Lecture XXVIII : Finite maps II

The same statement holds for arbitrary affine milities:
Theorem 1: Given
$$X \leq 1A^n$$
 affine veriety one $\overline{IK} = IK$ and any $P \leq X$, we have:
(1) $\mathcal{O}_{K}(X) \simeq IK[X]$ (2) $\forall f \in IK[X] \setminus 30$; $\mathcal{O}_{K}(\underline{D}_{K}(f)) \simeq IK[X]_{(F)}$ (2) $\mathcal{O}_{K}P \simeq IK[X]_{MP}$
Shoof. (1) follows from (2) where $f = I$. (3) follows from (2) since $P \in D_{X}(\overline{F}) \otimes \overline{F}(P) \neq 0 \iff \overline{F} \notin M_{P}$
We prove (2) Fix $\overline{F} \in IK[X] \setminus 30$; so $\overline{F}(x) \neq 0$ $\forall x \in \underline{D}(F)$. Since $F^n \notin I(x) \neq n \geq 0$
by Hilbert's Nullstellensate, we conclude that $\overline{F}^{*}\{_{n \geq 0} \leq IK[X]$ is multiplicatively closed.
By definition, $\mathcal{O}_{X}(D_{X}(F)) = \overline{S} \xrightarrow{P:D}_{X}(F) \longrightarrow A'_{IK}$ regular (= locally retinal)}.

We set a natural map of IK-algibras:

From this point on, the proof is almost reclation as the one given for the case when X is inclucible (see Lecture 13). The key difference is that localization is not as simple as when [K[X] is a kompain.

$$\frac{\text{Claim1}}{(x)} : \text{ker}(x) = \frac{T(x)}{(x)} = \frac{$$

$$\begin{split} & SF/\frac{g}{fm} \in \ker(x) \Leftrightarrow \frac{S}{fm}(x) := \forall \ x \in P_{X}(F) \iff S(x) := \forall \ X \in P_{X}(F) \iff g \in I(P_{X}(F)) \\ & (a) \ is \ dua \ because \ I(x) \le I(P_{X}(F)) \\ & (b) \ IF \ g \in I(P_{X}(F)) \implies gF \in I(X) \qquad & \frac{g}{Fm} = \frac{gF}{F^{m+1}} \in I(x)_{(F)} \\ \hline (Laim \ 2: \ d \ is \ surjective . \\ & SF/ \ Tix \ \Psi \in O_{X}(D_{X}(F)) \ x \ opens \ V_{1}, \dots V_{r} \ decorposing \ P_{X}(F) \ x \\ & g_{1}, \dots, g_{r}, \ h_{1}, \dots h_{r} \in K(x_{1}, \dots, x_{n}] \ with \ h_{1} \ worker \ o \ n \ V_{1} \ s.t. \\ & Y_{i} = \Psi_{|V_{i}|} = \frac{g_{i}}{h_{i}} \qquad & Y_{i} = U_{X}(F_{i}) = U_{X}(F_{i})$$

· By construction $\frac{8i}{h_i} = \frac{8j}{h_j}$ on $Dy(h_i) \cap Dy(h_j) = Dy(h_ih_j)$ By Claim 1 apphied to f=h;h; we conclude that $\frac{\partial c}{h_i} = \frac{g}{h_j} \qquad m = I(x) \frac{I(x)}{(h_i h_j)} = I(x) \frac{K(x_1, -, x_n)}{(h_i h_j)}$ Thus, INZI st. (hihj) (sihj-sihi) E I(X) ¥c,j Schinhj - Sjhj hu (Take N = max of the values for each pair of indices it j in 21, ..., r{) Replace 3k by Skhik & hkby hik +1 +k=1,..., T To get • Since $D_{\chi}(F) = \bigcup_{i=1}^{l} D_{\chi}(h_i)$ by construction, we set $V_{X}(h) = X \cap V(h) = \bigcap_{i=1}^{h} X \cap V(h_{i}) = X \cap V(h_{1}, \dots, h_{r})$ Hilbert's Nullstellensetz vives VI(X) + (F) = VI(X) + <h1,..., hr> In particular, $\exists m \geq 1 \quad a \quad a_1, \dots, a_r \in [K[x_1, \dots, x_n] \quad s.t.$ $f^m - \sum_{i=1}^r a_i h_i \in I(x)$ $\frac{\text{(laim 5)}}{\Gamma} = \chi \left(\frac{\alpha_1 \beta_1 + \dots + \alpha_r \beta_r}{\Gamma} \right)$ m bx(hi) because $\frac{\Im f}{\Im(h_i)} = \frac{\Im i}{h_i} = \frac{\Im i \Im i + \dots + \Im i \Im r}{F^m}$ $f^{m}si = \sum_{j=1}^{r} a_{j}h_{j}g_{i} = \sum_{j=1}^{r} a_{j}h_{j}g_{j} = (\sum_{j=1}^{r} a_{j}g_{j})h_{i}$ use I(x)So $F^{m} \Im i = hi \left(\sum_{j=1}^{r} \alpha_{j} \Im_{j} \right) m X \supseteq D_{X}(h_{i})$ D . A similar statement holds for abstract varieties: Ox(U) is completely determined by

the sets Ox: (Unx:) for an open concerning X=X, U....UX, by affine opens.

$$\begin{array}{c} \underline{\operatorname{GrodHaug}}_{1}, \quad \mathrm{IF} \ Y \subseteq X \subseteq \mathbb{A}^{n} \quad \text{are affine mixtues then } Y \stackrel{i}{=} > X \quad \operatorname{conspands to} \\ i^{*} & \mathrm{G}_{X} \longrightarrow i_{K} \mathrm{G}_{Y}, \quad \mathrm{The map} \ i^{*} \ is \quad \operatorname{subjective}_{2}. \\ \underline{\operatorname{Grodf}}_{1}: \ \operatorname{Bg} \quad \operatorname{constanction}, \quad i^{*}_{X}: \ \mathrm{G}_{X}(X) = \mathbb{K}(X) \longrightarrow \mathbb{K}(Y] = \mathbb{G}_{Y}(Y) \quad \text{is induced by} \\ \mathrm{I}(X) \subseteq \mathrm{I}(Y), \ \mathrm{Theo}, \ \mathrm{this} \ \mathrm{map} \ i^{*} \ is \quad \operatorname{subjective}_{2}. \quad \mathrm{Gh}_{X}(F) = \mathbb{G}_{Y}(Y) \quad \text{is induced by} \\ \mathrm{I}(X) \subseteq \mathrm{I}(Y), \ \mathrm{Theo}, \ \mathrm{this} \ \mathrm{map} \ i^{*} \ \mathrm{subjective}_{2}. \quad \mathrm{Gh}_{X}(F) = \mathbb{G}_{Y}(F) = \mathbb{G}_{Y}(F) \quad \text{is from mode to the exert} \\ i^{*}_{X}: \ \mathbb{G}_{Y}(F) = \mathbb{G}_{Y}(F) \quad \mathbb{F}_{Y} \quad \mathrm{Theom}, \ \mathrm{use have} \\ i^{*}_{X}: \ \mathbb{G}_{Y}(F) = \mathbb{G}_{Y}(F) = \mathbb{G}_{Y}(F) \quad \mathrm{If}(X), \quad \mathrm{if}(X) \quad \mathrm{if}(X)$$

Y (Y, Uy) Lemma 3 \$ 25.2 & Corollary 1 \$ 24.1 ensures that i is a closed embedding

Lemma z: If $\Psi_y^{\#}$ is finite, then $\Psi_{\Psi(x)}'$ is finite.

$$\frac{3 \text{ worf: By construction } \Psi_y^{\#} = (\Psi_y)^{\#} \circ i_y^{\#} : \mathbb{K}[y] \xrightarrow{i_y^{\#}} \mathbb{K}[\Psi(x)] \longrightarrow \mathbb{K}[x]$$

$$f \longmapsto f \circ \Psi'$$

$$f \longmapsto f \circ \Psi'$$

Since
$$i_y^*$$
 is surjective, it follows that $\mathbb{K}[x]$ is fig one $\mathbb{K}[y]$ is, and may if,
 $\mathbb{K}[x]$ is fig one $\mathbb{K}[\overline{\Psi(x)}]$. Thus, Ψ_y^* is finite $\bigoplus (\Psi')_{\overline{\Psi(x)}}^*$ is finite.

Conclusion: We can assume
$$\Psi$$
 is dominant, by replacing Ψ with Ψ' .
 \underline{Q} : What is the advantage of working with dominant finite maps $X \xrightarrow{\Psi} Y$
between affine neiters $X \subseteq A^m$ at $Y \subseteq A^m$ over $\overline{K} \subseteq \overline{K}$?
 \underline{A} : Since $\overline{K} \subseteq \overline{K}$, Theorem 1 ensures that Ψ_X^{th} corresponds to the pullback map a coord singo:
 $\Psi \rightleftharpoons A \equiv |\overline{K}[Y] \longrightarrow |\overline{K}[X] \equiv B$
 $\overline{K} = |\overline{K}[Y_1, \cdots, Y_n]/\underline{I}(Y)$
 $\overline{K} = |\overline{K}[X_1, \cdots, X_n]/\underline{I}(Y)$
 $\overline{K} = |\overline{K}$

$$\frac{1}{23.7} \frac{1}{1000} \frac{1}{1000$$

Kemark. This will be used to extend the finite definition of morphisms to abstract varieties.

Lemma 3, If
$$X \xrightarrow{\Psi} Y$$
 is a closed immersion of office rues/ $\overline{K}=K$, then Ψ is finite
 $\frac{JF}{JF}$ is mough to show that Ψ is surjective. But this follows by Theorem,
since $\Psi: |K[Y] \longrightarrow |K[X]$ cores from $I(Y) \subseteq I(X)$.

$$\frac{Example_{1}}{X} := \frac{1}{2} (u, t) \in Y \times A^{n} \text{ an affine variety } / i\overline{K} = iK \text{ and } a_{1}, \dots, a_{m} \in O_{y}(y). \text{ sol}$$

$$X := \frac{1}{2} (u, t) \in Y \times A^{n} : \overline{T}_{u}(t) = t^{n} + a_{1(u)} t^{n-1} + \dots + a_{m(u)} = 0 \text{ f}$$
Assume $\exists u \in Y \text{ sol} T_{u}(t) \in |K[t]| \text{ has anly simple above } (w)$
Thus $X := a^{n} \operatorname{Zarichi} \operatorname{dived} \operatorname{sol} d \operatorname{div} A^{n} + \cdots + a_{m(u)} = 0 \text{ f}$

Then X is a Zaciski closed set of
$$Y \times A'$$
, and the composition
 $X \subset \frac{i}{2} \to Y \times A' = \frac{\pi_1}{2} Y$

is finite. Furthermore $\mathcal{O}_{\chi(\chi)}$ is a free module over $\mathcal{O}_{\chi(\chi)}$ with Lasis ? 1, t, ..., t^{m-1} }. Why? . Using There I we have $O_y(y) = \mathbb{K}[y]$ so $X = V \left(\langle t^{n} + A_{1}(u) t^{n-1} + \cdots + A_{m}(u) \rangle + I(y) \mathbb{K}[\underline{u}, y] \right)$ $\eta_{7} \land i \in \mathbb{K}[x_{1}, ..., x_{n}]$ with $\overline{A}_{i} = a_{i} \in \mathbb{K}[u_{1}, ..., u_{n}] / \mathbb{I}(y)$ Furthermore: $I(x) = \sqrt{I(y) \, lk[u, y]} + \langle t^n + A_1(u) \, t^{n-1} + \dots + A_m(u) \rangle$ $= I(y) \mathbb{K}[\underline{u}, y] + < t^{n} + A_{1}(u) t^{n-1} + \cdots + A_{m}(u) >$ The first = arises from the Nullstellensatz a the second one among from the fact that

$$\frac{K_{[u,t]}}{(I(y) \ K[u,y] +)} = \frac{K_{[y][t]}}{)}$$

 $F_{(u)} \longrightarrow F_{0} \Psi = F_{(u)}$ $\mathbb{K}[x] = \mathbb{K}[u_{1}, \dots, u_{n}, t] / \mathbb{I}_{(y)} + \langle t^{n} + A_{1}(u_{1}) t^{n-1} + \dots + A_{m}(u_{n}) \rangle = \mathbb{K}[y][t] / \langle t^{n} + a_{1}(u_{2}) t^{n-1} + \dots + A_{m}(u_{n}) \rangle$ Thus, IK[4] 4, IK[x] is of finite-type & integral, hence finite by Lemma 1 \$27.2 0

Remark: The condition (*) can be stated by says that the discriminant of $\overline{T}_{u}(t)$ does not vomish identically mY, is disc($\overline{T}_{u}(t)$) $\notin \overline{I}(Y)$.

The wet assult gives a meaning to this terminalogy.
Theorem 2: A finite insephism
$$\Psi: X \longrightarrow Y$$
 between affine varieties one [K=1K has finit fibers: $\Psi \subseteq \Psi^{-1}(y)$ is finit (panily $\Rightarrow \psi_{y}$)
A The size of the fiber can vary along Y . If $X \cong Y$ are inselvential $a = \Psi$ is dominant, this much will be instant on a draw of ext of Y .
Shoof: By $\Xi = x$ we may assume Ψ is dominant $\Psi^{-1}(y) = \phi$ if $y \notin \Psi(x)$
The size of the fiber can vary along Y . If $(Y_1, \dots, Y_n)/T(y)$
By Lemine 3: $\Psi: K(y_1, \dots, y_n)/T(x_1) \longrightarrow K(x_1, \dots, x_n)/T(x_1)$
By Lemine 3: $\Psi: K(y_1, \dots, y_n)/T(x_1) \longrightarrow K(x_1, \dots, x_n)/T(x_1)$
By Lemine 3: $\Psi: K(y_1, \dots, y_n)/T(x_1) \longrightarrow K(x_1, \dots, x_n)/T(x_1)$
By Lemine 3: $\Psi: K(y_1, \dots, y_n)/T(x_1) \longrightarrow K(x_1, \dots, x_n)/T(x_1)$
By Lemine 3: $\Psi: K(y_1, \dots, y_n)/T(x_1) \longrightarrow K(x_1, \dots, x_n)/T(x_1)$
By Lemine 3: $\Psi: K(y_1, \dots, y_n)/T(x_1) \longrightarrow K(x_1, \dots, x_n)/T(x_1)$
By Lemine 3: $\Psi: K(y_1, \dots, y_n)/T(x_1) \longrightarrow K(x_1, \dots, x_n)/T(x_1)$
By Lemine 3: $\Psi: K(y_1, \dots, y_n)/T(x_1) \longrightarrow K(x_1, \dots, x_n)/T(x_1)$
By Lemine 3: $\Psi: K(y_1, \dots, y_n)/T(x_1) \longrightarrow K(x_1, \dots, x_n)/T(x_1)$
By Lemine 3: $\Psi: K(y_1, \dots, y_n)/T(x_1) \longrightarrow K(x_1, \dots, x_n)/T(x_1)$
By Lemine 3: $\Psi: K(y_1, \dots, y_n)/T(x_1) \longrightarrow K(x_1, \dots, x_n)/T(x_1)$
By Lemine 3: $\Psi: K(y_1, \dots, y_n)/T(x_1) \longrightarrow K(x_1, \dots, x_n)/T(x_n)$
By Lemine 3: $\Psi: K(y_1, \dots, y_n)/T(x_1)$
By Lemine 3: $\Psi: K(y_1, \dots, y_n)/T(x_1)$
By Lemine 4 Misse big $\in K[Y_1] = SY \longrightarrow SA^1$ as $y \in Y$. To $y \in K[Y_1](x_1)$
By a producte earch big $\in K[Y_1] = SY \longrightarrow SA^1$ as $y \in Y$. To $y \in Y$ of y dynamice
 $P_{i,Y_2} \in I(X) = X_1^{i_1} + P_{i,Y_2}(x_1) = 0$
Induct $T_{i,Y_2}(x_1) = X_1^{i_1} + P_{i,Y_2}(x_1) = 0$
Induct $T_{i,Y_2}(x_1) = X_1^{i_1} + P_{i,Y_2}(x_1) = 0$
Induct $T_{i,Y_2} \in T(x) = X_1^{i_1} + P_{i,Y_2}(x_1) = 0$
Induct $T_{i,Y_2} \in T(x) = X_1^{i_1} + P_{i,Y_2}(x_1) = 0$
Induct $T_{i,Y_2} \in T(x) = X_1^{i_1} + P_{i,Y_2}(x_2) = 0$
Induct $T_{i,Y_2} \in T(x) = X_1^{i_1} + P_{i,Y_2}(x_2) = 0$
Induct $T_{i,Y_2} \in T(x) = X_1^{i_1} + P_{i,Y_2}(x_2) = 0$
Induct $T_{i,Y_2} \in T(x) = X_1^{i_1} + P_{i,Y_2}(x_2) = 0$
Ind

I converse is not true!