Correction to: A Family of Foliations with One Singularity

S. C. Coutinho¹ · Filipe Ramos Ferreira¹

Published online: 6 July 2020

© Sociedade Brasileira de Matemática 2020

Abstract

We fix a mistake in the argument leading to the proof that the family of foliations introduced in the paper does not have an algebraic solution apart from the line at infinity

Correction to: Bull Braz Math Soc, New Series

<https://doi.org/10.1007/s00574-019-00183-8>

We use throughout the notation of section 5 of our paper. A mistake was introduced in the paper by our assumption in Proposition 5.1 that $\phi_m = 1$, because it requires that we divide all the coefficients of the algebraic solution f by ϕ_m . However, in doing that we get a polynomial whose coefficients do not belong to R , which precludes the divisibility arguments used to get contradictions in Propositions 5.1 and 5.3 and in Theorem 5.5. We show here that it is possible to arrive at the same contradictions without requiring f to be in $R[y, z]$.

We will assume that

$$A = \alpha y^{k-3}, \quad B = \beta y^{k-1} \quad \text{and} \quad q = \rho y^2, \quad (1)$$

since this is the only case needed for Theorem 5.5 and it simplifies the equations. We will also assume that $k \geq 7$, to avoid a multiplicity of cases. Examples of smaller degree can be handled using a computer algebra system.

The original article can be found online at <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00574-019-00183-8>.

✉ S. C. Coutinho
collier@dcc.ufrj.br

Filipe Ramos Ferreira
frferreira9@gmail.com

¹ Departamento de Ciência da Computação, Instituto de Matemática, Universidade Federal do Rio de Janeiro, P.O. Box 68530, 21945-970 Rio de Janeiro, RJ, Brazil

Proof of Proposition 5.1 The only point in the proof where a divisibility argument is used is at the very end of the proof, after the equation

$$z^{k-2}\phi'_{m+2} - 2A\phi_{m+2} = -(d-m)h. \quad (2)$$

Note that there was a typo on the first term of (2). Since we have already shown that $e_{m+2} = m - 2$, it follows that

$$\deg(\phi_{m+2}) = (m+2) - (m-2) = 4.$$

Let $\phi_{m+2} = e_0y^4 + e_1y^3z + e_2y^2z^2 + e_3yz^3 + e_4z^4$. The terms $-2\alpha e_i y^{k+1-i} z^i$ on the left hand side of (2) have no correspondent on the right side for $i = 1, \dots, 4$ and the same holds for $4e_0y^3z^{k-2}$. Thus, $\phi_{m+2} = 0$, which gives the desired contradiction because $d \neq m$ and $h \neq 0$ by hypothesis. $\square$

Proof of Proposition 5.3 Divisibility arguments are used twice in the proof of this proposition. The first time is right at the beginning, where we assume that $\mu(m) = \varepsilon_0(m) = \varepsilon_2(m) = m$. However, in this case, the equation that results from (5.7) is (2) and we have already shown that it leads to a contradiction. The second place where a divisibility condition intervenes is at the end of the proof. Let $m < k \leq d$ be the smallest integer such that $e_k = 0$. We know such an integer exists because, by Corollary 3.2, $e_d = 0$. But, having proved that $e_j = 3m - 2j$, we have that

$$e_{k-1} = 3m - 2(k-1) = (3m - 2k) + 2 = e_k + 2 = 2;$$

so that $\varepsilon_0(k-1) = 2$, $\varepsilon_1(k-1) = 1$ and $\varepsilon_1(k-1) + \sigma = 0$. Thus, $\mu(k-1) = 0$. Since, either $\varepsilon_2(k-1) = e_{k+1} + 2 \geq 2$ or $\psi_{k+1} = 0$, it follows from (5.7), with $r = k-1$, that $\theta_3(k-1) = -\alpha\psi_{m+1}\psi_k = 0$, which implies, by Lemma 5.1, that $\psi_k = 0$, contradicting the formula for ψ_k in (5.8).

Proof of Theorem 5.5 It follows from the hypothesis of the theorem that the propositions in section 5 can be applied to ω_{u_0} . Moreover, by Theorem 2.1, we can assume that the coefficients of f belong to $\mathbb{Q}(\alpha, \beta, \rho, c)$. It follows from Proposition 5.1 that $e_m = m$ and from Proposition 5.3 that $e_{m+1} = m - 1$. Hence, $\sigma = 0$ and $\varepsilon_0(m) = \varepsilon_1(m) = m$. If $\mu(m) = \varepsilon_2(m) < m$ then we can deduce from (5.9) with $r = m$ that $\theta_2(m) = 2\alpha y^{k-3}\psi_{m+2} = 0$. Hence, $\psi_{m+2} = 0$, which is only possible when $\phi_{m+2} = 0$. However, if this were the case, we would have $\mu(m) = m$, so that again by (5.9) with $r = m$,

$$-(d-m)\eta + 2\beta\psi_{m+1} - \alpha\psi_{m+1}^2 = 0,$$

contradicting our assumption that $\psi_{m+1} \in \mathbb{Q}(\alpha, \beta, \rho, c)$. Since $\varepsilon_2(m) > m$ implies that $\mu(m) = m$, we also get a contradiction in this case. Hence, $\varepsilon_2(m) = m$ and $e_{m+2} = m - 2$. It follows from $e_{m+1} = m - 1$ and $e_{m+2} = m - 2$ that $\deg(\phi_{m+1}) = 2$

and $\deg(\phi_{m+2}) = 4$; so we can set

$$\phi_{m+1} = \sum_{j=0}^2 s_j y^j z^{2-j} \quad \text{and} \quad \phi_{m+2} = \sum_{i=0}^4 e_i y^i z^{4-i},$$

where $e_i, s_j \in \mathbb{Q}(\alpha, \beta, \rho, c)$ for $0 \leq j \leq 2$ and $0 \leq i \leq 4$. Now, equation (5.6) with $r = m$ gives

$$\begin{aligned} (m-d)h + y^{k-3} \left(\beta y^2 \phi_{m+1} + 2\alpha \phi_{m+2} - \alpha \phi_{m+1}^2 \right) \\ = z^{k-2} \left(\rho y^2 \phi'_{m+1} + \phi'_{m+2} - \phi'_{m+1} \phi_{m+1} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Equating the coefficients of $y^{k-2}z^3$ and z^{k+1} on both sides of the previous equation, we get

$$2e_1\alpha - 2s_0s_1\alpha = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad c(m-d) = e_1 - s_0s_1.$$

Since $\alpha \neq 0$ the first equation gives $e_1 = s_0s_1$. Substituting this into the second equation above we get $c(m-d) = 0$, which is a contradiction because $c \neq 0$ and $m < d$. $\square$

Unfortunately, the specialization from generic u to $u_0 = (\alpha y^{k-3}, \beta y^{k-1}, \rho y^2, c)$ in the proof of Corollary 5.6 requires that Propositions 5.1 and 5.3 hold in the generic case. Thus, the statement of this corollary should now be taken as a conjecture.

Acknowledgements During the preparation of the paper the first author was partially supported by CNPq Grant 304543/2017-9 and the second author by a Grant PIBIC(CNPq). We also benefited from the access to on-line journals provided by CAPES.

Publisher's Note Springer Nature remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.