

# On the family of affine varieties

$$x_1^{r_1} \cdots x_m^{r_m} y = F(x_1, \dots, x_m, z, t)$$

Parnashree Ghosh\* and Neena Gupta\*\*

*Theoretical Statistics and Mathematics Unit, Indian Statistical Institute,  
203 B.T.Road, Kolkata-700108, India*

*e-mail : \* parnashree\_r@isical.ac.in, ghoshparnashree@gmail.com*

*e-mail : \*\* neenag@isical.ac.in, rnanina@gmail.com*

## Abstract

Let  $k$  be a field and  $m$  be a non-negative integer. Let  $\mathbb{V}$  be an affine subvariety of  $\mathbb{A}^{m+3}$  defined by  $x_1^{r_1} \cdots x_m^{r_m} y = F(x_1, \dots, x_m, z, t)$ . In [10], the second author has studied the  $m = 1$  case. In this paper, we have studied the higher dimensional analogue of this variety and we have proved a necessary and sufficient condition for  $\mathbb{V}$  to be isomorphic to  $\mathbb{A}^{m+2}$ , under certain hypothesis. Further we have given examples of a family of higher dimensional varieties for which the Abhyankar-Sathaye Conjecture holds. We have constructed an infinite family of pairwise non-isomorphic varieties of higher dimension ( $\geq 3$ ) which are counter examples to the Zariski's Cancellation Problem in positive characteristic. Also computed the Derksen invariant, the Makar-Limanov invariant and the automorphisms of these varieties under certain conditions.

**Keywords.** Polynomial algebra, Abhyankar-Sathaye Conjecture, Graded ring, Derksen invariant, Makar-Limanov invariant.

**2020 MSC.** Primary: 14R10; Secondary: 13B25, 13A50, 13A02

## 1 Introduction

Throughout this paper,  $k$  will denote a field and for a commutative ring  $R$ ,  $R^{[n]}$  will denote a polynomial ring in  $n$  variables over  $R$ .  $R^*$  will denote the group of units in  $R$ .

In this paper we study the integral domain  $A$  defined as follows:

$$A := \frac{k[X_1, \dots, X_m, Y, Z, T]}{(X_1^{r_1} \cdots X_m^{r_m} Y - F(X_1, \dots, X_m, Z, T))}, \quad r_i > 1 \text{ for all } 1 \leq i \leq m \quad (1)$$

and  $f(Z, T) = F(0, \dots, 0, Z, T) \neq 0$ . This ring appeared as a counter example to the Zariski's Cancellation Problem in dimensions greater than two. More precisely, the second author showed that, for any integer  $m \geq 1$ , ([11], Proposition 3.4, Theorem 3.7):

(a)  $A^{[1]} = k^{[m+3]}$ , when  $\frac{k[X_1, \dots, X_m, Z, T]}{(X_1 \cdots X_m, F(X_1, \dots, X_m, Z, T))} \cong \left( \frac{k[X_1, \dots, X_m]}{(X_1 \cdots X_m)} \right)^{[1]}$ .

(b) If  $A = k^{[m+2]}$  and  $f(Z, T)$  is a line in  $k[Z, T]$ , i.e.,  $\frac{k[Z, T]}{(f(Z, T))} = k^{[1]}$ , then  $k[Z, T] = k[f]^{[1]}$ .

As a consequence, for  $ch.k = p > 0$ , if  $f(Z, T)$  is an example of Segre-Nagata nontrivial line in  $k[Z, T]$ , in particular if  $f(Z, T) = Z^{p^e} + T + T^{sp}$ , where  $p^e \nmid sp$  and  $sp \nmid p^e$ , then  $A \neq k^{[m+2]}$ . Therefore, it solves the Zariski's Cancellation problem for  $ch.k = p > 0$  in dimensions greater than equal to three ([11], Corollary 3.8).

Further for  $m = 1$ , the second author has shown that  $A = k^{[m+2]}$  if and only if  $f$  is a coordinate in  $k[Z, T]$ . In fact, she proved the following result ([10], Theorem 3.11):

**Theorem A** *Let  $k$  be a field and  $B = \frac{k[X, Y, Z, T]}{(X^r Y - F(X, Z, T))}$ , where  $r > 1$ . Let  $x$  be the image of  $X$  in  $B$ . If  $G := X^r Y - F(X, Z, T)$  and  $f(Z, T) = F(0, Z, T) \neq 0$ , then the following statements are equivalent:*

- (i)  $k[X, Y, Z, T] = k[X, G]^{[2]}$ .
- (ii)  $k[X, Y, Z, T] = k[G]^{[3]}$ .
- (iii)  $B = k[x]^{[2]}$ .
- (iv)  $B = k^{[3]}$ .
- (v)  $k[Z, T] = k[f]^{[1]}$ .

In view of Theorem A, A. K. Dutta had asked the authors whether similar results hold for  $m > 1$ , i.e.,

**Question 1 :** For  $m > 1$ , is the condition  $k[Z, T] = k[f]^{[1]}$  necessary and sufficient for  $A$  to be  $k^{[m+2]}$  ?

Also note that in Theorem A, equivalence of the facts (ii) and (iv) answers a special case of the Abhyankar-Sathaye conjecture which asserts an affirmative answer to the following question:

**Question 2 :** If  $\frac{k[X_1, \dots, X_n]}{(H)} = k^{[n-1]}$ , then is  $k[X_1, \dots, X_n] = k[H]^{[n-1]}$ ?

In this paper, we answer **Question 1** when

$$F(X_1, \dots, X_m, Z, T) = f(Z, T) + (X_1 \cdots X_m)g(X_1, \dots, X_m, Z, T).$$

In fact, we have proved the following result which generalises Theorem A (Theorem 3.9):

**Theorem B** *Let  $k$  be a field and*

$$A = \frac{k[X_1, \dots, X_m, Y, Z, T]}{(X_1^{r_1} \cdots X_m^{r_m} Y - F(X_1, \dots, X_m, Z, T))}, \quad r_i > 1 \text{ for all } 1 \leq i \leq m.$$

*Let  $F(X_1, \dots, X_m, Z, T) = f(Z, T) + (X_1 \cdots X_m)g(X_1, \dots, X_m, Z, T)$  be such that  $f(Z, T) \neq 0$ . Let  $G = X_1^{r_1} \cdots X_m^{r_m} Y - F(X_1, \dots, X_m, Z, T)$  and  $x_1, \dots, x_m$  denote the images of  $X_1, \dots, X_m$  respectively. Then the following statements are equivalent:*

- (i)  $k[X_1, \dots, X_m, Y, Z, T] = k[X_1, \dots, X_m, G]^{[2]}$ .
- (ii)  $k[X_1, \dots, X_m, Y, Z, T] = k[G]^{[m+2]}$ .
- (iii)  $A = k[x_1, \dots, x_m]^{[2]}$ .
- (iv)  $A = k^{[m+2]}$ .

(v)  $k[Z, T] = k[f(Z, T)]^{[1]}$ .

The equivalence of (iv) and (v) in the above theorem answers **Question 1** for the particular structure of  $F$ . Also the equivalence of (ii) and (iv) gives an affirmative answer to **Question 2** (Abhyankar-Sathaye conjecture) for  $n > 4$  and for the special kind of hypersurfaces  $G$ .

In section 4, we have given necessary and sufficient conditions for an endomorphism of  $A$  to be an automorphism, when  $A$  is as in Theorem B and  $\text{DK}(A) = k[x_1, \dots, x_m, z, t]$  (Theorem 4.1, Theorem 4.2). Also we have given example of an infinite family of affine varieties of higher dimensions ( $\geq 3$ ), which are pairwise non-isomorphic and they are counter examples to the Zariski's Cancellation Problem in positive characteristic.

In section 5, we have studied the generalised Danielewski varieties (introduced by Dubouloz in [7]). In [7] has shown that over the field  $\mathbb{C}$  these varieties are counter example to the generalised Zariski's Cancellation Problem. we have extended the result over the fields of arbitrary characteristic (Theorem 5.10, Theorem 5.12). Further we have given a complete description of  $\text{ML}(A)$  and  $\text{DK}(A)$  for

$$A \cong \frac{k[X_1, \dots, X_m, Y, Z, T]}{(X_1^{r_1} \cdots X_m^{r_m} Y - f(Z, T))},$$

$k$  is an infinite field and  $A$  is a regular UFD (Corollary 5.14).

## 2 Preliminaries

We first give the definition of a line in  $k^{[2]}$  where  $k$  is a field.

**Definition 2.1.** *Let  $k$  be a field. A polynomial  $h(X, Y) \in k[X, Y]$  is said to be a line in  $k[X, Y]$ , if  $\frac{k[X, Y]}{(h)} \cong k^{[1]}$ . Furthermore, if  $k[X, Y] \neq k[h]^{[1]}$ , then  $h$  is said to be a non-trivial line.*

We now define exponential maps on a  $k$ -algebra  $B$  and two invariants related to it, namely, the *Makar-Limanov invariant* and the *Derksen invariant*.

**Definition 2.2.** *Let  $B$  be a  $k$ -algebra and  $\phi : B \rightarrow B^{[1]}$  be a  $k$ -algebra homomorphism. For an indeterminate  $U$  over  $B$ , let  $\phi_U$  denote the map  $\phi : B \rightarrow B[U]$ . Then  $\phi$  is said to be an exponential map on  $B$ , if the following conditions are satisfied:*

- (i)  $\epsilon_0 \phi_U = \text{id}_B$ , where  $\epsilon_0 : B[U] \rightarrow B$  is the evaluation map at  $U = 0$ .
- (ii)  $\phi_V \phi_U = \phi_{U+V}$ , where  $\phi_V : B \rightarrow B[V]$  is extended to a  $k$ -algebra homomorphism  $\phi_V : B[U] \rightarrow B[U, V]$ , by setting  $\phi_V(U) = U$ .

The ring of invariants of  $\phi$  is defined to be a subring of  $B$  as follows:

$$B^\phi := \{b \in B \mid \phi(b) = b\}$$

If  $\text{EXP}(B)$  denotes the set of all exponential maps on  $B$ , then the *Makar-Limanov invariant* is defined by

$$\text{ML}(B) := \bigcap_{\phi \in \text{EXP}(B)} B^\phi$$

and the *Derksen invariant* is defined by

$$\text{DK}(B) := k \left[ b \in B^\phi \mid \phi \in \text{EXP}(B) \text{ and } B^\phi \subsetneq B \right]$$

Next we record some useful results on exponential maps. The following two lemmas can be found in [4] and [9] respectively.

**Lemma 2.1.** *Let  $B$  be an affine domain over a field  $k$  and  $\phi$  be a non-trivial exponential map on  $B$ . Let  $S$  be a multiplicatively closed subset of  $B^\phi \setminus \{0\}$ . Then  $\phi$  will induce a non-trivial exponential map  $S^{-1}\phi$  on  $S^{-1}B$  such that  $(S^{-1}B)^{S^{-1}\phi} = S^{-1}(B^\phi)$ .*

**Lemma 2.2.** *Let  $k$  be a field and  $B = k^{[n]}$ . Then  $\text{DK}(B) = B$  for  $n \geq 2$  and  $\text{ML}(B) = k$ .*

Next we define *proper* and *admissible  $\mathbb{Z}$ -filtration* on an affine domain.

**Definition 2.3.** *Let  $k$  be a field and  $B$  be an affine  $k$ -domain. A collection  $\{B_n \mid n \in \mathbb{Z}\}$  of  $k$ -subspaces of  $B$  is said to be a *proper  $\mathbb{Z}$ -filtration* if*

- (i)  $B_{n+1} \subseteq B_n$ , for every  $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ .
- (ii)  $B = \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} B_n$
- (iii)  $\bigcap_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} B_n = \{0\}$
- (iv)  $(B_n \setminus B_{n+1}) \cdot (B_m \setminus B_{m+1}) \subseteq B_{m+n} \setminus B_{m+n-1}$  for all  $m, n \in \mathbb{Z}$ .

A proper  $\mathbb{Z}$ -filtration  $\{B_n\}$  of  $B$  is said to be *admissible* if there is a finite generating set  $\Gamma$  of  $B$  such that every element in  $B_n$  can be written as finite sum of monomials in elements of  $\Gamma$  so that the monomials are also elements of  $B_n$ , for every  $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ .

A proper  $\mathbb{Z}$ -filtration  $\{B_n\}$  of  $B$  defines an associated graded domain defined by

$$\text{gr}(B) := \bigoplus_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} \frac{B_n}{B_{n+1}}.$$

Also it defines the natural map  $\rho : B \rightarrow \text{gr}(B)$  such that  $\rho(b) = b + B_{n+1}$ , if  $b \in B_n \setminus B_{n+1}$ .

Let us now record the following lemma on homogenization of exponential maps due to Derksen *et al.* [6]. The following version can be found in [4, Theorem 2.6].

**Theorem 2.3.** *Let  $B$  be an affine domain over a field  $k$  with an admissible proper  $\mathbb{Z}$ -filtration and  $\text{gr}(B)$  be the induced  $\mathbb{Z}$ -graded domain. Let  $\phi$  be a non-trivial exponential map on  $B$ . Then  $\phi$  induces a non-trivial homogeneous exponential map  $\bar{\phi}$  on  $\text{gr}(B)$  such that  $\rho(B^\phi) \subseteq \text{gr}(B)^{\bar{\phi}}$ .*

We quote below a criterion for flatness from [12, (20. G)].

**Lemma 2.4.** *Let  $R \rightarrow S \rightarrow T$  be local homomorphism of Noetherian local rings and  $M$  be a finite  $T$  module. Suppose  $S$  is  $R$  flat and  $\kappa$  be the residue field of  $R$ . Then the following statements are equivalent:*

- (i)  $M$  is  $S$  flat.
- (ii)  $M$  is  $R$  flat and  $M \otimes_R \kappa$  is  $S \otimes_R \kappa$  flat.

The following is a well known result due to S.S. Abhyankar, P. Eakin and W. Heinzer ([1]).

**Theorem 2.5.** *Let  $k$  be a field and  $R$  be a normal domain such that  $k \subseteq R \subseteq k^{[n]}$ . If  $\text{tr. deg}_k R = 1$ , then  $R \cong k^{[1]}$ .*

Next we state the Russell-Sathaye criterion [13, Theorem 2.3.1].

**Theorem 2.6.** *Let  $R \subseteq S$  be integral domains such that  $S$  is finitely generated  $R$ -algebra. Let  $T$  be a multiplicatively closed subset of  $R \setminus \{0\}$  generated by prime elements of  $R$ , which remain prime in  $S$  and  $T^{-1}S = (T^{-1}R)^{[1]}$ . If for every prime element  $p \in T$ ,  $pR = pS \cap R$  and  $\frac{R}{pR}$  is algebraically closed in  $\frac{S}{pS}$ , then  $S = R^{[1]}$ .*

Next we note down the following lemma which follows from [5, Theorem 7].

**Lemma 2.7.** *Let  $k$  be a field. Let  $f \in k[Z, T]$  such that  $L[Z, T] = L[f]^{[1]}$ , for some separable field extension of  $L$  of  $k$ . Then  $k[Z, T] = k[f]^{[1]}$ .*

The next result gives a necessary and sufficient conditions for the domain  $B = \frac{k[X, Y, Z, T]}{(X^r Y - F(X, Z, T))}$  to be a UFD ([10, Lemma 3.1]).

**Lemma 2.8.** *Let  $k$  be a field and  $B := \frac{k[X, Y, Z, T]}{(X^r Y - F(X, Z, T))}$  where  $r > 0$  and  $F(0, Z, T) = f(Z, T) \neq 0$ . Then the following statements are equivalent:*

- (i)  $B$  is a UFD.
- (ii)  $x$  is prime or unit where  $x$  is image of  $X$  in  $B$ .
- (iii)  $f(Z, T)$  is irreducible in  $k[Z, T]$  or a unit in  $k$ .

For the next two results,  $A$  denotes the affine domain as in (1) and  $x_1, \dots, x_m, z, t$  denote the images of  $X_1, \dots, X_m, Z, T$  respectively in  $A$ . The following result is proved in [11, Lemma 3.3].

**Lemma 2.9.** *For the domain  $A$  as defined in (1),  $k[x_1, \dots, x_m, z, t] \subseteq \text{DK}(A)$ .*

The second author proved the following proposition ([11, Proposition 3.4]) with the condition  $\text{DK}(A) = A$ . However, this condition can be strengthened to  $k[x_1, \dots, x_m, z, t] \subsetneq \text{DK}(A)$  and the same proof will work. Here we are quoting the result with the modified condition.

**Proposition 2.10.** *Let  $k$  be an infinite field and  $A$  be the ring as in (1) where  $f(Z, T) := F(0, \dots, 0, Z, T) \neq 0$ . Suppose that  $k[x_1, \dots, x_m, z, t] \subsetneq \text{DK}(A)$ . Then the following statements hold*

- (i) *There exist  $Z_1, T_1 \in k[Z, T]$  and  $a_0, a_1 \in k^{[1]}$  such that  $k[Z, T] = k[Z_1, T_1]$  and  $f(Z, T) = a_0(Z_1) + a_1(Z_1)T_1$ .*
- (ii) *Suppose that  $k[Z, T]/(f) = k^{[1]}$ . Then  $k[Z, T] = k[f]^{[1]}$ .*

**Remark 2.11.** We note that Proposition 2.10(ii) also holds over finite fields. Let  $k$  be a finite field and  $k[x_1, \dots, x_m, z, t] \subsetneq \text{DK}(A)$ . Let  $\bar{k}$  be an algebraic closure of  $k$  and  $\bar{A} = A \otimes_k \bar{k}$ . Since  $k[x_1, \dots, x_m, z, t] \subsetneq \text{DK}(A)$ , we have  $\bar{k}[x_1, \dots, x_m, z, t] \subsetneq \text{DK}(\bar{A})$ . If  $k[Z, T]/(f) = k^{[1]}$ , then  $\bar{k}[Z, T]/(f) = \bar{k}^{[1]}$  and hence  $\bar{k}[Z, T] = \bar{k}[f]^{[1]}$ . By Lemma 2.7, we get that  $k[Z, T] = k[f]^{[1]}$ .

In the rest of this section we will note some  $K$ -theoretic aspects of a Noetherian ring  $R$  ([2], [3]). Let  $R$  be a Noetherian ring,  $\mathcal{M}(R)$  denotes the category of finitely generated  $R$ -modules and  $\mathcal{P}(R)$  denotes the category of finitely generated projective  $R$ -modules. Let  $G_0(R)$  and  $G_1(R)$  denote the *Grothendieck group* and the *Whitehead group* of the category  $\mathcal{M}(R)$  respectively. Let  $K_0(R)$  and  $K_1(R)$  denote the *Grothendieck group* and the *Whitehead group* of the category  $\mathcal{P}(R)$  respectively. For  $i \geq 2$ , the definition of  $G_i(R)$  and  $K_i(R)$  can be found in ([14], Chapters 4 and 5).

**Lemma 2.12.** *Let  $t$  be a non-zero divisor of  $R$ . Then the inclusion map  $j : R \hookrightarrow R[t^{-1}]$  and the natural surjection map  $\pi : R \rightarrow \frac{R}{tR}$  induces the following long exact sequence of groups:*

$$\longrightarrow G_i\left(\frac{R}{tR}\right) \xrightarrow{\pi^*} G_i(R) \xrightarrow{j^*} G_i(R[t^{-1}]) \longrightarrow \cdots \longrightarrow G_0(R[t^{-1}]) \longrightarrow 0$$

**Lemma 2.13.** *Let  $t$  be a non-zero divisor of  $R$  and  $\phi : R \rightarrow S$  be a flat ring homomorphism such that  $u = \phi(t)$ . Then we get the following commutative diagram:*

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} \cdots & \longrightarrow & G_i\left(\frac{R}{tR}\right) & \longrightarrow & G_i(R) & \longrightarrow & G_i(R[t^{-1}]) & \longrightarrow & G_{i-1}\left(\frac{R}{tR}\right) & \longrightarrow & \cdots \\ & & \downarrow \overline{\phi}^* & & \downarrow \phi^* & & \downarrow (t^{-1}\phi)^* & & \downarrow \overline{\phi}^* & & \\ \cdots & \longrightarrow & G_i\left(\frac{S}{uS}\right) & \longrightarrow & G_i(S) & \longrightarrow & G_i(S[u^{-1}]) & \longrightarrow & G_{i-1}\left(\frac{S}{uS}\right) & \longrightarrow & \cdots, \end{array}$$

where  $\phi$  induces the vertical maps.

**Lemma 2.14.** *Let  $T$  be indeterminate over  $R$ . Then the following hold:*

- (a) *The maps  $G_i(R) \rightarrow G_i(R[T])$ , which are induced by  $R \hookrightarrow R[T]$ , are isomorphism for every  $i \geq 0$ .*
- (b) *Let  $j : R \rightarrow R[T, T^{-1}]$  be the inclusion map. Then for every  $i$ , the following sequence is split exact.*

$$0 \longrightarrow G_i(R[T]) \xrightarrow{j^*} G_i(R[T, T^{-1}]) \longrightarrow G_{i-1}(R) \longrightarrow 0.$$

*In particular, for  $i = 0$ ,  $j^*$  is an isomorphism and for  $i \geq 1$ ,  $G_i(R[T, T^{-1}]) \cong G_i(R[T]) \oplus G_{i-1}(R) \cong G_i(R) \oplus G_{i-1}(R)$ .*

**Remark 2.15.** For a regular ring  $R$ ,  $G_i(R) = K_i(R)$ , for every  $i \geq 0$ . In particular,  $G_1(k[X]) = K_1(k[X]) = k^*$  and  $G_0(k) = K_0(k) = \mathbb{Z}$ . Also for  $B_m = k[X_1, \dots, X_m, X_1^{-1}, \dots, X_m^{-1}]$ ,  $G_0(B_m) = K_0(B_m) = \mathbb{Z}$  (since every finitely generated projective module over  $B_m$  is free) and by repeated application of Lemma 2.14 (b), we get that  $G_1(B_m) \cong k^* \oplus \mathbb{Z}^m$ , for every  $m \geq 1$ .

### 3 Main Theorem

We begin this section with the following lemma.

**Lemma 3.1.** *Let  $B = k[X_1, \dots, X_m, Y, Z, T]$  and  $G = X_1^{r_1} \cdots X_m^{r_m} Y - X_1 \cdots X_m g + Z$ , for any  $g \in k[X_1, \dots, X_m, Z, T]$ . Then  $B = k[X_1, \dots, X_m, G, T]^{[1]}$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $D = k[X_1, \dots, X_m, G, T] \subseteq B$ . Let  $S$  be the multiplicatively closed subset of  $D \setminus \{0\}$ , which is generated by  $X_1, \dots, X_m$ . From the expression of  $G$ , it is clear that  $S^{-1}B = (S^{-1}D)^{[1]}$ . Again  $\frac{B}{X_i B} = (\frac{D}{X_i D})^{[1]}$ , for every  $1 \leq i \leq m$ . Therefore, by Theorem 2.6, we get that  $B = D^{[1]}$ . Hence the result follows.  $\square$

In the rest of this section  $A$  denotes the following ring:

$$A = \frac{k[X_1, \dots, X_m, Y, Z, T]}{(X_1^{r_1} \cdots X_m^{r_m} Y - F(X_1, \dots, X_m, Z, T))}, \quad r_i > 1, \text{ for all } 1 \leq i \leq m, \quad (2)$$

where  $f(Z, T) = F(0, \dots, 0, Z, T) \neq 0$ . Let  $G := X_1^{r_1} \cdots X_m^{r_m} Y - F$ . Note that  $A$  is an integral domain. Let  $x_1, \dots, x_m, y, z, t$  denote the images of  $X_1, \dots, X_m, Y, Z, T$  in  $A$  and  $S = k[x_1, \dots, x_m]$ . Note that

$$B = k[x_1, \dots, x_m, z, t] \hookrightarrow A \hookrightarrow B[x_1^{-1}, \dots, x_m^{-1}].$$

Fix  $(e_1, \dots, e_m) \in \mathbb{Z}^m$ . The ring  $B[x_1^{-1}, \dots, x_m^{-1}]$  can be given the following  $\mathbb{Z}$ -graded structure:

$$B[x_1^{-1}, \dots, x_m^{-1}] = \bigoplus_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} B_n,$$

where  $B_n = \bigoplus_{(i_1, \dots, i_m) \in \mathbb{Z}^m, e_1 i_1 + \dots + e_m i_m = n} k[z, t] x_1^{i_1} \cdots x_m^{i_m}$ . Now every  $b \in B[x_1^{-1}, \dots, x_m^{-1}]$  can be written uniquely as  $b = \sum_{i=d_l}^{d_h} b_i$ , where  $b_i \in B_i$ ,  $d_l, d_h$  are some integers and  $b_{d_l}, b_{d_h} \neq 0$ . If  $b \in B$ , then each  $b_i \in B$ . We call  $d_h$  the degree of  $b$  and hence  $b_{d_h}$  is the highest degree homogeneous summand of  $b$ . For every  $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ , if  $A_n = \bigoplus_{i \leq n} B_i \cap A$ , then  $\{A_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{Z}}$  define a  $\mathbb{Z}$ -filtration on  $A$ . For every  $1 \leq j \leq m$ ,  $x_j \in A_{e_j} \setminus A_{e_j-1}$ . If  $d$  denotes degree of  $F(x_1, \dots, x_m, z, t)$ , then  $y \in A_p \setminus A_{p-1}$ , where  $p = d - (r_1 e_1 + \dots + r_m e_m)$ .

With respect to the notations as above, we quote two lemmas [11, Lemmas 3.1, 3.2].

**Lemma 3.2.** *The  $k$ -linear subspaces  $\{A_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{Z}}$  define a proper admissible  $\mathbb{Z}$ -filtration on  $A$  with the generating set  $\Gamma = \{x_1, \dots, x_m, y, z, t\}$ , and the associated graded ring  $gr(A) = \bigoplus_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} \frac{A_n}{A_{n-1}}$  is generated by the image of  $\Gamma$  in  $gr(A)$ .*

**Lemma 3.3.** *Let  $d$  be the degree of  $F(x_1, \dots, x_m, z, t)$ , and  $x_j \nmid F_d$ , for every  $j$ ,  $1 \leq j \leq m$ , where  $F_d$  denotes the highest degree homogeneous summand of  $F$ . Then the associated graded ring  $gr(A)$  is isomorphic to*

$$\frac{k[X_1, \dots, X_m, Y, Z, T]}{(X_1^{r_1} \cdots X_m^{r_m} Y - F_d(X_1, \dots, X_m, Z, T))}$$

as  $k$ -algebras.

The next result gives description of  $ML(A)$  when  $DK(A)$  is exactly equal to the subring  $k[x_1, \dots, x_m, z, t]$  of  $A$ .

**Proposition 3.4.** *Let  $A$  be the affine domain as in (2). Then the following hold:*

(a) *If  $x_i \notin A^*$ , for every  $i \in \{1, \dots, m\}$ , and either  $\partial F / \partial z \neq 0$  or  $\partial F / \partial t \neq 0$ , then  $ML(A) \subseteq k[x_1, \dots, x_m]$ .*

(b) *If  $DK(A) = k[x_1, \dots, x_m, z, t]$  then  $ML(A) = k[x_1, \dots, x_m]$ .*

*Proof.* (a) By Lemma 2.9, we know that  $k[x_1, \dots, x_m, z, t] \subseteq \text{DK}(A)$ . We now show that  $\text{ML}(A) \subseteq k[x_1, \dots, x_m]$ . Without loss of generality, suppose  $\partial F/\partial t \neq 0$ .

Consider the map  $\phi_1 : A \rightarrow A[U]$  defined as follows:

$$\phi_1(x_i) = x_i \ (1 \leq i \leq m), \quad \phi_1(z) = z, \quad \phi_1(t) = t + x_1^{r_1} \cdots x_m^{r_m} U,$$

$$\phi_1(y) = \frac{F(x_1, \dots, x_m, z, t + x_1^{r_1} \cdots x_m^{r_m} U)}{x_1^{r_1} \cdots x_m^{r_m}} = y + Uv(x_1, \dots, x_m, z, t, U),$$

for some  $v \in k[x_1, \dots, x_m, z, t, U]$ . It is easy to see that  $\phi_1 \in \text{EXP}(A)$ . Now  $k[x_1, \dots, x_m, z] \subseteq A^{\phi_1} \subseteq A \subseteq k[x_1, \dots, x_m, (x_1 \cdots x_m)^{-1}, z, t]$ . Since  $\partial F/\partial t \neq 0$ , and for every  $i$ ,  $1 \leq i \leq m$ ,  $x_i \notin A^*$ , it follows that  $A \cap k[x_1, \dots, x_m, (x_1 \cdots x_m)^{-1}, z] = k[x_1, \dots, x_m, z]$ . Therefore,  $k[x_1, \dots, x_m, z]$  is algebraically closed in  $A$ . Also  $\text{tr. deg}_k(k[x_1, \dots, x_m, z]) = \text{tr. deg}_k(A^{\phi_1}) = m + 1$ , that means  $A^{\phi_1}$  is algebraic over  $k[x_1, \dots, x_m, z]$ . Hence  $A^{\phi_1} = k[x_1, \dots, x_m, z]$ .

Again consider the map  $\phi_2 : A \rightarrow A[U]$  defined as follows:

$$\phi_2(x_i) = x_i \ (1 \leq i \leq m), \quad \phi_2(t) = t, \quad \phi_2(z) = z + x_1^{r_1} \cdots x_m^{r_m} U,$$

$$\phi_2(y) = \frac{F(x_1, \dots, x_m, z + x_1^{r_1} \cdots x_m^{r_m} U, t)}{x_1^{r_1} \cdots x_m^{r_m}} = y + Uw(x_1, \dots, x_m, z, t, U),$$

for some  $w \in k[x_1, \dots, x_m, z, t, U]$ . It follows that  $\phi_2 \in \text{EXP}(A)$ . Here  $k[x_1, \dots, x_m, t] \subseteq A^{\phi_2}$ . Since  $A^{\phi_2}$  is algebraic over  $k[x_1, \dots, x_m, t]$ , we have  $A^{\phi_2} \subseteq k[x_1, \dots, x_m, (x_1 \cdots x_m)^{-1}, t]$ .

Therefore,  $\text{ML}(A) \subseteq A^{\phi_1} \cap A^{\phi_2} \subseteq k[x_1, \dots, x_m]$ .

(b) Now let us consider the case when  $\text{DK}(A) = k[x_1, \dots, x_m, z, t]$ . Note that for every  $i$ ,  $1 \leq i \leq m$ ,  $x_i \notin A^*$  in this case. Further, if either  $\partial F/\partial t = 0$  or  $\partial F/\partial z = 0$ , then  $y \in A^{\phi_1}$  or  $y \in A^{\phi_2}$ , respectively, where  $\phi_1, \phi_2 \in \text{EXP}(A)$  as defined in part (a). This contradicts our assumption that  $\text{DK}(A) = k[x_1, \dots, x_m, z, t]$ . Therefore,  $\partial F/\partial t, \partial F/\partial z \neq 0$ , and hence by part (a), it is clear that  $\text{ML}(A) \subseteq k[x_1, \dots, x_m]$ . Let  $\phi \in \text{EXP}(A)$ . We show that  $k[x_1, \dots, x_m] \subseteq A^\phi$ . Now  $\text{tr. deg}_k A^\phi = m + 1$  and  $A^\phi \subseteq k[x_1, \dots, x_m, z, t]$ . Suppose  $\{f_1, \dots, f_{m+1}\}$  be an algebraically independent set of elements in  $A^\phi$ . We fix  $x_j$  for some  $j \in \{1, \dots, m\}$ . Now

$$f_i = g_i^j(x_1, \dots, x_{j-1}, x_{j+1}, \dots, x_m, z, t) + x_j h_i^j(x_1, \dots, x_m, z, t) \quad (3)$$

for every  $i \in \{1, \dots, m\}$ . If some  $g_i^j = 0$ , then clearly  $x_j \in A^\phi$ . Therefore, we assume that  $g_i^j \neq 0$ , for every  $i$ .

We consider the  $\mathbb{Z}$ -filtration on  $A$  induced by  $(0, \dots, 0, -1, 0, \dots, 0) \in \mathbb{Z}^m$ , where the  $j$ -th entry is  $-1$ . If  $f_{ij}$  denotes the highest degree homogeneous summand of  $f_i$ , then from (3), we get that  $f_{ij} = g_i^j$ . Now  $\phi$  will induce a non-trivial exponential map  $\phi_j$  on the associated graded ring  $A_j$  where

$$A_j \cong \frac{k[X_1, \dots, X_m, Y, Z, T]}{(X_1^{r_1} \cdots X_m^{r_m} Y - F(X_1, \dots, X_{j-1}, 0, X_{j+1}, \dots, X_m, Z, T))}. \quad (4)$$



By Theorem 2.3, we that  $\{g_i^j \mid 1 \leq i \leq m+1\} \subseteq A_j^{\phi_j}$ . We now show that  $\{g_i^j \mid 1 \leq i \leq m+1\}$  is algebraically dependent set of elements of  $k[x_1, \dots, x_{j-1}, x_{j+1}, \dots, x_m, z, t]$ . If  $\{g_i^j \mid 1 \leq i \leq m+1\}$  is algebraically independent, then  $k[x_1, \dots, x_{j-1}, x_{j+1}, \dots, x_m, z, t]$  is algebraic over  $k[g_i^j \mid 1 \leq i \leq m+1]$ . As  $k[g_i^j \mid 1 \leq i \leq m+1] \subseteq A_j^{\phi_j}$  and  $A_j^{\phi_j}$  is algebraically closed, we have  $k[x_1, \dots, x_{j-1}, x_{j+1}, \dots, x_m, z, t] \subseteq A_j^{\phi_j}$ . Therefore, from (4) we get that  $x_j, y \in A_j^{\phi_j}$  which contradicts that  $\phi_j$  is non-trivial. Therefore,  $\{g_i^j \mid 1 \leq i \leq m+1\}$  is algebraically dependent. Hence there exists a polynomial  $P \in k^{[m+1]}$  such that

$$P(g_1^j, \dots, g_{m+1}^j) = 0.$$

Therefore, from (3), we get that there exists  $H \in k[x_1, \dots, x_m, z, t]$  such that  $x_j H = P(f_1, \dots, f_{m+1}) \in A^\phi$ . As  $A^\phi$  is factorially closed, we have that  $x_j \in A^\phi$ . Since  $j$  is arbitrarily chosen from  $\{1, \dots, m\}$ , we have  $k[x_1, \dots, x_m] \subseteq \text{ML}(A)$ . Therefore,  $\text{ML}(A) = k[x_1, \dots, x_m]$ .  $\square$

**Remark 3.5.** From Proposition 2.10, it follows that if  $k$  is an infinite field and there is no system of variables  $\{Z_1, T_1\}$  of  $k[Z, T]$  such that  $f(Z, T) = a_0(Z_1) + a_1(Z_1)T_1$ , then  $\text{DK}(A) = k[x_1, \dots, x_m, z, t]$  and hence  $\text{ML}(A) = k[x_1, \dots, x_m]$ .

From now onwards,  $F$  will be of the form

$$F(X_1, \dots, X_m, Z, T) = f(Z, T) + (X_1 \cdots X_m)g(X_1, \dots, X_m, Z, T). \quad (5)$$

Our next Proposition gives equivalent conditions for  $A$  to be a UFD.

**Proposition 3.6.** *The following statements are equivalent:*

- (i)  $A$  is a UFD.
- (ii)  $f(Z, T)$  is either an irreducible element in  $k[Z, T]$  or a unit in  $k$ .
- (iii) For  $1 \leq i \leq m$ ,  $x_i$  is a prime in  $A$  or a unit.

*Proof.* We prove this by induction on  $m$ . For  $m = 1$  the equivalence follows from Lemma 2.8. Therefore we can assume that  $m \geq 2$ . Let us assume that the result is true for  $1 \leq i \leq m-1$ .

(i)  $\Rightarrow$  (ii) : Since  $A$  is UFD,  $A \otimes_{k[x_1]} k(x_1) \cong \frac{k(x_1)[X_2, \dots, X_m, Y, Z, T]}{(X_2^{r_2} \cdots X_m^{r_m} Y - F(X_1, \dots, X_m, Z, T))}$  is a UFD. Therefore, by induction hypothesis we get that  $f(Z, T)$  is irreducible in  $k(x_1)[Z, T]$  or unit in  $k(x_1)$ . As  $f(Z, T) \in k[Z, T]$ , it follows that it is either irreducible in  $k[Z, T]$  or a unit in  $k$ .

(ii)  $\Rightarrow$  (iii) : For  $1 \leq i \leq m$ , we obtain that

$$\frac{A}{x_i A} \cong \frac{k[Z, T, X_1, \dots, X_{i-1}, X_{i+1}, \dots, X_m]}{(f(Z, T))}.$$

Since  $f(Z, T)$  is an irreducible or a unit in  $k[Z, T]$ , it follows that  $\frac{A}{x_i A}$  is an integral domain or a zero ring, respectively. Hence we obtain that every  $x_i$  is a prime in  $A$  or all of them are units in  $A$ .

(iii)  $\Rightarrow$  (i) : Since  $A[x_1^{-1}, \dots, x_m^{-1}] = k[x_1, \dots, x_m, x_1^{-1}, \dots, x_m^{-1}]^{[2]}$  is a UFD, if every  $x_i$  is prime, then by Nagata's criterion for UFD, we obtain that  $A$  is a UFD.

If every  $x_i$  is unit, then  $A = A[x_1^{-1}, \dots, x_m^{-1}]$  and hence  $A$  is a UFD.  $\square$

**Lemma 3.7.** *Let  $f(Z, T)$  be a line in  $k[Z, T]$  or  $f(Z, T) = a_0(Z) + a_1(Z)T$ , for some  $a_0, a_1 \in k^{[1]}$  such that  $\gcd(a_0, a_1) = 1$ . Then  $A$  is flat  $S$ -algebra.*

*Proof.* Note that  $A[x_1^{-1}, \dots, x_m^{-1}] \cong S[x_1^{-1}, \dots, x_m^{-1}, z, t]$  is a flat  $S$ -algebra. Let  $q \in \text{Spec}(A)$  and  $p = q \cap A \in \text{Spec}(S)$ . It is enough to show that  $S_p \hookrightarrow A_q$  is flat.

*Case 1:*  $x_i \notin p$  for every  $i = 1, \dots, m$ . Then  $A_q = A[x_1^{-1}, \dots, x_m^{-1}]_q$ . Hence  $A_q$  is flat over  $S_p$ .

*Case 2:* Suppose  $x_i \in p$  for some  $i$ . Consider the following maps:

$$k[x_i]_{(x_i)} \hookrightarrow S_p \hookrightarrow A_q.$$

We observe that  $S_p$  and  $A_q$  both are flat over  $k[x_i]_{(x_i)}$ . Note that

$$\frac{A}{x_i A} \cong \frac{(S/x_i S)[Y, Z, T]}{(f(Z, T))}.$$

If  $f(Z, T)$  is a line in  $k[Z, T]$ , then  $\frac{A}{x_i A} \cong \left(\frac{S}{x_i S}\right)^{[2]}$ , and if  $f(Z, T) = a_0(Z) + a_1(Z)T$ , where  $\gcd(a_0(Z), a_1(Z)) = 1$  in  $k[Z]$ , then  $\frac{A}{x_i A} \cong \frac{S}{x_i S} \left[ Y, Z, \frac{1}{a_1(Z)} \right]$ . Hence it follows that  $\frac{A_q}{x_i A_q}$  is flat over  $\frac{S_p}{x_i S_p}$  and therefore, by Lemma 2.4, we get that  $A_q$  is flat over  $S_p$ . Therefore, we obtain that  $A$  is locally flat over  $S$ , hence  $A$  is  $S$  flat.  $\square$

**Proposition 3.8.** *The following statements are equivalent:*

- (i)  $A$  is an  $\mathbb{A}^2$ -fibration over  $S$ .
- (ii)  $\frac{A}{(x_1, \dots, x_m)} = k^{[2]}$ .
- (iii)  $f(Z, T)$  is a line in  $k[Z, T]$ , i.e.,  $\frac{k[Z, T]}{(f(Z, T))} = k^{[1]}$ .

*Proof.* (i)  $\Rightarrow$  (ii) : Since  $A$  is an  $\mathbb{A}^2$ -fibration over  $S$ , for every  $p \in \text{Spec}(S)$ , we have

$$A \otimes_S \frac{S_p}{pS_p} = \left( \frac{S_p}{pS_p} \right)^{[2]}.$$

Hence for  $p = (x_1, \dots, x_m)$ , we get  $\frac{A}{(x_1, \dots, x_m)} = k^{[2]}$ .

(ii)  $\Rightarrow$  (iii) : Since

$$k \hookrightarrow \frac{k[Z, T]}{(f(Z, T))} \hookrightarrow \frac{A}{(x_1, \dots, x_m)A} = \left( \frac{k[Z, T]}{(f(Z, T))} \right)^{[1]} = k^{[2]},$$

we obtain that  $\frac{k[Z, T]}{(f(Z, T))}$  is an one dimensional normal domain. Hence, by Theorem 2.5, we obtain that  $f(Z, T)$  is a line in  $k[Z, T]$ .

(iii)  $\Rightarrow$  (i) : Since  $f(Z, T)$  is a line in  $k[Z, T]$ , by Lemma 3.7,  $A$  is a flat  $S$ -algebra. Let  $p \in \text{Spec}(S)$  and  $A_p$  denotes the localisation of the ring  $A$  with respect to the multiplicatively closed set  $S \setminus p$ . We now show  $A$  is an  $\mathbb{A}^2$ -fibration over  $S$ .

*Case 1:* If  $x_i \notin p$  for every  $i = 1, \dots, m$ , then  $A_p = S_p[z, t]$ . Hence,

$$\frac{A_p}{pA_p} = A \otimes_S \frac{S_p}{pS_p} = \left( \frac{S_p}{pS_p} \right)^{[2]}. \quad (6)$$

Case 2: Now suppose some  $x_i \in p$ . Since  $f(Z, T)$  is a line in  $k[Z, T]$ , we have

$$\frac{A_p}{(x_i)A_p} = \left( \frac{S_p}{(x_i)S_p} \right)^{[2]}.$$

Hence,  $A \otimes_S \kappa(p) = \kappa(p)^{[2]}$ , where  $\kappa(p) = \frac{S_p}{pS_p}$ .

Therefore, by above two cases we obtain that  $A$  is  $\mathbb{A}^2$ -fibration over  $S$ .  $\square$

Now we prove our main result.

**Theorem 3.9.** *The following statements are equivalent:*

- (i)  $k[X_1, \dots, X_m, Y, Z, T] = k[X_1, \dots, X_m, G]^{[2]}$ .
- (ii)  $k[X_1, \dots, X_m, Y, Z, T] = k[G]^{[m+2]}$ .
- (iii)  $A = k[x_1, \dots, x_m]^{[2]}$ .
- (iv)  $A = k^{[m+2]}$ .
- (v)  $A^{[l]} = k^{[l+m+2]}$  for some  $l \geq 0$  and  $k[x_1, \dots, x_m, z, t] \subsetneq \text{DK}(A)$ .
- (vi)  $k[Z, T] = k[f(Z, T)]^{[1]}$ .
- (vii)  $k[x_1, \dots, x_m, z, t] \subsetneq \text{DK}(A)$  and  $f(Z, T)$  is a line in  $k[Z, T]$ .
- (viii)  $A$  is  $\mathbb{A}^2$ -fibration over  $k[x_1, \dots, x_m]$  and  $k[x_1, \dots, x_m, z, t] \subsetneq \text{DK}(A)$ .
- (ix)  $A^{[l]} = k^{[l+m+2]}$  for  $l \geq 0$  and  $\text{ML}(A) = k$ .
- (x)  $\text{ML}(A) = k$  and  $f(Z, T)$  is a line in  $k[Z, T]$ .
- (xi)  $A$  is  $\mathbb{A}^2$ -fibration over  $k[x_1, \dots, x_m]$  and  $\text{ML}(A) = k$ .

*Proof.* Note that (i)  $\Rightarrow$  (ii)  $\Rightarrow$  (iv)  $\Rightarrow$  (v) and (i)  $\Rightarrow$  (iii)  $\Rightarrow$  (iv) follow trivially.

(v)  $\Rightarrow$  (vi) : Let us first assume that  $k$  is algebraically closed. Since  $k[x_1, \dots, x_m, z, t] \subsetneq \text{DK}(A)$ , therefore, by Proposition 2.10, without loss of generality we get that

$$f(Z, T) = a_0(Z) + a_1(Z)T$$

and by Proposition 3.6, we obtain that  $f(Z, T)$  is irreducible in  $k[Z, T]$ .

Suppose  $a_1(Z) = 0$ , i.e.,  $f(Z, T) = a_0(Z)$ . As  $k$  is algebraically closed, either  $f(Z, T)$  is a linear polynomial in  $Z$  or a unit. If  $f(Z, T) \in k^*$ , then for every  $i$ ,  $1 \leq i \leq m$ ,  $x_i \in A^*$ . This contradicts the fact that  $A^* = (A^{[l]})^* = (k^{[m+l+2]})^* = k^*$ . Therefore,  $f(Z, T) = a_0(Z)$  is linear, hence it is a coordinate of  $k[Z, T]$ .

We now investigate the case when  $a_1(Z) \neq 0$ . It is enough to show that  $a_1(Z) \in k^*$ . Note that  $\gcd(a_0(Z), a_1(Z)) = 1$  in  $k[Z]$ , as  $f(Z, T)$  is irreducible in  $k[Z, T]$ .

By Lemma 3.7, we get that  $S \xleftarrow{\beta} A$  is a flat map. Now consider the mappings  $k \xleftarrow{\alpha} S \xleftarrow{\beta} A \xleftarrow{\gamma} A^{[l]}$ . Since  $S = k^{[m]}$  and  $A^{[l]} = k^{[m+l+2]}$ , by Lemma 2.14(a), the inclusions  $\alpha$  and  $\gamma\beta\alpha$  induce the isomorphisms  $G_i(k) \xrightarrow[\cong]{G_i(\alpha)} G_i(S)$  and  $G_i(k) \xrightarrow[\cong]{G_i(\gamma\beta\alpha)} G_i(A)$ ,

respectively. Hence we get that  $\beta$  induces an isomorphism  $G_i(S) \xrightarrow[\cong]{G_i(\beta)} G_i(A)$ , for every  $i \geq 0$ .

Let  $u = x_1 \cdots x_m \in S$ . Note that  $A[u^{-1}] = S[u^{-1}, z, t]$ . Therefore, by Lemma 2.14(a), we have the inclusion  $S[u^{-1}] \hookrightarrow A[u^{-1}]$  induces  $G_i(S[u^{-1}]) \xrightarrow{\cong} G_i(A[u^{-1}])$  for  $i \geq 0$ . By Lemma 2.13, the flat map  $\beta : S \hookrightarrow A$  induces the following commutative diagram for  $i \geq 1$ :

$$\begin{array}{ccccccccc} G_i(S) & \longrightarrow & G_i(S[u^{-1}]) & \longrightarrow & G_{i-1}\left(\frac{S}{uS}\right) & \longrightarrow & G_{i-1}(S) & \longrightarrow & G_{i-1}(S[u^{-1}]) \\ \downarrow \cong & & \downarrow \cong & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \cong & & \downarrow \cong \\ G_i(A) & \longrightarrow & G_i(A[u^{-1}]) & \longrightarrow & G_{i-1}\left(\frac{A}{uA}\right) & \longrightarrow & G_{i-1}(A) & \longrightarrow & G_{i-1}(A[u^{-1}]). \end{array}$$

From the above diagram, applying the Five lemma we obtain that the map  $\frac{S}{uS} \xrightarrow{\bar{\beta}} \frac{A}{uA}$ , induced by  $S \xrightarrow{\beta} A$ , induces isomorphism of groups

$$G_i\left(\frac{S}{uS}\right) \xrightarrow[\cong]{G_i(\bar{\beta})} G_i\left(\frac{A}{uA}\right) \quad (7)$$

for every  $i \geq 0$ . Let  $R = \frac{S}{uS}$ . Now using the structure of  $f(Z, T)$  we get an isomorphism as follows

$$\frac{A}{uA} \xrightarrow[\cong]{\eta} R\left[Y, Z, \frac{1}{a_1(Z)}\right].$$

Further, note that  $\bar{\beta}$  factors through the following maps

$$\bar{\beta} : R \xrightarrow{\gamma_1} R[Z] \xrightarrow{\gamma_2} R\left[Z, \frac{1}{a_1(Z)}\right] \xrightarrow{\gamma_3} R\left[Y, Z, \frac{1}{a_1(Z)}\right] \xrightarrow{\eta^{-1}} A/uA.$$

Since  $\bar{\beta}, \gamma_1, \gamma_3, \eta^{-1}$  induce isomorphism of  $G_i$ -groups for  $i \geq 1$ , we obtain that  $\gamma_2$  induces an isomorphism of groups

$$G_i(R[Z]) \xrightarrow[\cong]{G_i(\gamma_2)} G_i\left(R\left[Z, \frac{1}{a_1(Z)}\right]\right). \quad (8)$$

Now we will show that  $a_1(Z) \in k^*$ . Suppose that  $a_1(Z) \notin k^*$ . Since  $k$  is algebraically closed we have  $a_1(Z) = \prod_{i=1}^n (Z - \alpha_i)$  where  $\alpha_i \in k$ . Without loss of generality we may assume that  $\alpha_i \neq \alpha_j$  for  $i \neq j$ . Now we have

$$R\left[Z, \frac{1}{a_1(Z)}\right] = R\left[Z, \frac{1}{Z - \alpha_1}, \dots, \frac{1}{Z - \alpha_n}\right].$$

Let  $R_i = R\left[Z, \frac{1}{Z - \alpha_1}, \dots, \frac{1}{Z - \alpha_i}\right]$ , for  $i \geq 1$  and  $R_0 = R[Z]$ . For every  $i \geq 1$ , we have the map  $R[Z] \hookrightarrow R_{i-1}$  is flat. Therefore, applying Lemma 2.13 and Lemma 2.14(b), we get the following commutative diagram for  $j \geq 1$ :

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
0 & \longrightarrow & G_j(R[Z]) & \longrightarrow & G_j\left(R\left[Z, \frac{1}{Z-\alpha_i}\right]\right) & \longrightarrow & G_{j-1}\left(\frac{R[Z]}{(Z-\alpha_i)}\right) \longrightarrow 0 \\
& & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \cong \downarrow \mu_{j-1} \\
0 & \longrightarrow & G_j(R_{i-1}) & \longrightarrow & G_j\left(R_{i-1}\left[\frac{1}{Z-\alpha_i}\right]\right) & \longrightarrow & G_{j-1}\left(\frac{R_{i-1}}{(Z-\alpha_i)}\right) \longrightarrow 0.
\end{array}$$

Since the inclusion  $R[Z] \hookrightarrow R_{i-1}$  induces isomorphism of the rings  $\frac{R[Z]}{(Z-\alpha_i)} \xrightarrow{\cong} \frac{R_{i-1}}{(Z-\alpha_i)}$  for every  $i$ ,  $1 \leq i \leq n$ , the maps  $\mu_{j-1}$ 's are isomorphisms for every  $j \geq 1$ . Since the sequence in the first row is a split exact sequence (Lemma 2.14(b)) and  $\mu_{j-1}$  is an isomorphism, we have that the exact sequence in the second row is also split. That means the inclusion  $R_{i-1} \hookrightarrow R_i = R_{i-1}\left[\frac{1}{Z-\alpha_i}\right]$  will induce the following group isomorphism

$$G_j(R_i) \cong G_j(R_{i-1}) \oplus G_{j-1}(R)$$

for every  $j \geq 1$  and  $1 \leq i \leq n$ . In particular for  $j = 1$ , inductively we get that the inclusion  $R[Z] \hookrightarrow R_n = R\left[Z, \frac{1}{a_1(Z)}\right]$  induces the isomorphism

$$G_1\left(R\left[Z, \frac{1}{a_1(Z)}\right]\right) \cong G_1(R[Z]) \oplus (G_0(R))^n. \quad (9)$$

(9) contardicts (8) if  $G_0(R) \neq 0$ , and  $n > 0$  i.e.,  $a_1(Z) \notin k^*$ . Therefore, to show  $a_1(Z) \in k^*$ , it remains to show that  $G_0(R) \neq 0$ .

As  $u$  is non zero divisor in  $S$ , by Lemma 2.12 we have the following exact sequence:

$$G_1(S) \longrightarrow G_1(S[u^{-1}]) \longrightarrow G_0(R) \longrightarrow G_0(S) \xrightarrow{h} G_0(S[u^{-1}]) \longrightarrow 0.$$

If  $G_0(R) = 0$ , then we have the following exact sequence:

$$G_1(S) \longrightarrow G_1(S[u^{-1}]) \longrightarrow 0. \quad (10)$$

By Lemma 2.14, it is clear that the map  $G_1(S) \rightarrow G_1(S[u^{-1}])$  is split injective which is induced by the inclusion  $S \hookrightarrow S[u^{-1}]$ . More precisely, we obtain that

$$G_1(S) \cong k^* \longrightarrow G_1(S[u^{-1}]) \cong k^* \oplus \mathbb{Z}^m \quad (11)$$

is a split inclusion and hence this map can not be surjective, which contradicts (10). Therefore,  $G_0(R) \neq 0$  and consequently  $a_1(Z) \in k^*$ . Hence we obtained that for an algebraically closed field  $k$ ,  $A = k^{[m+2]}$  will imply that  $k[Z, T] = k[f]^{[1]}$ .

When  $k$  is not algebraically closed, Consider the ring  $\overline{A} = A \otimes_k \overline{k}$ , where  $\overline{k}$  is an algebraic closure of  $k$ . Note that  $\overline{A}^{[l]} = \overline{k}^{[m+l+2]}$  and  $\overline{k}[x_1, \dots, x_m, z, t] \subsetneq \text{DK}(\overline{A})$ . We now consider the following two cases.

*Case 1:* If  $k$  is a finite field, then we have  $\overline{k}[Z, T] = \overline{k}[f]^{[1]}$ . Therefore, by Lemma 2.7,  $k[Z, T] = k[f]^{[1]}$ .

*Case 2:* Let  $k$  be an infinite field. Then by Proposition 2.10 we can assume that  $f(Z, T) =$

$a_0(Z) + a_1(Z)T$ . As  $\bar{k}$  is algebraically closed, we have  $f$  is a coordinate in  $\bar{k}[Z, T]$ . Therefore, if  $a_1(Z) = 0$ , then  $f(Z, T) = a_0(Z) \in k[Z]$  is linear. Also for  $a_1(Z) \neq 0$ , we get that  $a_1(Z) \in \bar{k}^*$  and hence  $a_1(Z) \in k^*$ . Therefore by structure of  $f(Z, T)$  it is clear that

$$k[Z, T] = k[f]^{[1]}.$$

(vi)  $\Rightarrow$  (i) : Let  $h \in k[Z, T]$  such that  $k[Z, T] = k[f, h]$ . Therefore, without loss of generality we can assume that  $f = Z$  and  $h = T$ . Hence  $G = X_1^{r_1} \cdots X_m^{r_m} Y - X_1 \cdots X_m g + Z$ , for some  $g \in k[X_1, \dots, X_m, Z, T]$ . Now by Lemma 3.1, we get that

$$k[X_1, \dots, X_m, Y, Z, T] = k[X_1, \dots, X_m, G, T]^{[1]} = k[X_1, \dots, X_m, G]^{[2]}.$$

Therefore the equivalence of the first six facts are established.

By Proposition 2.10 and Remark 2.11, (vii)  $\Rightarrow$  (vi). By Proposition 3.8, (vii)  $\Leftrightarrow$  (viii) and (x)  $\Leftrightarrow$  (xi). Therefore, (vi)  $\Leftrightarrow$  (iii)  $\Rightarrow$  (viii)  $\Leftrightarrow$  (vii).

By Proposition 3.4(b) and Lemma 2.9, (ix)  $\Rightarrow$  (v), and (xi)  $\Rightarrow$  (viii). Now we see that the following hold:

$$(ix) \Rightarrow (v) \Leftrightarrow (iii) \Rightarrow (ix).$$

$$(x) \Leftrightarrow (xi) \Rightarrow (viii) \Leftrightarrow (iii) \Rightarrow (xi).$$

Hence equivalence of all the facts are established.  $\square$

## 4 Automorphisms and Isomorphism classes

Throughout this section  $A$  be the affine domain as in (2), where  $F(X_1, \dots, X_m, Z, T) = f(Z, T) + (X_1 \cdots X_m)g(X_1, \dots, X_m, Z, T)$ ,  $f(Z, T) \neq 0$ .

The next two results characterise the automorphisms of  $A$  when  $\text{DK}(A) = k[x_1, \dots, x_m, z, t]$ .

**Theorem 4.1.** *Let  $A$  be the affine domain as in (2), where  $F(X_1, \dots, X_m, Z, T) = f(Z, T) + (X_1 \cdots X_m)g(X_1, \dots, X_m, Z, T)$  and  $\text{DK}(A) = k[x_1, \dots, x_m, z, t]$ . If  $\phi \in \text{Aut}_k(A)$ , then the following hold:*

(a)  $\phi$  restricts to an automorphism of  $k[x_1, \dots, x_m]$  and  $k[x_1, \dots, x_m, z, t]$ .

(b)  $\phi(x_i) = \lambda_j x_j$  such that  $r_i = r_j$ , where  $\lambda_j \in k^*$  ( $1 \leq i, j \leq m$ ).

(c)  $\phi(I) = I$ , where  $I = (x_1^{r_1} \cdots x_m^{r_m}, F(x_1, \dots, x_m, z, t)) k[x_1, \dots, x_m, z, t]$ .

(d) Let  $\tilde{\phi} \in \text{End}_k(k[z, t])$  such that  $\tilde{\phi}(h) := \phi(h)(0, \dots, 0, z, t)$ , for all polynomials  $h \in k[z, t]$ . Then  $\tilde{\phi} \in \text{Aut}_k(k[z, t])$ .

*Proof.* (a)  $\text{DK}(A) = k[x_1, \dots, x_m, z, t]$ . By Proposition 3.4(b),  $\text{ML}(A) = k[x_1, \dots, x_m]$ . Let  $R$  and  $S$  denote  $\text{DK}(A)$  and  $\text{ML}(A)$  respectively. For every  $\psi \in \text{EXP}(A)$  and  $\phi \in \text{Aut}_k(A)$ ,  $\phi\psi\phi^{-1} \in \text{EXP}(A)$ . Therefore,  $\phi(R) \subseteq R$  and  $\phi(S) \subseteq S$ . As  $\phi$  is an automorphism,  $\phi(R) = R$  and  $\phi(S) = S$ .

(b) In  $A$ ,  $x_1^{r_1} \cdots x_m^{r_m} y - F(x_1, \dots, x_m, z, t) = 0$ . That means,

$$x_1^{r_1} \cdots x_m^{r_m} y - f(z, t) - (x_1 \cdots x_m)g(x_1, \dots, x_m, z, t) = 0$$

Hence,

$$\phi(y) = \frac{f(\phi(z), \phi(t)) + \phi(x_1) \cdots \phi(x_m) \phi(g)}{\phi(x_1)^{r_1} \cdots \phi(x_m)^{r_m}}, \quad (12)$$

where  $f(\phi(z), \phi(t)) + \phi(x_1) \cdots \phi(x_m) \phi(g) = \phi(F)$ . Since  $\phi \in \text{Aut}_k(A)$  and  $\phi(R) = R$ , we have  $\phi(y) \in k[x_1, \dots, x_m, (x_1 \cdots x_m)^{-1}, z, t] \setminus R$ , otherwise  $\phi(A) \subseteq R$ . Therefore, there exists  $n > 0$  such that  $(x_1 \cdots x_m)^n \phi(y) \in k[x_1, \dots, x_m, z, t]$ . That means

$$\frac{(x_1 \cdots x_m)^n \phi(F)}{\phi(x_1)^{r_1} \cdots \phi(x_m)^{r_m}} \in k[x_1, \dots, x_m, z, t] = R.$$

For every  $i \in \{1, \dots, m\}$ , since  $x_i$  is irreducible in  $R$  and  $\phi(R) = R$ , we have  $\phi(x_i)$  is irreducible. In  $R$ , since  $x_i \nmid F$ , we get that  $\phi(x_i) \nmid \phi(F)$ , and hence  $\phi(x_i) \mid x_1 \cdots x_m$ . Therefore, we obtain that  $\phi(x_i) = \lambda_j x_j$ , for some  $\lambda_j \in k^*$  and  $j \in \{1, \dots, m\}$ .

Let  $\phi(z) = \rho_1(z, t) + H_1(x_1, \dots, x_m, z, t)$  and  $\phi(t) = \rho_2(z, t) + H_2(x_1, \dots, x_m, z, t)$ , where  $H_1, H_2 \in (x_1, \dots, x_m)R$ . Now consider the ideal  $J = (x_1 \cdots x_m, f(z, t))k[x_1, \dots, x_m, z, t]$ . We first show that  $\phi(J) = J$ . Note that  $J = (x_1 \cdots x_m)A \cap R$ . Since for every  $i \in \{1, \dots, m\}$ ,  $\phi(x_i) = \lambda_j x_j$  for some  $j \in \{1, \dots, m\}$ , and  $\phi(R) = R$ , we have  $\phi(J) \subseteq J$ . Since  $\phi$  is an automorphism, we get that  $\phi(J) = J$ . Therefore,

$$(x_1 \cdots x_m, f(\phi(z), \phi(t)))R = (x_1 \cdots x_m, f(z, t))R.$$

Hence

$$f(\phi(z), \phi(t)) = u(x_1, \dots, x_m, z, t)f(z, t) + x_1 \cdots x_m v(x_1, \dots, x_m, z, t),$$

for some  $u, v \in R$ . In the above equation putting  $x_i = 0$  for  $1 \leq i \leq m$ , we obtain that

$$f(\rho_1, \rho_2) = u(0, \dots, 0, z, t)f(z, t). \quad (13)$$

Similarly expressing  $f(z, t)$  in terms of  $f(\phi(z), \phi(t))$  and  $x_1 \cdots x_m$ , we get that

$$f(z, t) = \tilde{u}(0, \dots, 0, z, t)f(\rho_1, \rho_2) \quad (14)$$

for some  $\tilde{u} \in R$ . Therefore, by (13) and (14) we get that

$$f(\rho_1, \rho_2) = \mu f(z, t) \quad (15)$$

for some  $\mu \in k^*$ .

We now show that if  $\phi(x_i) = \lambda_j x_j$ , then  $r_i = r_j$ . Suppose  $r_i > r_j$ . Consider the ideal  $\mathfrak{a}_i = x_i^{r_i} A \cap R = (x_i^{r_i}, F)R$ . Now  $\phi(\mathfrak{a}_i) = (x_j^{r_i} A \cap R) = (x_j^{r_i}, x_j^{r_i - r_j} F)R \subseteq (x_j)R$ . Also  $\phi(F) = f(\phi(z), \phi(t)) + \phi(x_1) \cdots \phi(x_m) \phi(g) \in \phi(\mathfrak{a}_i)$ . By (15), we get that

$$\phi(F) = \mu f(z, t) + H(x_1, \dots, x_m, z, t),$$

for some  $H \in (x_1, \dots, x_m)R$ . As  $\mu \in k^*$  and  $f(z, t) \neq 0$ , the above expression contradicts that  $\phi(F) \in (x_j)R$ . Hence we have  $r_i \leq r_j$ .

Now suppose  $\sigma$  be a permutation of  $\{1, \dots, m\}$ , such that  $\phi(x_i) = \lambda_{\sigma(i)} x_{\sigma(i)}$ , for  $1 \leq i \leq m$ . If  $(a_1 a_2 \dots a_s)$  be a disjoint cycle in the cycle decomposition of  $\sigma$ , then  $\phi(x_{a_i}) = \lambda_{a_{i+1}} x_{a_{i+1}}$  for  $1 \leq i \leq s-1$  and  $\phi(x_{a_s}) = \lambda_{a_1} x_{a_1}$ . Therefore, we have  $r_{a_1} \leq$

$\cdots \leq r_{a_s} \leq r_{a_1}$ , i.e.,  $r_{a_1} = \cdots = r_{a_s}$ . Hence we have proved that if  $\phi(x_i) = \lambda_j x_j$ , then  $r_i = r_j$ , ( $1 \leq i, j \leq m$ ).

(c) By part (b), we can see that  $\phi(x_1^{r_1} \cdots x_m^{r_m}) = \tilde{\mu} x_1^{r_1} \cdots x_m^{r_m}$ , for some  $\tilde{\mu} \in k^*$ . Now  $I = (x_1^{r_1} \cdots x_m^{r_m}, F)R = (x_1^{r_1} \cdots x_m^{r_m})A \cap R$ . Therefore,  $\phi(I) \subseteq I$ . Since  $\phi$  is an automorphism, we have  $\phi(I) = I$ .

(d) Since  $\phi(R) = R$ , we have  $k[x_1, \dots, x_m, z, t] = k[x_1, \dots, x_m, \phi(z), \phi(t)]$ . If  $\phi(z) = \rho_1(z, t) + H_1(x_1, \dots, x_m, z, t)$  and  $\phi(t) = \rho_2(z, t) + H_2(x_1, \dots, x_m, z, t)$  where  $H_1, H_2 \in (x_1, \dots, x_m)R$ , putting  $x_i = 0$  ( $1 \leq i \leq m$ ), we get that  $k[\rho_1, \rho_2] = k[z, t]$ , that means  $\phi$  is an automorphism of  $k[z, t]$ .  $\square$

**Theorem 4.2.** *Let  $A$  be as in Theorem 4.1 and  $\phi$  be an endomorphism of  $A$  satisfying the conditions (a) and (c) in Theorem 4.1. Then  $\phi$  is an automorphism of  $A$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $R = k[x_1, \dots, x_m, z, t]$  and  $S = k[x_1, \dots, x_m]$ . Now  $\phi(I) = I$  (Theorem 4.1(c)), together with the facts that  $\phi(S) = S$  (Theorem 4.1(a)) and  $I \cap S = (x_1^{r_1} \cdots x_m^{r_m})S$  will imply that  $\phi(x_1)^{r_1} \cdots \phi(x_m)^{r_m} \in (x_1^{r_1} \cdots x_m^{r_m})S$ . Since for every  $i \in \{1, \dots, m\}$ ,  $\phi(x_i)$  is irreducible in  $S$ ,  $\phi(x_i) = \lambda_j x_j$ , for some  $\lambda_j \in k^*$  and  $j \in \{1, \dots, m\}$ .

Now if  $\phi(x_i) = \lambda_j x_j$ , then in  $\phi(x_1)^{r_1} \cdots \phi(x_m)^{r_m}$  the exponent of  $x_j$  is  $r_i$  and hence  $r_i \geq r_j$ . Let  $\sigma$  be a permutation of  $\{1, \dots, m\}$ , such that  $\phi(x_i) = \lambda_{\sigma(i)} x_{\sigma(i)}$ , for  $1 \leq i \leq m$ . If  $(a_1 a_2 \dots a_s)$  be a disjoint cycle in the cycle decomposition of  $\sigma$ , then  $\phi(x_{a_i}) = \lambda_{a_{i+1}} x_{a_{i+1}}$  for  $1 \leq i \leq s-1$  and  $\phi(x_{a_s}) = \lambda_{a_1} x_{a_1}$ . Therefore, we have  $r_{a_1} \geq \cdots \geq r_{a_s} \geq r_{a_1}$ , i.e.,  $r_{a_1} = \cdots = r_{a_s}$ . Hence we have proved that if  $\phi(x_i) = \lambda_j x_j$ , then  $r_i = r_j$ , ( $1 \leq i, j \leq m$ ). From here it is clear that  $\phi(x_1^{r_1} \cdots x_m^{r_m}) = \lambda x_1^{r_1} \cdots x_m^{r_m}$ , for some  $\lambda \in k^*$ .

Since  $\phi$  is an automorphism of  $R$  and  $A \subseteq R[(x_1 \cdots x_m)^{-1}]$ ,  $\phi$  is injective endomorphism of  $A$ . Therefore, it is enough to show that  $\phi$  is surjective. For this it is enough to find a preimage of  $y$  in  $A$ . Since  $\phi(I) = I$ , we have  $F = x_1^{r_1} \cdots x_m^{r_m} u(x_1, \dots, x_m, z, t) + \phi(F)v(x_1, \dots, x_m, z, t)$ , for some  $u, v \in R$ . Since  $y = \frac{F(x_1, \dots, x_m, z, t)}{x_1^{r_1} \cdots x_m^{r_m}}$ , therefore,

$$y = u(x_1, \dots, x_m, z, t) + \frac{\phi(F)v(x_1, \dots, x_m, z, t)}{\lambda^{-1} \phi(x_1^{r_1} \cdots x_m^{r_m})}. \quad (16)$$

Since  $\phi(R) = R$ , there exist  $\tilde{u}, \tilde{v} \in R$  such that  $\phi(\tilde{u}) = u$  and  $\phi(\tilde{v}) = v$ . And hence from (16), we get that  $y = \phi(\tilde{u} + \lambda y \tilde{v})$  such that  $\tilde{u} + \lambda y \tilde{v} \in A$ .  $\square$

Let  $(r_1, \dots, r_m) \in \mathbb{Z}_{>1}^m$  and  $f(Z, T) \in k[Z, T]$ . Let

$$A(r_1, \dots, r_m, f) := \frac{k[X_1, \dots, X_m, Y, Z, T]}{(X_1^{r_1} \cdots X_m^{r_m} Y - f(Z, T))}.$$

If  $f(Z, T)$  is a non-trivial line in  $k[Z, T]$ , then by Lemma 2.9 and Proposition 2.10, we have  $\text{DK}(A(r_1, \dots, r_m, f)) = k[x_1, \dots, x_m, z, t]$ . Our next result determines the isomorphism classes among the family of rings defined above.

**Theorem 4.3.** *Let  $(r_1, \dots, r_m), (s_1, \dots, s_m) \in \mathbb{Z}_{>1}^m$ , and  $f, g \in k[Z, T]$  be non-trivial lines. Then  $A(r_1, \dots, r_m, f) \cong A(s_1, \dots, s_m, g)$  if and only if  $(r_1, \dots, r_m) = (s_1, \dots, s_m)$  upto a permutation of  $\{1, \dots, m\}$  and there exists  $\alpha \in \text{Aut}_k(k[Z, T])$  such that  $\alpha(g) = \mu f$ , for some  $\mu \in k^*$ .*



*Proof.* If  $(r_1, \dots, r_m) = (s_1, \dots, s_m)$  upto a permutation of  $\{1, \dots, m\}$ , and  $\alpha(f) = \lambda g$ , for some  $\lambda \in k^*$  and  $\alpha \in \text{Aut}_k(k[Z, T])$ , then clearly  $A(r_1, \dots, r_m, f) \cong A(s_1, \dots, s_m, g)$ .

We now show the converse part. Let  $A = A(r_1, \dots, r_m, f)$  and  $A' = A(s_1, \dots, s_m, g)$ , and  $\rho: A \rightarrow A'$  be an isomorphism. Replacing  $A$  by  $\rho(A)$ , we can assume that  $A = A'$ . Let  $A = k[x_1, \dots, x_m, y, z, t]$  and  $A' = k[x'_1, \dots, x'_m, y', z', t']$ , where  $x_1, \dots, x_m, y, z, t$  and  $x'_1, \dots, x'_m, y', z', t'$  denote the images of  $X_1, \dots, X_m, Y, Z, T$  in  $A$  and  $A'$  respectively. Since  $f, g$  both are non-trivial lines in  $k[Z, T]$ , we have  $\text{DK}(A) = k[x_1, \dots, x_m, z, t]$  and  $\text{DK}(A') = k[x'_1, \dots, x'_m, z', t']$ . Since  $A = A'$ , we have  $k[x_1, \dots, x_m, z, t] = k[x'_1, \dots, x'_m, z', t']$ . Let  $R = k[x_1, \dots, x_m, z, t]$ .

Now

$$y' = \frac{g(z', t')}{(x'_1)^{s_1} \dots (x'_m)^{s_m}} \in A' \setminus R,$$

otherwise  $A' = R$ , which is a contradiction. Since  $A' = A \hookrightarrow k[x_1^{\pm 1}, \dots, x_m^{\pm 1}, z, t]$ , there exists  $n > 0$  such that

$$(x_1 \cdots x_m)^n y' = \frac{(x_1 \cdots x_m)^n g(z', t')}{(x'_1)^{s_1} \dots (x'_m)^{s_m}} \in R.$$

Since for every  $i \in \{1, \dots, m\}$ ,  $x'_i$  is irreducible in  $R$ , we have

$$x'_i = \lambda_j x_j, \tag{17}$$

for some  $j \in \{1, \dots, m\}$  and  $\lambda_j \in k^*$ . we now show that  $s_i = r_j$ . Suppose  $s_i > r_j$ . Consider the ideal  $\mathfrak{a}_i = \langle (x'_i)^{s_i} \rangle A' \cap R = \langle (x'_i)^{s_i}, g(z', t') \rangle$ . Again  $\mathfrak{a}_i = \langle x_j^{s_i} \rangle A \cap R = \langle x_j^{s_i}, x_j^{s_i - r_j} f(z, t) \rangle$ , which implies that  $g(z', t') \in \langle x_j \rangle R$ . But this is a contradiction. Therefore,  $s_i \leq r_j$ .

Suppose  $s_i < r_j$ . Now consider the ideal  $\mathfrak{b}_j = \langle x_j^{r_j} \rangle A \cap R = \langle x_j^{r_j}, f(z, t) \rangle$ . Since  $\mathfrak{b}_j = \langle (x'_i)^{r_j} \rangle A' \cap R = \langle (x'_i)^{r_j}, (x'_i)^{r_j - s_i} g(z', t') \rangle$ . But then  $f(z, t) \in \langle x'_i \rangle R$ , which is a contradiction. Therefore, we have  $s_i = r_j$ . Hence from (17) it follows that  $(r_1, \dots, r_m) = (s_1, \dots, s_m)$  upto a permutation.

Since  $\langle x_1 \cdots x_m \rangle A \cap R = \langle x'_1 \cdots x'_m \rangle A' \cap R$ , we have  $\langle x_1 \cdots x_m, f(z, t) \rangle R = (\langle x'_1 \cdots x'_m, g(z', t') \rangle) R$ . Therefore, by (17) it follows that

$$g(z', t') = \mu f(z, t) + H(x_1, \dots, x_m, z, t), \tag{18}$$

for some  $\mu \in k^*$  and  $H \in (x_1, \dots, x_m)R$ . Let  $z' = h_1(x_1, \dots, x_m, z, t)$  and  $t' = h_2(x_1, \dots, x_m, z, t)$ . Then we have  $k[z, t] = k[h_1(0, \dots, 0, z, t), h_2(0, \dots, 0, z, t)]$ . Hence  $\alpha: k[Z, T] \rightarrow k[Z, T]$  defined by  $\alpha(Z) = h_1(0, \dots, 0, Z, T)$  and  $\alpha(T) = h_2(0, \dots, 0, Z, T)$  gives an automorphism of  $k[Z, T]$ , and from (18) it follows that  $\alpha(g) = \mu f$ .  $\square$

**Remark 4.4.** Note that as  $f(Z, T)$  is a non-trivial line in  $k[Z, T]$ , for every  $(r_1, \dots, r_m) \in \mathbb{Z}_{>1}^m$ ,  $A(r_1, \dots, r_m, f)^{[1]} \cong k^{[m+3]}$  and  $A(r_1, \dots, r_m, f) \not\cong k^{[m+2]}$  ([11], Theorem 3.7). Therefore by Theorem 4.3, it follows that if  $(r_1, \dots, r_m)$  is not a permutation of  $(s_1, \dots, s_m)$  or  $f$  and  $g$  are not equivalent, then  $A(r_1, \dots, r_m, f) \not\cong A(s_1, \dots, s_m, g)$ . Hence we get an infinite family of non-isomorphic varieties of dimension  $m + 2$  ( $m \geq 1$ ), which are counterexample to the Zariski's Cancellation Problem in positive characteristic.

## 5 Appendix

Throughout this section, unless specified,  $A$  will denote the affine domain as in (2). Let  $x_1, \dots, x_m, y, z, t$  denote the images of  $X_1, \dots, X_m, Y, Z, T$  in  $A$ , respectively.

We start this section with two important lemmas.

**Lemma 5.1.** *Let  $k[x_1, \dots, x_m, z, t] \subsetneq \text{DK}(A)$ . Then there exists an graded integral domain*

$$\widehat{A} \cong \frac{k[X_1, \dots, X_m, Y, Z, T]}{(X_1^{r_1} \cdots X_m^{r_m} Y - f(Z, T))}$$

and a non-trivial, homogeneous exponential map  $\widehat{\phi}$  on  $\widehat{A}$ , such that for every  $i \in \{1, \dots, m\}$ ,  $wt(\widehat{x}_i) = -1$ ,  $wt(\widehat{z}) = wt(\widehat{t}) = 0$ ,  $wt(\widehat{y}) = r_1 + \cdots + r_m$  and  $\widehat{y} \in \widehat{A}^{\widehat{\phi}}$ , where  $\widehat{x}_1, \dots, \widehat{x}_m, \widehat{y}, \widehat{z}, \widehat{t}$  denote the images of  $X_1, \dots, X_m, Y, Z, T$  respectively in  $\widehat{A}$ .

*Proof.* Since  $k[x_1, \dots, x_m, z, t] \subsetneq \text{DK}(A)$ , there exist an exponential map  $\phi$  on  $A$  such that  $g \in A^\phi$  and  $g$  has a monomial summand of the form  $g_{\vec{i}} = x_1^{i_1} \cdots x_m^{i_m} y^j z^p t^q$  where  $\vec{i} = (i_1, \dots, i_m) \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^m$ ,  $j \geq 1, p \geq 0, q \geq 0$  and there exists some  $i_s$  such that  $i_s < r_s$ . Without loss of generality let us assume that  $i_s = i_1$ .

Now let us consider the proper  $\mathbb{Z}$ -filtration on  $A$  with respect to  $(-1, 0, \dots, 0) \in \mathbb{Z}^m$ . Let  $\widetilde{A}$  be the associated graded ring and  $\widetilde{F}(x_1, \dots, x_m, z, t)$  denotes the highest homogeneous summand of  $F(x_1, \dots, x_m, z, t)$ . Then  $\widetilde{F}(x_1, \dots, x_m, z, t) = F(0, x_2, \dots, x_m, z, t)$ . Since  $f(z, t) \neq 0$ , we have  $x_i \nmid \widetilde{F}$ , for every  $1 \leq i \leq m$ . Therefore, by Lemma 3.3, we have

$$\widetilde{A} \cong \frac{k[X_1, \dots, X_m, Y, Z, T]}{(X_1^{r_1} \cdots X_m^{r_m} Y - \widetilde{F})}$$

For every  $h \in A$ , let  $\widetilde{h}$  denotes its image in  $\widetilde{A}$ . By Theorem 2.3,  $\phi$  will induce a non-trivial homogeneous exponential map  $\widetilde{\phi}$  on  $\widetilde{A}$  such that  $\widetilde{y} \in \widetilde{A}^{\widetilde{\phi}}$ . From the chosen filtration on  $A$ , it is clear that  $\widetilde{y} \mid \widetilde{g}$  and hence  $\widetilde{y} \in \widetilde{A}^{\widetilde{\phi}}$ .

Let us consider the  $\mathbb{Z}$ -filtration on  $\widetilde{A}$  with respect to  $(-1, \dots, -1) \in \mathbb{Z}^m$ . By Theorem 2.3, we have a homogeneous non-trivial exponential map  $\widehat{\phi}$  on the associated graded ring  $\widehat{A}$  induced by  $\widetilde{\phi}$ . By Lemma 3.3,

$$\widehat{A} \cong \frac{k[X_1, \dots, X_m, Y, Z, T]}{(X_1^{r_1} \cdots X_m^{r_m} Y - f(Z, T))},$$

since  $f(Z, T) = \widetilde{F}(0, \dots, 0, Z, T)$  is the highest degree homogeneous summand of  $\widetilde{F}$ . For every  $a \in \widetilde{A}$ , let  $\widehat{a}$  denotes its image in  $\widehat{A}$ . Since  $\widetilde{y} \in \widetilde{A}^{\widetilde{\phi}}$ , we have  $\widehat{y} \in \widehat{A}^{\widehat{\phi}}$ . The weights of  $\widehat{x}_1, \dots, \widehat{x}_m, \widehat{y}, \widehat{z}, \widehat{t}$  are clear from the chosen filtration on  $\widetilde{A}$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 5.2.** *Suppose  $m > 1$  and  $k[x_1, \dots, x_m, z, t] \subsetneq \text{DK}(A)$ . Then there exists an integral domain*

$$A_l \cong \frac{k(X_l)[X_1, \dots, X_{l-1}, X_{l+1}, \dots, X_m, Y, Z, T]}{(X_1^{r_1} \cdots X_m^{r_m} Y - f(Z, T))}$$

for some  $l \in \{1, \dots, m\}$  such that the image  $y'$  of  $Y$  belongs to  $\text{DK}(A_l)$ . In particular,  $\text{DK}(A_l) = A_l$ .

*Proof.* By Lemma 5.1, there exists an integral domain

$$\widehat{A} \cong \frac{k[X_1, \dots, X_m, Y, Z, T]}{(X_1^{r_1} \cdots X_m^{r_m} Y - f(Z, T))},$$

and a non-trivial, homogeneous exponential map  $\widehat{\phi}$  on  $\widehat{A}$  such that for every  $i \in \{1, \dots, m\}$ ,  $wt(\widehat{x}_i) = -1$ ,  $wt(\widehat{z}) = wt(\widehat{t}) = 0$ ,  $wt(\widehat{y}) = r_1 + \cdots + r_m$  and  $\widehat{y} \in \widehat{A}^{\widehat{\phi}}$ , where  $\widehat{x}_1, \dots, \widehat{x}_m, \widehat{y}, \widehat{z}, \widehat{t}$  denote the images of  $X_1, \dots, X_m, Y, Z, T$  respectively in  $\widehat{A}$ .

Since  $m > 1$ ,  $tr.deg_k(\widehat{A}^{\widehat{\phi}}) \geq 3$ . Hence if  $\widehat{A}^{\widehat{\phi}} \subseteq k[\widehat{y}, \widehat{z}, \widehat{t}]$ , then  $\widehat{A}^{\widehat{\phi}} = k[\widehat{y}, \widehat{z}, \widehat{t}]$ . But then  $\widehat{x}_1^{r_1} \cdots \widehat{x}_m^{r_m} \widehat{y} = f(\widehat{z}, \widehat{t}) \in \widehat{A}^{\widehat{\phi}}$ , that means  $\widehat{\phi}$  is trivial, which is a contradiction. Therefore, there exists  $h_1 \in \widehat{A}^{\widehat{\phi}} \setminus k[\widehat{y}, \widehat{z}, \widehat{t}]$ , which is homogeneous with respect to the grading on  $\widehat{A}$ . Let

$$h_1 = h'(\widehat{x}_1, \dots, \widehat{x}_m, \widehat{z}, \widehat{t}) + \sum_{\underline{i}=(i_1, \dots, i_m) \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^m, j > 0, p, q \geq 0} \alpha_{\underline{i} j p q} \widehat{x}_1^{i_1} \cdots \widehat{x}_m^{i_m} \widehat{y}^j \widehat{z}^p \widehat{t}^q$$

such that  $\alpha_{\underline{i} j p q} \in k$  and for every  $j > 0$  and  $\underline{i} = (i_1, \dots, i_m) \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^m$ , there exist  $s_j \in \{1, \dots, m\}$  such that  $i_{s_j} < r_{s_j}$ . Now we have the following two cases:

*Case 1:* If  $h' \notin k[\widehat{z}, \widehat{t}]$ , then it has a monomial summand  $h_2$  such that  $\widehat{x}_l | h_2$ , for some  $\widehat{x}_l$ .

*Case 2:* If  $h' \in k[\widehat{z}, \widehat{t}]$ , then each of the monomial summands of the form  $\alpha_{\underline{i} j p q} \widehat{x}_1^{i_1} \cdots \widehat{x}_m^{i_m} \widehat{y}^j \widehat{z}^p \widehat{t}^q$  of  $h_1$  have degree zero. That means,  $j(r_1 + \cdots + r_m) = i_1 + \cdots + i_m$ . Therefore, for every  $j > 0$  and  $\underline{i} \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^m$ , there exists  $l_j \in \{1, \dots, m\}$ ,  $l_j \neq s_j$  such that  $i_{l_j} > j r_{l_j}$ , as  $i_{s_j} < r_{s_j}$ . We choose one of these  $l_j$  s and call it  $l$ .

We consider the  $\mathbb{Z}$ -filtration on  $\widehat{A}$  with respect to  $(0, \dots, 0, 1, 0, \dots, 0) \in \mathbb{Z}^m$ , where the  $l$ -th entry is 1. Let  $\overline{A}$  be the associated graded ring  $\widehat{A}$ , and by Lemma 3.3,

$$\overline{A} \cong \frac{k[X_1, \dots, X_m, Y, Z, T]}{(X_1^{r_1} \cdots X_m^{r_m} Y - f(Z, T))}.$$

For every  $a \in \widehat{A}$ , let  $\overline{a}$  denotes its image in  $\overline{A}$ . By Theorem 2.3,  $\widehat{\phi}$  induces a non-trivial exponential map  $\overline{\phi}$  on the associated graded ring  $\overline{A}$  such that  $\overline{h}_1 \in \overline{A}^{\overline{\phi}}$ . By *Case 1* and *Case 2*,  $\overline{h}_1$  is divisible by  $\overline{x}_l$ , hence we get that  $\overline{x}_l \in \overline{A}^{\overline{\phi}}$ . Therefore, by Lemma 2.1,  $\overline{\phi}$  will induce a non-trivial exponential map  $\phi_l$  on  $A_l = \overline{A} \otimes_{k[\overline{x}_l]} k(\overline{x}_l)$ , where

$$A_l \cong \frac{k(X_l)[X_1, \dots, X_{l-1}, X_{l+1}, \dots, X_m, Y, Z, T]}{(X_1^{r_1} \cdots X_m^{r_m} Y - f(Z, T))}.$$

Since  $A_l^{\phi_l} = \overline{A}^{\overline{\phi}} \otimes_{k[\overline{x}_l]} k(\overline{x}_l)$  and  $\overline{y} \in \overline{A}^{\overline{\phi}}$ , the image  $y'$  of  $Y$  in  $A_l$  is in  $A_l^{\phi_l}$ . Therefore, by Lemma 2.9, we get that  $DK(A_l) = A_l$ .  $\square$

We now introduce two additional facts which are also equivalent to the facts in Theorem 3.9.

**Theorem 5.3.** *Let  $A$  be the affine domain as in (2) and  $F$  is of the form (5). Then the following facts are equivalent with the facts in Theorem 3.9.*

(i)  $A$  is geometrically factorial,  $k[x_1, \dots, x_m, z, t] \subsetneq \text{DK}(A)$  and  $\left(\frac{A}{x_i A}\right)^* = k^*$ , for every  $i \in \{1, \dots, m\}$ .

(ii)  $k[Z, T] = k[f]^{[1]}$ .

(iii)  $A = k[x_1, \dots, x_m]^{[2]}$ .

(iv)  $A$  is geometrically factorial,  $\text{ML}(A) = k$  and  $\left(\frac{A}{x_i A}\right)^* = k^*$ , for every  $i \in \{1, \dots, m\}$ .

*Proof.* (ii)  $\Leftrightarrow$  (iii) follows from Theorem 3.9. (iii)  $\Rightarrow$  (iv) holds trivially and (iv)  $\Rightarrow$  (i) follows by Proposition 3.4.

(i)  $\Rightarrow$  (ii) : For  $m = 1$ , the assertion follows from [10, Theorem 3.11]. Therefore, we assume  $m > 1$ . Since  $k[x_1, \dots, x_m, z, t] \subsetneq \text{DK}(A)$ , by Lemma 5.2, there exists an integral domain

$$A_l \cong \frac{k(X_l)[X_1, \dots, X_{l-1}, X_{l+1}, \dots, X_m, Y, Z, T]}{(X_1^{r_1} \cdots X_m^{r_m} Y - f(Z, T))},$$

Such that  $\text{DK}(A_l) = A_l$ . Note that for every  $i \in \{1, \dots, m\}$ ,  $\frac{A}{x_i A} \cong \frac{k[X_1, \dots, X_{i-1}, X_{i+1}, \dots, X_m, Y, Z, T]}{f(Z, T)}$ . For every  $i \neq l$ ,

$$\frac{A}{x_i A} \otimes_{k[x_i]} k(x_l) \cong \frac{k(X_l)[X_1, \dots, X_{i-1}, X_{i+1}, \dots, X_{l-1}, X_{l+1}, \dots, X_m, Y, Z, T]}{f(Z, T)} \cong \frac{A_l}{\overline{x_i} A_l},$$

where  $\overline{x_i}$  denotes the image of  $X_i$  in  $A_l$ . Since  $\left(\frac{A}{x_i A}\right)^* = k^*$ , it follows that  $\left(\frac{A_l}{\overline{x_i} A_l}\right)^* \cong k(X_l)^*$ . Since  $A$  is geometrically factorial, by Proposition 3.6,  $f(Z, T)$  is irreducible in  $k[Z, T]$ . Now, using the fact that  $\text{DK}(A_l) = A_l$ , by Proposition 2.10, without loss of generality we get  $a_0, a_1 \in k(X_l)^{[1]}$  such that  $f(Z, T) = a_0(Z) + a_1(Z)T$  in  $k(X_l)[Z, T]$ . For  $i \neq l$ ,  $\left(\frac{A_l}{\overline{x_i} A_l}\right)^* \cong \left(\frac{k(X_l)[Z, T]}{f(Z, T)}\right)^* \cong k(X_l)^*$ . Therefore, if  $a_1(Z) = 0$ , then  $f(Z, T) = a_0(Z)$  has to be linear. If  $a_1(Z) \neq 0$ , then  $\gcd(a_0(Z), a_1(Z)) = 1$ , as  $f(Z, T)$  is irreducible, and hence  $a_1(Z) \in \left(\frac{A_l}{\overline{x_i} A_l}\right)^* \cong k(X_l)^*$ . Hence we have  $k(X_l)[Z, T] = k(X_l)[f]^{[1]}$ . Therefore, by Lemma 2.7, we have  $k[Z, T] = k[f]^{[1]}$ .  $\square$

In the rest of this section, we will study the *Derksen invariant* and the *Makar-Limanov invariant* of the affine domain  $A$ , subject to certain conditions on  $F(X_1, \dots, X_m, Z, T)$ .

In section 3, we have seen that if  $\text{DK}(A) = k[x_1, \dots, x_m, z, t]$ , then  $\text{ML}(A) = k[x_1, \dots, x_m]$  (Proposition 3.4). When  $A$  is geometrically factorial and  $F$  is of the form (5), the following proposition gives a description of  $\text{ML}(A)$ , when  $\text{DK}(A) \neq k[x_1, \dots, x_m, z, t]$ .

**Proposition 5.4.** *Let  $A$  be the affine domain as in (2),  $F$  be of the form (5) and  $A$  is geometrically factorial. Then the following hold:*

(a) *If  $f(Z, T) \in k^*$ , then  $\text{DK}(A) = A$  and  $\text{ML}(A) = k[x_1, \dots, x_m, x_1^{-1}, \dots, x_m^{-1}]$ .*

(b) *If  $f(Z, T) \notin k^*$  and  $\text{DK}(A) \neq k[x_1, \dots, x_m, z, t]$ , then  $\text{ML}(A) \subsetneq k[x_1, \dots, x_m]$ . Moreover, if  $m = 1$  then  $\text{ML}(A) = k$ .*

*Proof.* Since  $A$  is geometrically factorial, by Proposition 3.6, either  $f(Z, T) \in k^*$  or it is irreducible in  $\overline{k}[Z, T]$ , where  $\overline{k}$  is an algebraic closure of  $k$ .

(a) If  $f(Z, T) \in k^*$ , then  $A = k[x_1, \dots, x_m, x_1^{-1}, \dots, x_m^{-1}, z, t]$ . Therefore,  $\text{DK}(A) = A$  and  $\text{ML}(A) = k[x_1, \dots, x_m, x_1^{-1}, \dots, x_m^{-1}]$ .

(b) Here we have  $f(Z, T)$  is irreducible in  $\bar{k}[Z, T]$ , and hence for every  $i$ ,  $1 \leq i \leq m$ ,  $x_i \notin A^*$  (Proposition 3.6). Therefore, by Proposition 3.4(a),  $\text{ML}(A) \subseteq k[x_1, \dots, x_m]$ . Suppose  $\text{ML}(A) = k[x_1, \dots, x_m]$ . Let  $\phi$  be a non-trivial exponential map on  $A$ . Since  $k[x_1, \dots, x_m] \subseteq A^\phi$  and  $\text{DK}(A) \neq k[x_1, \dots, x_m, z, t]$ , by Lemma 5.1,  $\phi$  induces a non-trivial exponential map  $\widehat{\phi}$  on

$$\widehat{A} \cong \frac{k[X_1, \dots, X_m, Y, Z, T]}{(X_1^{r_1} \cdots X_m^{r_m} Y - f(Z, T))},$$

such that  $\widehat{x}_1, \dots, \widehat{x}_m, \widehat{y} \in \widehat{A}^{\widehat{\phi}}$ , where  $\widehat{x}_1, \dots, \widehat{x}_m, \widehat{y}$  denote the images of  $X_1, \dots, X_m, Y$  in  $\widehat{A}$ , respectively. That means  $\text{DK}(\widehat{A}) = \widehat{A}$ . We now show that  $k[Z, T] = k[f]^{[1]}$ .

*Case 1:* Let  $k$  be an infinite field. Then by Proposition 2.10, we can assume that  $f(Z, T) = a_0(Z) + a_1(Z)T$ , for some  $a_0, a_1 \in k^{[1]}$ . If  $a_1(Z) = 0$ , then  $f(Z, T) = a_0(Z)$  is irreducible in  $\bar{k}[Z, T]$ , hence it is linear in  $Z$ . If  $a_1(Z) \neq 0$ , then  $\gcd(a_0(Z), a_1(Z)) = 1$ , as  $f(Z, T)$  is irreducible. Hence  $\widehat{\phi}$  induces a non-trivial exponential map on

$$\widetilde{A} = \widehat{A} \otimes_{k[\widehat{x}_1, \dots, \widehat{x}_m, \widehat{y}]} k(\widehat{x}_1, \dots, \widehat{x}_m, \widehat{y}) \cong \frac{\widetilde{L}[Z, T]}{(\mu - f(Z, T))},$$

where  $\widetilde{L} = k(X_1, \dots, X_m, Y)$ ,  $\mu \in \widetilde{L} \setminus k$ , and hence  $\gcd(\mu - a_0, a_1) = 1$  in  $\widetilde{L}^{[1]}$ . If  $a_1 \notin k^*$ , then  $\widetilde{A}$  is rigid, which is a contradiction. Therefore,  $a_1 \in k^*$ , and hence  $k[Z, T] = k[f]^{[1]}$ .

*Case 2:* Let  $k$  be a finite field. Now  $\widehat{\phi}$  induces a non-trivial exponential map  $\overline{\phi}$  on

$$\overline{A} \cong \frac{\bar{k}[X_1, \dots, X_m, Y, Z, T]}{(X_1^{r_1} \cdots X_m^{r_m} Y - f(Z, T))},$$

such that  $\overline{x}_1, \dots, \overline{x}_m, \overline{y} \in \overline{A}^{\overline{\phi}}$ , where  $\overline{x}_1, \dots, \overline{x}_m, \overline{y}$  denote the images of  $X_1, \dots, X_m, Y$  in  $\overline{A}$ , respectively. That means  $\text{DK}(\overline{A}) = \overline{A}$ . By Case 1, we have  $\bar{k}[Z, T] = \bar{k}[f]^{[1]}$ , and hence by Lemma 2.7,  $k[Z, T] = k[f]^{[1]}$ .

Now by Theorem 3.9,  $\text{ML}(A) = k$  which is a contradiction. Therefore,  $\text{ML}(A) \subsetneq k[x_1, \dots, x_m]$ . As  $\text{ML}(A)$  is algebraically closed, for  $m = 1$ ,  $\text{ML}(A) = k$ .  $\square$

The following proposition gives the structure of  $\text{DK}(A)$  and  $\text{ML}(A)$  for some special form of  $F$ .

**Proposition 5.5.** *Let  $A$  be the affine domain as in (2) and  $F(X_1, \dots, X_m, Z, T) = f(Z, T) + H(X_1, \dots, X_m, Z, T)$ . If there exists a system of coordinates  $\{Z_1, T_1\}$  of  $k[Z, T]$  such that  $f(Z, T) = a_0(Z_1) + a_1(Z_1)T_1$ ,  $a_1(Z_1) \neq 0$  and  $\partial H / \partial T_1 = 0$ , then  $\text{DK}(A) = A$  and  $\text{ML}(A) = k$ .*

*Proof.* Here without loss of generality we can assume that  $f(Z, T) = a_0(Z) + a_1(Z)T$ ,  $a_1(Z) \neq 0$  and  $\partial H / \partial T = 0$ , i.e.,

$$A \cong \frac{k[X_1, \dots, X_m, Y, Z, T]}{(X_1^{r_1} \cdots X_m^{r_m} Y - a_0(Z) - a_1(Z)T - H(X_1, \dots, X_m, Z))}.$$

It is clear that  $x_i \notin A^*$ , for every  $i \in \{1, \dots, m\}$ . Let  $P \in k^{[m+2]}$ , such that  $P(x_1, \dots, x_m, y, z) = x_1^{r_1} \cdots x_m^{r_m} y - H(x_1, \dots, x_m, z)$ .

For every  $j \in \{1, \dots, m\}$ , we now define the following maps  $\phi_j : A \rightarrow A[U]$  such that

$$\phi_j(x_i) = x_i \ (1 \leq i \leq m, i \neq j), \ \phi_j(x_j) = x_j + a_1(z)U, \ \phi_j(y) = y, \ \phi_j(z) = z,$$

and

$$\phi_j(t) = \frac{P(x_1, \dots, x_{j-1}, x_j + a_1(z)U, x_{j+1}, \dots, x_m, y, z)}{a_1(z)} = t + Uv_j(x_1, \dots, x_m, y, z, U),$$

for some  $v_j \in k[x_1, \dots, x_m, y, z, U]$ . It is easy to see that  $\phi_j \in \text{EXP}(A)$ , for every  $j$ . Since  $y \in A^{\phi_j}$ , by Lemma 2.9, we have  $\text{DK}(A) = A$ .

Also  $k[x_1, \dots, x_{j-1}, x_{j+1}, \dots, x_m, y, z] \subseteq A^{\phi_j} \subseteq A$ . As  $k[x_1, \dots, x_{j-1}, x_{j+1}, \dots, x_m, y, z]$  is algebraically closed and  $\text{tr. deg}_k k[x_1, \dots, x_{j-1}, x_{j+1}, \dots, x_m, y, z] = \text{tr. deg}_k A^{\phi_j} = m+1$ , we have  $A^{\phi_j} = k[x_1, \dots, x_{j-1}, x_{j+1}, \dots, x_m, y, z]$ . In Proposition 3.4(a), we have shown that  $\text{ML}(A) \subseteq k[x_1, \dots, x_m]$ . Since  $j$  is arbitrarily chosen from  $\{1, \dots, m\}$ , we get that  $\text{ML}(A) \subseteq k[x_1, \dots, x_m] \bigcap_{1 \leq j \leq m} A^{\phi_j} = k$ , that means  $\text{ML}(A) = k$ .  $\square$

The ultimate aim of this section is to give a description of  $\text{ML}(A)$  and  $\text{DK}(A)$ , where

$$A \cong \frac{k[X_1, \dots, X_m, Y, Z, T]}{(X_1^{r_1} \dots X_m^{r_m} Y - f(Z, T))}. \quad (19)$$

Before that we want to draw the attention of the reader towards the generalised Danielewski varieties with constant coefficients (introduced by Dubouloz in [7]) defined as follows:

$$B(r_1, \dots, r_m, P) \cong \frac{k[T_1, \dots, T_m, U, V]}{(T_1^{r_1} \dots T_m^{r_m} U - P(V))},$$

where  $(r_1, \dots, r_m) \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}^m$  and  $\text{deg}_V P > 1$ . Let  $t_1, \dots, t_m, u, v$  denote the images of  $T_1, \dots, T_m, U, V$  in  $B(r_1, \dots, r_m, P)$ . First we fix some notations. For  $\underline{r} = (r_1, \dots, r_m) \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}^m$ ,  $B_{\underline{r}} := B(r_1, \dots, r_m, P)$ .

Note that  $k[t_1, \dots, t_m, v] = k^{[m+1]} \hookrightarrow B_{\underline{r}} \hookrightarrow k[t_1^{\pm 1}, \dots, t_m^{\pm 1}, v]$ . Fix  $(e_1, \dots, e_m) \in \mathbb{Z}^m$ . The ring  $k[t_1^{\pm 1}, \dots, t_m^{\pm 1}, v]$  can be given the following  $\mathbb{Z}$ -graded structure:

$$k[t_1^{\pm 1}, \dots, t_m^{\pm 1}, v] = \bigoplus_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} C_n,$$

where  $C_n = \bigoplus_{(i_1, \dots, i_m) \in \mathbb{Z}^m, e_1 i_1 + \dots + e_m i_m = n} k[v] t_1^{i_1} \dots t_m^{i_m}$ . For every,  $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ , if  $B_n = \bigoplus_{i \leq n} C_i \cap B_{\underline{r}}$ , then  $\{B_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{Z}}$  define a proper  $\mathbb{Z}$ -filtration on  $B_{\underline{r}}$ . For every  $j$ ,  $1 \leq j \leq m$ ,  $t_j \in B_{e_j} \setminus B_{e_j-1}$  and  $u \in A_p \setminus A_{p-1}$ , where  $p = -(r_1 e_1 + \dots + r_m e_m)$ . Note that every element  $b \in B_{\underline{r}}$  can be uniquely expressed as

$$b = \tilde{b}(t_1, \dots, t_m, v) + \sum_{\underline{i}=(i_1, \dots, i_m) \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^m, j > 0, p \geq 0} \alpha_{\underline{i}j} t_1^{i_1} \dots t_m^{i_m} u^j v^p,$$

where  $\tilde{b} \in k^{[m+1]}$ ,  $\alpha_{\underline{i}j} \in k$ , and for every  $j > 0$  and  $\underline{i} = (i_1, \dots, i_m) \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^m$ , there exist  $s_j \in \{1, \dots, m\}$  such that  $i_{s_j} < r_{s_j}$ .

Therefore, it is easy to see that the filtration  $\{B_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{Z}}$  is admissible with respect to the generating set  $\Gamma = \{t_1, \dots, t_m, u, v\}$  of  $B_{\underline{r}}$  and the associated graded ring  $\text{gr}(B_{\underline{r}}) =$

$\bigoplus_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} \frac{B_n}{B_{n-1}}$  is generated by the image of  $\Gamma$  in  $gr(B_{\underline{r}})$ . For  $b \in B_{\underline{r}}$ , let  $\bar{b}$  denotes its image in  $gr(B_{\underline{r}})$ . Note that  $\bar{t}_1^{r_1} \cdots \bar{t}_m^{r_m} \bar{u} = P(\bar{v})$  in  $gr(B_{\underline{r}})$ . Also as  $gr(B_{\underline{r}})$  can be identified as a subring of the graded domain  $k[t_1^{\pm 1}, \dots, t_m^{\pm 1}, v]$ , we have  $\bar{t}_1, \dots, \bar{t}_m, \bar{v}$  are algebraically independent in  $gr(B_{\underline{r}})$ . Now since  $\frac{k[T_1, \dots, T_m, U, V]}{(T_1^{r_1} \cdots T_m^{r_m} U - P(V))}$  is an integral domain, we have the following isomorphism:

$$gr(B_{\underline{r}}) \cong \frac{k[T_1, \dots, T_m, U, V]}{(T_1^{r_1} \cdots T_m^{r_m} U - P(V))} \cong B_{\underline{r}}.$$

In [7], Dubouloz showed the following when  $k = \mathbb{C}$  ([7], Corollary 1.1, Corollary 1.2):

**Theorem C.** If all the roots of  $P \in \mathbb{C}[V]$  are distinct and  $\underline{r}, \underline{s} \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}^m$  such that they are not permutation of each other, then  $B_{\underline{r}} \not\cong B_{\underline{s}}$  but  $B_{\underline{r}}^{[1]} \cong B_{\underline{s}}^{[1]}$ .

In the literature we could not find any generalisation of Dubouloz's result over a field of arbitrary characteristic. Therefore, for the sake of completeness of this paper we are generalising Theorem C, over any field.

In [7] Dubouloz showed that when  $k = \mathbb{C}$ ,  $ML(B_{\underline{r}}) = \mathbb{C}[t_1, \dots, t_m]$ , when  $\underline{r} \in \mathbb{Z}_{>1}^m$ . When  $ch.k = 0$ , similar result appears in [8] (Lemma 6.2). We extend this result over fields of arbitrary characteristic. First we recall the following lemma ([10], Lemma 3.5).

**Lemma 5.6.** *Let  $k$  be a field. For  $m = 1$  and  $r_1 > 1$ , there is no non-trivial exponential map  $\phi$  on  $B(r_1, P) \cong k[T_1, U, V]/(T_1^{r_1} U - P(V))$ , such that  $u \in B(r_1, P)^\phi$ , where  $u$  denotes the image of  $U$  in  $B(r_1, P)$ .*

The following lemma is a generalisation of the above lemma when  $m > 1$ .

**Lemma 5.7.** *Let  $k$  be any field and  $\underline{r} \in \mathbb{Z}_{>1}$ . If  $u$  denotes the image of  $U$  in  $B_{\underline{r}}$ , then there is no non-trivial exponential map  $\phi$  on  $B_{\underline{r}}$ , such that  $u \in B_{\underline{r}}^\phi$ .*

*Proof.* Let

$$B := B_{\underline{r}} \cong \frac{k[T_1, \dots, T_m, U, V]}{(T_1^{r_1} \cdots T_m^{r_m} U - P(V))}.$$

We will prove the result by induction. For  $m = 1$ , the result holds by Lemma 5.6. Therefore we can assume  $m \geq 2$ . Suppose the assertion holds upto  $m - 1$ .

If possible, suppose there exists a non-trivial exponential map  $\phi$  on  $B$  such that  $u \in B^\phi$ . Then with respect to the filtration induced by  $(-1, \dots, -1) \in \mathbb{Z}^m$  on  $B$ , we get a non-trivial exponential map  $\bar{\phi}$  on the associated graded ring  $\bar{B}$ , which is isomorphic to  $B$  itself. Therefore we can assume that  $B$  is a graded ring and  $\bar{\phi}$  is a homogeneous exponential map on  $B$ , such that  $u \in B^\phi$  and the weights of the generators of  $B$  are as follows:

$$wt(t_i) = -1 \quad (1 \leq i \leq m), \quad wt(u) = r_1 + \cdots + r_m, \quad wt(v) = 0.$$

Since  $m \geq 2$ ,  $tr.deg_k B^{\bar{\phi}} \geq 2$ . Therefore, if  $B^{\bar{\phi}} \subseteq k[u, v]$ , then  $B^{\bar{\phi}} = k[u, v]$  and hence it follows that  $t_1, \dots, t_m \in B^{\bar{\phi}}$ . But this contradicts the fact that  $\bar{\phi}$  is non-trivial. Therefore, there exists  $h \in B^\phi$ , which is homogeneous with respect to the grading on  $B$  and

$$h = \tilde{h}(t_1, \dots, t_m, v) + \sum_{\underline{i}=(i_1, \dots, i_m) \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^m, j > 0, p \geq 0} \alpha_{\underline{i}, jp} t_1^{i_1} \cdots t_m^{i_m} u^j v^p,$$

where  $\tilde{h} \in k^{[m+1]}$ ,  $\alpha_{\underline{i}jp} \in k$ , and for every  $j > 0$  and  $\underline{i} = (i_1, \dots, i_m) \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^m$ , there exist  $s_j \in \{1, \dots, m\}$  such that  $i_{s_j} < r_{s_j}$ .

Now applying the similar arguments as in *Case 1* and *Case 2* of Lemma 5.2, we get some  $l \in \{1, \dots, m\}$  such that if we consider the filtration on  $B$ , induced by  $(0, \dots, 0, 1, 0, \dots, 0) \in \mathbb{Z}^m$ , where the  $l$ -th entry is 1, then  $\bar{\phi}$  will induce a non-trivial exponential map  $\hat{\phi}$  on the associated graded ring

$$\hat{B} \cong B \cong \frac{k[T_1, \dots, T_m, U, V]}{(T_1^{r_1} \dots T_m^{r_m} U - P(V))},$$

such that the images  $\hat{t}_l, \hat{u}$  of  $T_l$  and  $U$  in  $\hat{B}$ , are in  $\hat{B}^{\hat{\phi}}$ . Therefore, by Lemma 2.1,  $\hat{\phi}$  will induce a non-trivial exponential map  $\tilde{\phi}$  on

$$\tilde{B} = \hat{B} \otimes_{k[\hat{t}_l]} k(\hat{t}_l) \cong \frac{k(T_l)[T_1, \dots, T_{l-1}, T_{l+1}, \dots, T_m, U, V]}{(T_1^{r_1} \dots T_m^{r_m} U - P(V))},$$

such that  $\tilde{u} \in \tilde{B}^{\tilde{\phi}}$ , where  $\tilde{u}$  is the image of  $U$  in  $\tilde{B}$ . But this contradicts the induction hypothesis. Hence the result follows.  $\square$

**Lemma 5.8.** *The following hold:*

- (a) If  $\underline{r} \in \mathbb{Z}_{>1}^m$ , then  $\text{ML}(B_{\underline{r}}) = k[t_1, \dots, t_m]$ .
- (b) For  $\underline{1} = (1, \dots, 1)$ ,  $\text{ML}(B_{\underline{1}}) = k$ .

*Proof.* (a) We show that for every non-trivial exponential map  $\phi$  on  $B_{\underline{r}}^{\phi} \subseteq k[t_1, \dots, t_m]$ .

Suppose there exists  $\psi \in \text{EXP}(B_{\underline{r}})$ , which is non-trivial and  $B_{\underline{r}}^{\psi} \not\subseteq k[t_1, \dots, t_m]$ . Therefore, there exists  $h \in B_{\underline{r}}^{\psi}$  such that

$$h = h_1(t_1, \dots, t_m, v) + \sum_{\substack{\underline{i}=(i_1, \dots, i_m) \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^m, \\ j > 0, p \geq 0}} \alpha_{\underline{i}jp} t_1^{i_1} \dots t_m^{i_m} v^j v^p,$$

where  $h_1 \in k^{[m+1]}$ ,  $\alpha_{\underline{i}jp} \in k$ , and for every  $j > 0$  and  $\underline{i} = (i_1, \dots, i_m) \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^m$ , there exist  $s_j \in \{1, \dots, m\}$  such that  $i_{s_j} < r_{s_j}$ .

Suppose  $\alpha_{\underline{i}jp} \neq 0$ , for some  $j > 0$  and  $p \geq 0$ . We consider the  $\mathbb{Z}$ -filtration on  $B_{\underline{r}}$ , induced by  $(0, \dots, 0, 1, 0, \dots, 0) \in \mathbb{Z}^m$ , where the  $s_j$ -th entry is 1. Then  $\psi$  induces a non-trivial exponential map  $\bar{\psi}$  on the associated graded ring  $\bar{B}_{\underline{r}}$ , which is isomorphic to  $B_{\underline{r}}$  itself. For every  $b \in B_{\underline{r}}$ , let  $\bar{b}$  denotes the image of  $b$  in  $\bar{B}_{\underline{r}}$ . With respect to the chosen filtration it is clear that  $\bar{u} \mid \bar{h}$  and since  $\bar{h} \in \bar{B}_{\underline{r}}^{\bar{\psi}}$  (Theorem 2.3),  $\bar{u} \in \bar{B}_{\underline{r}}^{\bar{\psi}}$ . But this contradicts Lemma 5.7. Therefore, we have  $h = h_1(t_1, \dots, t_m, v)$ .

Now note that  $B_{\underline{r}} \hookrightarrow C := k[t_1^{\pm 1}, \dots, t_m^{\pm 1}, v]$ . The ring  $k[t_1^{\pm 1}, \dots, t_m^{\pm 1}, v]$  can be given the following  $\mathbb{Z}$ -graded structure:

$$k[t_1^{\pm 1}, \dots, t_m^{\pm 1}, v] = \bigoplus_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} C_n,$$

where  $C_n = k[t_1^{\pm 1}, \dots, t_m^{\pm 1}]v^n$ . This induces a proper  $\mathbb{Z}$ -filtration  $\{(B_{\underline{r}})_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{Z}}$  on  $B_{\underline{r}}$  such that  $(B_{\underline{r}})_n = \bigoplus_{i \leq n} C_i \cap B_{\underline{r}}$ . Also note that every element  $b \in B_{\underline{r}}$  can be uniquely



expressed as

$$b = \sum_{n \geq 0} b_n(t_1, \dots, t_m)v^n + \sum_{\underline{i}=(i_1, \dots, i_m) \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^m, j > 0} b_{\underline{i}j}(v) t_1^{i_1} \cdots t_m^{i_m} v^j,$$

such that for every  $j > 0$  and  $\underline{i} = (i_1, \dots, i_m) \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^m$ , there exist  $s_j \in \{1, \dots, m\}$  such that  $i_{s_j} < r_{s_j}$ .

Therefore, it is easy to see that the filtration  $\{(B_{\underline{r}})_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{Z}}$  is admissible with respect to the generating set  $\Gamma = \{t_1, \dots, t_m, u, v\}$  of  $B_{\underline{r}}$  and the associated graded ring  $E = \bigoplus_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} \frac{B_n}{B_{n-1}}$  is generated by the image of  $\Gamma$  in  $E$ . For  $b \in B_{\underline{r}}$ , let  $\tilde{b}$  denotes its image in  $E$ . Note that  $\tilde{t}_1^{r_1} \cdots \tilde{t}_m^{r_m} \tilde{u} = \lambda \tilde{v}^q$  in  $E$ , where  $\lambda \in k^*$  and  $q = \deg_V P(V) (> 1)$ . Also in  $E$ ,  $wt(\tilde{t}_i) = 0$  ( $1 \leq i \leq m$ ),  $wt(\tilde{v}) = 1$  and  $wt(\tilde{u}) = q$ . As  $E$  can be identified as a subring of the graded domain  $C = k[t_1^{\pm 1}, \dots, t_m^{\pm 1}, v]$ , we have  $\tilde{t}_1, \dots, \tilde{t}_m, \tilde{v}$  are algebraically independent in  $E$ . Now since  $\frac{k[T_1, \dots, T_m, U, V]}{(T_1^{r_1} \cdots T_m^{r_m} U - \lambda V^q)}$  is an integral domain, we have the following isomorphism

$$E \cong \frac{k[T_1, \dots, T_m, U, V]}{(T_1^{r_1} \cdots T_m^{r_m} U - \lambda V^q)}. \quad (20)$$

Now by Theorem 2.3, we have  $\psi$  induces a non-trivial exponential map  $\tilde{\psi}$  on  $E$  such that  $\tilde{h} \in E^{\tilde{\psi}}$ . Now from the grading on  $E$  it is clear that  $\tilde{v} \mid \tilde{h}$  and hence  $\tilde{v} \in E^{\tilde{\psi}}$ . But then from (20) it follows that  $\tilde{t}_1, \dots, \tilde{t}_m, \tilde{u} \in E^{\tilde{\psi}}$  and hence  $\tilde{\psi}$  is a trivial exponential map, which is a contradiction.

Therefore we obtain that for every non-trivial exponential map  $\phi$  on  $B_{\underline{r}}$ ,  $B_{\underline{r}}^{\phi} \subseteq k[t_1, \dots, t_m]$ . Since  $B_{\underline{r}}^{\phi}$  is algebraically closed in  $B_{\underline{r}}$  and  $tr. \deg B_{\underline{r}} = m$ , we have  $B_{\underline{r}}^{\phi} = k[t_1, \dots, t_m]$ . Therefore  $ML(B_{\underline{r}}) = k[t_1, \dots, t_m]$ .

(b) Consider the following map  $\phi : B_{\underline{1}} \rightarrow B_{\underline{1}}[W]$  such that

$$\phi(t_i) = t_i \quad (1 \leq i \leq m), \quad \phi(v) = v + t_1 \cdots t_m W$$

and

$$\phi(u) = \frac{P(v + t_1 \cdots t_m W)}{t_1 \cdots t_m} = u + W\alpha(t_1, \dots, t_m, v, W),$$

where  $\alpha \in k^{[m+2]}$ . It is easy to see that  $\phi \in \text{EXP}(B_{\underline{1}})$  and  $k[t_1, \dots, t_m] \subseteq B_{\underline{1}}^{\phi}$ . As  $k[t_1, \dots, t_m]$  is algebraically closed in  $B_{\underline{1}}$ , we have  $B_{\underline{1}}^{\phi} = k[t_1, \dots, t_m]$ .

Again for every  $j \in \{1, \dots, m\}$ , consider the following exponential maps  $\phi_j : B_{\underline{1}} \rightarrow B_{\underline{1}}[W]$ :

$$\phi_j(t_i) = t_i \quad (1 \leq i \leq m, i \neq j), \quad \phi_j(u) = u, \quad \phi_j(v) = v + t_1 \cdots t_{j-1} t_{j+1} \cdots t_m u W$$

and

$$\phi_j(t_j) = \frac{P(v + t_1 \cdots t_{j-1} t_{j+1} \cdots t_m u W)}{t_1 \cdots t_{j-1} t_{j+1} \cdots t_m u} = t_j + W\alpha_j(t_1, \dots, t_{j-1}, t_{j+1}, \dots, t_m, u, v, W),$$

where  $\alpha_j \in k^{[m+2]}$ . It is easy to see that  $k[t_1, \dots, t_{j-1}, t_{j+1}, \dots, t_m, u] \subseteq B_{\underline{1}}^{\phi_j}$ . Since  $k[t_1, \dots, t_{j-1}, t_{j+1}, \dots, t_m, u]$  is algebraically closed in  $B_{\underline{1}}$ , we have  $B_{\underline{1}}^{\phi_j} = k[t_1, \dots, t_{j-1}, t_{j+1}, \dots, t_m, u]$ . Therefore, we obtain that  $k \subseteq ML(B_{\underline{1}}) \subseteq B_{\underline{1}}^{\phi} \cap_{1 \leq j \leq m} B_{\underline{1}}^{\phi_j} = k$ , hence the result follows.  $\square$

**Remark 5.9.** From Lemma 5.8, it is clear that when  $\underline{r} \in \mathbb{Z}_{>1}^m$ , then  $B_{\underline{r}} \not\cong B_{\underline{1}}$ .

The next theorem classifies the generalised Danielewski varieties upto isomorphism.

**Theorem 5.10.** *Let  $(r_1, \dots, r_m), (s_1, \dots, s_m) \in \mathbb{Z}_{>1}^m$  and  $P, Q \in k[V]$ . Then  $B(r_1, \dots, r_m, P) \cong B(s_1, \dots, s_m, Q)$  if and only if  $(r_1, \dots, r_m) = (s_1, \dots, s_m)$  upto a permutation of  $\{1, \dots, m\}$  and there exists  $\alpha \in \text{Aut}_k(k[V])$  such that  $\alpha(Q) = \lambda P$ , for some  $\lambda \in k^*$ .*

*Proof.* If  $(r_1, \dots, r_m) = (s_1, \dots, s_m)$  upto a permutation of  $\{1, \dots, m\}$ , and  $\alpha(Q) = \lambda P$ , for some  $\lambda \in k^*$  and  $\alpha \in \text{Aut}_k(k[V])$ , then clearly  $B(r_1, \dots, r_m, P) \cong B(s_1, \dots, s_m, Q)$ .

We now show the converse part. Let  $B = B(r_1, \dots, r_m, P)$  and  $B' = B(s_1, \dots, s_m, Q)$ , and  $\rho : B \rightarrow B'$  be an isomorphism. Replacing  $B$  by  $\rho(B)$ , we can assume that  $B = B'$ . Let  $B = k[t_1, \dots, t_m, u, v]$  and  $B' = k[t'_1, \dots, t'_m, u', v']$ , where  $t_1, \dots, t_m, u, v$  and  $t'_1, \dots, t'_m, u', v'$  denote the images of  $T_1, \dots, T_m, U, V$  in  $B$  and  $B'$  respectively. Since  $B = B'$ , by Lemma 5.8(a), we have

$$\text{ML}(B) = k[t_1, \dots, t_m] = k[t'_1, \dots, t'_m] = \text{ML}(B').$$

Now

$$B \otimes_{k[t_1, \dots, t_m]} k(t_1, \dots, t_m) = B' \otimes_{k[t'_1, \dots, t'_m]} k(t'_1, \dots, t'_m),$$

and hence

$$k(t_1, \dots, t_m)[v] = k(t'_1, \dots, t'_m)[v'] = k(t_1, \dots, t_m)[v']. \quad (21)$$

Now note that  $k[t_1, \dots, t_m, v] \hookrightarrow B \hookrightarrow k[t_1^{\pm 1}, \dots, t_m^{\pm 1}, v]$ . We show that  $v' \in k[t_1, \dots, t_m, v]$ . Suppose  $v' \in B \setminus k[t_1, \dots, t_m, v]$ . Then

$$v' = h(t_1, \dots, t_m, v) + \sum_{\underline{i}=(i_1, \dots, i_m) \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^m, j>0} b_{\underline{i}j}(v) t_1^{i_1} \cdots t_m^{i_m} v^j, \quad (22)$$

such that  $h \in k[t_1, \dots, t_m, v]$ ,  $b_{\underline{i}j}(v) \in k[v]$  and for every  $j > 0$  and  $\underline{i} = (i_1, \dots, i_m) \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^m$ , there exists  $s_j \in \{1, \dots, m\}$  such that  $i_{s_j} < r_{s_j}$ . Since  $u = \frac{P(v)}{t_1^{r_1} \cdots t_m^{r_m}}$  and  $\deg_v P(v) > 1$ , from (22), it is clear that  $\deg_v v' > 1$ . But this contradicts (21). Therefore,  $v' \in k[t_1, \dots, t_m, v]$  and using (21), we obtain that

$$k[t_1, \dots, t_m, v] = k[t'_1, \dots, t'_m, v'] (= R). \quad (23)$$

Now

$$u' = \frac{Q(v')}{(t'_1)^{s_1} \cdots (t'_m)^{s_m}} \in B' \setminus R,$$

otherwise  $B' = R$ , which is a contradiction. Since  $B' = B \hookrightarrow k[t_1^{\pm 1}, \dots, t_m^{\pm 1}, v]$ , there exists  $n > 0$  such that

$$(t_1 \cdots t_m)^n u' = \frac{(t_1 \cdots t_m)^n Q(v')}{(t'_1)^{s_1} \cdots (t'_m)^{s_m}} \in R.$$

Since for every  $i \in \{1, \dots, m\}$ ,  $t'_i$  is irreducible in  $R$ , we have

$$t'_i = \lambda_j t_j, \quad (24)$$

for some  $j \in \{1, \dots, m\}$  and  $\lambda_j \in k^*$ . we now show that  $s_i = r_j$ . Suppose  $s_i > r_j$ . Consider the ideal  $\mathfrak{a}_i = \langle (t'_i)^{s_i} \rangle B' \cap R = \langle (t'_i)^{s_i}, Q(v') \rangle$ . Again  $\mathfrak{a}_i = \langle t_j^{s_i} \rangle B \cap R = \langle t_j^{s_i}, t_j^{s_i - r_j} P(v) \rangle$ , which implies that  $Q(v') \in \langle t_j \rangle R$ . But this is a contradiction. Therefore,  $s_i \leq r_j$ .

Suppose  $s_i < r_j$ . Now consider the ideal  $\mathfrak{b}_j = \langle t_j^{r_j} \rangle B \cap R = \langle t_j^{r_j}, P(v) \rangle$ . Since  $\mathfrak{b}_j = \langle (t'_i)^{r_j} \rangle B' \cap R = \langle (t'_i)^{r_j}, (t'_i)^{r_j - s_i} Q(v') \rangle$ . But then  $P(v) \in \langle t'_i \rangle R$ , which is a contradiction. Therefore, we have  $s_i = r_j$ . Hence from (24) it follows that  $(r_1, \dots, r_m) = (s_1, \dots, s_m)$  upto a permutation.

Since  $\langle t_1 \cdots t_m \rangle B \cap R = \langle t'_1 \cdots t'_m \rangle B' \cap R$ , we have  $\langle t_1 \cdots t_m, P(v) \rangle R = \langle t'_1 \cdots t'_m, Q(v') \rangle R$ . Therefore, by (24) it follows that

$$Q(v') = \lambda P(v) + H(t_1, \dots, t_m, v), \quad (25)$$

for some  $\lambda \in k^*$  and  $H \in (t_1, \dots, t_m)R$ . From (22) and (23), it is clear that  $v' = \gamma v + h'(t_1, \dots, t_m)$ , for some  $\gamma \in k^*$  and  $h' \in k[V]$ . Therefore  $\alpha : k[V] \rightarrow k[V]$  defined by  $\alpha(V) = \gamma V + h'(0, \dots, 0)$  is an automorphism of  $k[Z, T]$  and from (25) it follows that  $\alpha(Q) = \lambda P$ .  $\square$

We now record the following lemma.

**Lemma 5.11.** *Let  $R, S$  be integral domains such that  $R \subseteq S$ . Suppose there exists  $a \in R$  such that  $R_a = S_a$  and  $aS \cap R = aR$ . Then  $R = S$ .*

We now show that the Danielewski varieties are stably isomorphic.

**Theorem 5.12.** *Let  $(r_1, \dots, r_m), (s_1, \dots, s_m) \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}^m$ . Let  $P \in k[V]$  be an irreducible polynomial and  $P'$  denotes the first derivative of  $P$  with respect to  $V$ . If  $\gcd(P, P') = 1$ , then*

$$B(r_1, \dots, r_m, P)^{[1]} \cong B(s_1, \dots, s_m, P)^{[1]}.$$

*Proof.* Let

$$B(r_1, \dots, r_m, P) \cong \frac{k[T_1, \dots, T_m, U, V]}{(T_1^{r_1} \cdots T_m^{r_m} U - P(V))},$$

be such that  $r_j > 1$  for some  $j \in \{1, \dots, m\}$  and  $t_1, \dots, t_m, u, v$  be the images of  $T_1, \dots, T_m, U, V$  respectively. Without loss of generality we assume  $r_1 > 1$ . We now show that

$$B(r_1 - 1, r_2, \dots, r_m, P)^{[1]} \cong B(r_1, \dots, r_m, P)^{[1]},$$

and therefore for any pair  $(r_1, \dots, r_m), (s_1, \dots, s_m) \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}^m$ , we get the result inductively.

Let  $B = B(r_1, \dots, r_m, P)[w] = B(r_1, \dots, r_m, P)^{[1]}$ . Consider the exponential map  $\phi : B \rightarrow B[H] = B^{[1]}$  as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \phi(t_i) &= t_i \quad (1 \leq i \leq m), \\ \phi(v) &= v + t_1^{r_1} \cdots t_m^{r_m} H, \\ \phi(u) &= \frac{P(v + t_1^{r_1} \cdots t_m^{r_m} H)}{t_1^{r_1} \cdots t_m^{r_m}} = v + H\alpha(t_1, \dots, t_m, v, H), \\ \phi(w) &= w - t_1 H, \end{aligned}$$

where  $\alpha \in k^{[m+2]}$ . Now for  $v_1 = v + t_1^{r_1-1}t_2^{r_2} \cdots t_m^{r_m}w$ , we have  $v_1 \in B^\phi$ . Again,

$$\begin{aligned} P(v_1) &= P(v + t_1^{r_1-1} \cdots t_m^{r_m}w) \\ &= P(v) + t_1^{r_1-1} \cdots t_m^{r_m}(wP'(v) + bt_1) \\ &= t_1^{r_1-1} \cdots t_m^{r_m}(t_1u + wP'(v) + bt_1) \\ &= t_1^{r_1-1} \cdots t_m^{r_m}u_1, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$u_1 = t_1u + wP'(v) + bt_1, \quad (26)$$

for some  $b \in B$ . Since  $t_1, \dots, t_m, v_1 \in B^\phi$ , we have  $u_1 \in B^\phi$ . Now Since  $\gcd(P, P') = 1$ , there exist  $g_1, g_2 \in k^{[1]}$  such that

$$P(v)g_1(v) + P'(v)g_2(v) = 1. \quad (27)$$

Now note that  $g_2(v_1) - g_2(v) \in \langle t_1 \rangle B$ . Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} w - u_1g_2(v_1) &= w - t_1ug_2(v_1) - wP'(v)g_2(v_1) - bt_1g_2(v_1) \\ &= w(1 - P'(v)g_2(v_1)) + t_1\theta \\ &= w(1 - P'(v)g_2(v)) + t_1\delta \\ &= wP(v)g_1(v) + t_1\delta \\ &= t_1\tilde{w}, \end{aligned}$$

where  $\theta, \delta, \tilde{w} \in B$ . Therefore, we have  $\tilde{w} = \frac{w - u_1g_2(v_1)}{t_1} \in B$  such that  $\phi(\tilde{w}) = \tilde{w} - H$  and hence  $B = B^\phi[\tilde{w}] = (B^\phi)^{[1]}$ . Note that  $C := k[t_1, \dots, t_m, v_1, u_1] \subseteq B^\phi$ . Since

$$P(v_1) = t_1^{r_1-1} \cdots t_m^{r_m}u_1, \quad (28)$$

using (26) we have  $\text{tr. deg}_k C = m + 1$  and hence  $\dim C = m + 1$ . We now show the following:

(a)  $C \cong B(r_1 - 1, r_2, \dots, r_m, P) \cong \frac{k[T_1, \dots, T_m, U, V]}{(T_1^{r_1-1}T_2^{r_2} \cdots T_m^{r_m}U - P(V))}$ ,

(b)  $C = B^\phi$ .

(a) Consider the surjection  $\psi : k[T_1, \dots, T_m, V, U] \rightarrow C$  such that  $\psi(T_i) = t_i$  ( $1 \leq i \leq m$ ),  $\psi(V) = v_1$ ,  $\psi(U) = u_1$ . From (28) it is clear that  $(T_1^{r_1-1}T_2^{r_2} \cdots T_m^{r_m}U - P(V)) \subseteq \ker \psi$ . Therefore,  $\psi$  induces a surjection

$$\bar{\psi} : B(r_1 - 1, r_2, \dots, r_m, P) \cong \frac{k[T_1, \dots, T_m, U, V]}{(T_1^{r_1-1}T_2^{r_2} \cdots T_m^{r_m}U - P(V))} \rightarrow C.$$

Since  $B(r_1 - 1, r_2, \dots, r_m, P)$  is an integral domain and  $\dim C = m + 1$ , we have  $\bar{\psi}$  is an isomorphism.

(b) Note that  $B\left[\frac{1}{t_1 \cdots t_m}\right] = k[t_1^{\pm 1}, \dots, t_m^{\pm 1}, v_1, w]$ . Therefore,  $\phi$  induces a non-trivial exponential map  $\tilde{\phi}$  on  $B\left[\frac{1}{t_1 \cdots t_m}\right]$  such that  $\left(B\left[\frac{1}{t_1 \cdots t_m}\right]\right)^{\tilde{\phi}} = k[t_1^{\pm 1}, \dots, t_m^{\pm 1}, v_1] = B^\phi\left[\frac{1}{t_1 \cdots t_m}\right]$  (by Lemma 2.1). Hence we have  $C\left[\frac{1}{t_1 \cdots t_m}\right] = B^\phi\left[\frac{1}{t_1 \cdots t_m}\right]$ .

We now show for every  $i \in \{1, \dots, m\}$ ,  $t_i C = t_i B \cap C$ . Consider the natural surjection  $\pi_i : B \rightarrow B/t_i B$ . Note that  $\text{tr. deg}_k \pi_i(C) = m$  and

$$\frac{C}{t_i C} \cong \frac{k[T_1, \dots, T_{i-1}, T_{i+1}, \dots, T_m, U, V]}{(P(V))},$$

which is an integral domain such that  $\dim C/t_i C = m$ . Therefore  $\pi_i$  induces an inclusion  $\bar{\pi}_i : C/t_i C \rightarrow B/t_i B$ . Therefore, we get that  $t_i C = t_i B \cap C$  and hence it follows that  $t_i C = t_i B^\phi \cap C$ . Therefore by Lemma 5.11, we get that  $C = B^\phi$ .

Therefore we obtain that

$$B(r_1, \dots, r_m, P)^{[1]} \cong B = B^\phi[\tilde{w}] = C^{[1]} \cong B(r_1 - 1, r_2, \dots, r_m, P)^{[1]},$$

hence the result follows.  $\square$

**Remark 5.13.** From Lemma 5.8(b), Theorem 5.10 and Theorem 5.12, if  $P(V)$  is a irreducible polynomial such that  $\gcd(P, P') = 1$ , then  $\{B(r_1, \dots, r_m, P) \mid (r_1, \dots, r_m) \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}^m\}$  is a family of pairwise non-isomorphic varieties of higher dimension ( $\geq 2$ ) which are stably isomorphic. Hence these varieties are counter example to the generalised Zariski's Cancellation Problem in arbitrary characteristic.

We now give a description of  $\text{DK}(A)$  and  $\text{ML}(A)$ , where  $A$  is the affine domain as in (19).

**Corollary 5.14.** *Let  $A \cong \frac{k[X_1, \dots, X_m, Y, Z, T]}{(X_1^{r_1} \dots X_m^{r_m} Y - f(Z, T))}$ , such that  $A$  be a UFD as well as regular.*

*Then the following hold:*

- (a) *If  $f(Z, T)$  is coordinate in  $k[Z, T]$ , then  $\text{DK}(A) = A$  and  $\text{ML}(A) = k$ .*
- (b) *If there exists a system of coordinates  $\{Z_1, T_1\}$  of  $k[Z, T]$  such that  $f(Z, T) = a_0(Z_1) + a_1(Z_1)T_1$ , then  $\text{DK}(A) = A$  and  $\text{ML}(A) = k$ .*
- (c) *If  $k$  is an infinite field and  $f(Z, T)$  can not be expressed in the form as in part (b), then  $\text{DK}(A) = k[x_1, \dots, x_m, z, t]$  and  $\text{ML}(A) = k[x_1, \dots, x_m]$ .*

*Proof.* (a) Follows from (vi)  $\Rightarrow$  (iv) of Theorem 3.9 and the fact that  $\text{DK}(k^{[m+2]}) = k^{[m+2]}$  and  $\text{ML}(k^{[m+2]}) = k$ .

(b) If  $a_1(Z_1) \neq 0$ , then the assertion follows from Proposition 5.5. If  $a_1(Z_1) = 0$ , then  $f(Z, T) = a_0(Z_1)$ . Since  $A$  is a UFD,  $a_0(Z_1)$  is irreducible (Proposition 3.6) and as  $A$  is regular we have  $\gcd(a_0(Z_1), a'_0(Z_1)) = 1$ , where  $a'_0(Z_1)$  is the first derivative of  $a_0(Z_1)$  with respect to  $Z_1$ . Further note that,  $A \cong B(r_1, \dots, r_m, a_0)^{[1]}$ . Therefore, by Theorem 5.12, we have  $A \cong B(1, \dots, 1, a_0)^{[1]}$  and hence  $\text{ML}(A) = k$ , by Lemma 5.8(b).

(c) Follows from Remark 3.5.  $\square$

## References

- [1] S.S. Abhyankar, P. Eakin and W. Heinzer, *On the uniqueness of the coefficient ring in a polynomial ring*, J. Algebra **23** (1972) 310–342.

- [2] Hyman Bass, *Introduction to some methods of algebraic K-theory*, American Mathematical Society, Providence, R.I., 1974. Expository Lectures from the CBMS Regional Conference held at Colorado State University, Ft. Collins, Colo., August 24-28, 1973; Conference Board of the Mathematical Sciences Regional Conference Series in Mathematics, No. 20. MR0347942 (50 #441).
- [3] S. M. Bhatwadekar, Neena Gupta, and Swapnil A. Lokhande, *Some K-Theoretic properties of the kernel of a locally nilpotent derivation on  $k[X_1, \dots, X_4]$* , Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **369** (2017), no-1, 341-363.
- [4] A. J. Crachiola, *The hypersurface  $x + x^2y + z^2 + t^3 = 0$  over a field of arbitrary characteristic*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **134** (2005), 1289-1298.
- [5] A.K. Dutta, *On separable  $\mathbb{A}^1$ -forms*, Nagoya Math. J. **159** (2000), 45–51.
- [6] H. Derksen, O. Hadas and L. Makar-Limanov, *Newton polytopes of invariants of additive group actions*, J. Pure Appl. Algebra, **156** (2001), 187–197.
- [7] Dubouloz, Adrien, *Additive group actions on Danielewski varieties and the cancellation problem*, Math. Z. **255** (2007), no. 1, 77–93.
- [8] Gaifullin, Sergey A, *Automorphisms of Danielewski varieties*, J. Algebra **573** (2021), 364–392.
- [9] N. Gupta, *On the cancellation problem for the affine space  $\mathbb{A}^3$  in characteristic  $p$* , Invent. Math. **195** (2014) 279–288.
- [10] Neena Gupta, *On the family of affine threefolds  $x^m y = F(x, z, t)$* , Compositio Math. **150** (2014) 979-998.
- [11] Neena Gupta, *On Zariski's Cancellation Problem in positive characteristic*, Adv. Math. **264** (2014) 296-307.
- [12] Hideyuki Matsumura, *Mathematics Lecture Note Series, Commutative Algebra, Second edition*, The Benjamin/ Cummings Publishing Company.
- [13] P. Russell and A. Sathaye, *On finding and cancelling variables in  $k[X, Y, Z]$* , J. Algebra **57** (1979), 151-166.
- [14] V. Srinivas, Algebraic K-theory, 2nd ed., Modern Birkhäuser Classics, Birkhäuser Boston, Inc., Boston, MA, 2008. MR2371852 (2008i:19001)