

# ESSENTIAL DIMENSION OF HOMOGENEOUS POLYNOMIALS

Angelo Vistoli  
Scuola Normale Superiore

London, February 18, 2011

The theory of *essential dimension* was born in 1997 with the publication of “On the essential dimension of a finite group”, by Joe Buhler and Zinovy Reichstein. It has since attracted a lot of attention.

The basic question is: how complicated is it to write down an algebraic or geometric object in a certain class? How many independent parameters do we need?

Let us start with the very general definition, due to Merkurjev.

We will fix a base field  $k$  of characteristic 0. Can take  $k = \mathbb{Q}$  or  $k = \mathbb{C}$ .

Let  $\text{Fields}_k$  the category of extensions of  $k$ . Let  $F: \text{Fields}_k \rightarrow \text{Sets}$  be a functor. We should think of each  $F(K)$  as the set of isomorphism classes of some class of objects we are interested in. If  $\zeta$  is an object of some  $F(K)$ , a *field of definition* of  $\zeta$  is an intermediate field  $k \subseteq L \subseteq K$  such that  $\zeta$  is in the image of  $F(L) \rightarrow F(K)$ .

**Definition** (Merkurjev). The *essential dimension* of  $\zeta$ , denoted by  $\text{ed}_k \zeta$ , is the least transcendence degree  $\text{tr deg}_k L$  of a field of definition  $L$  of  $\zeta$ .

The *essential dimension* of  $F$ , denoted by  $\text{ed}_k F$ , is the supremum of the essential dimensions of all objects  $\zeta$  of all  $F(K)$ .

The essential dimension  $\text{ed}_k \zeta$  is finite, under weak hypothesis on  $F$ . But  $\text{ed}_k F$  could still be  $+\infty$ .

It is easy to see that if  $F$  is represented by a scheme  $X$  of finite type over  $k$ , then  $\text{ed}_k F = \dim X$ . Thus, for example, if  $g$  and  $d$  are natural numbers, and  $F(K)$  is the set of smooth curves in  $\mathbb{P}_K^n$  of genus  $g$  and degree  $d$ , the essential dimension of  $F$  is the dimension of the Hilbert scheme of smooth curves of genus  $g$  and degree  $d$  in  $\mathbb{P}^n$ . But if we ask for the essential dimension of the functor of smooth curves of genus  $g$  and degree  $d$ , up to projective equivalence, the question may be very hard.

Suppose that we have an action of  $\text{GL}_n$  on some scheme  $X$  which is of finite type over  $k$ . Then we can define the *functor of orbits*  $F: \text{Fields}_k \rightarrow \text{Sets}$  that sends each extension  $K$  of  $k$  into the set  $X(K)/\text{GL}_n(K)$  of orbits for the action of  $\text{GL}_n(K)$  on the set of  $K$ -rational points  $X(K)$ . The *essential dimension of the action* is the essential dimension of this functor. Clearly  $\text{ed}_k F \leq \dim X$ .

Here are some interesting examples.

- (1) Let  $X_{n,d}$  be the affine space of dimension  $\binom{d+n-1}{n-1}$  of forms of degree  $d$  in  $n$  variables, with the natural action of  $GL_n$  by base change. The functor of orbits is the functor  $\mathbf{F}_{n,d}$  of forms of degree  $d$  in  $n$  variables, up to change of coordinates.
- (2) The functor  $F_{\mathcal{M}_g}$  be the functor that associates with each extension  $k \subseteq K$  the set of isomorphism classes of smooth projective curves of genus  $g$  is isomorphic to a functor of orbits for  $g \neq 1$ .
- (3) If  $G \subseteq GL_n$  is a closed subgroup, the functor of orbits for the action of  $GL_n$  on  $GL_n/G$  is isomorphic to the functor of isomorphism classes of  $G$ -torsors.

The essential dimension of the functor of isomorphism classes of  $G$ -torsors is known as the essential dimension of  $G$ . Buhler and Reichstein introduced this concept for finite groups, with a rather different geometric definition. This case has been studied a lot, but many important questions are still open. For example, the essential dimension of  $\mathrm{PGL}_n$  is very interesting, because  $\mathrm{PGL}_n$ -torsors correspond to Brauer–Severi varieties, and also to central simple algebras.

Assume that  $k$  contains enough roots of 1. It is known that  $\mathrm{ed}_k \mathrm{PGL}_2 = \mathrm{ed}_k \mathrm{PGL}_3 = 2$ ; this follows from the fact that central simple algebras of degree 2 and 3 are *cyclic*. This is easy for degree 2; in degree 3 it is a theorem of Albert. A cyclic algebra of degree  $n$  over  $K$  has a presentation of the type  $x^n = a$ ,  $y^n = b$  and  $yx = \omega xy$ , where  $a, b \in K^*$  and  $\omega$  is a primitive  $n^{\mathrm{th}}$  root of 1. Hence a cyclic algebra is defined over a field of the type  $k(a, b)$ , and has essential dimension at most 2.

When  $n$  is a prime larger than 3, it is only known (due to Lorenz, Reichstein, Rowen and Saltman) that

$$2 \leq \text{ed}_k \text{PGL}_n \leq \frac{(n-1)(n-2)}{2}.$$

Computing  $\text{ed}_k \text{PGL}_n$  when  $n$  is a prime is an extremely important question, linked with the problem of cyclicity of simple algebras of prime degree. If every simple algebra of prime degree is cyclic, then  $\text{ed}_k \text{PGL}_n = 2$ . Most experts think that a generic simple algebra of prime degree larger than 3 should not be cyclic. One way to show this would be to prove that  $\text{ed}_k \text{PGL}_n > 2$  when  $n$  is a prime larger than 3.

Consider the functor  $\mathbf{F}_{n,2}$ , associating with an extension  $K$  the set of isometry classes of quadratic forms. Of course, every quadratic form can be diagonalized, i.e., written in the form  $\sum_{i=1}^n a_i x_i^2$ ; this implies that its orbit is defined on an extension  $k(a_1, \dots, a_n)$  of transcendence degree at most  $n$ . So  $\text{ed}_k \mathbf{F}_{n,2} \leq n$ . Can one do better? It was proved by Z. Reichstein in 2000 that  $\text{ed}_k \mathbf{F}_{n,2} = n$ .

In this examples, as in most cases, getting upper bounds is much easier than getting lower bounds.

In 2003, Grégory Berhuy and Giordano Favi proved that  $\text{ed}_k \mathbf{F}_{3,3} = 4$  (more or less).



In 2005 Berhuy and Reichstein proved the following result. Assume that  $n \geq 4$  and  $d \geq 3$ , or  $n = 3$  and  $d \geq 4$ , or  $n = 2$  and  $d \geq 5$  (these conditions mean that the generic hypersurface of degree  $d$  in  $n$  variables has no non-trivial projective automorphisms). Let  $\Phi_{n,d}(x)$  be the generic  $n$ -form of degree  $d$ ; in other words, the form all of whose coefficients are independent indeterminates; or the form corresponding to the generic point of  $X_{n,d}$ . The essential dimension  $\text{ed}_k \Phi_{n,d}(x)$  is the essential dimension of the orbit of  $\Phi(x)$ . There is an obvious lower bound for  $\text{ed}_k \Phi_{n,d}(x)$ , which is  $\binom{d+n-1}{n-1} - n^2$  (the dimension of the moduli space  $M_{n,d}$  of  $n$ -forms of degree  $d$ ). The point is that there is a dominant invariant rational map  $X_{n,d} \dashrightarrow M_{n,d}$ , so a field of definition of a form in the orbit of  $\Phi_{n,d}(x)$  must always contain  $k(M_{n,d})$ .

**Theorem** (Berhuy, Reichstein).

(a) *If  $\gcd(n, d) = 1$ , then*

$$\text{ed}_k \Phi_{n,d}(x) = \binom{d+n-1}{n-1} - n^2 + 1.$$

(b) *Suppose that  $\gcd(n, d) = p^i$ , where  $p$  is a prime and  $i > 0$ . Call  $p^j$  the largest power of  $p$  dividing  $d$ . Then*

$$\text{ed}_k \Phi_{n,d}(x) = \binom{d+n-1}{n-1} - n^2 + p^j.$$

But is  $\text{ed}_k \mathbf{F}_{n,d}$  equal to  $\text{ed}_k \Phi_{n,d}(x)$ ? In other words, could it happen that there are special forms that are more complicated than the generic one?

Suppose that  $X$  is an integral scheme of finite type over  $k$  with an action of  $GL_n$ , and call  $K$  its field of fraction. Let  $F$  be its orbit functor. We define the *generic essential dimension of  $F$* , denoted by  $\text{ged}_k F$ , as the essential dimension of the orbit of the generic point  $\text{Spec } K \rightarrow X$ . This turns out to depend only on  $F$ , and not on the specific group action. The result of Berhuy and Reichstein is about the generic essential dimension of  $\mathbf{F}_{n,d}$ . Obviously,  $\text{ed}_k F \geq \text{ged}_k F$ .

In order to determine the essential dimension of  $F$ , we split the work into two parts.

- (a) We compute  $\text{ged}_k F$ .
- (b) We show that  $\text{ed}_k F = \text{ged}_k F$ .

The techniques involved are very different.

Let us see an example in which  $\text{ed}_k F > \text{g ed}_k F$ . Let  $M_n$  be the affine space of  $n \times n$  matrices, and let  $\text{GL}_n$  act on it by left multiplication. Let  $F_n$  be the orbit functor. The generic  $n \times n$  matrix is invertible, so it has the identity matrix in its orbit, therefore  $\text{g ed}_k F_n = 0$ . On the other hand, two matrices  $A$  and  $B$  in  $M_n(K)$  are in the same orbit if and only if  $\ker A = \ker B$ ; so  $F_n(K)$  can also be described as the set of linear subspaces of  $K^n$ . So  $F_n(K)$  is the set of  $K$ -points of the disjoint union of Grassmannians  $\coprod_{i=0}^n \mathbb{G}(i, n)(K)$ ; hence  $\text{ed}_k F_n$  equals the dimension of  $\coprod_{i=0}^n \mathbb{G}(i, n)$ , which is positive if  $n \geq 2$ .

Is there a general case in which we can assert that  $\text{ed}_k F = \text{g ed}_k F$ ?

Yes.

**Genericity theorem** (Brosnan, Reichstein, —). *Suppose that  $GL_n$  acts with finite stabilizers on a connected smooth variety  $X$  over  $k$ . Let  $F$  be the orbit functor. Then  $\mathrm{ed}_k F = \mathrm{g ed}_k F$ .*

This is a particular case of the general statement about Deligne–Mumford stacks.

This is definitely false, in general, when  $X$  is singular. It seems very hard to say something in the singular case.

**Corollary.** *Suppose that  $GL_n$  acts with finite stabilizers on a connected smooth variety  $X$  over  $k$ , with trivial generic stabilizer. Let  $F$  be the orbit functor. Then  $\mathrm{ed}_k F = \dim X - n^2$ .*

Here is an application. Recall that  $F_{\mathcal{M}_g}$  is the functor that associates with each extension  $k \subseteq K$  the set of isomorphism classes of smooth projective curves of genus  $g$ . What is  $\text{ed}_k F_{\mathcal{M}_g}$ ? In other words, how many independent variables do you need to write down a general curve of genus  $g$ ?

Curves of genus 0 are conics, hence they can be written in the form  $ax^2 + by^2 + z^2 = 0$ , so  $\text{ed}_k F_{\mathcal{M}_0} \leq 2$ . By Tsen's theorem,  $\text{ed}_k F_{\mathcal{M}_0} = 2$ . An easy argument using moduli spaces of curves reveals that  $\text{ed}_k F_{\mathcal{M}_g} \geq 3g - 3$  for  $g \geq 2$ , and  $\text{ed}_k F_{\mathcal{M}_1} \geq 1$ .

**Theorem** (Brosnan, Reichstein, —).

$$\text{ed } F_{\mathcal{M}_g} = \begin{cases} 2 & \text{if } g = 0 \\ +\infty & \text{if } g = 1 \\ 5 & \text{if } g = 2 \\ 3g - 3 & \text{if } g \geq 3. \end{cases}$$

What can one say when the stabilizers are not finite? Let us go back to our example of the action of  $GL_n$  by left multiplication on  $M_n$ . In this case the generic essential dimension is 0. If a matrix  $A \in M_n(K)$  has rank  $r$ , then the orbit of  $A$  in  $M_n(K)$  is in natural correspondence with the  $K$ -points of the Grassmannian  $G(r, n)$  of quotients of dimension  $r$ ; so its essential dimension is 0 exactly when  $A$  is invertible or  $A = 0$ . The stabilizer of  $A$  is a parabolic subgroup of  $GL_n$ , and this is never reductive, unless  $A$  is invertible or  $A$  is 0.

Recall that a linear algebraic group  $G$  over  $k$  is *reductive* when one of the following equivalent condition is satisfied.

- (a)  $G$  contains no non-trivial normal unipotent subgroups.
- (b)  $G$  is *linearly reductive*, i.e., the linear representations of  $G$  are completely reducible.



This, and many other examples, let Reichstein and myself to conjecture the following result, which recently became a theorem.

**Generalized genericity theorem** (Reichstein, —). *Let  $X$  be a smooth connected variety with an action of  $GL_n$ , and call  $F$  its orbit functor. Assume that the generic stabilizer is finite. Let  $K$  be an extension of  $k$ , and let  $\xi \in X(K)$ , such that the stabilizer of  $\xi$  is reductive. Then the essential dimension of the orbit of  $\xi$  is at most equal to the generic essential dimension of the orbit functor.*

*In particular, if all stabilizers are reductive, then  $\text{ed}_k F = \text{g ed}_k F$ .*

More generally, this can be stated for algebraic stacks.

This can be applied to the action of  $GL_n$  on the space of forms  $X_{n,d}$ . The forms whose stabilizer is not reductive are very special, and they live in a subvariety of  $X_{n,d}$  of high codimension.

**Theorem** (Reichstein, —). *Assume that  $n \geq 2$  and  $d \geq 3$ . Then*

$$\text{ed}_k \mathbf{F}_{n,d} = g \text{ed}_k \mathbf{F}_{n,d}.$$

**Corollary.** *Assume that  $n \geq 4$  and  $d \geq 3$ , or  $n = 3$  and  $d \geq 4$ , or  $n = 2$  and  $d \geq 5$ .*

(a) *If  $\gcd(n, d) = 1$ , then*

$$\text{ed}_k \mathbf{F}_{n,d} = \binom{d+n-1}{n-1} - n^2 + 1.$$

(b) *Suppose that  $\gcd(n, d) = p^i$ , where  $p$  is a prime and  $i > 0$ . Call  $p^j$  the largest power of  $p$  dividing  $d$ . Then*

$$\text{ed}_k \mathbf{F}_{n,d} = \binom{d+n-1}{n-1} - n^2 + p^j.$$