

Bunk If $\varphi: V \rightarrow W$ is a dominant morphism, we obtain an injective • ring hom.

$$\begin{aligned}\varphi^*: \Gamma(W) &\rightarrow \Gamma(V) \\ f &\mapsto f \circ \varphi\end{aligned}$$

which induces a field hom.

$$\begin{aligned}\varphi^*: K(W) &\longrightarrow K(V) \\ \frac{a}{b} &\longmapsto \frac{\varphi^*(a)}{\varphi^*(b)} \\ f &\mapsto f \circ \varphi\end{aligned}$$

Bunk Dominance of φ is important:

Otherwise, f might not be defined at any point in $\varphi(V)$, so $f \circ \varphi$ might not be defined anywhere!

(Or: $\varphi^*(b)$ might be 0 for $b \neq 0$.
 $\Rightarrow \varphi^*\left(\frac{1}{b}\right) = \frac{1}{\varphi^*(b)}$ undefined.)

Bunk $U_{\varphi^*(f)} \supseteq \varphi^{-1}(U_f) \neq \emptyset$

\uparrow
open subset
of V

Def For any open subset $\emptyset \neq U \subseteq V$, let $\mathcal{O}_V(U)$ be the ring (!) of rational functions $f \in K(V)$ defined at every point in U .

For $U = \emptyset$, let $\mathcal{O}_V(\emptyset) = 1$, the one-element ring.

Brink Elements of $\mathcal{O}_V(U)$ correspond to functions $f: U \rightarrow K$ which are (locally) given by ~~a~~ a quotient of regular functions.

Brink If $\varphi: V \rightarrow W$ is any morphism between alg. sets and $U \subseteq W$ any open subset, we obtain a ring hom.

$$\varphi^*: \mathcal{O}_W(U) \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}_V(\varphi^{-1}(U)).$$

Def Let $V \subseteq K^n$ and $W \subseteq K^m$ be alg. subsets and let V be irreducible.

A rational map $\varphi: V \dashrightarrow W$ is a ~~map~~ map

$V \rightarrow W$ for an open subset U of V which is given by m rational ~~functions~~ ^{f_1, \dots, f_m} functions defined on U , where we identify two such maps $U_1 \rightarrow W, U_2 \rightarrow W$ if they agree on the (nonempty) intersection $U_1 \cap U_2$.

~~Ex~~ ~~$K^3 \rightarrow K^2$~~ ~~$(x,y,z) \mapsto \left(\frac{x}{y+z}, \frac{z}{y} \right)$~~

Ex $\mathcal{O}(X^3 - Y^2) \rightarrow K$
 $(x,y) \mapsto \frac{y}{x}$

Ese any morphism $V \rightarrow W$.

Ese & rat. map $V \dashrightarrow K^m$ is the same as ~~maps of~~
~~rational functions on~~ rational functions on V .

~~Def~~

Def & rat. map $\varphi: V \dashrightarrow W$ is dominant

if $\overline{\varphi(U)} = W$ for any/every open $\emptyset \neq U \subseteq V$
where φ is defined.

Brule If $\varphi: A \dashrightarrow B$ and $\psi: B \dashrightarrow C$ are rat. maps,
and φ is dominant, we get a rat. map
 $\psi \circ \varphi: A \dashrightarrow C$.

In particular: If $\varphi: V \dashrightarrow W$ is dominant, we
get a field hom. $\varphi^*: K(W) \rightarrow K(V)$.
 $f \mapsto f \circ \varphi$

Brule We get a bijection

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{dominant} \\ \text{rat. map} \\ V \dashrightarrow W \end{array} \right\} \leftrightarrow \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{K-algebra} \\ \text{hom.} \\ K(W) \rightarrow K(V) \end{array} \right\}.$$

Qf Same as for morphisms:

$f_i = \varphi^*(x_i)$, where $x_i \in \Gamma(W) \subseteq K(W)$ is the
i-th coordinate map. \square

Def V, W are birational if there are dominant rational maps $\varphi: V \dashrightarrow W$ and $\psi: W \dashrightarrow V$ with $\varphi \circ \psi = \text{id}_V$ and $\psi \circ \varphi = \text{id}_W$.

Ex K and $\mathcal{V}(x^3 - y^2) \subset K^2$ are not isomorphic (Problem 1d on Bset 4), but are birational:

$$\varphi: K \longrightarrow \mathcal{V}(x^3 - y^2)$$

$$t \mapsto (t^2, t^3)$$

$$\psi: \mathcal{V}(x^3 - y^2) \dashrightarrow K$$

$$(x, y) \mapsto \frac{y}{x} \quad (\text{def. on } \mathcal{V}(x^3 - y^2) \setminus \{(0, 0)\})$$

Rule V, W are birational if and only if the K -algebras $K(V), K(W)$ are isomorphic.

10. Dimension and transcendence degree

Def Let L/K be a field extension.

Elements $a_1, \dots, a_n \in L$ are algebraically dependent

~~over K~~ if there is a pol. $\partial \neq f \in K[X_1, \dots, X_n]$ such that $f(a_1, \dots, a_n) = 0$.

Brule ~~For $n=1$~~ this is equiv. to a_1 being algebraic over K .

Ex $x_1, \dots, x_n \in K(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ are alg. independent over K .

Ex $x, y \in K(\sqrt{x^3-y^2})$ are alg. dep. because $x^3-y^2=0$ in $K(\sqrt{x^3-y^2})$.

Ex π, e are transcendental over \mathbb{Q} .

It is unknown whether π, e are alg. indep. over \mathbb{Q} .

Thm 10.1 $a_1, \dots, a_n \in L$ are alg. dep. if and only if some a_i is alg. over $K(a_1, \dots, a_{i-1})$.

Analogy Let V be a K -vector space.

$v_1, \dots, v_n \in V$ are linearly dep. if and only if some v_i is a lin. comb. of v_1, \dots, v_{i-1} .

Pf " \Leftarrow " ~~a_i~~ a_i alg. over K(a₁, ..., a_{i-1})

$\Rightarrow f(a_i) = 0$ for some $0 \neq f \in K(a_1, \dots, a_{i-1})[x]$.

Each coeff. of f is the quotient of two pol.
in a₁, ..., a_{i-1} with coeff. in K.

We can clear out denominators so the coeff.
are pol. in a₁, ..., a_{i-1}.

" \Rightarrow " Let ~~f(a₁, ..., a_n) = 0~~ for some $0 \neq f \in K[x_1, \dots, x_n]$.

Let $g(x_n) = f(a_1, \dots, a_{n-1}, x_n)$. ($\Rightarrow g(a_n) = 0$)

case 1: $g \in K[x_n]$ is not the zero pol.

$\Rightarrow a_n$ is alg. over K

case 2: $g \in K[x_n]$ is the zero pol.

Write $f = \sum_m f_m(x_1, \dots, x_{n-1}) \cdot x_n^m$. Some $f_m \neq 0$.

$\Rightarrow g(x_n) = \sum_i f(a_1, \dots, a_{n-1}) \cdot x_n^i \Rightarrow f_m(a_1, \dots, a_{n-1}) = 0$.

$\Rightarrow a_1, \dots, a_{n-1}$ are alg. dep.

Proceed by induction over n. □

Def Elements $a_1, \dots, a_n \in L$ form a transcendence basis of L over K if they are alg. indep. and L is an alg. ext. of $K(a_1, \dots, a_n)$.

Brule A transcendence basis is a maximal list of alg. indep. el. of K (a list to which we can't append any el. of L without destroying algebraic independence).

Ese x_1, \dots, x_n is a tr. basis of $K(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ over K .

Lemma 10.2 ("Exchange lemma")

If $a_1, \dots, a_n \in L$ are alg. indep. and L is alg. over $K(b_1, \dots, b_m)$ (with $b_1, \dots, b_m \in L$), then there are indices $1 \leq i_1 < \dots < i_r \leq m$ ($r \geq 0$) such that $a_1, \dots, a_n, b_{i_1}, \dots, b_{i_r}$ form a transcendence basis of L over K .

Pf Choose any max. alg. indep. sublist of $a_1, \dots, a_n, b_1, \dots, b_m$ containing a_1, \dots, a_n . The remaining b_i are alg. over K (this list) =: F .

$\Rightarrow K(a_1, \dots, a_n, b_1, \dots, b_m)$ is alg. over F

Also, L is alg. over $K(b_1, \dots, b_m) \subseteq K(a_1, \dots, a_n, b_1, \dots, b_m)$.

$\Rightarrow L$ is alg. over F . \Rightarrow The list forms a tr. basis. □

Lor 10.3 Any finitely generated field exts has a (finite) tr. basis.

Thm 10.4 If a_1, \dots, a_n is a tr.-basis of L over K and $b_1, \dots, b_m \in L$ are alg.-indep., then $n \geq m$.

Analogy If v_1, \dots, v_n span V and ~~$w_1, \dots, w_m \in V$~~ are lin. indep., then $n \geq m$.

Lor 10.5 Any two tr.-bases of L over K have the same size, called the transcendence degree of L over K .

trdeg($L|K$)

Brnls $\text{trdeg}(L|K) = 0 \Leftrightarrow L$ is an alg. ext. of K .

Ex $\text{trdeg}(K(x_1, \dots, x_n)|K) = n$.

Pf of Thm 10.4 Use ind. overn.

$n=0$: $\Rightarrow L$ is alg. over K

\Rightarrow There are no alg. indep. el.

$\Rightarrow m=0$.

$n-1 \rightarrow n$: ~~the~~ By the exchange lemma, b_1 , together with some of the a_i , form a tr. basis of L over K .
W.l.o.g. b_1, a_1, \dots, a_r do.

We have $r < n$ because a_1, \dots, a_n already form a tr. basis, so b_1 is alg. ~~over~~ over $K(a_1, \dots, a_n)$.

Now, a_1, \dots, a_r form a tr. basis of L over $K(b_1)$.

Also, $b_2, \dots, b_m \in L$ are alg. indep. over $K(b_1)$.

The ind. hypothesis shows that $r \geq m-1$.

$\frac{n}{n-1}$

$\Rightarrow n \geq m$.

