

Suppose that $d_0(x) = i_0a_1(x)$ with $2 \leq i_0 \leq n - 1$. Then $\deg(d_0(x) - ia_1(x)) = \deg a_1(x) > \deg a_2(x)$ for $1 \leq i \leq n$ and $i \neq i_0$. It follows from equation (3.2) that $\deg c_{i+1}(x) = \deg a_1(x) + \deg c_i(x)$ for $1 \leq i \leq i_0 - 1$ and $\deg c_{i+1}(x) = \deg a_2(x) + \deg c_{i+1}(x)$. Then we have $\deg c_{i+1}(x) + \deg a_1(x) = \deg a_1(x) + \deg a_2(x) + \deg c_{i+1}(x)$.

Substituting equation (3.2) $(i = i_0 - 1)$ and equation (3.2) $(i = i_0)$ into equation (3.2) $(i = i_0 + 1)$, we have

$$\begin{align*}
(i_0 + 2)a_0c_{i_0+2}(x) &= \frac{n - i_0}{i_0a_0}a_2(x)[(n - i_0 + 2)a_2(x)c_{i_0-2}(x) + a_1(x)c_{i_0-1}(x)] - c'_{i_0-2}(x) + \frac{-a_1(x)}{(i_0 + 1)a_0}[(n - i_0 + 1)a_2(x)c_{i_0-1}(x) - c'_{i_0-1}(x)] - c''_i(x).
\end{align*} \tag{3.11}$$

Clearly,

$$\begin{align*}
\frac{n - i_0}{i_0a_0}a_2(x)a_1(x)c_{i_0-1}(x) + \frac{-a_1(x)}{(i_0 + 1)a_0}(n - i_0 + 1)a_2(x)c_{i_0-1}(x) &= \frac{n - 2i_0}{i_0(i_0 + 1)a_0}a_1(x)a_2(x)c_{i_0-1}(x).
\end{align*} \tag{3.12}$$

If $n = 2i_0$, then we consider

$$\begin{align*}
\frac{n - i_0}{i_0a_0}a_2(x)(n - i_0 + 2)a_2(x)c_{i_0-2}(x) + \frac{a_1(x)}{(i_0 + 1)a_0}c'_{i_0-1}(x) - c'_i(x).
\end{align*} \tag{3.13}$$

Substituting equation (3.2) $(i = i_0 - 1)$ into equation (3.13), we have

$$\begin{align*}
\frac{i_0 + 2}{a_0}a_2^2(x)c_{i_0-2}(x) + \frac{a_1(x)}{(i_0 + 1)a_0}c'_{i_0-1}(x) - \frac{1}{i_0a_0}[(i_0 + 2)a'_2(x)c_{i_0-2}(x) + (i_0 + 2)a_2(x)c'_{i_0-2}(x) + a_1(x)c''_{i_0-1}(x) - c''_{i_0-2}(x)]
\end{align*} \tag{3.14}$$

$$\begin{align*}
= \frac{i_0 + 2}{a_0}(a_2^2(x) - \frac{a'_2(x)}{i_0})c_{i_0-2}(x) - \frac{1}{i_0a_0}(i_0 + 2)a_2(x)c'_{i_0-2}(x) + \frac{1}{i_0a_0}c''_{i_0-2}(x)
- \frac{a'_1(x)}{i_0a_0}c_{i_0-1}(x) - \frac{a_1(x)}{i_0(i_0 + 1)a_0}c''_{i_0-1}(x).
\end{align*}$$
Lemma 3.3. Let \( D = y \partial_x + (a_2(x)y^2 + a_1(x)y + a_0)\partial_y \) be a derivation of \( K[x, y] \) with \( a_1(x) \in K[x], a_2(x) \in K[x], \deg a_1(x) \geq 1, \deg a_2(x) \geq 1 \) and \( a_0 \in K^* \). If \( D \) has a Darboux polynomial \( F(x, y) = \sum_{i=0}^{n} c_i(x)y^i \not\in K \) with \( c_n(x) \neq 0, c_i(x) \in K[x] \) for \( 0 \leq i \leq n \) and \( n \geq 2 \) such that \( D(F(x, y)) = \Lambda(x, y)F(x, y) \) for some \( \Lambda(x, y) \in K[x, y] \), then \( d_0(x) \in K^* \) and \( c_1(x)c_0(x) \neq 0 \), where \( d_0(x) \) be as in Lemma 3.1 (1).

Proof. Suppose that \( d_0(x) = 0 \). Then it follows from equation (3.3) that \( c_1(x) = 0 \). If \( n = 2 \), then we have a contradiction by comparing the degree of \( x \) of equation (3.2) \((i = 1)\). If \( n \geq 3 \) and \( c_2(x) = 0 \), then it follows from equations (3.2) that \( c_i(x) = 0, 3 \leq i \leq n \), this contradicts the fact that \( c_n(x) \in K^* \). If \( n \geq 3 \) and \( c_2(x) \neq 0 \), then it follows from equation (3.1) that \( c_{n-1}(x) \neq 0 \). Otherwise, \( na_1(x)c_n(x) = 0 \), a contradiction. Thus, we have \( \deg a_1(x) = \deg a_2(x) + \deg c_{n-1}(x) \geq \deg a_2(x) \). It follows from equations (3.2) that \( c_{i+1}(x) \neq 0 \) and \( \deg c_{i+1}(x) = \deg a_1(x) + \deg c_i(x) \) for \( 2 \leq i \leq n-1 \). Then we have \( \deg c_n(x) \geq 1 \), which is a contradiction.

Suppose that \( c_1(x) = 0 \). Then it follows from equation (3.3) that \( c_0(x) = 0 \). It follows from equations (3.2) that \( c_i(x) = 0 \) for \( 2 \leq i \leq n \). This contradicts the fact that \( c_n(x) \in K^* \). Analogously, we have \( c_0(x) \neq 0 \).

Let \( t := \max\{\deg d_0(x), \deg a_1(x)\} \). Suppose that \( \deg d_0(x) \geq 1 \). It follows from \( c_{n-1}(x) \neq 0, d_0(x) - na_1(x) \not\in K \) (by Lemma 3.1) and equation (3.1) that

\[
\deg(d_0(x) - na_1(x)) = \deg a_2(x) + \deg c_{n-1}(x).
\]
Then we have \( \deg c_n(x) = \deg c_{n-1}(x) + t \geq 1 \). This contradicts the fact that \( c_n(x) \in K^* \).

Case 2: If there exists an index \( i_0 \in \{1, \ldots, n-1\} \) such that \( d_0(x) - i_0a_1(x) = 0 \), then \( \deg(d_0(x) - na_1(x)) = \deg a_1(x) \). It follows from equation (3.15) that \( \deg a_1(x) = \deg a_2(x) + \deg c_{n-1}(x) \geq \deg a_2(x) \). Thus, \( \deg(d_0(x) - ia_1(x)) = \deg a_1(x) \geq \deg a_2(x) \) for \( 1 \leq i \leq n \) and \( i \neq i_0 \).

It follows from Lemma 3.2 that \( \deg a_1(x) \leq \deg a_2(x) \). Thus, \( \deg a_1(x) = \deg a_2(x) \). It follows from equation (3.15) that \( \deg c_{n-1}(x) = 0 \). If \( n = 2 \), then \( \deg c_{1}(x) = 0 \). If \( n \geq 3 \), then it follows from equation (3.2)(\( i = n - 1 \)) that \( i_0 \neq n-1 \). Otherwise, we have a contradiction by comparing the degree of \( x \). Hence we have \( \deg c_{n-1}(x) = 0 \) by comparing the degree of \( x \) of the equation (3.2)(\( i = n - 1 \)). Continuing in this way we arrive at \( \deg c_1(x) = \deg c_2(x) = 0 \). It follows from equation (3.3) that \( \deg c_1(x) = \deg d_0(x) + \deg c_0(x) \geq 1 \), which is a contradiction.

Case 3: If there exists an index \( i_0 \in \{1, \ldots, n-1\} \) such that \( d_0(x) - i_0a_1(x) = 0 \), then it follows from equation (3.15) that \( \deg a_1(x) = \deg a_2(x) + \deg c_{n-1}(x) \geq \deg a_2(x) \). Thus, \( \deg(d_0(x) - ia_1(x)) = \deg a_1(x) \geq \deg a_2(x) \) for \( 1 \leq i \leq n \) and \( i \neq i_0 \).

If \( \deg a_1(x) > \deg a_2(x) \) and \( n \geq 3 \), then it follows from equations (3.2) that \( \deg c_{i_0+1}(x) = \deg c_{i_0}(x) \), \( \deg c_{i+1}(x) = \deg c_i(x) + \deg a_1(x) \) for \( i \neq i_0 \) and \( 1 \leq i \leq n-1 \). Then we have \( \deg c_n(x) \geq \deg c_1(x) + \deg a_1(x) \geq 1 \), which is a contradiction.

If \( \deg a_1(x) > \deg a_2(x) \) and \( n = 2 \), then it follows from equation (3.2) that \( \deg c_2(x) = \deg c_1(x) \). It follows from equation (3.3) that \( \deg c_1(x) = \deg c_0(x) + \deg d_0(x) \geq 1 \). Then we have \( \deg c_2(x) \geq 1 \), which is a contradiction.

If \( \deg a_1(x) = \deg a_2(x) \), then it follows from equation (3.1) that \( \deg c_{n-1}(x) = 0 \). If \( n = 2 \), then we have \( \deg c_1(x) = 0 \). If \( n \geq 3 \) and \( i_0 = n-1 \), then it follows from equation (3.2)(\( i = n - 1 \)) that \( c_{n-2}(x) = 0 \). Otherwise, we have a contradiction by comparing the degree of \( x \) of equation (3.2)(\( i = n - 1 \)). If \( c_{n-3}(x) = 0 \), then it follows from equation (3.2)(\( i = n - 2 \)) that \( (n-1)a_0c_{n-1}(x) = 0 \), a contradiction. If \( c_{n-3}(x) \neq 0 \), then we have a contradiction by comparing the degree of \( x \) of equation (3.2)(\( i = n - 2 \)). Thus, we have \( i_0 \neq n-1 \). It follows from equation (3.2)(\( i = n - 1 \)) that \( \deg c_{n-2}(x) = 0 \). Continuing in this way we arrive at \( i_0 \neq 2 \) and \( \deg c_1(x) = 0 \). It follows from equation (3.3) that \( \deg c_1(x) \geq 1 \), which is a contradiction.

Case 4: If \( \deg(d_0(x) - ia_1(x)) \geq 1 \) for \( 1 \leq i \leq n \) and there exists an index \( i_0 \in \{1, \ldots, n\} \) such that \( \deg(d_0(x) - i_0a_1(x)) < t \), then \( \deg a_1(x) = \deg d_0(x) \) and \( \deg(d_0(x) - ia_1(x)) = \deg a_1(x) = \deg d_0(x) \) for \( 1 \leq i \leq n \) and \( i \neq i_0 \).

If \( i_0 = n \), then \( \deg(d_0(x) - na_1(x)) < \deg a_1(x) \). It follows from equation (3.15) that \( \deg a_1(x) > \deg c_{n-1}(x) + \deg a_2(x) \geq \deg a_2(x) \), then \( \deg(d_0(x) - ia_1(x)) = \deg a_1(x) > \deg a_2(x) \) for \( 1 \leq i \leq n - 1 \). It follows from equation (3.3) that \( \deg c_1(x) \geq 1 \), which is a contradiction.
that \( \deg c_1(x) \geq \deg c_0(x) + 1 \). It follows from equations (3.2) that \( c_i(x) \neq 0 \) and \( \deg c_{i+1}(x) = \deg c_i(x) + \deg a_1(x) \) for \( 1 \leq i \leq n - 1 \). Then \( \deg c_n(x) = \deg c_{n-1}(x) + \deg a_1(x) \geq 1 \), which is a contradiction.

If \( i_0 \neq n \), then \( \deg(d_0(x) - na_1(x)) = \deg a_1(x) \). It follows from equation (3.15) that \( \deg a_1(x) = \deg c_{n-1}(x) + \deg a_2(x) \). Then we have \( \deg(d_0(x) - ia_1(x)) = \deg a_1(x) \geq \deg a_2(x) \) for \( i \neq i_0 \) and \( 1 \leq i \leq n \).

If \( \deg a_1(x) = \deg a_2(x) \), then \( \deg c_{n-1}(x) = 0 \). It follows from equation (3.2) \((i = n - 1)\) that \( i_0 \neq n - 1 \). Comparing the degree of \( x \) of the equation (3.2) \((i = n - 1)\), we have \( \deg c_{n-2}(x) = 0 \). Similarly, we have \( \deg c_i(x) = 0 \) for \( 1 \leq i \leq n - 2 \). Thus, we have \( \deg c_i(x) = 0 \) for \( 1 \leq i \leq n - 1 \). It follows from equation (3.3) that \( \deg c_1(x) = \deg d_0(x) + \deg c_0(x) \geq 1 \), which is a contradiction.

If \( \deg a_1(x) > \deg a_2(x) \), then it follows from equation (3.3) that \( \deg c_1(x) \geq \deg c_0(x) + 1 \). It follows from equation (3.2) \( c_{i+1}(x) = \deg c_i(x) + \deg(d_0(x) - i_0a_1(x)) \geq 1 + \deg c_0(x) \). Then we have \( c_i(x) \neq 0 \) and \( \deg c_{i+1}(x) = \deg c_i(x) + \deg a_1(x) \) for \( i \neq i_0 \), \( 1 \leq i \leq n - 1 \). Thus, we have \( \deg c_n(x) \geq \deg c_{n-1}(x) + 1 \), which is a contradiction.

\[ \square \]

4 The main result

In this section, we prove that \( D = y\partial_x + (a_2(x)y^2 + a_1(x)y + a_0(x))\partial_y \) with \( a_0(x), a_1(x), a_2(x) \in K[x] \) is simple iff \( 1 \) \( a_0(x) \in K^* \), \( 2 \) \( \deg a_1(x) \geq 1 \) or \( \deg a_2(x) \geq 1 \), \( 3 \) there exist no \( l \in K^* \) such that \( a_2(x) = la_1(x) - l^2a_0(x) \).

**Theorem 4.1.** Let \( D = y\partial_x + (a_2(x)y^2 + a_1(x)y + a_0(x))\partial_y \) be a derivation of \( K[x, y] \) with \( a_1 \in K, a_0(x), a_2(x) \in K[x] \). Then \( D \) is simple if and only if \( a_0(x) \in K^* \) and \( \deg a_2(x) \geq 1 \).

**Proof.** “ \( \Rightarrow \)” If \( a_0(x) \notin K^* \), then \( (y, a_0(x)) \) is a \( D \)-stable ideal. Thus, \( D \) is not simple. Hence we have \( a_0(x) \in K^* \). If \( a_2(x) = 0, a_1 = 0 \), then \( \left( \frac{1}{2}y^2 - xa_0(x) \right) \) is a \( D \)-stable ideal. Thus, \( D \) is not simple. If \( a_2(x) = 0, a_1 \in K^* \), then \( (y + a_0(x)) \) is a \( D \)-stable ideal. Thus, \( D \) is not simple. If \( a_2(x) \in K^* \), then \( \left( y^2 + \frac{a_0(x)}{a_2(x)} \right) \) is a \( D \)-stable ideal. Thus, \( D \) is not simple. Hence we have \( \deg a_2(x) \geq 1 \).

“ \( \Leftarrow \)” Let \( a_0 := a_0(x) \in K^* \). It follows from Proposition 2.1 in [5] that it suffices to prove that \( (y, a_2(x)y^2 + a_1y + a_0) = (1) \) and \( D \) has no Darboux polynomial. Clearly, \( (y, a_2(x)y^2 + a_1y + a_0) = (a_0) = (1) \). If \( a_1 = 0 \), then it follows from Theorem 2.1 that \( D \) is simple. Then we can assume \( a_1 \in K^* \). Suppose that \( F(x, y) \in K[x, y] \) is a Darboux polynomial of \( D \) and \( F(x, y) = \sum_{i=0}^{n} c_i(x)y^i \notin K \) with \( c_n(x) \neq 0, c_i(x) \in K[x] \) for \( 0 \leq i \leq n \). Then we have \( D(F(x, y)) = \Lambda(x, y)F(x, y) \) for some \( \Lambda(x, y) \in K[x, y] \).

It follows from Lemma 3.1 that \( n \geq 1, \Lambda(x, y) = d_1(x)y + d_0(x) \) with \( d_1(x), d_0(x) \in K[x], c_0(x) \in K^* \) and \( d_1(x) = na_2(x) \).
If $n = 1$, then it follows from Lemma 3.1 that

$$
\begin{align*}
\left\{ \begin{array}{l}
c'_0(x) = a_2(x)c_0(x) + (d_0(x) - a_1)c_1(x), \\
a_0c_1(x) = d_0(x)c_0(x).
\end{array} \right.
\end{align*}
$$

(4.1)

It follows from equations (4.1) that $\deg c_0(x) = \deg d_0(x) = 0$, $d_0(x) = a_1$, $c_0(x) = 0$ and $c_1(x) = 0$, which is a contradiction.

If $n \geq 2$, then it follows from Lemma 3.1 that we have the following equations:

$$
\begin{align*}
(i + 1)a_0c_{i+1}(x) &= (n - i + 1)a_2(x)c_{i-1}(x) + (d_0(x) - ia_1)c_i(x) - c'_{i-1}(x), \\
(4.3) \quad a_0c_1(x) &= d_0(x)c_0(x)
\end{align*}
$$

for $1 \leq i \leq n - 1$.

It follows from Lemma 3.1 that $\deg d_0(x) \geq 1$, $c_0(x)c_1(x) \neq 0$ and $c_{n-1}(x) \neq 0$.

It follows from equation (4.1) that $\deg c_1(x) = \deg d_0(x) + \deg c_0(x) \geq 1 + \deg c_0(x)$. It follows from equation (4.2) that $\deg(d_0(x) - na_1) = \deg c_{n-1}(x) + \deg a_2(x)$. Then we have $\deg d_0(x) = \deg(d_0(x) - ia_1) = \deg(d_0(x) - na_1) \geq \deg a_2(x)$ for $1 \leq i \leq n$. It follows from equation (4.3) that $c_1(x) \neq 0$ and $\deg c_{i+1}(x) = \deg c_i(x) + \deg d_0(x)$ for $1 \leq i \leq n - 1$. Thus, we have $\deg c_n(x) = \deg c_{n-1}(x) + \deg d_0(x) \geq 1$, which is a contradiction. Hence $D$ has no Darboux polynomial. Therefore, $D$ is simple.

\[\Box\]

**Theorem 4.2.** Let $D = y\partial_x + (a_2(x)y^2 + a_1(x)y + a_0(x))\partial_y$ be a derivation of $K[x,y]$ with $a_0(x), a_1(x), a_2(x) \in K[x]$. Then $D$ is simple iff the following conditions hold:

1. $a_0(x) \in K^*$,
2. $\deg a_1(x) \geq 1$ or $\deg a_2(x) \geq 1$,
3. there exist no $l \in K^*$ such that $a_2(x) = la_1(x) - l^2a_0(x)$.

**Proof.** “$\Rightarrow$” If $a_0(x) \notin K^*$, then $(y, a_0(x))$ is a $D$-stable ideal. Thus, $D$ is not simple. Hence we have $a_0(x) \in K^*$. If $\deg a_1(x) \leq 0, \deg a_2(x) = 0$, then $(y + a_0(x))$ is $D$-stable. Thus, $D$ is not simple. If $\deg a_1(x) = 0, a_2(x) = 0$, then $(y + a_0(x))$ is $D$-stable. Thus, $D$ is not simple. If $a_1(x) = 0, a_2(x) = 0$, then $(\frac{1}{2}y^2 - xa_0(x))$ is a $D$-stable ideal. Thus, $D$ is not simple. Hence we have $\deg a_2(x) > 1$ or $\deg a_1(x) > 1$.

Clearly, $(y, a_2(x)y^2 + a_1(x)y + a_0(x)) = (a_0(x)) = (1)$. It follows from Proposition 2.1 in [5] that $D$ is simple if and only if $D$ has no Darboux polynomial. If $a_2(x) = la_1(x) - l^2a_0(x)$ for some $l \in K^*$, then $D(y + l^{-1}) = l \cdot (a_1(x)y - la_0(x)y + a_0(x))(y + l^{-1})$. Hence $(y + l^{-1})$ is $D$-stable, whence $D$ is not simple. Then the conclusion follows.

“$\Leftarrow$” Let $a_0 := a_0(x) \in K^*$. If $a_2(x) \in K$, then it follows from Theorem 2.2 in [12] that $D$ is simple. If $\deg a_2(x) \geq 1, a_1 \in K$, then it follows from Theorem 4.1 that $D$ is simple.
Then we have $K \in D$ of equation (4.5) and the following arguments.

It follows from Proposition 2.1 in [5] that it suffices to prove that $(y, a_2(x)y^2 + a_1(x)y + a_0) = (1)$ and $D$ has no Darboux polynomial. Clearly, $(y, a_2(x)y^2 + a_1(x)y + a_0) = (a_0) = (1)$. Suppose that $F(x, y) \in K[x, y]$ is a Darboux polynomial of $D$ and $F(x, y) = \sum_{i=0}^{n} c_i(x)y^i \notin K$ with $c_n(x) \neq 0, c_i(x) \in K[x]$ for $0 \leq i \leq n$. Then we have $D(F(x, y)) = \Lambda(x, y)F(x, y)$ for some $\Lambda(x, y) \in K[x, y]$.

It follows from Lemma 3.1 that $n \geq 1, \Lambda(x, y) = d_1(x)y + d_0(x)$ with $d_1(x), d_0(x) \in K[x], c_n(x) \in K^*$ and $d_1(x) = na_2(x)$.

If $n = 1$, then we have the following equations:

$$c_0(x) = a_2(x)c_0(x) + (d_0(x) - a_1(x))c_1(x),$$

$$a_0c_1(x) = d_0(x)c_0(x)$$

(4.5)

It follows from the above equations that $0 = \deg c_1(x) = \deg c_0(x) + \deg d_0(x)$. Then $\deg c_0(x) = \deg d_0(x) = 0$ and $c_0(x) \neq 0$. Hence we have $a_2(x) = \frac{\text{c}_i(x)}{c_0(x)}a_1(x) - \frac{c_i(x)}{c_0(x)}a_0(x)$, which is a contradiction.

If $n \geq 2$, then it follows from Lemma 3.1 that

$$c_{n-1}'(x) = a_2(x)c_{n-1}(x) + (d_0(x) - na_1(x))c_n(x),$$

(4.6)

$$a_0c_1(x) = d_0(x)c_0(x)$$

(4.7)

$$(i + 1)a_0(x)c_{i+1}(x) = (n - i + 1)a_2(x)c_{i-1}(x) + (d_0(x) - ia_1(x))c_i(x) - c_{i-1}(x),$$

(4.8)

$$a_0c_1(x) = d_0(x)c_0(x)$$

for $1 \leq i \leq n - 1$.

It follows from Lemma 3.3 that $d_0(x) \in K^*$.

It follows from equation (4.6) that $c_{n-1}(x) \neq 0$ and $\deg c_{n-1}(x) + \deg a_2(x) = \deg a_1(x)$. Then we have $\deg a_1(x) \geq \deg a_2(x)$.

If $\deg a_1(x) > \deg a_2(x)$, then it follows from equation (4.8) that $c_1(x) = \deg c_0(x)$. It follows from equation (4.7) that $c_i(x) \neq 0$ and $\deg c_{i+1}(x) = \deg c_i(x) + \deg a_1(x) \geq \deg a_1(x) \geq 1$ for $1 \leq i \leq n - 1$. Then we have $\deg c_n(x) = \deg c_{n-1}(x) + \deg a_1(x) \geq 1$. This contradicts the fact that $c_n(x) \in K^*$.

If $\deg a_1(x) = \deg a_2(x)$, then $\deg c_{n-1}(x) = 0$. Comparing the degree of $x$ the equation (4.7) $(i = n - 1)$, we have $\deg c_{n-2}(x) = 0$. Similarly, we have $\deg c_i(x) = 0$ for $0 \leq i \leq n - 2$. Thus, we have $\deg c_i(x) = 0$ for $0 \leq i \leq n$. Since $d_0(x) \in K^*$, it follows from equation (4.6) that $c_{n-1}(x) \neq 0$. Let $c_i := c_i(x), d_0 := d_0(x)$ for $1 \leq i \leq n$. It follows from equation (4.6) that $a_2(x) = \frac{nc_n}{c_{n-1}}a_1(x) - \frac{c_n}{c_{n-1}}d_0$. Then it follows from equation (4.7) $(i = n - 1)$ that

$$\left(\frac{2nc_n}{c_{n-1}} - (n - 1)c_{n-1}\right)a_1(x) + d_0c_{n-1} - \frac{2c_nc_{n-2}}{c_{n-1}}d_0 - na_0c_n = 0.$$  

(4.9)

Then we have $c_{n-2} = \frac{(n-1)c_{n-1}}{2nc_n}$ and $d_0c_{n-1} - \frac{2c_nc_{n-2}}{c_{n-1}}d_0 - na_0c_n = 0$ by comparing the coefficients of $x$ with highest degree of equation (4.9). Then we have $d_0 = \frac{n^2c_n}{c_{n-1}}a_0$. 

[1, 2, 3, 4, 5]
Thus, we have $a_2(x) = \frac{nc_n}{cn-1} a_1(x) - (\frac{nc_n}{cn-1})^2 a_0$, which is a contradiction. Hence $D$ has no Darboux polynomial. Therefore, $D$ is simple. \hfill \Box

5 The images of some derivations

In this section, we prove that the images of some derivations of $K[x,y_1,\ldots,y_n]$ and $K[y_1,\ldots,y_n]$ are Mathieu-Zhao spaces.

\textbf{Theorem 5.1.} Let $D = \partial_x + \sum_{i=1}^{n} \gamma_i(x) y_i^k \partial_i$ be a derivation of $K[x,y_1,\ldots,y_n]$ and $k_i \geq 1, \gamma_i(x) \in K[x]\setminus\{0\}$ for all $1 \leq i \leq n$. Then $\text{Im } D$ is a Mathieu-Zhao space if and only if $k_i = 1$ and $\gamma_i(x) \in K$ for all $1 \leq i \leq n$.

\textit{Proof.} “$\Leftarrow$” If $k_i = 1$ and $\gamma_i(x) \in K$ for all $1 \leq i \leq n$, then $D$ is locally finite. Note that $1 \in \text{Im } D$. Thus, the conclusion follows from Proposition 1.4 in [13].

“$\Rightarrow$” Since $1 \in \text{Im } D$, we have $\text{Im } D = K[x,y_1,\ldots,y_n]$ if $\text{Im } D$ is a Mathieu-Zhao space of $K[x,y_1,\ldots,y_n]$.

If there exists $i_0 \in \{1,2,\ldots,n\}$ such that $k_i > 1$, then we claim $y_{i_0} \notin \text{Im } D$. Without loss of generality, we can assume that $i_0 = 1$. Suppose that $y_1 \in \text{Im } D$. Then there exists $f(x,y_1,\ldots,y_n) \in K[x,y_1,\ldots,y_n]$ such that

$$D(f(x,y_1,\ldots,y_n)) = y_1. \tag{5.1}$$

Let $f = \sum_{i=0}^{t} d_i(x) y_i^1 + \sum_{|\alpha| = 1}^{d} c_\alpha(x) y_1^{\alpha_1} \cdots y_n^{\alpha_n}$ with $d_i(x) \neq 0$ and $\alpha_2 + \alpha_3 + \cdots + \alpha_n \geq 1$, where $c_\alpha(x) \in K[x]$, $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}^n$, $|\alpha| = \alpha_1 + \alpha_2 + \alpha_3 + \cdots + \alpha_n$ and $d_i(x) \in K[x]$ for all $0 \leq i \leq t$. It follows from equation (5.1) that

$$f_x + \sum_{i=1}^{n} \gamma_i(x) y_i^k f y_i = y_1. \tag{5.2}$$

If $t \geq 1$, then we have

$$\sum_{i=0}^{t} d_i'(x) y_i^1 + \gamma_1(x) y_1^k \sum_{i=1}^{t} i d_i(x) y_1^{i-1} = y_1 \tag{5.3}$$

by comparing the part of degree zero with respect to $y_2,\ldots,y_n$ of equation (5.2). Thus, we have $t \gamma_1(x) d_t(x) = 0$ by comparing the coefficients of $y_1^{k_1+t-1}$ of equation (5.3), which is a contradiction.

If $t = 0$, then we have $d_0'(x) = y_1$ by comparing the part of degree zero with respect to $y_2,\ldots,y_n$ of equation (5.2), which is a contradiction.

If $k_i = 1$ for all $1 \leq i \leq n$ and there exists $j_0 \in \{1,2,\ldots,n\}$ such that $\text{deg } \gamma_{j_0}(x) \geq 1$, then without loss of generality, we can assume that $j_0 = 1$, we claim $y_1 \notin \text{Im } D$. Suppose that $y_1 \in \text{Im } D$. Then there exists $g(x,y_1,\ldots,y_n) \in K[x,y_1,\ldots,y_n]$ such that

$$D(g(x,y_1,\ldots,y_n)) = y_1. \tag{5.4}$$
Let \( g = g^{(d)} + g^{(d-1)} + \cdots + g^{(1)} + g^{(0)} \) with \( g^{(j)} \neq 0 \), where \( g^{(j)} \) is the homogeneous part of degree \( j \) with respect to \( y_1, \ldots, y_n \) of \( g \). It follows from equation (4.4) that

\[
(5.5) \quad g_x + \sum_{i=1}^{n} \gamma_i(x)y_i g_{y_i} = y_1.
\]

Then we have

\[
(5.6) \quad g_x^{(1)} + \sum_{i=1}^{n} \gamma_i(x)y_i g_{y_i}^{(1)} = y_1.
\]

by comparing the homogeneous part of degree one with respect to \( y_1, \ldots, y_n \) of equation (5.5).

We view the polynomials as in \( K[x][y_1, \ldots, y_n] \) with coefficients in \( K[x] \) when we comparing the coefficients of \( y_1^i \cdots y_n^j \). Let \( g^{(1)} = c_1(x)y_1 + \cdots + c_n(x)y_n \) with \( c_i(x) \in K[x] \) for \( 1 \leq i \leq n \). Then equation (5.6) has the following form:

\[
(5.7) \quad \sum_{i=1}^{n} c_i'(x)y_i + \sum_{i=1}^{n} \gamma_i(x)y_i c_i(x) = y_1.
\]

Thus, we have

\[
(5.8) \quad c_1'(x) + \gamma_1(x)c_1(x) = 1
\]

by comparing the coefficients of \( y_1 \) of equation (5.7). Since \( \deg \gamma_1(x) \geq 1 \), we have \( c_1(x) = 0 \) by comparing the degree of \( x \) of equation (5.8). Then equation (5.8) is \( 0=1 \), which is a contradiction. Then the conclusion follows.

**Corollary 5.2.** Let \( D = \partial_x + \sum_{i=1}^{n} \gamma_i(x)y_i^k_i \partial_i \) be a derivation of \( K[x, y_1, \ldots, y_n] \) and \( k_i \geq 1, \gamma_i(x) \in K[x] \) for all \( 1 \leq i \leq n \). Then \( \text{Im} \ D \) is a Mathieu-Zhao space if and only if \( D \) is locally finite.

**Proof.** If \( \gamma_i(x) = 0 \) for all \( 1 \leq i \leq n \), then \( D \) is locally finite and \( \text{Im} \ D \) is a Mathieu-Zhao space of \( K[x, y_1, \ldots, y_n] \). If there exists \( i_0 \in \{1, 2, \ldots, n\} \) such that \( \gamma_{i_0}(x) \neq 0 \), then the conclusion follows from Theorem 5.1.

**Theorem 5.3.** Let \( D = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \gamma_i y_i^k_i \partial_i \) be a derivation of \( K[y_1, \ldots, y_n] \), \( n \geq 2 \) and \( \gamma_i \in K^* \) for all \( 1 \leq i \leq n \). Then \( \text{Im} \ D \) is a Mathieu-Zhao space if and only if \( k_i \leq 1 \) for all \( 1 \leq i \leq n \).

**Proof.** “ \( \Leftarrow \)” If \( k_i = 1 \) for all \( 1 \leq i \leq n \), then \( D = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \gamma_i y_i \partial_i \). Then the conclusion follows from Theorem 2.5 in [2].

If there exists \( k_i = 0 \), then \( 1 \in \text{Im} \ D \) and \( D \) is locally finite. Then the conclusion follows from Proposition 1.4 in [13].

“ \( \Rightarrow \)” Suppose that there exists \( k_{i_0} > 1 \) and \( k_i \neq 0 \) for all \( 1 \leq i \leq n \), then we claim \( y_{i_0} y_2^m \notin \text{Im} \ D \), where \( m \gg 0 \). Without loss of generality, we can assume that
\[ i_0 = 1. \] Suppose that \( y_1 y_2^n \in \text{Im} \, D. \) Then there exists \( f(y_1, \ldots, y_n) \in K[y_1, \ldots, y_n] \) such that

\[ D(f(y_1, \ldots, y_n)) = y_1 y_2^m. \] (5.9)

Let \( f = h(y_1, y_2) + \sum_{|\alpha| = 1}^p c_\alpha y_1^{\alpha_1} \cdots y_n^{\alpha_n} \neq 0 \) with \( \alpha_3 + \cdots + \alpha_n \geq 1 \), where \( c_\alpha \in K, |\alpha| = \alpha_1 + \alpha_2 + \alpha_3 + \cdots + \alpha_n \) and \( h(y_1, y_2) \in K[y_1, y_2]. \)

It follows from equation (5.9) that

\[ \sum_{i=1}^n \gamma_i y_i^k f_{y_i} = y_1 y_2^m. \] (5.10)

Let \( h(y_1, y_2) = \sum_{i=0}^t c_i(y_2) y_i^1 \) with \( c_t(y_2) \neq 0 \), where \( c_t(y_2) \in K[y_2] \) for \( 0 \leq i \leq t \). If \( t = 0 \), then \( D(h) \in K[y_2] \) and \( D(h) \neq y_1 y_2^m \). Thus we have \( t \geq 1 \).

Then we have

\[ \gamma_1 y_1^{k_1} \sum_{i=1}^t i c_i(y_2) y_i^{i-1} + \gamma_2 y_2^{k_2} \sum_{i=0}^t c_i(y_2) y_i^1 = y_1 y_2^m \] (5.11)

by comparing the homogeneous part of degree zero with respect to \( y_3, \ldots, y_n \) of equation (5.10). Thus, we have \( t \gamma_1 c_t(y_2) = 0 \) by comparing the coefficients of \( y_1^{k_1+t-1} \) of equation (5.11), which is a contradiction.

Note that \( y_2^m = D \left( \frac{y_2^m}{y_2^{m-k_2+1}} \right) \) for \( m \geq k_2 \), then we have \( y_2^m \in \text{Im} \, D \) for \( m \gg 0 \), but \( y_1 y_2^m \notin \text{Im} \, D \) for \( m \gg 0 \), which is a contradiction.

Now suppose that there exists \( k_{j_0} > 1 \) and \( k_{p_0} = 0 \). Without loss of generality, we can assume that \( j_0 = 1 \) and \( p_0 = 2 \).

If \( n = 2 \), then \( D = \gamma_1 y_1^{k_1} \partial_1 + \gamma_2 \partial_2 \). It follows from Theorem [5.1] that \( \text{Im} \, D \) is not a Mathieu-Zhao space, which is a contradiction.

If \( n \geq 3 \), then \( D = \gamma_1 y_1^{k_1} \partial_1 + \gamma_2 \partial_2 + \sum_{i=3}^n \gamma_i y_i^{k_i} \partial_i \). Clearly, \( 1 \in \text{Im} \, D \). We have \( \text{Im} \, D = K[y_1, \ldots, y_n] \) if \( \text{Im} \, D \) is a Mathieu-Zhao space of \( K[y_1, \ldots, y_n] \). We claim \( y_1 \notin \text{Im} \, D \). Suppose that \( y_1 \in \text{Im} \, D \). Then there exists \( g(y_1, \ldots, y_n) \in K[y_1, \ldots, y_n] \) such that

\[ D(g(y_1, \ldots, y_n)) = y_1. \] (5.12)

Let \( g = \sum_{j=0}^s c_j y_j^1 \) with \( c_s \neq 0 \), where \( c_j \in K[y_2, \ldots, y_n] \) for \( 0 \leq j \leq s \). If \( s = 0 \), then \( D(g) \in K[y_2, \ldots, y_n] \) and \( D(g) \neq y_1 \). Thus we have \( s \geq 1 \).

It follows from equation (5.12) that

\[ \gamma_1 y_1^{k_1} \sum_{j=1}^s j c_j y_1^{j-1} + \gamma_2 \sum_{j=0}^s c_{j,2} y_1^j + \sum_{i=3}^n \gamma_i y_i^{k_i} \sum_{j=0}^s c_{j,i} y_1^j = y_1 \] (5.13)

where \( c_{j,i} \) denotes \( \frac{\partial c_j}{\partial y_i} \) for \( 2 \leq i \leq n \) and \( 0 \leq j \leq s \).

Thus, we have \( s \gamma_1 c_s = 0 \) by comparing the coefficients of \( y_1^{k_1+s-1} \) of equation (5.13), which is a contradiction. Then the conclusion follows. Similarly, we can prove the case that \( k_{j_0} > 1, k_{p_0} = \cdots = k_{p_r} = 0. \) \( \square \)
6 A conjecture

Based on the conclusions of section 2 to section 4, we give the following conjecture.

**Conjecture 6.1.** Let $D = y^\alpha \partial_x + (a_2(x)y^{\alpha+1} + a_1(x)y^\alpha + a_0(x))\partial_y$ be a derivation of $K[x,y]$ with $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}^*$. Then $D$ is simple if and only if

1. $a_0(x) \in K^*$,
2. $\deg a_2(x) \geq 1$ or $\deg a_1(x) \geq 1$,
3. there is no $l \in K^*$ such that $a_2(x) = la_1(x) + (-1)^{\alpha+1}a_0(x)$.

**Remark 6.2.** In our paper, we have proved Conjecture 6.1 if $\alpha = 1$. In addition, one direction of Conjecture 6.1 is easy to prove. Thus, we have the following proposition.

**Proposition 6.3.** Let $D = y^\alpha \partial_x + (a_2(x)y^{\beta+1} + a_1(x)y^\beta + a_0(x))\partial_y$ be a derivation of $K[x,y]$ with $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{N}^*$ and $\alpha \leq \beta$. If $D$ is simple, then we have the following statements:

1. $a_0(x) \in K^*$,
2. $\deg a_2(x) \geq 1$ or $\deg a_1(x) \geq 1$,
3. there is no $l \in K^*$ such that $a_2(x) = la_1(x) + (-1)^{\beta+1}a_0(x)$.

**Proof.** (1) If $a_0(x) \notin K^*$, then the ideal $(y,a_0(x))$ is $D$-stable. Hence $D$ is not simple, which is a contradiction. Thus, we have $a_0(x) \in K^*$.

(2) If $a_2(x) \in K^*$ or $a_1(x) \in K^*$, then the ideal $(a_2(x)y^{\beta+1} + a_1(x)y^\beta + a_0(x))$ is $D$-stable. If $a_2(x) = a_1(x) = 0$, then the ideal $(y^{\alpha+1} - a_0 \cdot x)$ is $D$-stable. Hence $D$ is not simple, which is a contradiction. Thus, we have $\deg a_2(x) \geq 1$ or $\deg a_1(x) \geq 1$.

(3) If there is $l_0 \in K^*$ such that $a_2(x) = l_0a_1(x) + (-1)^{\beta}l^{\beta+1}a_0(x)$, then the ideal $(y + l_0^{-1})$ is $D$-stable. Hence $D$ is not simple, which is a contradiction. Then the conclusion follows.
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