

Accepted Manuscript

Plane model-fields of definition, fields of definition, and the field of moduli for smooth plane curves

Eslam Badr, Francesc Bars

PII: S0022-314X(18)30229-4
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jnt.2018.07.010>
Reference: YJNTH 6094

To appear in: *Journal of Number Theory*

Received date: 27 March 2018
Revised date: 24 July 2018
Accepted date: 25 July 2018

Please cite this article in press as: E. Badr, F. Bars, Plane model-fields of definition, fields of definition, and the field of moduli for smooth plane curves, *J. Number Theory* (2018), <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jnt.2018.07.010>

This is a PDF file of an unedited manuscript that has been accepted for publication. As a service to our customers we are providing this early version of the manuscript. The manuscript will undergo copyediting, typesetting, and review of the resulting proof before it is published in its final form. Please note that during the production process errors may be discovered which could affect the content, and all legal disclaimers that apply to the journal pertain.



**PLANE MODEL-FIELDS OF DEFINITION, FIELDS OF
DEFINITION, AND THE FIELD OF MODULI FOR SMOOTH
PLANE CURVES**

ESLAM BADR AND FRANCESC BARS

ABSTRACT. Let C/\bar{k} be a smooth plane curve defined over \bar{k} , a fixed algebraic closure of a perfect field k . We call a subfield $k' \subseteq \bar{k}$ a *plane model-field of definition for C* if C descends to k' as a smooth plane curve over k' , that is if there exists a smooth curve C'/k' defined over k' which is k' -isomorphic to a non-singular plane model $F(X, Y, Z) = 0$ with coefficients in k' , and such that $C' \otimes_{k'} \bar{k}$ and C are isomorphic. In this paper, we provide (explicit) families of smooth plane curves for which the three fields types; the field of moduli, fields of definition, and plane-models fields of definition are pairwise different.

1. INTRODUCTION

Let C/k be a smooth projective curve defined over a perfect field k . We say that C descends to a subfield $k' \subset k \subset \bar{k}$, where \bar{k} is a fixed algebraic closure of a field k , if there exists a smooth projective curve C'/k' defined over k' such that $C' \otimes_{k'} k \cong C$. In this case, k' is called a *field of definition for C* . The intersection of all fields of definition for $C \otimes_k \bar{k}$ is called the *absolute field of moduli for C* and is denoted by k_C . Alternatively, the *relative field of moduli to the field extension k/k'* is commonly used in the literature, and it is defined to be the subfield $M_{k/k'}(C)$ fixed by the subgroup

$$\{\sigma \in \text{Gal}(k/k') : C \cong_k \sigma C\}.$$

The main relation between the absolute and the relative field of moduli is due to [8, Theorem 1.6.9]; k_C is a field of definition for C if and only if given any algebraically closed field $K \supseteq k$, and any subfield $k' \subseteq K$ with K/k' Galois, $M_{K/k'}(C \otimes_k K)$ is a field of definition for $C \otimes_k K$.

Finding fields of definition and/or fields of moduli of varieties is a long standing problem. It is also very common to ask when the field of moduli for a smooth projective curve is a field of definition. A necessary and sufficient condition (Weil's cocycle criterion of descent) for the field of moduli to be a field of definition was provided by Weil [17]. If the full automorphism group $\text{Aut}(C \otimes_k \bar{k})$ is trivial, then this condition becomes trivially true and so the field of moduli needs to be a field of definition. It is also well known that if C has geometric genus $g = 0$ then it is \bar{k} -isomorphic to the projective line \mathbb{P}^1 , which is defined over k_0 , the prime field of k (cf. [5, §1]). Moreover, if $g = 1$, then the field of moduli is $k_0(j)$, where j is the modular invariant of C , and it is known that for characteristic $p \neq 2, 3$, C is \bar{k} -isomorphic to a model defined over $k_0(j)$ (cf. [16, Chp. III, Proposition 1.4]). However, if $g > 1$ and $\text{Aut}(C \otimes_k \bar{k})$ is non-trivial, then Weil's conditions are difficult to be checked and so there is no guarantee that the field of moduli is a field of definition for $C \otimes_k \bar{k}$. Explicit examples of hyperelliptic curves over \mathbb{C} not definable over their field of moduli were first provided by Earle [6], Shimura [15]. Later on, Huggins [8, 9] proved that a hyperelliptic curve of genus $g \geq 2$ defined over

F. Bars is supported by MTM2016-75980-P and MDM-2014-0445.

Download English Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/en/article/11012911>

Download Persian Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/article/11012911>

[Daneshyari.com](https://daneshyari.com)