

# REDUCIBILITY BY POLYNOMIAL FUNCTIONS

RICCARDO CAMERLO AND CARLA MASSAZA

ABSTRACT. We study the preorder  $\leq_p$  on the family of subsets of an algebraically closed field of characteristic 0 defined by letting  $A \leq_p B$  if there exists a polynomial  $P$  such that  $A = P^{-1}(B)$ .

## CONTENTS

1. Introduction and plan of the paper	1
1.1. Some terminology and notation	4
2. Reducibility on finite sets	5
2.1. The variety $\Sigma_n$	6
2.2. A geometric description of polynomial bireducibility	9
2.3. $\Sigma_3$ is a line	14
2.4. Exceptional classes	15
2.5. Polynomial reducibility on finite sets	23
3. Sets that are infinite and coinfinite	33
3.1. Subfields of $\mathbb{C}$	35
4. Further questions	36
5. Appendix: a variation on Vandermonde	37
References	38

## 1. INTRODUCTION AND PLAN OF THE PAPER

We let  $k$  always denote a commutative field, and  $\kappa$  its cardinality; in a moment we shall add the assumption that  $k$  is algebraically closed and has characteristic 0. Purpose of the paper is to study the following relation between subsets of  $k$ .

**Definition 1.** For  $A, B \subseteq k$ , let  $A \leq_p B$  if there is a polynomial function  $P : k \rightarrow k$  such that

$$(1) \quad A = P^{-1}(B).$$

---

2020 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 12E05. Secondary 14A05.

*Key words and phrases.* Reducibility; polynomial; affine variety; dimension.

We then say that  $A$  *polynomially reduces* to  $B$ . A polynomial  $P$  as in (1) is said to *reduce*  $A$  to  $B$ . Also, let  $A \equiv_p B$  denote  $A \leq_p B \leq_p A$ , in which case we say that  $A, B$  are *polynomially bireducible*. If  $A \leq_p B$  but  $A \not\equiv_p B$ , we write  $A <_p B$ .

Relation  $\leq_p$  is an instance of a *reducibility relation*: if  $\mathcal{F}$  is a class of functions from a set  $X$  to itself, containing the identity function and closed under composition, setting

$$(2) \quad A \leq_{\mathcal{F}} B \Leftrightarrow \exists f \in \mathcal{F}, A = f^{-1}(B),$$

for  $A, B \subseteq X$ , defines a preorder on  $\mathcal{P}(X)$ , the powerset of  $X$ . This preorder is called  $\mathcal{F}$ -*reducibility* and the function  $f$  appearing in (2) is called a *reduction* of  $A$  to  $B$ .

The idea underlying the notion of reducibility is that, whenever the relation  $A \leq_{\mathcal{F}} B$  is witnessed by a reduction  $f \in \mathcal{F}$ , the complexity of the set  $A$  is bounded by the complexity of the set  $B$  since the problem of recognising membership in  $A$  is reduced to the same problem for  $B$ , as  $x \in A \Leftrightarrow f(x) \in B$ . This notion of relative complexity depends on the chosen class of reductions  $\mathcal{F}$ , and the most notable example is when  $X$  is a topological space and  $\mathcal{F}$  is the collection of continuous functions on  $X$ . Then  $\leq_{\mathcal{F}}$  is called *continuous reducibility*, or *Wadge reducibility*, since the first systematic study of it (for  $X = \mathbb{N}^{\mathbb{N}}$ ) was performed in Wadge's thesis [11].

In this paper we are interested in the case our set is an algebraically closed field  $k$  of characteristic 0, and we choose as  $\mathcal{F}$  the class of polynomial functions on  $k$ , since these are the basic functions of interest in commutative algebra and algebraic geometry, being the morphisms of the affine variety  $k$ . As  $\equiv_p$  is an equivalence relation, we still denote  $\leq_p$  the partial order induced on the equivalence classes, that is on  $\mathcal{P}(k) / \equiv_p$ . The  $\equiv_p$ -equivalence classes  $[A] = \{B \in \mathcal{P}(k) \mid B \equiv_p A\}$  will be called *polynomial classes*.

We focus mainly on the study of  $\leq_p$  on finite subsets of  $k$ : this is the content of section 2, which constitutes the core of the paper. After presenting some general facts, in section 2.1 we prove that polynomial classes of sets of  $n$  elements, for any given  $n$ , form an affine variety  $\Sigma_n$  of dimension  $n - 2$ . The import of this fact is that it provides a framework to study  $\leq_p$  quantitatively, by using dimension, which is done in the subsequent sections. In section 2.2 we describe  $\equiv_p$  on finite sets from a geometrical viewpoint and in section 2.3 we prove that  $\Sigma_3$  is an affine line. Section 2.4 is devoted to those polynomial classes that have less representatives than the generic ones. In this sense, we call them *exceptional classes* and we prove in proposition 36 and corollary 38 that they form a subvariety of  $\Sigma_n$  of dimension  $\frac{n-2}{2}$  or  $\frac{n-3}{2}$ , according to whether  $n$  is even or odd. In section 2.5 we prove several results about  $\leq_p$  on finite sets. Given a  $n$ -element subset  $A$  of  $k$ , we give conditions for a  $m$ -element set to be comparable with  $A$  and we prove that the family of polynomial classes of  $m$ -element sets comparable with  $[A]$  is a subvariety of  $\Sigma_m$  of which we compute the dimension (proposition 41 and theorems

42 and 44). In theorem 47 we show that most polynomial classes of finite sets are  $\leq_p$ -maximal below the class of 1-element sets, thus providing a big antichain for  $\leq_p$ .

In section 3 we gather some results about  $\leq_p$  on sets that are both infinite and coinfinite. We show that there are  $2^\kappa$  polynomial classes of sets of cardinality  $\kappa$  and whose complement has cardinality  $\kappa$  that are  $\leq_p$ -maximal (theorem 48). Moreover, if  $k$  is countable, most subsets of  $k$  are  $\leq_p$ -maximal from the Baire category point of view, in the sense that they form a comeagre subset of the powerset of  $k$  (theorem 49). Finally, when  $k \subseteq \mathbb{C}$ , we construct a chain of polynomial classes of order type  $\zeta$  —the order type of the integers— in proposition 51.

To establish one of our main results, we need in lemma 43 that a specific matrix, which is an enrichment of the Vandermonde matrix, is non-singular. This observation, which we could not find in the existing literature, might be interesting on its own and its proof is given in a separate section (section 5).

**Remark 1.** (1) Denote by  $Pol$  the monoid of polynomial functions on  $k$  under the operation of composition. The preorder  $\leq_p$  is induced by the right action of  $Pol$  on  $\mathcal{P}(k)$  defined by  $(A, P) \mapsto P^{-1}(A)$ .  
 (2) There are two incomparable polynomial classes that precede every other polynomial class:  $[\emptyset] = \{\emptyset\}$  and  $[k] = \{k\}$ . Indeed, if  $A$  is a proper subset of  $k$ , then any constant polynomial with value outside  $A$  is a reduction of  $\emptyset$  to  $A$ ; similarly,  $k$  is polynomially reducible to any non-empty set  $A$ .

Polynomial functions are continuous with respect to the Zariski topology on  $k$  (which is the cofinite topology), so it follows that

$$(3) \quad \forall A, B \in \mathcal{P}(k), A \leq_p B \Rightarrow A \leq_W B$$

where  $\leq_W$  is the relation of Wadge reducibility with respect to the Zariski topology. The relation  $\leq_W$  for Zariski topologies has been studied in [1]: for example, it is noted there that non-empty, proper, closed subsets of  $k$  (when  $k$  is infinite these are exactly the finite non-empty sets) form a single class with respect to the equivalence relation associated to  $\leq_W$ . Proposition 2 below shows that for some fields  $k$  the relation  $\leq_p$  can coincide with  $\leq_W$  on finite sets. However, purpose of this note is to illustrate that in general the situation is quite different.

**Proposition 2.** *Let  $A$  be a finite, non-empty subset of  $k$ . Then  $A \leq_p \{0\}$ .*

*If  $k$  is an ordered field, then  $\{0\} \leq_p A$  holds as well. Consequently, if  $k$  is an ordered field then  $A \equiv_p B$  for any finite, non-empty subsets  $A, B$ .*

*Proof.* The polynomial  $P(X) = \prod_{a \in A} (X - a)$  reduces  $A$  to  $\{0\}$ . If  $k$  is an ordered field, let  $a = \max A$ ; then  $Q(X) = X^2 + a$  reduces  $\{0\}$  to  $A$ .  $\square$

From now on  $k$  is algebraically closed and has characteristic 0.

**Remark 3.** The assumption on  $k$  implies in particular that:

- (1)  $k$  is infinite, so this allows to identify polynomials and polynomial functions.
- (2) Every non-constant polynomial function is surjective; therefore if the non-constant polynomial  $P$  reduces  $A$  to  $B$ , it also follows that  $P(A) = B$ .

**Proposition 4.** *Let  $A \in \mathcal{P}(k) \setminus \{\emptyset, k\}$ . If  $A \leq_p B$ , then either  $A, B$  are both finite, in which case  $\text{card}(A) \geq \text{card}(B)$ , or  $\text{card}(A) = \text{card}(B)$ . Consequently, for any  $A, B$ , if  $A \equiv_p B$  then  $\text{card}(A) = \text{card}(B)$ .*

*Proof.* This holds since non-constant polynomials are surjective and every element has finitely many preimages.  $\square$

For  $\lambda \leq \kappa$  let

$$\mathcal{P}_\lambda = \{A \in \mathcal{P}(k) \mid \text{card}(A) = \lambda\}, \quad \check{\mathcal{P}}_\lambda = \{k \setminus A\}_{A \in \mathcal{P}_\lambda}.$$

By proposition 4, every  $\mathcal{P}_\lambda$  and  $\check{\mathcal{P}}_\lambda$ , as well as  $\mathcal{P}_\kappa \cap \check{\mathcal{P}}_\kappa$ , is invariant with respect to  $\equiv_p$ . Recall that  $\text{card}(\mathcal{P}_\lambda) = \text{card}(\check{\mathcal{P}}_\lambda) = \kappa^\lambda$  (see [7, exercise I.13.20]) and that  $\text{card}(\mathcal{P}_\kappa \cap \check{\mathcal{P}}_\kappa) = 2^\kappa$ .

We denote  $\Sigma_\lambda = \{[A] \mid A \in \mathcal{P}_\lambda\}$ : this is the quotient of  $\mathcal{P}_\lambda$  with respect to the restriction of  $\equiv_p$ . Similarly, define  $\check{\Sigma}_\lambda = \{[A] \mid A \in \check{\mathcal{P}}_\lambda\}$ . The results on polynomial reducibility for  $\mathcal{P}_\lambda, \Sigma_\lambda$  transfer to  $\check{\mathcal{P}}_\lambda, \check{\Sigma}_\lambda$ , respectively, via the bijection  $A \mapsto k \setminus A$  and the fact that  $A \leq_p B \Leftrightarrow k \setminus A \leq_p k \setminus B$ .

**1.1. Some terminology and notation.** The terminology and notation that we employ throughout the paper is quite standard: main references are [5, 4, 9, 2]. We collect here a list of some common notions we use.

- We denote  $\deg(P)$  the degree of a polynomial  $P$ . A *linear polynomial* is a polynomial of degree 1, that is, of the form  $cX + c'$  where  $c \neq 0$ . We denote  $\mathcal{L}$  the set of linear polynomials; this is a group under composition. A *quadratic polynomial* is a polynomial of degree 2, that is, of the form  $cX^2 + c'X + c''$  where  $c \neq 0$ . If  $P(X) = cX + c'$  is a linear polynomial, then repeated applications of  $P$  give

$$(4) \quad P^j(X) = c^j X + (c^j + \cdots + c + 1)c';$$

consequently, if moreover  $c \neq 1$ , then

$$(5) \quad P^j(X) = c^j X + \frac{c^j - 1}{c - 1} c'.$$

- A polynomial  $h \in k[X_1, \dots, X_n]$  is *translation invariant* if

$$\forall a_1, \dots, a_n, t \in k, h(a_1, \dots, a_n) = h(a_1 + t, \dots, a_n + t).$$

- If  $\mathcal{S} \subseteq k[X_1, \dots, X_n]$ , we denote  $V(\mathcal{S}) = \{(a_1, \dots, a_n) \in k^n \mid \forall f \in \mathcal{S}, f(a_1, \dots, a_n) = 0\}$ ; when  $f_1, \dots, f_m \in k[X_1, \dots, X_n]$  we also let  $V(f_1, \dots, f_m) = V(\{f_1, \dots, f_m\})$ . Sets isomorphic to some  $V(\mathcal{S})$  are *affine varieties*.

Note that by our definition an affine variety may be empty.

- If  $f \in k[X_1, \dots, X_n]$ , the set  $D(f) = k^n \setminus V(f)$  is a *standard open set*: it consists of all elements of  $k^n$  where  $f$  does not vanish. By [9, proposition III.3.3],  $D(f)$  is an affine variety endowed with the restriction of the sheaf of regular functions of  $k^n$ .
- If  $V \subseteq k^n$  is an affine variety, we denote  $I(V) = \{f \in k[X_1, \dots, X_n] \mid \forall (a_1, \dots, a_n) \in V, f(a_1, \dots, a_n) = 0\}$  the ideal of  $V$ .
- We denote  $Sym(A)$  the symmetric group on a set  $A$ ; we let also  $Sym_n = Sym(\{1, \dots, n\})$ .
- If  $\alpha$  is a group action and  $a$  is an element of the set acted upon, we denote  $Stab_a^\alpha$  the stabiliser of  $a$  under action  $\alpha$ .

## 2. REDUCIBILITY ON FINITE SETS

From (3) it follows that if  $B$  is finite, so closed in the Zariski topology, and  $A \leq_p B$ , then either  $A = k$  or  $A$  is finite. Thus finite sets, together with  $k$ , constitute an initial segment of  $\leq_p$ .

- Proposition 5.** (1) *If  $1 \leq n < m$ ,  $A \in \mathcal{P}_n$ ,  $B \in \mathcal{P}_m$ , then  $A \not\leq_p B$ .*  
 (2) *For every  $n \geq 1$ , every  $A \in \mathcal{P}_n$ , and every  $B \in \mathcal{P}_1$ , it holds that  $A \leq_p B$ .*  
 (3)  $\forall A, B \in \mathcal{P}_2, A \equiv_p B$ .

*In particular,  $\Sigma_1$  and  $\Sigma_2$  both consist of a single element.*

*Proof.* (1) This is proposition 4.

(2) Let  $B = \{b\}$ . Then the polynomial  $\prod_{a \in A} (X - a) + b$  reduces  $A$  to  $B$ .

(3) Let  $A = \{a_1, a_2\}, B = \{b_1, b_2\}$ , in order to show the existence of a polynomial  $P : k \rightarrow k$ , in fact a linear one, such that  $A = P^{-1}(B)$ . Let  $P(X) = cX + c'$ . The coefficients of such a polynomial can be found as the solutions of the linear system

$$(6) \quad \begin{pmatrix} a_1 & 1 \\ a_2 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} c \\ c' \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} b_1 \\ b_2 \end{pmatrix}.$$

This shows that  $A \subseteq P^{-1}(B)$ ; the fact that  $P$  cannot be constant implies that  $P^{-1}(B)$  has cardinality 2 and yields  $A = P^{-1}(B)$ .

As the polynomial  $P^{-1}$  reduces  $B$  to  $A$ , the assertion is proved.  $\square$

**Proposition 6.** *Let  $n \geq 2$ . If  $A, B \in \mathcal{P}_n$  and  $P$  is a polynomial such that  $A = P^{-1}(B)$ , then  $P$  is linear.*

*Proof.* Let  $A = \{a_1, \dots, a_n\}, B = \{b_1, \dots, b_n\}$ , where it can be assumed that  $P(a_j) = b_j$  for every  $j$ . Suppose, toward contradiction, that  $P$  has degree  $\gamma > 1$ . Then each equation  $P(x) - b_j = 0$  has  $a_j$  as its unique solution, with multiplicity  $\gamma$ , so that  $P(X) - b_j = c(X - a_j)^\gamma$  for some  $c \neq 0$ . This means that for every  $j, j'$ , the polynomial  $c(X - a_j)^\gamma - c(X - a_{j'})^\gamma$  is constant, which is not the case for  $j \neq j'$  as the coefficient of degree  $\gamma - 1$  is  $c\gamma a_{j'}^\gamma - c\gamma a_j^\gamma \neq 0$ .  $\square$

**Corollary 7.** *If  $A, B \in \mathcal{P}_n$  are such that  $A \leq_p B$ , then  $A \equiv_p B$ . In other words, the elements of  $\Sigma_n$  are pairwise  $\leq_p$ -incomparable.*

*Proof.* By proposition 5(2), it can be assumed that  $n \geq 2$ . If  $A \leq_p B$ , by proposition 6 there is a linear polynomial  $P$  such that  $A = P^{-1}(B)$ . Then  $P^{-1}$  is a polynomial, in fact a linear one, reducing  $B$  to  $A$ .  $\square$

Therefore, if  $A \in \mathcal{P}_n$ , the polynomial class  $[A]$  is the family of all images of  $A$  under some linear polynomial. This leads to the following.

**Definition 2.** Let  $\alpha$  be the action of  $\mathcal{L}$  on  $\mathcal{P}(k)$  defined by  $\alpha(P, A) = P(A)$ .

We also denote  $\alpha$  the restriction of this action to a fixed  $\mathcal{P}_n$ .

**Corollary 8.** *The restriction  $\equiv_p^n$  of  $\equiv_p$  to  $\mathcal{P}_n$  is the orbit relation of the action  $\alpha$ .*

Corollary 8 do not extend to infinite sets: see remark 52.

**Remark 9.** From proposition 6 and the proof of proposition 5(3) it follows that for every  $A, B \in \mathcal{P}_2$  there are exactly two polynomials reducing  $A$  to  $B$ : one has as coefficients the solution  $(c, c')$  of (6); the other one is obtained by switching  $b_1, b_2$  in (6). A similar argument applied to the equation

$$(7) \quad \begin{pmatrix} a_1 & 1 \\ a_2 & 1 \\ \dots & \dots \\ a_n & 1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} c \\ c' \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} b_1 \\ b_2 \\ \dots \\ b_n \end{pmatrix}$$

shows that if  $\{a_1, \dots, a_n\} \leq_p \{b_1, \dots, b_n\}$ , then there are at most  $n!$  polynomials reducing  $\{a_1, \dots, a_n\}$  to  $\{b_1, \dots, b_n\}$ . Note indeed that (7) may be compatible for some enumerations of  $\{b_1, \dots, b_n\}$  and incompatible for others.

In particular, the stabiliser  $Stab_A^\alpha$  of every  $A \in \mathcal{P}_n$  has at most  $n!$  elements. The cardinality of  $Stab_A^\alpha$  plays a role in the geometry of polynomial classes: see remark 23.

**2.1. The variety  $\Sigma_n$ .** Corollary 8 suggests the possibility of endowing the orbit space of action  $\alpha$ , that is  $\Sigma_n$ , with a geometric structure. In fact, in this section we show that  $\mathcal{P}_n$  and, more importantly,  $\Sigma_n$  can be given the structure of a quotient affine variety. The import of this fact is that it provides a quantitative framework to study the relation  $\leq_p$ .

Let

$$f_n(X_1, \dots, X_n) = \prod_{j \neq j'} (X_j - X_{j'}) \in k[X_1, \dots, X_n].$$

Then the standard open set  $D(f_n) = k^n \setminus V(f_n)$  consists of all elements of  $k^n$  having distinct coordinates. In particular, the ring of regular functions on  $D(f_n)$  is the localised ring  $\Gamma(D(f_n)) = k[X_1, \dots, X_n]_{f_n} = \left\{ \frac{g}{f_n^r} \mid g \in k[X_1, \dots, X_n], r \in \mathbb{N} \right\}$ .

**Remark 10.** The polynomial  $f_n$  is not the least degree polynomial that identifies  $D(f_n)$ : one could use the Vandermonde determinant  $\prod_{j < j'} (X_j - X_{j'})$ . The polynomial  $f_n$  has the advantage of being symmetric, which is convenient in the

next steps. Note also that  $f_n$  is homogeneous of degree  $n(n-1)$  and translation invariant.

Next we describe the structure of  $\mathcal{P}_n$  as an affine variety. We identify  $\mathcal{P}_n$  as the orbit space of the action of  $Sym_n$  on  $D(f_n)$  by permutation of the coordinates. Then  $\mathcal{P}_n$  is an affine variety by [4, §10]: it is the geometric quotient of  $D(f_n)$  by this action. Denote  $\theta : D(f_n) \rightarrow \mathcal{P}_n$  the quotient projection. The ring  $\Gamma(\mathcal{P}_n)$  of regular functions on  $\mathcal{P}_n$  consists of those elements of  $\Gamma(D(f_n))$  that are invariant with respect to the action of  $Sym_n$ ; this means that if  $F \in \Gamma(\mathcal{P}_n)$  then there exist a symmetric  $g \in k[X_1, \dots, X_n]$  and  $r \in \mathbb{N}$  such that for every  $A = \{a_1, \dots, a_n\} \in \mathcal{P}_n$  one has

$$(8) \quad F(A) = \frac{g(a_1, \dots, a_n)}{(f_n(a_1, \dots, a_n))^r}.$$

By corollary 8,  $\Sigma_n$  is the orbit space of the action  $\alpha$  on  $\mathcal{P}_n$ . Let  $\theta' : \mathcal{P}_n \rightarrow \Sigma_n$  be the quotient projection. We claim that  $\Sigma_n$  is the geometric quotient of  $\mathcal{P}_n$  by  $\alpha$ . For this, we first identify which is the  $k$ -algebra  $\mathcal{A}$  consisting of the elements of  $\Gamma(\mathcal{P}_n)$  that are invariant under  $\alpha$ : if  $\Sigma_n$  is a geometric quotient, this is to be the ring of regular functions  $\Gamma(\Sigma_n)$ .

**Lemma 11.** *Let  $F, g, r$  be as in (8). Then  $F \in \mathcal{A}$  if and only if  $g$  is homogeneous of degree  $n(n-1)r$  and translation invariant.*

*Proof.* ( $\Rightarrow$ ) Assume  $F \in \mathcal{A}$ .

Let  $\{a_1, \dots, a_n\} \in \mathcal{P}_n, s \in k \setminus \{0\}$ . Since  $\{a_1, \dots, a_n\}, \{sa_1, \dots, sa_n\}$  belong to the same orbit, as witnessed by the linear polynomial  $P(X) = sX$ , from  $F(\{a_1, \dots, a_n\}) = F(\{sa_1, \dots, sa_n\})$  it follows that

$$\frac{g(a_1, \dots, a_n)}{(f_n(a_1, \dots, a_n))^r} = \frac{g(sa_1, \dots, sa_n)}{(f_n(sa_1, \dots, sa_n))^r} = \frac{g(sa_1, \dots, sa_n)}{s^{n(n-1)r} (f_n(a_1, \dots, a_n))^r}$$

whence  $g(sa_1, \dots, sa_n) = s^{n(n-1)r} g(a_1, \dots, a_n)$ , showing that  $g$  is homogeneous of degree  $n(n-1)r$ .

Let now  $\{a_1, \dots, a_n\} \in \mathcal{P}_n, t \in k$ . Since  $\{a_1, \dots, a_n\}, \{a_1+t, \dots, a_n+t\}$  belong to the same orbit, as witnessed by the linear polynomial  $P(X) = X+t$ , from  $F(\{a_1, \dots, a_n\}) = F(\{a_1+t, \dots, a_n+t\})$  it follows that

$$\frac{g(a_1, \dots, a_n)}{(f_n(a_1, \dots, a_n))^r} = \frac{g(a_1+t, \dots, a_n+t)}{(f_n(a_1+t, \dots, a_n+t))^r} = \frac{g(a_1+t, \dots, a_n+t)}{(f_n(a_1, \dots, a_n))^r}$$

whence  $g(a_1+t, \dots, a_n+t) = g(a_1, \dots, a_n)$ , showing that  $g$  is translation invariant.

( $\Leftarrow$ ) Assume  $g$  is homogeneous of degree  $n(n-1)r$  and translation invariant. Let  $A, B \in \mathcal{P}_n$  be in the same orbit. If  $A = \{a_1, \dots, a_n\}$ , then  $B = \{sa_1+t, \dots, sa_n+t\}$

for some  $s, t$ , with  $s \neq 0$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned} F(B) &= \frac{g(sa_1 + t, \dots, sa_n + t)}{(f_n(sa_1 + t, \dots, sa_n + t))^r} = \frac{g(sa_1, \dots, sa_n)}{(f_n(sa_1, \dots, sa_n))^r} = \\ &= \frac{s^{n(n-1)r} g(a_1, \dots, a_n)}{s^{n(n-1)r} (f_n(a_1, \dots, a_n))^r} = \frac{g(a_1, \dots, a_n)}{(f_n(a_1, \dots, a_n))^r} = F(A). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore  $F \in \mathcal{A}$ .  $\square$

It remains to show that the  $k$ -algebra  $\mathcal{A}$ , which is a ring of functions  $\Sigma_n \rightarrow k$ , generates the quotient topology on  $\Sigma_n$ , that is the following.

**Proposition 12.** (1) For every  $F \in \mathcal{A}$ , the zero set of  $F$  is closed in  $\Sigma_n$ .  
(2) For every closed  $C \subseteq \Sigma_n$  there exists  $\mathcal{B} \subseteq \mathcal{A}$  such that  $C$  is the zero set of  $\mathcal{B}$ .

*Proof.* (1) Let  $g, r$  as in (8). Then the zero set of  $F$  in  $\Sigma_n$  is the image under  $\theta'$  of the zero set determined by  $g$  in  $\mathcal{P}_n$ ; the latter is a closed subset of  $\mathcal{P}_n$  invariant under  $\alpha$ , so its projection under  $\theta'$  is closed in  $\Sigma_n$ .

(2) If  $C$  is closed in  $\Sigma_n$ , there exists a closed set  $C' \subseteq \mathcal{P}_n$  invariant under action  $\alpha$  such that  $C = \theta'(C')$ . In turn there exists a closed set  $C'' \subseteq D(f_n)$  invariant under permutation of the coordinates and such that  $C' = \theta(C'')$ . Note that  $C''$  is also invariant under the transformations  $(a_1, \dots, a_n) \mapsto (sa_1, \dots, sa_n)$ , for  $s \neq 0$ , and  $(a_1, \dots, a_n) \mapsto (a_1 + t, \dots, a_n + t)$ .

*Claim.* There exists  $\mathcal{S} \subseteq k[X_1, \dots, X_n]$  such that  $C'' = V(\mathcal{S})$  and every element of  $\mathcal{S}$  is homogeneous, invariant under translation, and symmetric.

*Proof of the claim.* Since  $C''$  is symmetric, there exists a set  $\mathcal{T}_0 \subseteq k[X_1, \dots, X_n]$  of symmetric polynomials such that  $C''$  is the zero set of  $\mathcal{T}_0$  in  $D(f_n)$ . To see this, notice that  $I(C'')$  is a symmetric ideal, that is given any  $f \in I(C'')$  any polynomial obtained from  $f$  by a permutation of the variables is in  $I(C'')$ ; by [10, proposition 2.6.4] (which is stated for  $\mathbb{C}$ , though the proof holds for any algebraically closed field), the radical of the ideal generated by the symmetric polynomials of  $I(C'')$  equals  $I(C'')$ . Therefore it is enough to take as  $\mathcal{T}_0$  the set of all symmetric polynomials in  $I(C'')$ .

The next step is to replace every  $h \in \mathcal{T}_0$  with a set of symmetric and homogeneous polynomials. The argument is similar to the proof that a projective variety admits homogeneous equations (see for instance [9, proposition-definition 4.1]). Let  $h = \sum_{j=1}^u h_j$ , where the polynomials  $h_j$  are homogeneous and have pairwise different degree  $\gamma_j$ ; notice that each  $h_j$  is symmetric too. If  $h_1(a_1, \dots, a_n) = \dots = h_u(a_1, \dots, a_n) = 0$ , then  $h(a_1, \dots, a_n) = 0$ . Conversely, if  $h(a_1, \dots, a_n) = 0$  for all  $h \in \mathcal{T}_0$ , then the properties of  $C''$  imply that, for every  $s \neq 0$ ,

$$0 = h(sa_1, \dots, sa_n) = \sum_{j=1}^u h_j(a_1, \dots, a_n) s^{\gamma_j}$$



so that  $h_1(a_1, \dots, a_n) = \dots = h_u(a_1, \dots, a_n) = 0$ . Therefore  $V(\mathcal{T}_0) = V(\mathcal{T}_1)$ , where  $\mathcal{T}_1$  consists of the homogenous parts of every degree of all the elements of  $\mathcal{T}_0$ .

The last step is to replace every element of  $\mathcal{T}_1$  with an equivalent symmetric, homogeneous, and translation invariant polynomial. For every  $h \in \mathcal{T}_1$ , let  $p_h(X_1, \dots, X_n) = h(X_1 - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n X_j, \dots, X_n - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n X_j)$ . A direct inspection using the properties of  $h$  shows that  $p_h$  is indeed symmetric, homogeneous, and translation invariant. Moreover, by the properties of  $C''$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \forall h \in \mathcal{T}_1, p_h(a_1, \dots, a_n) = 0 & \quad \text{iff} \\ \forall h \in \mathcal{T}_1, h\left(a_1 - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n a_j, \dots, a_n - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n a_j\right) = 0 & \quad \text{iff} \\ \forall h \in \mathcal{T}_1, h(a_1, \dots, a_n) = 0 & \end{aligned}$$

so letting  $\mathcal{S} = \{p_h\}_{h \in \mathcal{T}_1}$  establishes the claim.  $\square$

Now, for every  $h \in \mathcal{S}$ , let  $\gamma_h$  be the degree of  $h$ . It follows that the polynomial  $(h(X_1, \dots, X_n))^{n(n-1)}$  is homogeneous of degree  $n(n-1)\gamma_h$ , translation invariant, and symmetric. Setting  $\mathcal{B} = \left\{ \frac{h^{n(n-1)}}{f_n^{\gamma_h}} \right\}_{h \in \mathcal{S}}$  concludes the proof.  $\square$

A first immediate property of the variety  $\Sigma_n$  is the following.

**Corollary 13.** *The affine variety  $\Sigma_n$  is irreducible.*

*Proof.* Indeed,  $\Sigma_n$  is the image under the morphism  $\theta'\theta$  of the irreducible variety  $D(f_n)$ . Then apply [9, proposition I.6.11(2)].  $\square$

Moreover  $\dim(\Sigma_n) = n - 2$ , see corollary 16(2).

**Question 1.** Identify  $\Sigma_n$ .

We answer question 1 for  $n = 3$  in proposition 20.

**2.2. A geometric description of polynomial bireducibility.** In this section we describe geometrically the relation of polynomial bireducibility in  $\mathcal{P}_n$ , for  $n \geq 3$ , that is the orbit relation of the action  $\alpha$ ; in other words, we give a geometric description of the elements of  $\Sigma_n$ .

Fix  $B = \{b_1, \dots, b_n\} \in \mathcal{P}_n$ . Given  $(x_1, \dots, x_n) \in D(f_n)$ , the set  $A = \{x_1, \dots, x_n\}$  is in  $[B]$  if and only if there exist a linear polynomial  $P(X) = cX + c'$  and a permutation  $\sigma$  of  $\{1, \dots, n\}$  such that  $P(x_j) = b_{\sigma(j)}$ , for  $j \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ . Therefore, the condition is that there exists  $\sigma \in \text{Sym}_n$  such that  $(x_1, \dots, x_n)$  makes the lin-

ear system whose augmented matrix is  $N = \begin{pmatrix} x_1 & 1 & b_{\sigma(1)} \\ x_2 & 1 & b_{\sigma(2)} \\ \dots & \dots & \dots \\ x_n & 1 & b_{\sigma(n)} \end{pmatrix}$  compatible. As

$$rk \begin{pmatrix} x_1 & 1 \\ x_2 & 1 \\ \dots & \dots \\ x_n & 1 \end{pmatrix} = 2, \text{ the condition becomes}$$

$$(9) \quad rkN = 2,$$

which means that the points  $(1, \dots, 1), (x_1, \dots, x_n), (b_{\sigma(1)}, \dots, b_{\sigma(n)})$  belong to the same plane through the origin.

More precisely, since any two rows of  $N$  are linearly independent, (9) means that every row is linearly dependent from the first two rows, which translates into the system of linear equations:

$$(10) \quad \begin{cases} (b_{\sigma(3)} - b_{\sigma(2)})x_1 + (b_{\sigma(1)} - b_{\sigma(3)})x_2 + (b_{\sigma(2)} - b_{\sigma(1)})x_3 & = 0 \\ \dots & \\ (b_{\sigma(j)} - b_{\sigma(2)})x_1 + (b_{\sigma(1)} - b_{\sigma(j)})x_2 + (b_{\sigma(2)} - b_{\sigma(1)})x_j & = 0 \\ \dots & \\ (b_{\sigma(n)} - b_{\sigma(2)})x_1 + (b_{\sigma(1)} - b_{\sigma(n)})x_2 + (b_{\sigma(2)} - b_{\sigma(1)})x_n & = 0 \end{cases} .$$

As the coefficient matrix of (10) has rank  $n - 2$ , the set  $\pi_\sigma$  of the solutions to this system in  $k^n$  is a 2-dimensional vector space, that is a plane, containing the line

$$(11) \quad r : x_1 = x_2 = \dots = x_n.$$

Notice that  $\pi_\sigma$  also depends on the enumeration of  $B$ , while  $\mathcal{F}_B = \{\pi_\sigma\}_{\sigma \in \text{Sym}_n}$  does not —see definition 3.

Using the above discussion and notation, the following is obtained.

**Lemma 14.** *Fix  $\sigma \in \text{Sym}_n$  and let  $B = \{b_1, \dots, b_n\} \in \mathcal{P}_n$ . Let  $\pi_\sigma$  and  $r$  be defined as in (10) and (11), respectively. If  $A \in \mathcal{P}_n$  and  $A \leq_p B$ , then there exists  $(a_1, \dots, a_n) \in \pi_\sigma \setminus r$  such that  $A = \{a_1, \dots, a_n\}$ . Conversely, if  $(a_1, \dots, a_n) \in \pi_\sigma \setminus r$  then  $\{a_1, \dots, a_n\} \leq_p B$ .*

*Proof.* Assume that the polynomial  $P$  reduces  $A = \{x_1, \dots, x_n\}$  to  $B$ , so that  $P$  is linear by proposition 6. Then there exists  $\tau \in \text{Sym}_n$  such that  $\forall j \in \{1, \dots, n\}, P(x_j) = b_{\tau(j)}$ , whence  $\forall j \in \{1, \dots, n\}, P(x_{\tau^{-1}\sigma(j)}) = b_{\sigma(j)}$ . Therefore  $(x_{\tau^{-1}\sigma(1)}, \dots, x_{\tau^{-1}\sigma(n)}) \in \pi_\sigma \setminus r$ .

The converse holds by the previous discussion and the fact that the elements in  $\pi_\sigma \setminus r$  have coordinates that are all distinct.  $\square$

Therefore we have the following.

**Remark 15.** (1) The set of all  $(x_1, \dots, x_n)$  such that  $\{x_1, \dots, x_n\} \in [B]$  is  $\bigcup_{\sigma \in \text{Sym}_n} \pi_\sigma \setminus r = (\theta'\theta)^{-1}([B])$ : this is the fiber of  $[B] \in \Sigma_n$  under the morphism  $\theta'\theta : D(f_n) \rightarrow \Sigma_n$ . The closure of this fiber in  $k^n$  is  $\bigcup_{\sigma \in \text{Sym}_n} \pi_\sigma$ .

(2) For any fixed  $\sigma \in \text{Sym}_n$ ,

$$[B] = \{\{x_1, \dots, x_n\} \mid (x_1, \dots, x_n) \in \pi_\sigma \setminus r\}.$$

- (3) Two distinct planes as in (10), for the same or distinct  $B$ , intersect in  $r$ .
- (4) Letting  $B$  range in  $\mathcal{P}_n$ , the planes in (10) cover  $k^n$  except for those points having two equal coordinates, that is the points on the  $\frac{n(n-1)}{2}$  hyperplanes  $x_j = x_{j'}$  for  $j \neq j'$ .

**Corollary 16.** (1) *Every polynomial class  $[B]$  is a 2-dimensional subvariety of  $\mathcal{P}_n$ .*  
 (2)  $\dim(\Sigma_n) = n - 2$ .

*Proof.* Every fiber of the morphism  $\theta$  is finite and every fiber of the morphism  $\theta'\theta$  has dimension 2 by remark 15(1). Apply [9, corollary IV.3.8(2)].  $\square$

So every polynomial class is identified by any plane  $\pi_\sigma$  in the set (10) of at most  $n!$  planes, where  $\sigma$  ranges over  $Sym_n$ . Such planes belong to the sheaf of planes based on line  $r$ .

**Definition 3.** Let  $B = \{b_1, \dots, b_n\} \in \mathcal{P}_n$ .

- We call each of the planes in (10) a *characteristic plane* of  $B$ , or a *characteristic plane* of  $[B]$ . Denote  $\mathcal{F}_B$  the set of characteristic planes of  $B$ .
- We call *characteristic number* of  $B$ , or *characteristic number* of  $[B]$ , and denote it  $\chi(B)$  or  $\chi([B])$ , the number of characteristic planes of  $B$ , that is  $\text{card}(\mathcal{F}_B)$ .

Therefore  $\chi(B) \leq n!$  —see also definition 5.

**Definition 4.** Given  $B = \{b_1, \dots, b_n\}$ , let  $\beta : Sym_n \times \mathcal{F}_B \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_B$  be the action defined by letting  $\beta(\tau, \pi_\sigma) = \pi_{\tau\sigma}$ .

**Lemma 17.** *Action  $\beta$  depends only on the polynomial class  $[B]$ , and not on the representative set  $B$  nor on its enumeration.*

*Proof.* First we show that  $\beta$  does not depend on any enumeration of  $B = \{b_1, \dots, b_n\}$ . So let  $B = \{b_{\rho(1)}, \dots, b_{\rho(n)}\}$  be another enumeration, with  $\rho \in Sym_n$ . For every  $\sigma \in Sym_n$ , let  $\pi'_\sigma$  be the plane defined as in (10) using this new enumeration, that is

$$\pi'_\sigma : (b_{\sigma\rho(j)} - b_{\sigma\rho(2)})x_1 + (b_{\sigma\rho(1)} - b_{\sigma\rho(j)})x_2 + (b_{\sigma\rho(2)} - b_{\sigma\rho(1)})x_j = 0, \quad j \in \{3, \dots, n\}.$$

Then  $\pi'_\sigma = \pi_{\sigma\rho}$ . Therefore, if  $\beta' : (\tau, \pi'_\sigma) \mapsto \pi'_{\tau\sigma}$  is the action on  $\mathcal{F}_B$  defined using the new enumeration,  $\beta(\tau, \pi'_\sigma) = \beta(\tau, \pi_{\sigma\rho}) = \pi_{\tau\sigma\rho} = \pi'_{\tau\sigma} = \beta'(\tau, \pi'_\sigma)$ , whence  $\beta = \beta'$ .

Now let  $C \in [B]$ , and let  $(c_1, \dots, c_n) \in \pi_{id}$  such that  $C = \{c_1, \dots, c_n\}$ , where  $id$  is the identity permutation on  $\{1, \dots, n\}$ . If  $\pi'_\sigma$  is the plane defined as in (10) using  $(c_1, \dots, c_n)$ , that is

$$\pi'_\sigma : (c_{\sigma(j)} - c_{\sigma(2)})x_1 + (c_{\sigma(1)} - c_{\sigma(j)})x_2 + (c_{\sigma(2)} - c_{\sigma(1)})x_j = 0, \quad j \in \{3, \dots, n\},$$

it is enough to show that  $\pi'_\sigma = \pi_\sigma$  for every  $\sigma \in Sym_n$ . Since  $r \subseteq \pi_\sigma \cap \pi'_\sigma$  and  $(c_{\sigma(1)}, \dots, c_{\sigma(n)}) \in \pi'_\sigma$  by direct substitution into the equation, it is in turn enough

to show that  $(c_{\sigma(1)}, \dots, c_{\sigma(n)}) \in \pi_\sigma$ , that is  $(c_1, \dots, c_n) \in \pi = \{(p_1, \dots, p_n) \in k^n \mid (p_{\sigma(1)}, \dots, p_{\sigma(n)}) \in \pi_\sigma\}$ . But this follows since  $\pi$  is a plane including  $r$  and containing the point  $(b_1, \dots, b_n)$ , so  $\pi = \pi_{id}$ .  $\square$

Therefore, letting  $\mathcal{F}$  be the collection of planes containing line  $r$  and that are not contained in any hyperplane  $x_j = x_{j'}$ , for  $j \neq j'$ , definition 4 yields an action  $Sym_n \times \mathcal{F} \rightarrow \mathcal{F}$ , which we still denote  $\beta$ . The orbits are the sets of characteristic planes of a given polynomial class.

Given  $(b_1, \dots, b_n) \in D(f_n)$ , the plane in  $\mathcal{F}$  which  $(b_1, \dots, b_n)$  belongs to is obtained by choosing in (10) the permutation  $\sigma$  to be the identity, that is

$$(12) \quad \pi_{id} : \begin{cases} (b_2 - b_1)(x_3 - x_1) + (b_1 - b_3)(x_2 - x_1) & = 0 \\ \dots & \\ (b_2 - b_1)(x_j - x_1) + (b_1 - b_j)(x_2 - x_1) & = 0 \\ \dots & \\ (b_2 - b_1)(x_n - x_1) + (b_1 - b_n)(x_2 - x_1) & = 0 \end{cases} .$$

For  $j \in \{1, \dots, n\}$  let

$$(13) \quad \lambda_j = \frac{b_1 - b_j}{b_1 - b_2}.$$

Notice that  $\lambda_1 = 0, \lambda_2 = 1$ , and the subset of  $k^{n-2}$  over which  $(\lambda_3, \dots, \lambda_n)$  ranges for  $(b_1, \dots, b_n) \in D(f_n)$  is defined by the conditions

$$(14) \quad \begin{aligned} \forall j \in \{3, \dots, n\}, \lambda_j &\notin \{0, 1\} \\ \forall j, j' \in \{3, \dots, n\}, j \neq j' &\Rightarrow \lambda_j \neq \lambda_{j'} \end{aligned} .$$

The subset of all  $(\lambda_3, \dots, \lambda_n) \in k^{n-2}$  satisfying (14) is a standard open subset of  $k^{n-2}$ , namely it is  $D(S_n)$  where  $S_n(\Lambda_3, \dots, \Lambda_n) = \prod_{h=3}^n \Lambda_h(\Lambda_h - 1) \cdot \prod_{3 \leq h < h' \leq n} (\Lambda_h - \Lambda_{h'})$ . Therefore (13) defines a surjective morphism  $\eta : D(f_n) \rightarrow D(S_n)$ :

$$\eta(b_1, \dots, b_n) = \left( \frac{b_1 - b_3}{b_1 - b_2}, \dots, \frac{b_1 - b_n}{b_1 - b_2} \right).$$

System (12) can be written as

$$(15) \quad (x_j - x_1) + \lambda_j(x_1 - x_2) = 0, \quad \text{for } j \in \{3, \dots, n\}$$

where the relationships between the parameters are given by

$$(16) \quad \lambda_j = \frac{b_1 - b_j}{b_1 - b_{j'}} \lambda_{j'}, \quad \text{for } j, j' \in \{3, \dots, n\}.$$

The following remark gathers some consequences of equations (15).

- Remark 18.** (1) Every characteristic plane (12) contains exactly one point with  $x_1 = 0, x_2 = 1$ , namely the point  $\lambda = (0, 1, \lambda_3, \dots, \lambda_n)$ .
- (2) The fibers of the morphism  $\eta$  are the characteristic planes, deprived of line  $r$ : that is,  $\eta^{-1}(\{\lambda_3, \dots, \lambda_n\})$  is the characteristic plane, without line  $r$ , containing the point  $(0, 1, \lambda_3, \dots, \lambda_n)$ .

(3) Equations (15) imply also that

$$(17) \quad \lambda_j = \frac{x_1 - x_j}{x_1 - x_2}.$$

Therefore the knowledge of  $(\lambda_3, \dots, \lambda_n) \in D(S_n)$  allows to find all elements  $\{x_1, \dots, x_n\}$  of  $[\{0, 1, \lambda_3, \dots, \lambda_n\}]$  by fixing arbitrarily distinct elements  $x_1, x_2 \in k$  and applying (17).

(4) The function  $(\lambda_3, \dots, \lambda_n) \mapsto (0, 1, \lambda_3, \dots, \lambda_n)$  is a morphism  $\xi : D(S_n) \rightarrow D(f_n)$ , which is a right inverse of  $\eta$ . Therefore, setting  $\eta' = \theta' \theta \xi : D(S_n) \rightarrow \Sigma_n$  we have the following commutative diagram of morphisms between varieties:

$$(18) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} D(f_n) & \xrightarrow{\theta} & \mathcal{P}_n \\ \downarrow \eta & & \downarrow \theta' \\ D(S_n) & \xrightarrow{\eta'} & \Sigma_n \end{array}$$

Given  $\Theta \in \Sigma_n$ , the fiber  $\eta'^{-1}(\{\Theta\})$  is a set of  $\chi(\Theta)$  elements.

All these morphisms depend on  $n$ . When it is important to specify the value of  $n$ , this will be added as a subscript.

(5) From the commutative diagram (18) it also follows that a subset  $F \subseteq \Sigma_n$  is closed if and only if  $\eta'^{-1}(F)$  is closed in  $D(S_n)$ . In other words, the topology on  $\Sigma_n$  is homeomorphic to the quotient topology of  $D(S_n)$  with respect to the equivalence relation induced by  $\eta'$ .

The definition (13) of the coefficients  $(\lambda_3, \dots, \lambda_n)$  can be used to provide complete invariants for the relation of polynomial bireducibility on finite sets. More precisely, if in addition to the Zariski topology  $k$  also carries a Polish topology with respect to which the operations are Borel, like in the case  $k = \mathbb{C}$ , the discussion above can be reframed in terms of the classification of equivalence relations under Borel reducibility —a general reference for the subject is [3]. Notice that in this case  $Fin = \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \mathcal{P}_n$  is a  $F_\sigma$  subset of  $K(k)$ , the Polish space of compact subsets of  $k$  endowed with the Vietoris topology, since each  $\bigcup_{h \leq n} \mathcal{P}_h$  is a closed set. Therefore  $Fin$  is a standard Borel space. The following proposition shows that from a descriptive set theoretic standpoint polynomial equivalence on finite sets is quite a simple equivalence relation.

**Proposition 19.** *If  $k$  is endowed with a Polish topology with respect to which the operations are Borel, then the restriction of the equivalence relation  $\equiv_p$  to  $Fin$  is a smooth equivalence relation.*

*Proof.* It is enough to prove that for each  $n \geq 3$  the restriction  $\equiv_p^n$  of  $\equiv_p$  to  $\mathcal{P}_n$  is smooth. For this, a Borel function  $\Phi : \mathcal{P}_n \rightarrow k^{n-2}$  is defined such that  $A \equiv_p^n B \Leftrightarrow \Phi(A) = \Phi(B)$ . Fix a Borel total order  $\preceq$  of  $k^{n-2}$ .

By [6, exercise 18.15] let  $\Phi_1, \dots, \Phi_n : \mathcal{P}_n \rightarrow k$  be Borel and such that  $\forall A \in \mathcal{P}_n, A = \{\Phi_1(A), \dots, \Phi_n(A)\}$ . Let  $\Lambda(b_1, \dots, b_n) = (\lambda_3, \dots, \lambda_n)$  be defined using (13). Then for every  $A \in \mathcal{P}_n$  define  $\Phi(A)$  as the  $\leq$ -least of all  $\Lambda(\Phi_{\sigma(1)}(A), \dots, \Phi_{\sigma(n)}(A))$  for  $\sigma \in \text{Sym}_n$ . Function  $\Phi$  has the desired properties.  $\square$

A detailed investigation of the descriptive set theoretic properties of polynomial reducibility and polynomial equivalence is not in the scope of this paper. We point out nevertheless the following question.

**Question 2.** What is the descriptive set theoretic complexity of  $\equiv_p, \leq_p$  on  $K(k)$ ?

**2.3.  $\Sigma_3$  is a line.** Let  $R_n^\gamma$  be the subspace of  $k[X_1, \dots, X_n]$  consisting of all polynomials that are symmetric, homogeneous of degree  $\gamma$ , and translation invariant (including the zero polynomial). By [8], a basis of the vector space  $R_n^\gamma$  is given by the polynomials

$$W_I(X_1, \dots, X_n) = \prod_{\ell=2}^n \left[ \sum_{j=1}^n \left( X_j - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{l=1}^n X_l \right)^\ell \right]^{i_\ell}$$

where  $I$  is a partition of  $\gamma$  into integers from 2 to  $n$  and  $i_\ell$  is the multiplicity of  $\ell$  in  $I$ . Letting

$$(19) \quad W_\ell = \sum_{j=1}^n \left( X_j - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{l=1}^n X_l \right)^\ell,$$

the elements of such a basis are all polynomials of the form

$$W_2^{i_2} W_3^{i_3} \cdot \dots \cdot W_n^{i_n}$$

where  $2i_2 + 3i_3 + \dots + ni_n = \gamma$ .

We now apply this fact and the above discussion to answer question 1 for  $n = 3$ .

**Theorem 20.**  $\Sigma_3$  is isomorphic to an affine line.

*Proof.* We show that the algebra  $\Gamma(\Sigma_3)$  is isomorphic to the algebra of regular functions of an affine line.

By lemma 11, if  $F \in \Gamma(\Sigma_3)$  then  $F = \frac{g(X_1, X_2, X_3)}{[f_3(X_1, X_2, X_3)]^\gamma}$  where  $g$  is symmetric, homogeneous of degree  $6\gamma$ , and translation invariant. By applying (19), we can write

$$F = \frac{\sum_{2i_2+3i_3=6\gamma} \beta_{i_2 i_3} W_2^{i_2} W_3^{i_3}}{f_3^\gamma}$$

where  $f_3 = \sum_{2j_2+3j_3=6} \alpha_{j_2 j_3} W_2^{j_2} W_3^{j_3}$ ; since  $2j_2 + 3j_3 = 6$  means that either  $j_2 = 3, j_3 = 0$  or  $j_2 = 0, j_3 = 2$ , we have  $f_3 = \alpha_0 W_2^3 + \alpha_1 W_3^2$ , for some fixed coefficients  $\alpha_0, \alpha_1$  —which are not both null.

The relation  $2i_2 + 3i_3 = 6\gamma$  implies that  $i_3$  is even, so let  $i_3 = 2i'_3$  with  $0 \leq i'_3 \leq \gamma$ , whence  $i_2 = 3\gamma - 3i'_3$ . Setting  $T_2 = W_2^3, T_3 = W_3^2$ , we get

$$(20) \quad F = \frac{\sum_{i'_3=0}^{\gamma} \beta_{i'_3} T_2^{\gamma-i'_3} T_3^{i'_3}}{(\alpha_0 T_2 + \alpha_1 T_3)^\gamma}.$$

The algebra of all functions as in (20) is the algebra of regular functions of the complement of the singleton  $\{(\alpha_1 : -\alpha_0)\}$  in the projective line  $\mathbb{P}^1$ , that is an affine line.  $\square$

#### 2.4. Exceptional classes.

**Definition 5.** Let  $n \geq 3$  and let  $B \in \mathcal{P}_n$ . If  $\chi(B) < n!$  we say that  $B$  is an *exceptional set* and  $[B]$  is an *exceptional class*.

So a polynomial class is an exceptional class if and only if there are distinct  $\sigma, \sigma' \in \text{Sym}_n$  such that the planes  $\pi_\sigma, \pi_{\sigma'}$  described by the system (10) for  $\sigma$  and for  $\sigma'$  coincide.

Exceptional classes have a peculiar role with respect to the relation  $\leq_p$ , see theorem 45. So the following questions appear to be natural.

- What are the exceptional classes?
- Given an exceptional class, what is its characteristic number?

The polynomial class  $[B]$  is an exceptional class if and only if given some (equivalently, any)  $\pi \in \mathcal{F}_B$ , the stabiliser of  $\pi$  under action  $\beta$  is not the trivial subgroup of  $\text{Sym}_n$ ; equivalently, if and only if there exists a non-identity permutation  $\sigma$  such that  $\pi_\sigma = \pi_{id}$ . Therefore, by (15), a polynomial class  $[\{b_1, \dots, b_n\}]$  is an exceptional class if and only if there exists a non-identity permutation  $\sigma$  such that, for every  $j \in \{3, \dots, n\}$ ,

$$(21) \quad \lambda_j = \frac{b_{\sigma(1)} - b_{\sigma(j)}}{b_{\sigma(1)} - b_{\sigma(2)}},$$

that is

$$(22) \quad \frac{b_{\sigma(1)} - b_{\sigma(2)}}{b_1 - b_2} = \frac{b_{\sigma(1)} - b_{\sigma(j)}}{b_1 - b_j}.$$

Notice that (21) always holds for  $j \in \{1, 2\}$ , while (22) always holds for  $j = 2$ . Note also that equations (21) can be written equivalently as

$$(23) \quad \lambda_{\sigma(j)} - \lambda_{\sigma(1)} = \lambda_j(\lambda_{\sigma(2)} - \lambda_{\sigma(1)}).$$

Any enumeration  $B = \{b_1, \dots, b_n\}$  induces an isomorphism (which depends on the chosen enumeration)

$$(24) \quad \text{Sym}(B) \rightarrow \text{Sym}_n, \quad \tau \mapsto \sigma$$

defined by

$$(25) \quad \tau(b_j) = b_{\sigma(j)}.$$

The images of a fixed  $\tau \in \text{Sym}(B)$  under the isomorphisms (24) induced by different enumerations of  $B$  are conjugate.

If  $\tau \in \text{Sym}(B)$ , given distinct  $b, b' \in B$  define

$$(26) \quad Y_\tau(b, b') = \frac{\tau(b) - \tau(b')}{b - b'}.$$

The following gives a characterisation of exceptional classes in terms of the difference quotient (26).

**Proposition 21.** *Let  $B \in \mathcal{P}_n$ . The following are equivalent:*

- (1) *The polynomial class  $[B]$  is an exceptional class.*
- (2) *For any  $b \in B$  there exists a non-identity permutation  $\tau \in \text{Sym}(B)$  such that the difference quotient  $Y_\tau(b, b')$  is constant for every  $b' \in B \setminus \{b\}$ .*
- (3) *There exist  $b \in B$  and a non-identity permutation  $\tau \in \text{Sym}(B)$  such that the difference quotient  $Y_\tau(b, b')$  is constant for every  $b' \in B \setminus \{b\}$ .*
- (4) *There exists a non-identity permutation  $\tau \in \text{Sym}(B)$  such that the difference quotient  $Y_\tau(b, b')$  is constant for any distinct  $b, b' \in B$ .*
- (5) *The stabiliser of  $B$  under action  $\alpha$  of definition 2 is not trivial.*

*Proof.* (1)  $\Rightarrow$  (2). Let  $B = \{b_1, \dots, b_n\}$ , with  $b_1 = b$ . Therefore (22) provides a non-identity  $\sigma \in \text{Sym}_n$  such that the ratio  $\frac{b_{\sigma(1)} - b_{\sigma(j)}}{b_1 - b_j}$  does not depend on  $j \neq 1$ . Defining  $\tau$  as is (25) yields the conclusion.

(4)  $\Rightarrow$  (2)  $\Rightarrow$  (3) is clear.

(3)  $\Rightarrow$  (1). Let  $B = \{b_1, \dots, b_n\}$  with  $b_1 = b$ . Define  $\sigma$  as is (25). Then (22) holds.

(3)  $\Rightarrow$  (4). Let  $\tau, b$  satisfy (3). Given distinct  $b', b'' \in B \setminus \{b\}$ , let  $\varepsilon = Y_\tau(b, b') = Y_\tau(b, b'')$ . Therefore,  $\tau(b) - \tau(b') = \varepsilon(b - b')$ , whence  $\tau(b) - \varepsilon b = \tau(b') - \varepsilon b'$ , and similarly  $\tau(b) - \varepsilon b = \tau(b'') - \varepsilon b''$ . It follows that  $\tau(b') - \varepsilon b' = \tau(b'') - \varepsilon b''$ , and finally  $Y_\tau(b', b'') = \varepsilon$ .

(3)  $\Rightarrow$  (5). Let  $\tau, b$  satisfy (3), and set  $\varepsilon = Y_\tau(b, b')$ , for any  $b' \neq b$ . Define

$$(27) \quad P(X) = \varepsilon X - \varepsilon b + \tau(b).$$

Then  $P(B) = B$ , since

$$(28) \quad \forall x \in B, P(x) = \tau(x).$$

(5)  $\Rightarrow$  (4). If  $P \in \mathcal{L} \setminus \{X\}$  is such that  $P(B) = B$ , then the restriction of  $P$  to  $B$  determines a non-identity permutation  $\tau$  of  $B$ ; the value of the difference ratios  $Y_\tau(b, b')$  is constant and coincide with the coefficient of degree 1 of  $P$ .  $\square$

In the proof of (3)  $\Rightarrow$  (5) of proposition 21 the polynomial  $P$  does not depend on the choice of  $b$ , but only on  $\tau$ . Indeed, if  $P_{b_0}, P_{b_1}$  are the polynomials defined by choosing  $b_0, b_1$ , respectively, from (28) it follows  $P_{b_0} = P_{b_1}$  since both  $P_{b_0}, P_{b_1}$  are linear and coincide on  $n$  points.



**Definition 6.** Let  $B \in \mathcal{P}_n, \tau \in \text{Sym}(B)$ . Then  $\tau$  is a *characteristic permutation* of  $B$  if  $Y_\tau(b, b')$  is constant, for  $b \neq b'$ ; in this case, denote  $Y_\tau$  such a value. Also, let  $G_B$  be the set of characteristic permutations of  $B$ . For  $\tau \in G_B$ , let  $P_\tau$  be the polynomial defined as in (27), and set  $H_B = \{P_\tau \mid \tau \in G_B\}$ .

**Proposition 22.** Let  $B \in \mathcal{P}_n$ .

- (1)  $G_B$  is a subgroup of  $\text{Sym}(B)$ ,  $H_B$  is the stabiliser of  $B$  under action  $\alpha$ , and the function  $\tau \mapsto P_\tau$  is an isomorphism between them.
- (2) The function  $Y : \tau \mapsto Y_\tau$  is an injective morphism of the group  $G_B$  into the multiplicative group  $k \setminus \{0\}$ .

*Proof.* (1)

- The identity  $id$  is a characteristic permutation, since  $Y_{id}(b, b') = 1$  for  $b \neq b'$ .
- Let  $\tau, \tau' \in G_B$ . If  $b \neq b'$ , then  $Y_{\tau\tau'}(b, b') = \frac{\tau\tau'(b) - \tau\tau'(b')}{\tau'(b) - \tau'(b')} \frac{\tau'(b) - \tau'(b')}{b - b'} = Y_{\tau'}Y_\tau$ , so  $\tau\tau' \in G_B$ .
- Let  $\tau \in G_B$ . If  $b \neq b'$ , then  $Y_{\tau^{-1}}(b, b') = \frac{\tau^{-1}(b) - \tau^{-1}(b')}{\tau\tau^{-1}(b) - \tau\tau^{-1}(b')} = Y_\tau^{-1}$ , so  $\tau^{-1} \in G_B$ .

The fact that every  $P_\tau$  is in the stabiliser of  $B$  follows immediately from (28), while the fact that every element in the stabiliser of  $B$  is of the form  $P_\tau$  for some  $\tau \in G_B$  is argued as in the proof of (5)  $\Rightarrow$  (4) of proposition 21. The fact that  $\tau \mapsto P_\tau$  is a morphism follows from (28), since

$$\forall x \in B, P_{\tau\tau'}(x) = \tau\tau'(x) = P_\tau P_{\tau'}(x)$$

whence  $P_{\tau\tau'} = P_\tau P_{\tau'}$ . Again from (28), if  $P_\tau(X) = X$ , then  $\tau$  is the identity, so  $\tau \mapsto P_\tau$  is an isomorphism.

(2) By the first part of the proof of (1), function  $Y$  is a morphism. To see that it is injective, let  $\tau \in G_B$  with  $Y_\tau = 1$ . Then the value  $\tau(b) - b$  is constant over  $B$ , say  $\tau(b) = b + c$  for some  $c \in k$ . Therefore  $\tau^r(b) = b + rc$  for every  $r$ . Let  $m$  be the order of  $\tau$ . It follows that  $b = \tau^m(b) = b + mc$ , whence  $c = 0$ , so that  $\tau$  is the identity.  $\square$

Therefore  $B$  is an exceptional set if and only if  $G_B$  is not the trivial subgroup of  $\text{Sym}(B)$ .

**Remark 23.** Given characteristic planes  $\pi, \pi'$  of  $B$ , their stabilisers  $Stab_\pi^\beta, Stab_{\pi'}^\beta$  are conjugate to each other, hence they are isomorphic.

Note that, by the proof of proposition 21,  $\tau \in \text{Sym}(B)$  is a characteristic permutation of  $B$  if and only if any (equivalently, every) permutation  $\sigma$  associated to  $\tau$  by (25) is in the stabiliser of some characteristic plane of  $B$ . Therefore facts on characteristic permutations give rise to corresponding results on permutations stabilising a characteristic plane. For instance, the polynomial class  $[B]$  is an exceptional class if and only if for some (equivalently, all)  $\pi \in \mathcal{F}_B$  the stabiliser  $Stab_\pi^\beta$  is not the trivial subgroup of  $\text{Sym}_n$ ; in fact,  $\chi(B) = \frac{n!}{\text{card}(Stab_\pi^\beta)} = \frac{n!}{\text{card}(G_B)} = \frac{n!}{\text{card}(H_B)}$ .

**Lemma 24.** *If  $\tau \in G_B$  and there are  $b, b'$  with  $b \neq b'$  such that  $\tau(b) = b, \tau(b') = b'$ , then  $\tau$  is the identity.*

*Proof.* By the assumption,  $Y_\tau = \frac{\tau(b) - \tau(b')}{b - b'} = 1$ . Now apply proposition 22(2).  $\square$

Every non-trivial finite group has an element whose order is prime. Therefore, to identify exceptional sets it is enough to consider permutations having as order a prime number.

**Corollary 25.** *The set  $B \in \mathcal{P}_n$  is an exceptional set if and only if there exists a characteristic permutation  $\tau$  of  $B$  such that*

$$\tau = c_1 \cdot \dots \cdot c_s$$

where  $c_1, \dots, c_s$  are disjoint  $p$ -cycles for some prime number  $p$ , and either  $n = sp$  or  $n = sp + 1$ .

*Proof.* Assume  $B$  is an exceptional set. Let  $\tau \in G_B$  have order some prime number  $p$ . Then  $\tau = c_1 \cdot \dots \cdot c_s$  for some disjoint  $p$ -cycles  $c_1, \dots, c_s$ . The fact that either  $n = sp$  or  $n = sp + 1$  follows from lemma 24.

The converse is immediate.  $\square$

**Lemma 26.** *Let  $B \in \mathcal{P}_n$ , and let  $\tau = c_1 \cdot \dots \cdot c_s \in G_B \setminus \{id\}$ , where  $c_1, \dots, c_s$  are pairwise disjoint cycles; let  $r \geq 2$  be the order of at least one of them. Then  $Y_\tau$  is a primitive  $r$ -th root of unity.*

*Proof.* Let  $(b_1 \dots b_r)$  be a  $r$ -cycle of  $\tau$ . Let  $P_\tau(X) = Y_\tau X - Y_\tau b_1 + \tau(b_1)$  be defined as in (27), choosing  $b_1$  as  $b$ . The restriction of  $P_\tau^r$  to  $\{b_1, \dots, b_r\}$  is the identity so, since  $r \geq 2$ , the polynomial  $P_\tau^r$  is the identity and, by (4),  $Y_\tau^r = 1$ ; moreover

$$(29) \quad (Y_\tau^{r-1} + \dots + Y_\tau + 1)(-Y_\tau b_1 + \tau(b_1)) = 0.$$

If  $Y_\tau = 1$ , from (29) it would follow  $\tau(b_1) = b_1$ , which is false. Therefore  $Y_\tau \neq 1$ , and since  $P_\tau^j$  is not the identity for any  $j < r$ , from (5) it follows that  $Y_\tau^j \neq 1$ .  $\square$

**Corollary 27.** *If  $\tau$  is a non-identity characteristic permutation of  $B \in \mathcal{P}_n$ , then  $\tau = c_1 \cdot \dots \cdot c_s$  is the product of the disjoint cycles  $c_1, \dots, c_s$ , where all such cycles have the same order, say  $r$ , and either  $n = sr$  or  $n = sr + 1$ .*

*Proof.* By lemmas 24 and 26.  $\square$

**Proposition 28.** *The group  $G_B$  is a cyclic group. Its order is either a divisor of  $n$  or a divisor of  $n - 1$ .*

*Proof.* By proposition 22(2) and lemma 26,  $G_B$  is isomorphic to a finite subgroup of the group of roots of unity; in particular  $G_B$  is cyclic. Let  $r$  be its order, and let  $\tau \in G_B$  have order  $r$ . By corollary 27,  $\tau$  is a product of disjoint  $r$ -cycles, so the conclusion follows by applying corollary 27 again.  $\square$

We now obtain a characterisation of the exceptional sets.

**Definition 7.** Let  $r \geq 2$ . A *regular star  $r$ -gon* is a sequence  $(z_1, \dots, z_r)$  of distinct elements of  $k$ , called *vertices*, such that there exists  $P \in \mathcal{L}$  with the property:

$$(30) \quad P(z_1) = z_2, \quad P(z_2) = z_3, \quad \dots, \quad P(z_{r-1}) = z_r, \quad P(z_r) = z_1.$$

A *regular  $r$ -gon* is the set of vertices of a regular star  $r$ -gon.

So, if  $k = \mathbb{C}$ , regular star  $r$ -gons and regular  $r$ -gons are the usual geometric concepts in the Gauss plane.

Note also that if  $P$  is as in (30) then  $P^r(X) = X$ , where  $P^r$  denoted the composition of  $P$  with itself  $r$  times.

**Lemma 29.** *Let  $(z_1, \dots, z_r)$  be a regular star  $r$ -gon, and let  $P$  be as in (30). Then  $P(X) = \varepsilon X + c$  where:*

- $\varepsilon$  is a primitive  $r$ -th root of unity;
- the fixed point of  $P$ , namely  $\frac{c}{1-\varepsilon}$ , is the barycentre  $b$  of the regular star  $r$ -gon.

*Proof.* Using (4), from  $P^r(X) = X$  it follows that  $\varepsilon$  is a  $r$ -th root of unity. Moreover  $\varepsilon \neq 1$ , since otherwise  $P^r(z_1) = z_1 + rc \neq z_1$ . If there existed  $r' < r$  such that  $\varepsilon^{r'} = 1$  then, by (5),  $P^{r'}(X) = X + c \frac{\varepsilon^{r'} - 1}{\varepsilon - 1} = X$ , a contradiction with (30). Finally,

$$\begin{aligned} b &= \frac{\sum_{j=0}^{r-1} P^j(z)}{r} = \frac{\sum_{j=0}^{r-1} \varepsilon^j z + \sum_{j=1}^{r-1} \sum_{\ell=0}^{j-1} \varepsilon^\ell c}{r} = \frac{\frac{\varepsilon^r - 1}{\varepsilon - 1} z + \sum_{j=1}^{r-1} \frac{\varepsilon^j - 1}{\varepsilon - 1} c}{r} = \\ &= \frac{(\varepsilon^{r-1} + \dots + \varepsilon + 1 - r)c}{r(\varepsilon - 1)} = \frac{c}{1 - \varepsilon}. \end{aligned}$$

□

Exceptional sets turn out to be the unions of regular  $r$ -gons with the same barycentre, possibly with the barycentre itself.

**Theorem 30.** *Let  $B \in \mathcal{P}_n$ . Then  $B$  is an exceptional set if and only if there are  $r \geq 2$  and  $s$  such that*

- (a) *either  $sr = n$  and  $B = \bigcup_{h=1}^s C_h$  where the sets  $C_h$  are pairwise disjoint, regular  $r$ -gons with the same barycentre  $b$ ;*
- (b) *or  $sr + 1 = n$  and  $B = \bigcup_{h=1}^s C_h \cup \{b\}$  where the sets  $C_h$  are pairwise disjoint, regular  $r$ -gons having the same barycentre  $b$ .*

*Proof.* Assume that (a) or (b) holds. For every  $h$ , let  $P_h(X) = \varepsilon_h X + c_h$  be the linear polynomial as in (30) for a regular  $r$ -star formed by the elements of  $C_h$ .

Now fix any  $h$ . By lemma 29, for every  $h'$  there exists  $\ell$  such that  $\varepsilon_h = \varepsilon_{h'}^\ell$ . Since  $\frac{c_{h'}}{1-\varepsilon_{h'}} = \frac{c_h}{1-\varepsilon_h} = b$ , it follows that  $c_h = c_{h'} \frac{1-\varepsilon_{h'}^\ell}{1-\varepsilon_{h'}} = c_{h'}(1 + \varepsilon_{h'} + \varepsilon_{h'}^2 + \dots + \varepsilon_{h'}^{\ell-1})$ . Therefore

$$P_h(X) = \varepsilon_{h'}^\ell X + c_{h'}(1 + \varepsilon_{h'} + \varepsilon_{h'}^2 + \dots + \varepsilon_{h'}^{\ell-1}) = P_{h'}^\ell(X).$$

Since  $P_{h'}$  sends  $C_{h'}$  onto itself, the same is true for  $P_h$ . As this holds for every  $h'$ , it follows that  $P_h(B) = B$ , so the stabiliser of  $B$  under the action  $\alpha$  is not trivial.

Conversely assume that  $B$  is an exceptional set, let  $\tau$  be a non-identity characteristic permutation of  $B$ , and let  $P_\tau$  be defined by (27). Let  $r$  be the order of  $\tau$ . Then  $\tau = c_1 \cdot \dots \cdot c_s$  with  $sr = n$  or  $sr + 1 = n$  by corollary 27, where the cycles  $c_j$  are pairwise disjoint and their elements form regular  $r$ -stars, as witnessed by the polynomial  $P_\tau$  by (28). Therefore their barycentres must coincide with the unique fixed point of  $P_\tau$ , which exists since the coefficient  $\varepsilon$  in (27) is different from 1 as  $\tau$  is not the identity.  $\square$

**Remark 31.** Theorem 30 tells that an exceptional set  $B \in \mathcal{P}_n$  can be identified by the choice of a number  $s$  as in (a) or (b) of the theorem and the choice of  $s + 1$  points, namely one point from each regular  $r$ -gon and the common barycentre. In turn, by lemma 29, the barycentre can be recovered by knowing the second vertex of one of the regular star  $r$ -gons and the leading coefficient (which is one of the finitely many primitive  $r$ -th roots of unity) of the polynomial  $P$  of (30).

So  $B$  is identified by  $s + 1$  parameters. This idea will be exploited in the computation of the dimension of the set of exceptional classes.

The following is a converse of proposition 28.

**Corollary 32.** *If  $r$  is a divisor of  $n$  or of  $n - 1$ , then there exists  $B \in \mathcal{P}_n$  such that  $G_B$  has order  $r$ .*

*Proof.* Assume first that  $r$  is a divisor of  $n$ , and let  $s$  be such that  $sr = n$ . Let  $B = \bigcup_{h=1}^s C_h$  where:

- (i) each  $C_h$  is a regular  $r$ -gon;
- (ii) all  $C_h$  have 0 as barycentre;
- (iii)  $h \in C_h$  for every  $h$ .

Therefore  $C_h = \{h, \varepsilon h, \varepsilon^2 h, \dots, \varepsilon^{r-1} h\}$ , where  $\varepsilon$  is a primitive  $r$ -th root of unity.

By theorem 30(a),  $B$  is an exceptional set. Let  $\tau$  be a generator of  $G_B$ . Then the elements in each cycle of  $\tau$  are contained in some  $C_h$ , so the order of  $\tau$  is a divisor of  $r$ ; moreover, if  $P_h$  is as in the proof of theorem 30, the restriction of  $P_h$  to  $C_h$  has order  $r$  and is a power of  $\tau|_{C_h}$ , so the order of  $\tau$  cannot be less than  $r$ .

A similar argument works if  $r$  is a divisor of  $n - 1$ , including in the set  $B$  the common barycentre 0 of the regular  $r$ -gons.  $\square$

Using the isomorphisms (25), from the proof of corollary 32 one obtains also the following.

**Corollary 33.** *The set of  $\sigma \in \text{Sym}_n$  associated via (25) to some characteristic permutation are all permutations of  $\{1, \dots, n\}$  of the form  $\sigma = c_1 \cdot \dots \cdot c_s$  for some disjoint cycles  $c_1, \dots, c_s$  all of the same length  $r$ , with  $n = sr$  or  $n = sr + 1$ .*

**Corollary 34.** *The set of all characteristic numbers of sets in  $\mathcal{P}_n$  is the set of all numbers of the form  $\frac{n!}{r}$  where  $r$  ranges over the set of divisors of either  $n - 1$  or of  $n$ .*

*Proof.* By proposition 28, corollary 32, and the fact that  $\chi(B) = \frac{n!}{\text{card}(G_B)}$ .  $\square$

**Corollary 35.** *Let  $B \in \mathcal{P}_n$ , and let  $\tau \in \text{Sym}(B)$  have order 2. Then  $\tau$  is a characteristic permutation of  $B$  if and only if the value of  $b + \tau(b)$  is constant for all  $b \in B$ .*

*Proof.* Lemma 26 states that  $\tau$  is a characteristic permutation of  $B$  if and only if  $\forall b, b' \in B, b \neq b' \Rightarrow Y_\tau(b, b') = -1$ ; this equality is equivalent to  $b + \tau(b) = b' + \tau(b')$ .  $\square$

**Definition 8.**  $\bullet$  We denote  $\mathcal{E}_n$  the set of exceptional classes of  $\Sigma_n$ .

- $\bullet$  We denote  $\mathcal{E}_n^*$  the set of exceptional classes of  $\Sigma_n$  whose elements have characteristic group of even order.

**Proposition 36.**  *$\mathcal{E}_n, \mathcal{E}_n^*$  are subvarieties of  $\Sigma_n$ .*

*Proof.* Using the notation of remark 18(4), a point  $(\lambda_3, \dots, \lambda_n) \in D(S_n)$  belongs to  $\eta'^{-1}(\mathcal{E}_n)$  if and only if there is some non-identity permutation  $\sigma$  such that the polynomial system (23) is satisfied. Therefore  $\eta'^{-1}(\mathcal{E}_n)$  is the union, with  $\sigma$  ranging in  $\text{Sym}_n \setminus \{id\}$ , of the affine varieties generated by the systems (23), so it is an affine variety invariant with respect to the fibers of  $\eta'$ . Consequently,  $\mathcal{E}_n$  is an affine variety.

The argument for  $\mathcal{E}_n^*$  is similar, by considering only permutations  $\sigma$  of even order.  $\square$

To determine the dimension of  $\mathcal{E}_n, \mathcal{E}_n^*$ , we use that

$$(31) \quad \dim(\mathcal{E}_n) = \dim((\theta'\theta)^{-1}(\mathcal{E}_n)) - 2$$

and similarly for  $\mathcal{E}_n^*$ . So let  $I$  be the set of all natural numbers  $r$  such that  $r \geq 2$  and  $r$  is a divisor of either  $n - 1$  or  $n$ , and let  $I^*$  be the set of even elements of  $I$ . For  $r \in I$ , let  $E_r$  be the set of all  $(b_1, \dots, b_n) \in D(f_n)$  such that  $\{b_1, \dots, b_n\}$  satisfies either (a) or (b) of theorem 30. Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} (\theta'\theta)^{-1}(\mathcal{E}_n) &= \bigcup_{r \in I} E_r \\ (\theta'\theta)^{-1}(\mathcal{E}_n^*) &= \bigcup_{r \in I^*} E_r \end{aligned} \cdot$$

**Lemma 37.** *Let  $n = sr$  or  $n = sr + 1$ , for some  $r \in I$ . Then  $E_r$  is a subvariety of  $D(f_n)$  and  $\dim(E_r) = s + 1$ .*

*Proof.* We exploit the idea of remark 31.

Assume first that  $n = sr$ . If  $\varepsilon$  is a primitive  $r$ -th root of unity, consider  $\psi_\varepsilon : k^{s+1} \rightarrow k^n$  defined as follows: given  $(b_1, b_2, b_{r+1}, b_{2r+1}, b_{3r+1}, \dots, b_{(s-1)r+1}) \in k^{s+1}$ , let

$$\psi_\varepsilon(b_1, b_2, b_{r+1}, b_{2r+1}, b_{3r+1}, \dots, b_{(s-1)r+1}) = (b_h)_{h=1}^n$$

where

$$(32) \quad b_{ur+1+j} = \varepsilon^j b_{ur+1} + (1 + \varepsilon + \varepsilon^2 + \dots + \varepsilon^{j-1})(b_2 - \varepsilon b_1)$$

for  $u \in \{0, \dots, s-1\}$ ,  $j \in \{1, \dots, r-1\}$ . Therefore  $\psi_\varepsilon$  takes as input a sequence of  $s$  vertices  $\vec{b} = (b_1, b_{r+1}, b_{2r+1}, \dots, b_{(s-1)r+1})$  plus an extra vertex  $b_2$ , and outputs  $s$  concentric regular star  $r$ -gons each one starting at a vertex  $b_{ur+1}$  in  $\vec{b}$  and having  $\varepsilon b_{ur+1} + b_2 - \varepsilon b_1$  as second vertex.

By (22) and lemma 26, every element of  $E_r$  is in the range of some  $\sigma\psi_\varepsilon$ , for  $\varepsilon$  a primitive  $r$ -th root of unity and  $\sigma$  a permutation of the coordinates.. Moreover,  $\psi_\varepsilon(b_1, b_2, b_{r+1}, b_{2r+1}, \dots, b_{(s-1)r+1})$  is in  $E_r$  if and only if its components  $b_h$ , for  $h \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ , are all distinct, which is equivalent to  $(b_1, b_2, b_{r+1}, b_{2r+1}, \dots, b_{(s-1)r+1}) \in D(g_\varepsilon)$  where  $g_\varepsilon$  is the product of the polynomials:

- $X_j - X_{j'}$  for  $j, j' \in \{1, 2, r+1, 2r+1, 3r+1, \dots, (s-1)r+1\}$ ,  $j \neq j'$ ,
- $X_{vr+1} - \varepsilon^j X_{ur+1} - (1 + \varepsilon + \varepsilon^2 + \dots + \varepsilon^{j-1})(X_2 - \varepsilon X_1)$  for  $u \neq v$ ,  $j \in \{1, \dots, r-1\}$ ,
- $X_j - \frac{1}{1-\varepsilon}(X_2 - \varepsilon X_1)$  for  $j \in \{r+1, 2r+1, 3r+1, \dots, (s-1)r+1\}$ .

By equations (32) the range of every  $\psi_\varepsilon|_{D(g_\varepsilon)}$  is an affine variety and  $\psi_\varepsilon|_{D(g_\varepsilon)}$  is an isomorphism onto its range. Therefore  $\dim(E_r) = \dim(D(g_\varepsilon)) = \dim(k^{s+1})$  for any  $\varepsilon$ , that is  $\dim(E_r) = s+1$ .

The case  $n = sr+1$  is similar. If  $\varepsilon$  is a primitive  $r$ -th root of unity, consider  $\psi_\varepsilon : k^{s+1} \rightarrow k^n$  defined as follows: given  $(b_1, b_2, b_{r+1}, b_{2r+1}, b_{3r+1}, \dots, b_{(s-1)r+1}) \in k^{s+1}$ , let

$$\psi_\varepsilon(b_1, b_2, b_{r+1}, b_{2r+1}, b_{3r+1}, \dots, b_{(s-1)r+1}) = (b_h)_{h=1}^n$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} b_{ur+1+j} &= \varepsilon^j b_{ur+1} + (1 + \varepsilon + \varepsilon^2 + \dots + \varepsilon^{j-1})(b_2 - \varepsilon b_1) \\ &\text{for } u \in \{0, \dots, s-1\}, j \in \{1, \dots, r-1\}, \\ b_n &= \frac{b_2 - \varepsilon b_1}{1 - \varepsilon}. \end{aligned}$$

Again by (22) and lemma 26, every element of  $E_r$  is in the range of some  $\sigma\psi_\varepsilon$ , for  $\varepsilon$  a primitive  $r$ -th root of unity and  $\sigma$  a permutation of the coordinates, and  $\psi_\varepsilon(b_1, b_2, b_{r+1}, b_{2r+1}, \dots, b_{(s-1)r+1})$  is in  $E_r$  if and only if  $(b_1, b_2, b_{r+1}, b_{2r+1}, \dots, b_{(s-1)r+1}) \in D(g_\varepsilon)$  where  $g_\varepsilon$  is the same as above. Now the proof can be concluded as in the previous case.  $\square$

Then

$$(33) \quad \begin{aligned} \dim((\theta'\theta)^{-1}(\mathcal{E}_n)) &= \max\{\dim(E_r)\}_{r \in I} \\ \dim((\theta'\theta)^{-1}(\mathcal{E}_n^*)) &= \max\{\dim(E_r)\}_{r \in I^*} \end{aligned}$$

Lemma 37 says that this maximum is attained when  $r$  is small.

**Corollary 38.** *If  $n$  is even then  $\dim(\mathcal{E}_n) = \dim(\mathcal{E}_n^*) = \frac{n-2}{2}$ , if  $n$  is odd then  $\dim(\mathcal{E}_n) = \dim(\mathcal{E}_n^*) = \frac{n-3}{2}$ .*

*Proof.* Apply (33), lemma 37, and (31).  $\square$

For example, in the affine line  $\Sigma_3$ , solving (23) where  $\sigma$  ranges over transpositions, yields for  $\lambda_3$  the values  $\frac{1}{2}, 2, -1$ . As  $\{0, 1, \frac{1}{2}\} \equiv_p \{0, 1, 2\} \equiv_p \{0, 1, -1\}$ , the subvariety  $\mathcal{E}_3^*$  consists of one point. Solving (23) where  $\sigma$  ranges over cycles of order 3, yields  $\lambda_3 = \frac{1 \pm \sqrt{3}i}{2}$ . As  $\left\{0, 1, \frac{1 + \sqrt{3}i}{2}\right\} \equiv_p \left\{0, 1, \frac{1 - \sqrt{3}i}{2}\right\}$ , it follows that  $\mathcal{E}_3 = \left\{ \left[ \left\{0, 1, \frac{1}{2}\right\} \right], \left[ \left\{0, 1, \frac{1 + \sqrt{3}i}{2}\right\} \right] \right\}$ .

**2.5. Polynomial reducibility on finite sets.** Let  $A = \{a_1, \dots, a_m\} \in \mathcal{P}_m$ ,  $B = \{b_1, \dots, b_n\} \in \mathcal{P}_n$ , for some  $m > n \geq 2$ . Let  $P$  be a polynomial such that  $A = P^{-1}(B)$  and let  $\gamma = \deg(P)$ . Since every equation  $P(x) - b_j = 0$  has at most  $\gamma$  solutions, it follows that  $m \leq n\gamma$ , that is  $\gamma \geq \frac{m}{n}$ .

On the other hand, if  $a$  is a multiple solution of  $P(x) - b_j = 0$  of multiplicity  $r_a > 1$ , then  $a$  is a root of multiplicity  $r_a - 1$  of the derivative  $P'$ . Let  $M$  be the set of all multiple solutions of the equations  $P(x) - b_j = 0$  for  $j \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ . Since  $P'$  has degree  $\gamma - 1$ , letting  $t = \sum_{a \in M} (r_a - 1)$  it follows that  $0 \leq t \leq \gamma - 1$ . From the fact that  $n\gamma - t = m$ , it then follows that  $n\gamma - (\gamma - 1) \leq m$ , whence  $\gamma \leq \frac{m-1}{n-1}$ .

Summing up,

$$(34) \quad \frac{m}{n} \leq \gamma \leq \frac{m-1}{n-1},$$

that is

$$(35) \quad \gamma(n-1) + 1 \leq m \leq \gamma n.$$

In particular, a necessary condition for a set in  $\mathcal{P}_m$  to reduce polynomially to a set in  $\mathcal{P}_n$  is that:

$$(36) \quad \text{there exists a natural number in } \left[ \frac{m}{n}, \frac{m-1}{n-1} \right].$$

Let  $e$  be the integer part of  $\frac{m}{n}$ , that is the biggest integer such that  $m \geq en$ . Then condition (36) is equivalent to

$$(37) \quad \text{either } m = en, \quad \text{or } m \geq (e+1)n - e.$$

Notice also that (35), which can be rewritten as

$$(38) \quad m \in \bigcup_{\gamma \geq 2} [\gamma(n-1) + 1, \gamma n] \cap \mathbb{N},$$

is certainly satisfied when  $m \geq (n-1)^2 + 1$ , since in the union displayed in (38) the interval with  $\gamma = n-1$  is adjacent to the interval with  $\gamma = n$ , and for bigger values of  $\gamma$  the intervals overlap.

By (37), given  $B \in \mathcal{P}_n$  the least  $m > n$  for which there may exist  $A \in \mathcal{P}_m$  with  $A \leq_p B$  is  $m = 2n - 1$ . In this case, by (34) any polynomial reducing  $A$  to  $B$  has degree 2. On the other hand, if there is a polynomial of degree 2 reducing  $A$  to  $B$ , then either  $A \in \mathcal{P}_{2n-1}$  or  $A \in \mathcal{P}_{2n}$ .

The following lemma extends remark 9.

**Lemma 39.** *Fix  $n, m, A, B$ , with  $2 \leq n < m$ ,  $A \in \mathcal{P}_m, B \in \mathcal{P}_n$ . Then there are only finitely many (if any) polynomials  $P$  such that  $A = P^{-1}(B)$ .*

*Proof.* It is enough to show that for any  $\gamma$  satisfying (34) there are only finitely many polynomials  $P$  of degree  $\gamma$  reducing  $A$  to  $B$ . Any such  $P$  determines a partition  $\{A_b^P\}_{b \in B}$  of  $A$  such that  $A_b^P = P^{-1}(\{b\})$  for every  $b \in B$ . Therefore it is enough to show that given a partition  $\{A_b\}_{b \in B}$  of  $A$  there are finitely many (in fact, at most one)  $P$  of degree  $\gamma$  such that  $A_b = A_b^P$  for every  $b \in B$ . Indeed, if  $P, Q$  are polynomials of degree  $\gamma$  such that  $A_b^P = A_b^Q$  for every  $b \in B$ , then  $P(X) - Q(X)$  is a polynomial of degree at most  $\gamma$  taking value 0 on all elements of  $A$ . From  $\gamma < m$  it then follows that  $P = Q$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 40.** *Let  $A, B \subseteq k$ . Assume that there is a polynomial  $P$  of degree  $\gamma \geq 1$  reducing  $A$  to  $B$ , and fix distinct  $a, a' \in A$  and distinct  $b, b' \in B$  with  $P(a) = b$  and  $P(a') = b'$ . Let also  $x, x', y, y' \in k$  be such that  $x \neq x'$  and  $y \neq y'$ . Then there exist  $A', B' \subseteq k$  with*

$$x, x' \in A', \quad A' \equiv_p A, \quad y, y' \in B', \quad B' \equiv_p B,$$

and a polynomial  $Q$  of degree  $\gamma$  reducing  $A'$  to  $B'$  and such that

$$Q(x) = y, \quad Q(x') = y'.$$

Moreover, the multiplicities of  $x, x'$  as roots of the polynomials  $Q(X) - y, Q(X) - y'$ , respectively, are the same as the multiplicities of  $a, a'$  as roots of the polynomials  $P(X) - b, P(X) - b'$ , respectively.

*Proof.* Let  $R$  be a linear polynomial such that  $R(x) = a, R(x') = a'$ , and let  $S$  be a linear polynomial such that  $S(b) = y, S(b') = y'$ . Set

$$A' = R^{-1}(A), \quad B' = S(B), \quad Q = SPR.$$

$\square$

The main use of lemma 40 is with  $x = 0, x' = 1$ , or  $y = 0, y' = 1$ : this allows in particular to replace a set with an equivalent set containing 0, 1, which sometimes simplifies calculations.

The following should be contrasted with theorem 44 and proposition 51.

**Proposition 41.** *Let  $\Theta \in \bigcup_{m \in \mathbb{N}} \Sigma_m$ . Then the set  $\{\Xi \mid \Theta \leq_p \Xi\}$  is finite.*

*Proof.* By proposition 5 and (34), it is enough to show that if  $A = \{a_1, \dots, a_m\} \in \mathcal{P}_m$ , then for  $2 \leq n < m$  and  $\frac{m}{n} \leq \gamma \leq \frac{m-1}{n-1}$  there are only finitely many classes  $[B]$  with  $B = \{0, 1, b_3, \dots, b_n\} \in \mathcal{P}_n$  such that  $A = P^{-1}(B)$  for some polynomial  $P$  of degree  $\gamma$ . If  $B$  is such a set and  $P$  such a polynomial, then there exist a non-empty set  $I = \{i_1, \dots, i_p\} \subseteq \{1, \dots, m\}$  and an element  $j \in \{1, \dots, m\} \setminus \{i_1, \dots, i_p\}$  such that  $P^{-1}(\{0\}) = \{a_{i_1}, \dots, a_{i_p}\}, P(a_j) = 1$ . Therefore there exist positive integers  $r_1, \dots, r_p$  with  $r_1 + \dots + r_p = \gamma$  such that  $P(X) = c(X - a_{i_1})^{r_1} \cdot \dots \cdot (X - a_{i_p})^{r_p}$



where, from  $P(a_j) = c(a_j - a_{i_1})^{r_1} \cdot \dots \cdot (a_j - a_{i_p})^{r_p} = 1$ , it follows that  $c = \frac{1}{(a_j - a_{i_1})^{r_1} \cdot \dots \cdot (a_j - a_{i_p})^{r_p}}$ . Since  $B = P(A)$ , this implies that the class  $[B]$  depends only on the choice of  $i_1, \dots, i_p, j, r_1, \dots, r_p$ ; as there are finitely many such choices, the result follows.  $\square$

**Definition 9.** Given  $n, m, \gamma$  satisfying (34) and  $\Theta \in \Sigma_n$ , let  $\mathcal{A}_m^\gamma(\Theta)$  be set of all  $\Xi \in \Sigma_m$  such that there exist  $B \in \Theta$ ,  $A \in \Xi$ , and a polynomial of degree  $\gamma$  reducing  $A$  to  $B$ .

Let also

$$(39) \quad \mathcal{A}_m(\Theta) = \{\Xi \in \Sigma_m \mid \Xi \leq_p \Theta\} = \bigcup_{\gamma \in [\frac{m}{n}, \frac{m-1}{n-1}] \cap \mathbb{N}} \mathcal{A}_m^\gamma(\Theta).$$

Note that the definition of  $\mathcal{A}_m^\gamma(\Theta)$  does not really depend on the choice of  $A, B$ , since any sets equivalent to  $A, B$ , respectively, are bireducible to them by linear polynomials.

Our goal is to show that  $\mathcal{A}_m(\Theta)$  is an affine variety and compute its dimension. Since the union in (39) is finite, this amounts to show this for all  $\mathcal{A}_m^\gamma(\Theta)$ .

**Theorem 42.** Fix  $n, m$  with  $n < m$  and let  $\Theta \in \Sigma_n$ . Then  $\mathcal{A}_m(\Theta)$  is a subvariety of  $\Sigma_m$ .

*Proof.* Let  $B = \{0, 1, b_3, \dots, b_n\} \in \Theta$ . It is enough to show that every

$$(40) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathcal{V}_\gamma &= (\theta'\theta)^{-1}(\mathcal{A}_m^\gamma(\Theta)) = \\ &= \{(a_1, \dots, a_m) \mid \{a_1, \dots, a_m\} = P^{-1}(\{0, 1, b_3, \dots, b_n\}) \text{ for some} \\ &\quad \text{polynomial } P \text{ of degree } \gamma\}, \end{aligned}$$

for  $\frac{m}{n} \leq \gamma \leq \frac{m-1}{n-1}$ , is a subvariety of  $D(f_m)$ .

The idea is that we can determine whether a given  $(a_1, \dots, a_m)$  is in  $\mathcal{V}_\gamma$  by looking at all partitions of  $\{a_1, \dots, a_m\}$  in  $n$  pieces and trying to write a polynomial of degree  $\gamma$  such that the elements of the partition are the sets of preimages of the elements of  $B$ ; in order to express this polynomial, we write its factorisation using one of the elements of the partition as the set of preimages of  $0 \in B$ .

So let  $(a_1, \dots, a_m) \in D(f_m)$ . Then  $(a_1, \dots, a_m) \in \mathcal{V}_\gamma$  if and only if there exist:

- an integer  $\ell$  with  $1 \leq \ell \leq \gamma$ ,
- a set of  $\ell$  indices  $I_1 = \{i_1, \dots, i_\ell\} \subseteq \{1, \dots, m\}$ ,
- positive integers  $r_1, \dots, r_\ell$  with  $r_1 + \dots + r_\ell = \gamma$ ,
- and  $c \in k \setminus \{0\}$

such that letting  $P(X) = c \prod_{h=1}^{\ell} (X - a_{i_h})^{r_h}$  one has  $\{a_1, \dots, a_m\} = P^{-1}(\{0, 1, b_3, \dots, b_n\})$ .

This is in turn equivalent to the following condition:

there exist  $\ell$  with  $1 \leq \ell \leq \gamma$ , a partition  $\{I_1, \dots, I_n\}$  of  $\{1, \dots, m\}$  with  $\text{card}(I_1) = \ell$ , and positive integers  $r_1, \dots, r_\ell$  with  $\sum_{h=1}^{\ell} r_h = \gamma$ , such that

the following equalities hold:

$$(41) \quad \begin{cases} c \prod_{h \in I_1} (a_j - a_h)^{r_h} = 1 & \text{for every } j \in I_2 \\ c \prod_{h \in I_1} (a_j - a_h)^{r_h} = b_3 & \text{for every } j \in I_3 \\ \dots & \dots \\ c \prod_{h \in I_1} (a_j - a_h)^{r_h} = b_n & \text{for every } j \in I_n \end{cases}$$

where  $c = \frac{1}{\prod_{h \in I_1} (a_j - a_h)^{r_h}}$ , for  $j$  any fixed element of  $I_2$ : in fact  $c$  could be computed from any of the equations (41) and plugged into the other equations.

Equations (41) provide polynomial equations in the coordinates  $(a_1, \dots, a_m)$ , therefore they define an affine variety in such coordinates. This affine variety depends on the choice of the partition  $\{I_1, \dots, I_n\}$  and of the integers  $r_1, \dots, r_\ell$ . Since there are finitely many such choices,  $V_\gamma$  is a finite union of affine varieties, therefore an affine variety itself.  $\square$

To compute the dimension of  $\mathcal{A}_m(\Theta)$  we start with the following.

**Lemma 43.** *Let  $n, m, \gamma$  satisfy (34) and fix  $B = \{b_1, \dots, b_n\} \in \mathcal{P}_n$ . Let  $\mathcal{U}$  be the collection of all  $(a_1, \dots, a_m, c_0, \dots, c_\gamma) \in D(f_m) \times k^{\gamma+1}$  such that  $\{a_1, \dots, a_m\} = P^{-1}(B)$  where  $P(X) = \sum_{j=0}^{\gamma} c_j X^j$ . Then  $\mathcal{U}$  is a subvariety of  $D(f_m) \times k^{\gamma+1}$  of dimension  $\gamma + 1 - (n\gamma - m)$ .*

*Proof.* Denote  $r = n\gamma - m$ , so that  $0 \leq r \leq \gamma - 1$  by (35).

Consider the following condition on a tuple  $(a_1, \dots, a_m) \in D(f_m)$  and a polynomial  $P$  of degree at most  $\gamma$ :

(\*) There exist:

- a sequence of positive integers  $\vec{\ell} = (\ell_1, \dots, \ell_n)$  such that  $\ell_1 + \dots + \ell_n = m$ ,
- and a sequence of natural numbers  $\vec{s} = (s_1, \dots, s_m)$  such that

$$(42) \quad \begin{cases} s_1 + s_2 + \dots + s_{\ell_1} + \ell_1 = \gamma \\ s_{\ell_1+1} + s_{\ell_1+2} + \dots + s_{\ell_1+\ell_2} + \ell_2 = \gamma \\ \dots \\ s_{\ell_1+\dots+\ell_{n-1}+1} + s_{\ell_1+\dots+\ell_{n-1}+2} + \dots + s_m + \ell_n = \gamma \end{cases}$$

(which implies in particular that  $s_1 + \dots + s_m = r$ )

satisfying

$$(43) \quad \left\{ \begin{array}{l} P(a_1) = \dots = P(a_{\ell_1}) = b_1 \\ P'(a_1) = P''(a_1) = \dots = P^{(s_1)}(a_1) = 0 \\ \dots \\ P'(a_{\ell_1}) = \dots = P^{(s_{\ell_1})}(a_{\ell_1}) = 0 \\ \hline P(a_{\ell_1+1}) = \dots = P(a_{\ell_1+\ell_2}) = b_2 \\ P'(a_{\ell_1+1}) = \dots = P^{(s_{\ell_1+1})}(a_{\ell_1+1}) = 0 \\ \dots \\ P'(a_{\ell_1+\ell_2}) = \dots = P^{(s_{\ell_1+\ell_2})}(a_{\ell_1+\ell_2}) = 0 \\ \hline \dots \\ \hline P(a_{\ell_1+\dots+\ell_{n-1}+1}) = P(a_{\ell_1+\dots+\ell_{n-1}+2}) = \dots = P(a_m) = b_n \\ P'(a_{\ell_1+\dots+\ell_{n-1}+1}) = \dots = P^{(s_{\ell_1+\dots+\ell_{n-1}+1})}(a_{\ell_1+\dots+\ell_{n-1}+1}) = 0 \\ \dots \\ P'(a_m) = \dots = P^{(s_m)}(a_m) = 0 \end{array} \right. .$$

System (43) is composed of  $n$  blocks, one for each element of  $B$ . Notice that  $n \geq 2$  implies that  $P$  is not a constant polynomial. Then the first block describes the preimages of  $b_1$ , saying that  $a_1$  is a root of the polynomial  $P(X) - b_1$  of multiplicity at least  $s_1 + 1, \dots, a_{\ell_1}$  is a root of the polynomial  $P(X) - b_1$  of multiplicity at least  $s_{\ell_1} + 1$ ; the other blocks have similar meanings. By (42) this implies that the multiplicity of each  $a_j$  as root of the corresponding polynomial  $P(X) - b_{i_j}$  is exactly  $s_j + 1$ . Therefore from (\*) and  $\deg(P) \leq \gamma$  it also follows that  $\deg(P) = \gamma$  and  $\{a_1, \dots, a_m\} = P^{-1}(B)$ . Conversely, if  $a_1, \dots, a_n, P$  are such that  $\{a_1, \dots, a_n\} = P^{-1}(B)$ , for distinct  $a_1, \dots, a_n$ , then there exists  $\sigma \in \text{Sym}_n$  such that  $(a_{\sigma(1)}, \dots, a_{\sigma(n)}, P)$  satisfies (43).

Equations (43) define a subvariety  $\mathcal{U}_{\vec{\ell}, \vec{s}}$ —depending on the choice of the sequences  $\vec{\ell}, \vec{s}$ —of  $D(f_m) \times k^{\gamma+1}$  in the coordinates  $(a_1, \dots, a_m, c_0, \dots, c_\gamma)$ , where  $c_j$  is the coefficient of degree  $j$  of  $P$ . Then  $\mathcal{U}$  is the union of the images under all permutations of the variables  $(a_1, \dots, a_n)$  of such varieties  $\mathcal{U}_{\vec{\ell}, \vec{s}}$ . Since such a union is finite,  $\mathcal{U}$  is a subvariety of  $D(f_m) \times k^{\gamma+1}$  whose dimension is the maximum of the dimensions of all  $\mathcal{U}_{\vec{\ell}, \vec{s}}$ . Therefore it is enough to establish the following two facts:

- (a) some  $\mathcal{U}_{\vec{\ell}, \vec{s}}$  is non-empty;
- (b) if  $\mathcal{U}_{\vec{\ell}, \vec{s}}$  is non-empty, then  $\dim(\mathcal{U}_{\vec{\ell}, \vec{s}}) = \gamma + 1 - r$ .

For part (a) it is enough to show that there exists at least a polynomial  $P$  of degree  $\gamma$  such that  $\text{card}(P^{-1}(B)) = m$ . Pick  $b \in B$  and consider the polynomials  $P_\mu(X) = \mu X^{r+1}(X-1)(X-2) \dots (X-(\gamma-r-1)) + b$ , for  $\mu \in k \setminus \{0\}$ . Notice that the set  $S$  of roots of the derivative  $P'_\mu$  does not depend on  $\mu$ , and  $0 \in S$  if and only if  $r > 0$ . Also,  $\text{card}(P_\mu^{-1}(B)) \leq m$ , while  $\text{card}(P_\mu^{-1}(B)) = m$  if and only

if  $\forall a \in S \setminus \{0\}, P_\mu(a) \notin B$ : this last fact holds for all but finitely many values of  $\mu$ .

We establish (b) by computing the Jacobian matrix of (43) and showing that it is non-singular at every point of  $\mathcal{U}_{\ell\bar{s}}$ : since this Jacobian is a  $(m+r) \times (m+\gamma+1)$  matrix, it follows that indeed  $\dim(\mathcal{U}_{\ell\bar{s}}) = m + \gamma + 1 - (m+r) = \gamma + 1 - r$ .

System (43) means that

$$(44) \quad \begin{cases} c_0 + c_1 a_j + c_2 a_j^2 + c_3 a_j^3 + \dots + c_{\gamma-1} a_j^{\gamma-1} + c_\gamma a_j^\gamma & = b_{i_j} \\ c_1 + 2c_2 a_j + 3c_3 a_j^2 + \dots + (\gamma-1)c_{\gamma-1} a_j^{\gamma-2} + \gamma c_\gamma a_j^{\gamma-1} & = 0 \\ 2c_2 + 6c_3 a_j + \dots + (\gamma-2)(\gamma-1)c_{\gamma-1} a_j^{\gamma-3} + (\gamma-1)\gamma c_\gamma a_j^{\gamma-2} & = 0 \\ \dots & \\ s_j! c_{s_j} + \dots + (\gamma-s_j) \cdot \dots \cdot (\gamma-1)c_{\gamma-1} a_j^{\gamma-s_j-1} + (\gamma-s_j+1) \cdot \dots \cdot \gamma c_\gamma a_j^{\gamma-s_j} & = 0 \end{cases}$$

for  $j \in \{1, \dots, m\}$ , where  $b_{i_j}$  is the image of  $a_j$  under  $P$  in (43). The part of the Jacobian of (43) corresponding to this block of equations is a  $(s_j+1) \times (m+\gamma+1)$  submatrix; the first  $m$  columns, containing the partial derivatives with respect to the variables  $(a_1, \dots, a_m)$  are

$$(45) \quad \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \dots & 0 & P'(a_j) & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ 0 & \dots & 0 & P''(a_j) & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots \\ 0 & \dots & 0 & P^{(s_j+1)}(a_j) & 0 & \dots & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

while the last  $\gamma+1$  columns, containing the partial derivatives with respect to the variables  $(c_0, \dots, c_\gamma)$  are

$$(46) \quad \begin{pmatrix} 1 & a_j & a_j^2 & a_j^3 & \dots & a_j^{\gamma-1} & a_j^\gamma \\ 0 & 1 & 2a_j & 3a_j^2 & \dots & (\gamma-1)a_j^{\gamma-2} & \gamma a_j^{\gamma-1} \\ 0 & 0 & 2 & 6a_j & \dots & (\gamma-2)(\gamma-1)a_j^{\gamma-3} & (\gamma-1)\gamma a_j^{\gamma-2} \\ \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \dots & (\gamma-s_j) \cdot \dots \cdot (\gamma-1)a_j^{\gamma-s_j-1} & (\gamma-s_j+1) \cdot \dots \cdot \gamma a_j^{\gamma-s_j} \end{pmatrix}.$$

Note that each of the submatrices (45) has exactly one non-null entry when computed in a point of  $\mathcal{U}_{\ell\bar{s}}$ , namely

$$(47) \quad P^{(s_j+1)}(a_j).$$

Let  $M$  be the  $r \times (\gamma+1)$  matrix obtained from the Jacobian by erasing the rows and columns corresponding to the entries (47). Then the proof is completed by the following claim, which will be established in section 5.

*Claim.* Matrix  $M$  is non-singular.

□

**Theorem 44.** *Let  $n, m$  satisfy (34) and let  $\Theta \in \Sigma_n$ . Let  $m = en + t$ , where  $e$  is the integer part of  $\frac{m}{n}$ . Then*

$$\dim(\mathcal{A}_m(\Theta)) = \begin{cases} e - 1 & \text{if } t = 0 \\ e - n + t & \text{if } t > 0 \end{cases}.$$

Notice that in the second case indeed  $e - n + t \geq 0$  by (37), since if  $m \in [\gamma(n-1) + 1, \gamma n]$ , then  $e < \gamma$ , so  $e - n + t = e - n + m - en = m - n - (n-1)e \geq \gamma(n-1) + 1 - n - (n-1)(\gamma-1) = 0$ .

*Proof of theorem 44.* Let  $B = \{b_1, \dots, b_n\} \in \Theta$ . Let  $\mathcal{A}'(\gamma)$  be the set of all  $(a_1, \dots, a_m) \in D(f_m)$  such that  $\{a_1, \dots, a_m\} = P^{-1}(B)$  for some polynomial  $P$  of degree  $\gamma$ . By lemma 43,  $\mathcal{U} = \mathcal{U}(\gamma) = \{(a_1, \dots, a_m, c_0, \dots, c_\gamma) \in D(f_m) \times k^{\gamma+1} \mid \{a_1, \dots, a_m\} = P^{-1}(B), \text{ where } P = \sum_{j=1}^{\gamma} c_j X^j\}$  is a subvariety of  $D(f_m) \times k^{\gamma+1}$  whose projection onto the first  $m$  coordinates is  $\mathcal{A}'(\gamma)$ . By lemma 39, for every  $(a_1, \dots, a_m) \in \mathcal{A}'(\gamma)$  there are only finitely many  $(c_0, \dots, c_\gamma) \in k^{\gamma+1}$  such that  $(a_1, \dots, a_m, c_0, \dots, c_\gamma) \in \mathcal{U}(\gamma)$ , which implies that  $\dim(\mathcal{A}'(\gamma)) = \gamma + 1 - (n\gamma - m)$  by lemma 43. Since  $\dim(\mathcal{A}_m(\Theta)) = \max\{\dim(\mathcal{A}_m^\gamma(\Theta))\}_{\gamma \in [\frac{m}{n}, \frac{m-1}{n-1}] \cap \mathbb{N}}$  and  $\dim(\mathcal{A}_m^\gamma(\Theta)) = \dim(\mathcal{A}'(\gamma)) - 2$ , it is enough to show that

$$\max\{\dim(\mathcal{A}'(\gamma))\}_{\gamma \in [\frac{m}{n}, \frac{m-1}{n-1}] \cap \mathbb{N}} = \begin{cases} e + 1 & \text{if } t = 0 \\ e - n + t + 2 & \text{if } t > 0 \end{cases}.$$

*Case 1.  $t = 0$ .*

The biggest value of  $\gamma + 1 - (n\gamma - m)$ , in the allowed range (34), is obtained for  $\gamma = e$ , yielding  $\dim(\mathcal{A}'(e)) = e + 1$ .

*Case 2.  $t > 0$ .*

Since (34) implies  $\frac{ne+t}{n} = e + \frac{t}{n} \leq \gamma$ , the biggest value of  $\gamma + 1 - (n\gamma - m)$  is obtained for  $\gamma = e + 1$ , yielding  $\dim(\mathcal{A}'(e+1)) = e + 2 - (n(e+1) - m) = e - n + t + 2$ .  $\square$

**Theorem 45.** *Let  $B \in \mathcal{P}_n$ .*

- (1) *If there exists a quadratic polynomial reducing  $A$  to  $B$ , then  $A$  is an exceptional set and either  $[A] \in \mathcal{E}_{2n-1}^*$  or  $[A] \in \mathcal{E}_{2n}^*$ , that is, the group  $G_A$  has even order.*
- (2) *There is a unique  $\Theta \in \Sigma_{2n-1}$  such that  $\Theta \leq_p [B]$ . Conversely, if  $\Theta \in \mathcal{E}_{2n-1}^*$ , then there exists a unique  $\Xi \in \Sigma_n$  such that  $\Theta \leq_p \Xi$ .*
- (3) *Let  $\mathcal{A}$  be the family of all  $[A] \in \Sigma_{2n}$  such that there exists a quadratic polynomial reducing  $A$  to  $B$ . Then  $\dim(\mathcal{A}) = 1$ . Conversely, if  $\Theta \in \mathcal{E}_{2n}^*$ , then there exists  $\Xi \in \Sigma_n$  and a quadratic polynomial  $P$  reducing some element of  $\Theta$  to some element of  $\Xi$ .*

Note that in case (3) of theorem 45, if  $n > 2$  the condition that the polynomials be quadratic is redundant, since it is implied by (34); so  $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{A}_{2n}([B])$ . For  $n = 2$ , a polynomial reducing an element of  $\mathcal{P}_{2n}$  to an element of  $\mathcal{P}_n$  may have degree 3.

*Proof of theorem 45.* Let  $P$  be a quadratic polynomial reducing  $A$  to  $B$ . We distinguish two cases, according to whether  $A \in \mathcal{P}_{2n-1}$  or  $A \in \mathcal{P}_{2n}$ .

Let first  $A \in \mathcal{P}_{2n-1}$ . In this case, there is a unique element in  $B$  having exactly one preimage under  $P$ , while all other elements of  $B$  have two preimages. By applying lemma 40 it can be assumed that  $B = \{0, 1, b_3, \dots, b_n\}$ , that  $\{0, 1\} \subseteq A$ , that 0 is a root of  $P$  of multiplicity 2, and that  $P(1) = 1$ . It follows that  $P(X) = X^2$ , so that  $A = \{0, \pm 1, \pm a_3, \dots, \pm a_n\}$  where  $a_j$  is a square root of  $b_j$ , establishing in particular the existence and uniqueness of  $[A]$ , that is the first part of (2). Now apply corollary 35 to  $\tau : A \rightarrow A$  defined by  $\tau(a) = -a$  to conclude that  $A$  is an exceptional set. The fact that  $A$  has a characteristic permutation of order 2 proves that  $\text{card}(G_A)$  is even. Therefore (1) is established in this case.

We now apply this argument to show that the correspondence  $[B] \mapsto [A]$  is injective, which gives unicity in the second part of (2). Given  $B = \{0, 1, b_3, \dots, b_n\}$ ,  $B' = \{0, 1, b'_3, \dots, b'_n\}$  and  $A = \{0, \pm 1, \pm a_3, \dots, \pm a_n\}$ ,  $A' = \{0, \pm 1, \pm a'_3, \dots, \pm a'_n\}$  such that  $A = P^{-1}(B)$ ,  $A' = P^{-1}(B')$  where  $P(X) = X^2$ , assume that  $A \equiv_p A'$ . Then let  $Q$  be a linear polynomial such that  $Q(A) = A'$ . Since  $Q$  preserves barycentres, it follows that  $Q(0) = 0$ , so that  $Q(X) = cX$  for some  $c \in k \setminus \{0\}$ , whence  $PQ(X) = c^2X^2$ . Therefore  $B' = PQ(A) = \{0, c^2, c^2a_3^2, \dots, c^2a_n^2\} = R(B) \equiv_p B$ , where  $R(X) = c^2X$ .

Now let  $A \in \mathcal{P}_{2n}$ . Then every element of  $B$  has exactly two preimages under  $P$ . By lemma 40 again, it can be assumed that:

- $A = \{0, 1, a_3, \dots, a_{2n}\}$ ,
- $B = \{0, 1, b_3, \dots, b_n\}$ ,
- $P(0) = P(1) = 0$ ,  $P(a_3) = P(a_4) = 1$ , and  $P(a_{2j-1}) = P(a_{2j}) = b_j$  for  $3 \leq j \leq n$ .

It follows that for some  $c \in k \setminus \{0\}$ :

$$\begin{cases} P(X) = cX(X-1) \\ P(X) - 1 = c(X-a_3)(X-a_4) \\ P(X) - b_j = c(X-a_{2j-1})(X-a_{2j}) \quad \text{for } 3 \leq j \leq n \end{cases}.$$

Then, from the equalities

$$cX(X-1) = c(X-a_3)(X-a_4) + 1 = c(X-a_{2j-1})(X-a_{2j}) + b_j,$$

that is

$$(48) \quad \begin{aligned} cX^2 - cX &= cX^2 - c(a_3 + a_4)X + ca_3a_4 + 1 = \\ &= cX^2 - c(a_{2j-1} + a_{2j})X + ca_{2j-1}a_{2j} + b_j, \end{aligned}$$

it follows that

$$\forall j \in \{2, \dots, n\}, a_{2j-1} + a_{2j} = 1.$$

Therefore, let  $\tau : A \rightarrow A$  be defined by

$$\tau(0) = 1, \quad \tau(1) = 0, \quad \tau(a_{2j-1}) = a_{2j}, \quad \tau(a_{2j}) = a_{2j-1}$$

for  $j \in \{2, \dots, n\}$ , and apply corollary 35 to obtain that  $A$  is an exceptional set. The fact that  $\tau$  has order 2 shows again that  $\text{card}(G_A)$  is even. This concludes the proof of (1).

The first part of (3) is a consequence of the proof of lemma 43: when  $\gamma = 2, r = 0$  it follows that  $\dim(\mathcal{U}_{\bar{s}}) = 3$  for non-empty  $\mathcal{U}_{\bar{s}}$ , whence  $\dim(\mathcal{A}) = 3 - 2 = 1$ .

It remains to prove the existence in the second part of (2) and the second part of (3). Let  $A$  be an exceptional set such that  $\text{card}(G_A)$  is even, say  $\text{card}(G_A) = r$ , and let  $\tau$  be a generator of  $G_A$ , so that  $\tau$  has order  $r$ . Therefore,  $\rho = \tau^{\frac{r}{2}}$  has order 2.

Suppose that  $A \in \mathcal{P}_{2n-1}$ . Using lemma 40, it can be assumed that 0 is the fixed point of  $\rho$ . So  $\forall a \in A, a + \rho(a) = 0$  by corollary 35, and it follows that  $A = \{0, \pm a_2, \dots, \pm a_n\}$  for some  $a_2, \dots, a_n$ . This implies that  $A = P^{-1}(\{0, a_2^2, \dots, a_n^2\})$  where  $P(X) = X^2$ .

Assume now that  $A \in \mathcal{P}_{2n}$ . By lemma 40 it can be assumed that  $\pm 1 \in A$ , with  $\rho(\pm 1) = \mp 1$ . Since  $\forall a \in A, a + \rho(a) = 0$  by corollary 35, it follows that  $A = \{\pm 1, \pm a_2, \dots, \pm a_n\}$  for some  $a_2, \dots, a_n$ . This implies that  $A = P^{-1}(\{1, a_2^2, \dots, a_n^2\})$  where  $P(X) = X^2$ .  $\square$

Theorem 45(2) shows that using  $\leq_p$  the points of  $\Sigma_n$  can be parameterised by the elements of  $\mathcal{E}_{2n-1}^*$ . The following proposition shows that no two elements of  $\Sigma_n$  have a common predecessor in  $\Sigma_{2n}$ . Therefore, by theorem 45(3), the relation  $\leq_p$  determines a partition of  $\mathcal{E}_{2n}^*$  into one-dimensional subvarieties, one for each element of  $\Sigma_n$ .

**Proposition 46.** *Let  $\Xi, \Xi' \in \Sigma_n$  and  $\Theta \in \Sigma_{2n}$  be such that both  $\Theta \leq_p \Xi$  and  $\Theta \leq_p \Xi'$  both hold. Then  $\Xi = \Xi'$ .*

*Proof.* It can be assumed that  $n > 2$ . If  $A \in \Theta, B \in \Xi$ , any polynomial  $P$  reducing  $A$  to  $B$  is quadratic. By lemma 40 it can be assumed that  $A = \{0, 1, a_3, \dots, a_{2n}\}, B = \{0, 1, b_3, \dots, b_n\}, P(0) = P(1) = 0$ . Therefore,  $P(X) = cX(X-1)$  for some  $c \in k \setminus \{0\}$ . Again by lemma 40, let  $B' = \{0, 1, b'_3, \dots, b'_n\} \in \Xi'$  and  $Q$  be a quadratic polynomial such that  $A = Q^{-1}(B'), Q(0) = Q(1) = 0$ . It follows that  $Q(X) = c'X(X-1)$  for some  $c' \in k \setminus \{0\}$ . Thus  $B = R^{-1}(B')$ , where  $R(X) = \frac{c'}{c}X$ , so  $B \equiv_p B'$ .  $\square$

Theorem 45 and proposition 46 say that two  $\equiv_p$ -incomparable sets with  $n$  elements do not have a common lower bound with  $2n - 1$  or  $2n$  elements. This suggests the following.

**Question 3.** Given non-empty  $B, B' \in \text{Fin}$ , when do they have a common lower bound other than  $\emptyset, k$ ? That is, when do there exist  $A \in \text{Fin} \setminus \{\emptyset, k\}$  such that  $A \leq_p B$  and  $A \leq_p B'$ ?

Examples of pairs of  $\equiv_p$ -incomparable sets having a common lower bound different from  $\emptyset, k$  can be constructed as follows. Let  $P(X), Q(X)$  be commuting

polynomials, that is such that  $P[Q(X)] = Q[P(X)]$ . Fix any  $C \in \text{Fin}$  and let  $B = P^{-1}(C), B' = Q^{-1}(C)$ . Then  $A = Q^{-1}(B) = P^{-1}(B')$  is a common lower bound of  $B, B'$ . There are indeed choices of  $C, P(X), Q(X)$  so that  $B, B'$  are  $\leq_p$ -incomparable. For example, for  $j \neq j'$ , let  $P(X) = X^j, Q(X) = X^{j'}$ , or let  $P(X), Q(X)$  be the  $j$ -th and the  $j'$ -th Chebyshev polynomials, respectively: if  $\text{card}(P^{-1}(C)), \text{card}(Q^{-1}(C))$  do not satisfy (36), then  $B, B'$  are  $\leq_p$ -incomparable. For instance, starting with the one-element set  $\{1\}$  and closing under the preimages of all powers  $X^j$ , one obtains the sublattice  $\mathcal{R}$  consisting of the sets of  $j$ -th roots of unity, for any  $j$ ; notice that these are exceptional sets by theorem 30. On  $\mathcal{R}$ , the relation  $\leq_p$  coincide with reverse inclusion  $\supseteq$ .

However we do not know how is the general situation.

**2.5.1. Large antichains and maximal elements.** In this section we discuss the existence of large antichains with respect to  $\leq_p$  among finite sets. For sets that are infinite and coinfinite, see theorem 48.

As a first remark, notice that by corollary 7 every  $\Sigma_m$  is an antichain, which has cardinality  $\kappa$  by [5, exercise I.4.8] if  $m \geq 3$ . Moreover, using an argument as in the proof of lemma 43, we can find antichains that extend across all  $\Sigma_m$  and are big, namely contain an open set, in each  $\Sigma_m$ . In fact, while there are no  $\leq_p$ -minimal polynomial classes of finite sets but  $[\emptyset]$  (see theorem 44), our argument proves that most classes are  $\leq_p$ -maximal.

**Theorem 47.** *There exists an antichain  $\mathcal{C}$  in  $\bigcup_{m \geq 2} \Sigma_m$  such that  $\mathcal{C} \cap \Sigma_m$  contains an open set of  $\Sigma_m$  for every  $m$ . In particular, for  $m \geq 3$  every  $\mathcal{C} \cap \Sigma_m$  has cardinality  $\kappa$ .*

*Proof.* The antichain  $\mathcal{C}$  consists of all elements in every  $\Sigma_m$  that are maximal, below the unique element of  $\Sigma_1$ , with respect to  $\leq_p$ . It is therefore enough to prove that for every  $m \geq 3$  the elements of  $\Sigma_m$  that are not  $\leq_p$ -maximal below the 1-element sets are contained in a proper subvariety of  $\Sigma_m$ ; equivalently, that the set

$$\mathcal{S} = \{(a_1, \dots, a_m) \in D(f_m) \mid \{a_1, \dots, a_m\} \text{ is polynomially reducible to a } n\text{-element set for some } n \geq 2\}$$

is contained in a proper subvariety of  $D(f_m)$ . The tuple  $(a_1, \dots, a_m)$  is in  $\mathcal{S}$  if and only if there exist  $n \geq 2$  and  $\gamma$  satisfying (34) such that  $\{a_1, \dots, a_m\}$  is reducible to some member of  $\mathcal{P}_n$  by a polynomial of degree  $\gamma$ .

Consider again the system constituted by the blocks (44), for  $j \in \{1, \dots, m\}$ , but now in the variables  $a_1, \dots, a_m, b_1, \dots, b_n, c_0, \dots, c_{\gamma+1}$ . This defines a subvariety  $\mathcal{W}_{\vec{\ell}, \vec{s}, \vec{i}}$  of  $D(f_m) \times D(f_n) \times k^{\gamma+1}$ , which depends on the choice of the sequences  $\vec{\ell}, \vec{s}$  as in condition (\*) of the proof of lemma 43, but also of the sequence  $\vec{i} = (i_1, \dots, i_m)$  such that  $\{1, \dots, n\} = \{i_1, \dots, i_m\}$ . Then  $\mathcal{S}$  is the union of the projections on  $D(f_m)$  of the images of the varieties  $\mathcal{W}_{\vec{\ell}, \vec{s}, \vec{i}}$  under any permutations of  $a_1, \dots, a_m$ .



Now we determine  $\dim(\mathcal{W}_{\vec{\ell}\vec{s}i}^{\vec{r}\vec{r}})$ , again by computing the Jacobian. This is as the Jacobian discussed in the proof of lemma 43, with  $n\gamma$  rows, except that every row is longer, since it contains also the derivatives with respect to  $b_1, \dots, b_n$ . In particular, it is non-singular at every point of  $\mathcal{W}_{\vec{\ell}\vec{s}i}^{\vec{r}\vec{r}}$ . Therefore  $\dim(\mathcal{W}_{\vec{\ell}\vec{s}i}^{\vec{r}\vec{r}}) = m+n+\gamma+1-n\gamma < m$  if and only if

$$(49) \quad (n-1)\gamma > n+1.$$

In this case, the projection of  $\mathcal{W}_{\vec{\ell}\vec{s}i}^{\vec{r}\vec{r}}$  on  $D(f_m)$  has also dimension less than  $m$ .

It remains to deal separately with the cases when (49) fails, that is:

$$n=2, \gamma=2, \quad n=3, \gamma=2, \quad n=2, \gamma=3.$$

When  $n=2$  use theorem 44 recalling that  $\Sigma_2$  contains just one element; when  $\gamma=2$  use theorem 45(1) and corollary 38.  $\square$

### 3. SETS THAT ARE INFINITE AND COINFINITE

We discuss now subsets of  $k$  that are infinite and coinfinite. Recall indeed from proposition 4 that such sets are  $\leq_p$ -incomparable with sets that are finite or cofinite; moreover if the infinite sets  $A, B$  are  $\leq_p$ -comparable, then

$$(50) \quad \text{card}(A) = \text{card}(B), \quad \text{card}(k \setminus A) = \text{card}(k \setminus B).$$

By the remark after proposition 2, the class of singletons and the class of their complements are maximal elements with respect to  $\leq_p$ . There are as many other maximal classes as there can be.

**Theorem 48.** *There exist  $2^\kappa$  maximal elements in  $\Sigma_\kappa \cap \check{\Sigma}_\kappa$ .*

*Proof.* Recall that if  $A <_p B$  then there exists a polynomial  $P$  of degree at least 2 reducing  $A$  to  $B$ . Using remark 3(2), it is enough to build  $2^\kappa$  inequivalent sets  $A \in \mathcal{P}_\kappa \cap \check{\mathcal{P}}_\kappa$ , such that, for every polynomial  $P$  of degree at least 2,  $A \neq P^{-1}(P(A))$ .

Let  $\{P_\alpha\}_{\alpha < \kappa}$  be an enumeration of all polynomials of degree at least 2. By recursion, let  $\alpha < \kappa$  and assume that elements  $a_\beta, b_\beta, c_\beta \in k$ , for every  $\beta < \alpha$ , have been defined such that all elements  $a_\beta, b_\beta, c_\beta$  for  $\beta < \alpha$  are distinct and with the property that  $\forall \beta < \alpha P_\beta(a_\beta) = P_\beta(b_\beta)$ .

Given any  $d \in k$ , the multiple roots of the polynomial  $P_\alpha(X) - d$  are also roots of  $P'_\alpha(X)$ . Since  $\text{card}(k \setminus P_\alpha(\{a_\beta, b_\beta, c_\beta\}_{\beta < \alpha})) = \kappa$ , there must exist  $d \in k \setminus P_\alpha(\{a_\beta, b_\beta, c_\beta\}_{\beta < \alpha})$  such that  $P_\alpha(X) - d$  has no multiple roots, in particular  $P_\alpha^{-1}(\{d\})$  contains at least two elements: call them  $a_\alpha, b_\alpha$ , fix also any  $c_\alpha \in k \setminus (\{a_\beta, b_\beta, c_\beta\}_{\beta < \alpha} \cup \{a_\alpha, b_\alpha\})$ .

Let now  $A$  be any set containing  $\{a_\alpha\}_{\alpha < \kappa}$  and disjoint from  $\{b_\alpha\}_{\alpha < \kappa}$ . By construction,  $\forall \alpha < \kappa, b_\alpha \in P_\alpha^{-1}(P_\alpha(A)) \setminus A$ , so that  $A$  satisfies the requirement.

Finally, there are  $2^\kappa$  such sets that are pairwise inequivalent. Indeed, there are  $2^\kappa$  sets of the form  $\{a_\alpha\}_{\alpha < \kappa} \cup C$ , where  $C \subseteq \{c_\alpha\}_{\alpha < \kappa}$ ; since every polynomial class has at most  $\kappa$  elements, there is a subfamily of cardinality  $2^\kappa$  of inequivalent such sets.  $\square$

While theorem 48 states that many subsets of  $k$  are maximal with respect to  $\leq_p$ , the argument of the proof can be used to show in fact that in the countable case most subsets of  $k$  are maximal, from a topological viewpoint. This can be viewed as an analogue for infinite sets of the fact that, geometrically, most polynomial classes of finite sets are  $\leq_p$ -maximal below the unique element of  $\Sigma_1$ , as established in the proof of theorem 47.

Endow  $\mathcal{P}(k)$  with the topology whose basis is given by the sets

$$U_{u_1 \dots u_n}^{v_1 \dots v_m} = \{A \in \mathcal{P}(k) \mid u_1, \dots, u_n \in A, v_1 \dots v_m \notin A\}$$

for any choice of distinct  $u_1, \dots, u_n, v_1, \dots, v_m \in k$ . When  $k$  is countable, this topology is homeomorphic to the Cantor space.

**Theorem 49.** *Assume that  $k$  is countable. Then the family of  $\leq_p$ -maximal subsets of  $k$  is a comeagre subset of  $\mathcal{P}(k)$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $A \in \mathcal{P}(k)$ . Then  $A$  is  $\leq_p$ -maximal if and only if for every polynomial  $P$  of degree at least 2:

- (a) either  $P$  is not a reduction of  $A$  to  $P(A)$
- (b) or there exists a polynomial  $Q$  such that  $P(A) = Q^{-1}(A)$

We show that the family of  $\leq_p$ -maximal sets contains a dense  $G_\delta$  set. Since there are countably many polynomials, it is then enough to show that, for any given  $P$ , the family of sets  $A$  satisfying (a) is an open dense subset of  $\mathcal{P}(k)$ .

Condition (a) can be written as  $A \neq P^{-1}[P(A)]$ ; since  $A \subseteq P^{-1}[P(A)]$  always holds, in turn (a) is equivalent to

$$(51) \quad \exists a \in k, (P(a) \in P(A) \wedge a \notin A)$$

For fixed  $a, P$ , both conditions  $P(a) \in P(A)$  and  $a \notin A$  are clopen in the argument  $A$ : the latter by definition of the topology of  $\mathcal{P}(A)$ ; the former because it is equivalent to  $a_1 \in A \vee \dots \vee a_l \in A$ , where  $\{a_1, \dots, a_l\} = P^{-1}[P(\{a\})]$ , and again by the definition of the topology. Therefore, for any fixed  $P$ , condition (51) defines an open set.

To show density, fix distinct elements  $u_1, \dots, u_n, v_1, \dots, v_m \in k$ , in order to find some  $A \in U_{u_1 \dots u_n}^{v_1 \dots v_m}$  satisfying (51). Let  $b \in k \setminus \{P(u_1), \dots, P(u_n), P(v_1), \dots, P(v_m)\}$  such that  $P^{-1}(\{b\})$  contains at least two distinct elements, and let  $u, v$  be two of them. Then any set  $A$  containing  $\{u, u_1, \dots, u_n\}$  and disjoint from  $\{v, v_1, \dots, v_m\}$ , that is any element of  $U_{uu_1 \dots u_n}^{vv_1 \dots v_m}$ , does.  $\square$

**Question 4.** Do there exist  $\leq_p$ -minimal polynomial classes above  $[\emptyset], [k]$ ?

The same ideas of the proof of theorem 49 show that, when  $k$  is countable, even if question 4 had a positive answer, from the topological point of view the family of  $\leq_p$ -minimal subsets of  $k$  above  $\emptyset, k$  is very small.

**Proposition 50.** *Assume that  $k$  is countable. Then the family of subsets of  $k$  that are  $\leq_p$ -minimal above  $\emptyset, k$  is a meagre subset of  $\mathcal{P}(k)$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $A \in \mathcal{P}(k)$ . Then  $A$  is minimal above  $\emptyset, k$  if and only if for every polynomial  $P$  of degree at least 2 there exists a polynomial  $Q$  such that  $A = Q^{-1}[P^{-1}(A)]$ . In other words, such a subset of  $\mathcal{P}(k)$  can be written as  $\bigcap_P \bigcup_Q \mathcal{A}_{PQ}$ , where  $\mathcal{A}_{PQ} = \{A \in \mathcal{P}(k) \mid A = Q^{-1}[P^{-1}(A)]\}$ . So it is enough to show that every  $\mathcal{A}_{PQ}$  is a closed set with empty interior.

The fact that each  $\mathcal{A}_{PQ}$  is closed holds since  $A \in \mathcal{A}_{PQ}$  if and only if

$$(52) \quad \forall a \in A, a \in A \Leftrightarrow PQ(a) \in A$$

To show that the complement is dense, fix distinct  $u_1, \dots, u_n, v_1, \dots, v_m \in k$  in order to show that there exists  $A \in U_{u_1 \dots u_n}^{v_1 \dots v_m}$  such that  $A$  does not satisfy (52). As the polynomial  $PQ$  has degree at least 2, pick any distinct  $u, v \in k \setminus \{u_1, \dots, u_n, v_1, \dots, v_m\}$  such that  $v \notin PQ(\{v_1, \dots, v_m\})$  and  $PQ(u) = v$ . Then any set  $A$  containing  $\{u, u_1, \dots, u_n\}$  and disjoint from  $\{v, v_1, \dots, v_m\}$ , that is any element of  $U_{uu_1 \dots u_n}^{vv_1 \dots v_m}$ , does.  $\square$

**3.1. Subfields of  $\mathbb{C}$ .** In this section we add the extra assumption  $k \subseteq \mathbb{C}$ , so that we can exploit some properties of the Euclidean topology.

Note that, in addition to satisfy (50), if  $A, B \notin \{\emptyset, k\}$  are  $\leq_p$ -comparable then if one of them is bounded, the other one is bounded as well; if the complement of one of them is bounded, then the complement of the other one is bounded as well. The reason is that the preimage under a non-constant polynomial function of a bounded (respectively, unbounded) subset of  $\mathbb{C}$  is bounded (respectively, unbounded).

**Proposition 51.** *There exists a  $\leq_p$ -chain of unbounded and counbounded subsets of  $k$  that has order type  $\zeta$ .*

*Proof.* For  $n \in \mathbb{N}, m \in \mathbb{Z}$  denote  $\mathcal{C}_n^m = \{x \in \mathbb{C} \mid n^{2^m} \leq |x| \leq (n+1)^{2^m}\}$ . For  $m \in \mathbb{Z}$  let

$$C_m = \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \mathcal{C}_{2n}^m, \quad A_m = C_m \cap k,$$

thus, if  $P(X) = X^2$  then  $\forall m \in \mathbb{Z}, A_m = P^{-1}(A_{m+1})$ . Therefore it is enough to show that  $\forall m \in \mathbb{Z}, A_{m+1} \not\leq_p A_m$ .

Toward contradiction, suppose that  $Q(X) = cX^\gamma + \dots \in k[X]$  is a polynomial of degree  $\gamma$  such that  $A_{m+1} = Q^{-1}(A_m)$ , from which it follows also that  $Q(A_{m+1}) = A_m$ . Note that  $\gamma \geq 2$ .

Denote by  $\hat{Q} : \mathbb{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$  the polynomial function extending  $Q$  to the complex field, which we endow with the Euclidean topology. So  $\hat{Q}$  is surjective and continuous. By the density of  $k$  in  $\mathbb{C}$  it follows that  $\hat{Q}(C_{m+1}) = C_m$ . Since every  $\mathcal{C}_h^{m+1}$  is connected, it follows that for every  $h$  there exists a unique  $l$  such that

$$(53) \quad \hat{Q}(C_h^{m+1}) \subseteq C_l^m.$$

If  $\varphi : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$  is the function assigning to each  $h$  the unique  $l$  as is (53), by the continuity of  $\hat{Q}$  with respect to the Euclidean topology we get that  $\forall h \in$

$\mathbb{N}$ ,  $\varphi(h+1) = \varphi(h) \pm 1$ . Since there must exist  $h$  such that  $\varphi(h) = 0$ , it follows that eventually  $\varphi(h) \leq h$ . In particular, eventually

$$(54) \quad |\hat{Q}((h+1)^{2^{m+1}})| \leq (h+1)^{2^m}.$$

However

$$\forall \varepsilon \in \mathbb{R}^+, \exists M \in \mathbb{R}^+, \forall x \in \mathbb{C}, |x| > M \Rightarrow \left| \frac{|\hat{Q}(x)|}{|x|^\gamma} - |c| \right| < \varepsilon$$

where the last inequality can be rewritten as  $(|c| - \varepsilon)|x|^\gamma < |\hat{Q}(x)| < (|c| + \varepsilon)|x|^\gamma$ . Therefore, for  $h$  big enough,  $|\hat{Q}((h+1)^{2^{m+1}})| > \frac{|c|}{2}(h+1)^{2^{m+1}\gamma}$ , contradicting (54).  $\square$

**Remark 52.** The fact that for finite sets polynomial bireducibility is witnessed by a linear polynomial (see proposition 6) does not extend to sets that are infinite and coinfinite.

Indeed, using the notation of the proof of proposition 51, let

$$A = \bigcup_{m \in \mathbb{Z}} \mathcal{C}_2^{2m} \cap k, \quad B = \bigcup_{m \in \mathbb{Z}} \mathcal{C}_2^{2m+1} \cap k.$$

Letting  $P(X) = X^2$ , it follows that  $A = P^{-1}(B)$ ,  $B = P^{-1}(A)$ , whence  $A \equiv_p B$ . However there is no linear polynomial  $Q$  such that  $A = Q^{-1}(B)$ , since otherwise, considering the polynomial function  $\hat{Q} : \mathbb{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$  extending  $Q$ , by the density of  $k$  in  $\mathbb{C}$  it would follow that  $\bigcup_{m \in \mathbb{Z}} \mathcal{C}_2^{2m} = \hat{Q}^{-1}(\bigcup_{m \in \mathbb{Z}} \mathcal{C}_2^{2m+1})$ , which is impossible.

#### 4. FURTHER QUESTIONS

We have restricted our study to the case of an algebraically closed field  $k$  of characteristic 0. While it is apparent that the hypothesis of algebraic closure has been widely used, we point out that the fact that  $k$  has characteristic 0 is needed in the the proof of proposition 6 and of lemma 29, and therefore plays a central role both for the combinatorics of  $\leq_p$  and for the geometric structure of the polynomial classes.

These observations raise the following questions (see also proposition 2).

**Question 5.** What can be said about  $\leq_p$  when  $k$  is not algebraically closed?

**Question 6.** What can be said about  $\leq_p$  when  $k$  has positive characteristic?

The polynomial functions  $k \rightarrow k$ , which we have chosen as the class of reductions inducing the preorder  $\leq_p$  we have studied in this paper, are the morphisms of the affine variety  $k$ . Similarly, the polynomial functions  $V \rightarrow V$  are the morphisms of  $V$ , for any affine variety  $V$ . It is then natural to try to extend our study, starting perhaps with the simplest case, namely  $k^n$ .

**Question 7.** Study the relation of polynomial reducibility on  $k^n$  and on other affine varieties. To what extent the structure of polynomial reducibility is sensible to the geometric properties of the variety?

An answer to the last part of question 7 should be compared with the results of [1], where it is shown that most of the geometric properties of the variety are forgotten by the relation of continuous reducibility  $\leq_W$ , whose structure turns out to depend only on few features of the variety, like the cardinality, the dimension, and the decomposition into irreducible components.

## 5. APPENDIX: A VARIATION ON VANDERMONDE

In this section we establish the claim in the proof of lemma 43.

Given a matrix  $M$ , denote  $R_1^M, R_2^M, \dots$  the rows of  $M$  and by  $C_1^M, C_2^M, \dots$  the columns of  $M$ . Let also  $M[i, j]$  be the entry of  $M$  on the  $i$ -th row and  $j$ -th column.

**Definition 10.** Let  $\gamma, h$  be natural numbers, with  $h \geq 1$ . Fix a sequence  $\vec{s} = (s_1, \dots, s_h)$  of natural numbers and a sequence  $\vec{a} = (a_1, \dots, a_h)$  of distinct variables. Define the sequence  $\vec{r} = (r_1, \dots, r_h)$  by 
$$\begin{cases} r_1 = 1 \\ r_{\ell+1} = r_\ell + s_\ell + 1 \text{ for } 1 \leq \ell < h \end{cases} .$$

Assume that  $R = \sum_{\ell=1}^h s_\ell + h \leq \gamma + 1$ .

We call *enriched Vandermonde matrix*, associated to the triple  $(\gamma + 1, \vec{s}, \vec{a})$ , the matrix  $M$  with  $R$  rows and  $\gamma + 1$  columns such that

$$M[i, j] = \frac{d^s}{da_\ell^s} a_\ell^{j-1},$$

where  $\ell, s$  are unique with

$$(55) \quad i = r_\ell + s, \quad 0 \leq s \leq s_\ell.$$

In other words, an enriched Vandermonde matrix is a matrix, with a number of rows not exceeding the number of columns, consisting of blocks of rows of the form (46). Notice that the matrix  $M$  of the claim in lemma 43 is an enriched Vandermonde matrix (though its blocks are one row shorter, as in its definition the last line of each block has been erased).

**Theorem 53.** *Let  $M$  be an enriched Vandermonde matrix, with  $R$  rows and  $\gamma + 1$  columns. Then  $rkM = R$ .*

*Proof.* Use the notation of definition 10. Consider the homogeneous linear system associated to matrix  $M$ , in the unknowns  $(c_0, c_1, \dots, c_\gamma)$ . Then  $(c_0, c_1, \dots, c_\gamma)$  is a solution to the system if and only if the polynomial  $P(X) = \sum_{\ell=0}^{\gamma} c_\ell X^\ell$  has  $a_j$  as root of multiplicity at least  $s_j + 1$ , since the equations in each block mean  $P(a_j) = P'(a_j) = \dots = P^{(s_j)}(a_j) = 0$ . Let  $V$  be the subvariety of  $k^{\gamma+1}$  of the solutions of the system. Then  $V$  is a vector subspace of  $k^{\gamma+1}$  of dimension  $\gamma + 1 - rkM$ , so it is enough to prove that  $\dim(V) = \gamma + 1 - R$ .

Let  $\varphi : k^{\gamma+1} \rightarrow k^{\gamma+1}$  be the morphism defined by letting

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi(c, \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_\gamma) &= \\ &= ((-1)^\gamma c E_\gamma(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_\gamma), (-1)^{\gamma-1} c E_{\gamma-1}(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_\gamma), \dots, -c E_1(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_\gamma), c), \end{aligned}$$

where  $E_1, \dots, E_\gamma$  are the elementary symmetric functions, so that  $\varphi(c, \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_\gamma)$  is the sequence of coefficients of the polynomial  $c(X - \alpha_1)(X - \alpha_2) \cdots (X - \alpha_\gamma)$ .

Let  $\mathcal{F} = \{F_1, \dots, F_h\}$  be a collection of disjoint subsets of  $\{1, \dots, \gamma\}$  with  $\text{card}(F_j) = s_j + 1$  for every  $j \in \{1, \dots, h\}$ , and let  $W$  be the subvariety of  $k^{\gamma+1}$ , in the coordinates  $c, \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_\gamma$ , obtained by setting  $\alpha_r = a_j$  for every  $r \in F_j, j \in \{1, \dots, h\}$ . Therefore  $\dim(W) = \gamma + 1 - R$ . Now note that the fibers of  $\varphi$  are finite and that  $\varphi(W) = V$ , so the result follows from [9, corollary IV.3.8(2)].  $\square$

#### REFERENCES

- [1] R. Camerlo, C. Massaza, *The Wadge hierarchy on Zariski topologies*, Topology and its Applications 294 (2021), 107661.
- [2] D.A. Cox, J. Little, D. O’Shea, *Ideals, varieties, and algorithms*, Springer 2015.
- [3] S. Gao, *Invariant descriptive set theory*, CRC 2009.
- [4] J. Harris, *Algebraic geometry*, Springer 1992.
- [5] R. Hartshorne, *Algebraic geometry*, Springer 1977.
- [6] A.S. Kechris, *Classical descriptive set theory*, Springer 1995.
- [7] K. Kunen, *The foundations of mathematics*, College Publications 2012.
- [8] J. Liptrap, *On translation invariant symmetric polynomials and Haldane’s conjecture*, in: Topology and physics (K. Lin, Z. Whang, W. Zhang, eds.), 279–287, World Scientific 2008.
- [9] D. Perrin, *Algebraic geometry*, Springer 2008.
- [10] B. Sturmfels, *Algorithms in invariant theory*, Springer 2008.
- [11] W.W. Wadge, *Reducibility and determinateness on the Baire space*, PhD thesis, University of California at Berkeley, 1983.

DIPARTIMENTO DI MATEMATICA, UNIVERSITÀ DI GENOVA, VIA DODECANESO 35, 16146 GENOVA — ITALY

*Email address:* `camerlo@dima.unige.it`

VIA MURIAGLIO 19, 10141 TORINO — ITALY

*Email address:* `carla.massaza@formerfaculty.polito.it`