

Algebraic Deformation Quantization

Frederick Leitner*
Ben-Gurion University

December 2, 2024

Abstract

In this note we give an algebraic proof of “deformation quantization” by making use of the theory of Unital Gröbner bases over a valuation ring.
MSC: 16Z05, 13P10

In this note we give an algebraic proof of deformation quantization (c.f. [7]). We do this by developing in (Sec. 1) the theory of unital Gröbner bases over a valuation ring. We then in (Sec. 2) obtain, almost immediately, our desired deformation quantization in a completely analogous manner to the Gröbner basis proof of the Poincaré-Birkhoff-Witt [PBW] Theorem for the universal enveloping algebra of a Lie algebra ([12]).

Proceeding in this manner, we obtain, essentially for free, that our “quantization map” is defined over \mathbb{Q} , rather than \mathbb{R} , and the Casimir functions are central in the quantized algebra.

We present here only the “local” picture. The global picture in the analytic case is described [3], and in the algebraic case in [8] and [15]. The holomorphic case is discussed in [13], while the positive characteristic setting is described in [1].

1 Gröbner Bases over Valued Rings

In this section, we develop the theory of unital Gröbner bases over a valuation ring. The case where R is an arbitrary ring, without a valuation, is discussed in [10]. The essential difference is that in this paper, we are allowing the base ring to affect the term ordering, while this is not the case in [10]. One may recover the results of [10] by taking \mathbf{val} to be the discrete or trivial valuation $\mathbf{val}(r) = 0$ for $r \in R^*$. In fact, all proofs are carried directly over from [10] once one emphasizes the role of a leading term rather than of a leading monomial and once one takes care of topological issues. We repeat the proofs here for completeness and clarity.

*Partially supported by a VATAT fellowship

We enforce the following throughout this section: R is a commutative ring with unity equipped with a (logarithmic) valuation:

$$R \xrightarrow{\text{val}} \Gamma_0 \cup \{\infty\}$$

where Γ_0 is commutative ordered group with multiplication $+$ and ordering $<_0$. We assume that $\text{val}(r) \geq_0 0$ for all $r \in R$, and we denote $\mathfrak{m} := \{r \in R \mid \text{val}(r) >_0 0\}$ and $R^\times := \{r \in R \mid \text{val}(r) = 0\}$.

All R -modules, R -algebras, etc., as well as their operations will be topological with the linear topology given by \mathfrak{m}^k . All ideals are two-sided, will taken to be identified with their closures, and generators are topological generators. If R is complete, then all R -modules M will be taken to be complete, pro-finite and Hausdorff (separated). In particular R itself satisfies these conditions. By a basis \mathcal{B} of M , we really mean a *psuedo-basis* (c.f. [5, 1.2]). In other words, $\mathcal{B} \pmod{\mathfrak{m}^k}$ is a basis for M/\mathfrak{m}^k for all $k \geq 1$. For example, if S is a commutative ring (with unity), then $\{\hbar^k\}_{k \geq 0}$ is a psuedo-basis for $R = S[[\hbar]]$.

We denote by A a unital associative R -algebra with no quasi-zeros, i.e. elements $a \in A$ such that for all $b, c \in A$ not both 1 one has $bac = 0$. For brevity, we only state and prove the results in the case of a two-sided ideal, although it is clear that the case of a one-sided ideal can be handled (c.f. [11]).

Definition 1.

Let A be an R -algebra. Choose a set of algebra generators x_i such that $A = R\langle x_i \mid i \in \Lambda \rangle$ for some index set Λ . We often identify $i \in \Lambda$ with $x_i \in A$ to simplify notation.

1.1. Let $\alpha = \alpha_1 \cdots \alpha_n$ be a finite length word in Λ . Denote:

$$x^\alpha := x_{\alpha_1} x_{\alpha_2} \cdots x_{\alpha_n}.$$

Then, for any $r \in R$, we define a *term* in A (subordinate to Λ) as the (ordered) product:

$$rx^\alpha := rx_{\alpha_1} x_{\alpha_2} \cdots x_{\alpha_n}.$$

We denote the set of all terms by $\mathbf{Terms}_\Lambda(A)$. We define:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{Terms}_\Lambda(A) &\xrightarrow{\text{val}} \Gamma_0 \cup \{\infty\} \\ t = rx^\alpha &\longmapsto \text{val}(r). \end{aligned}$$

1.2. Suppose A is a free R -module. We say that A has a *term basis* \mathcal{T} (subordinate to Λ) if $\mathcal{T} \subset \mathbf{Terms}_\Lambda(A)$ is such that A has an R -basis:

$$A = R\{\mathcal{T}\}.$$

1.3. Let \mathcal{T} be a term basis for A . Suppose additionally that \mathcal{T} is well ordered by some $<$. Then we say that \ll is a *valued well-ordering* on \mathcal{T} if we define for $t_i := r_i x^{\alpha_i} \in \mathcal{T}$:

$$t_1 \ll t_2 \text{ if and only if } \begin{cases} \text{EITHER: } \mathbf{val}(t_1) >_0 \mathbf{val}(t_2) \\ \text{OR: } \mathbf{val}(t_1) = \mathbf{val}(t_2) \text{ and } t_1 < t_2 \end{cases}$$

Although \ll extends to $\mathbf{Terms}_\Lambda(A)$, we should emphasize that \ll is *not* in general a well-ordering: if $u \in R^\times$, then $\mathbf{val}(t) = \mathbf{val}(ut)$.

1.4. Let \mathcal{T} be a term basis for A with a valued well ordering \ll . Let $0 \neq f \in A$. Then, for some k large enough, we have $f \neq 0 \pmod{\mathfrak{m}^k}$. Then, due to the pro-finite assumption on A , and the fact that \mathcal{T} is a (pseudo)-basis, we may write uniquely for some such choice of k :

$$f \equiv r_1 t_1 + r_2 t_2 \cdots + r_n t_n \pmod{\mathfrak{m}^k}$$

where $r_i \in R^*$ and $t_i \in \mathcal{T}$ are such that $t_1 \gg t_2 \gg \cdots \gg t_n$. The *leading term* of f is defined as:

$$\mathbf{LT}(f) := \mathbf{LT}_{\ll}(f) := t_1.$$

The *leading coefficient* of f is defined as:

$$\mathbf{LC}(f) := \mathbf{LC}_{\ll}(f) := r_1.$$

Due to the definition of the ordering \ll , these are independent of the choice of k .

1.5. A *term ordering* for a term basis \mathcal{T} is a valued well-ordering \ll such that for $t, t', u, v \in \mathcal{T}$ we have:

- (a) if $t \ll t'$ then $utv \ll ut'v$ whenever $utv \neq 0$ and $ut'v \neq 0$.
- (b) if $t' = \mathbf{LT}(utv) \neq 0$ with u or $v \neq 1$ then $t \ll \mathbf{LT}(t')$.

1.6. If \mathcal{T} admits a term ordering \ll , then the pair (\mathcal{T}, \ll) is an *admissible system*.

1.7. If (\mathcal{T}, \ll) is an admissible system, and $0 \neq f \in A$, then we say that $t \in \mathcal{T}$ divides f (and write $t|f$) if there are $u, v \in \mathcal{T}$ and $r \in R^*$ such that:

$$r\mathbf{LT}(utv) = \mathbf{LT}(f)$$

We now describe for a subset $I \subseteq A$ a “division algorithm.” We have put quotations to emphasize that this algorithm does not in general have a meaning. In fact, one may view the statement of (Thm. 5) as ascribing a meaning to this algorithm when we make the assumption of the existence of a *unital Gröbner basis* for I in the case that I is a (closed two-sided) ideal. A second reason for putting this in quotations is that we give no prescription for choosing the elements of I with which to divide. However, this need not be a hindrance and is in fact a benefit in view of (Lem. 4). We need one more set of definitions at this point:

Definition 2. Let (\mathcal{T}, \ll) be an admissible system on A , and a subset $I \subseteq A$. Then define a R -submodule $o(I)$ of A to be the R -submodule spanned by the set:

$$o(I) := \{rt \mid r \in R^*, t \in \mathcal{T}, \forall h \in I \text{ we have } \mathbf{LT}(h) \neq rt\}.$$

We also define the R -module $\tilde{o}(I)$ as the R -submodule spanned by the set:

$$\tilde{o}(I) := \mathcal{T} \setminus \{\mathbf{LT}(h) \mid h \in I\}.$$

Clearly $\tilde{o}(I)$ is a free R -module.

We desire an algorithm as follows:

Input: (\mathcal{T}, \ll) an admissible system on A , a subset $I \subseteq A$, and $f \in A$.

Output: $\tilde{f} \in I$ and $e \in o(I)$ so that $f = e + \tilde{f}$

```

1:  $i := 0$ 
2:  $f_0 := f$ 
3: while  $f_i \neq 0$  do
4:    $i := i + 1$ 
5:   if  $\nexists h \in I$  such that  $\mathbf{LT}(h) | f_i$  then
6:      $e_i := \mathbf{LT}(f_i)$ 
7:      $f_i := f_{i-1} - g_i$ 
8:   else
9:     Choose some  $h_i \in I$  such that  $0 \neq \mathbf{LT}(h_i) | f_{i-1}$ 
10:    Choose some  $r_i \in R^*$   $u_i, v_i \in \mathcal{T}$  so that:
11:       $r_i \mathbf{LT}(u_i h_i v_i) = \mathbf{LT}(f_{i-1})$ 
12:     $e_i := 0$ 
13:     $f_i := f_{i-1} - r_i u_i h_i v_i$ 
14:  end if
15: end while
16:  $e := \sum_i e_i$ 
17:  $\tilde{f} := \sum_i r_i u_i h_i v_i = f - e$ 

```

Because we do not specify how to choose the h_i (nor the u_i and v_i) it is not, in general, true that one has a unique output. Our aim is to show that under certain conditions, namely having a unital Gröbner basis for an ideal, these choices do not matter. We should also emphasize that, in general, this algorithm does not terminate in a finite amount of time. We call e the *remainder of f on division by I*

Definition 3.

Let (\mathcal{T}, \ll) be an admissible system on A .

3.1. Let I be an ideal in A . Let I have a set of generators:

$$\mathcal{G} = \{g_\gamma \mid \gamma \in \Gamma\} \text{ for some index set } \Gamma.$$

Then we say that \mathcal{G} is a *Gröbner basis with respect to (\mathcal{T}, \ll)* if for every $h \in I$ we have a representation:

$$h = \sum_{k \in K} r_k u_k g_{\gamma_k} v_k$$

for K an index set, $\gamma_k \in \Gamma$, $r_k \in R^*$ and $u_k, v_k \in \mathcal{T}$ such that $\mathbf{LT}(u_k g_{\gamma_k} v_k) \leq \mathbf{LT}(f)$ whenever $u_k g_{\gamma_k} v_k \neq 0$.

3.2. We call a subset $\mathcal{G} \subseteq A$ *unital* if:

- (a) For all $\gamma \in \Gamma$ we have $\mathbf{LC}(g_\gamma) \in R^\times$.
- (b) For all $\gamma \in \Gamma$ and for all $u, v \in \mathcal{T}$ we have $\mathbf{LC}(u g_\gamma v) \in R^\times$ whenever $u g_\gamma v \neq 0$

3.3. For $f, f' \in A$ we say that an S -polynomial is *constructible about f and f'* if there is some $u, u', v', v' \in \mathcal{T}$, $r, r' \in R^*$ such that:

$$r \mathbf{LT}(u \mathbf{LT}(f) v) = r' \mathbf{LT}(u' \mathbf{LT}(f') v').$$

In which case, we write:

$$S := S(f, f') := r u f v - r' u' f' v'.$$

We say that S is an S -polynomial about f and f' . The choices of u, u', v, v' are not in general unique.

We also note that the construction of an S -polynomial ensures that:

$$\mathbf{LT}(S(f, f')) \ll \mathbf{LT}(u \mathbf{LT}(f) v) = \mathbf{LT}(u' \mathbf{LT}(f') v').$$

Lemma 4. Let $(\mathcal{T}, <)$ an admissible system on A , and let I be a two-sided ideal of A which is generated by a unital Gröbner basis:

$$\mathcal{G} = \{g_\gamma \mid \gamma \in \Gamma\}.$$

Then, in the division algorithm, we may choose $h_i \in I$ so that $h_i = g_{\gamma_i}$ for some $\gamma_i \in \Gamma$.

Proof. Let us set $h := h_i$, $f := f_i$ to stop the proliferation of subscripts. Then, since $\mathcal{G} = \{g_\gamma \mid \gamma \in \mathcal{G}\}$ is a Gröbner basis, we may write:

$$h = \sum_{k \in K} r_k u_k g_{\gamma_k} v_k \tag{1}$$

with $r_k \in R^*$, $u_k, v_k \in \mathcal{T}$ and $\gamma_k \in \Gamma$. Denote $\alpha := \mathbf{LT}(h)$. As we are free to choose our representation (Eqn. 1) of h as we wish, we may choose one so that α is minimal with respect to the ordering \ll . Denote:

$$T := \{k \in K \mid \mathbf{LT}(u_k g_{\gamma_k} v_k) = \alpha\}.$$

We can further choose a representation of h so that $|T|$ is minimal. If $|T| = 1$ we are done. Otherwise, let $k_1 \neq k_2 \in T$, and denote $c_{k_i} := \mathbf{LC}(u_{k_i} g_{\gamma_{k_i}} v_{k_i})$. By the assumption that \mathcal{G} was a unital Gröbner basis, we have that $c_{k_i} \in R^\times$ so that we may form the S -polynomial:

$$S := r_{k_2} \frac{c_{k_2}}{c_{k_1}} u_{k_1} g_{\gamma_{k_1}} v_{k_1} - r_{k_2} u_{k_2} g_{\gamma_{k_2}} v_{k_2}.$$

Then we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
h &= r_{k_1} u_{k_1} g_{\gamma_{k_1}} u_{k_1} + r_{k_2} u_{k_2} g_{\gamma_{k_2}} u_{k_2} + \sum_{k \neq k_1, k_2} r_k u_k g_{\gamma_k} u_k \\
&= r_{k_1} u_{k_1} g_{\gamma_{k_1}} u_{k_1} + \begin{pmatrix} r_{k_2} \frac{c_{k_2}}{c_{k_1}} u_{k_1} g_{\gamma_{k_1}} v_{k_1} \\ -r_{k_2} \frac{c_{k_2}}{c_{k_1}} u_{k_1} g_{\gamma_{k_1}} v_{k_1} \end{pmatrix} + r_{k_2} u_{k_2} g_{\gamma_{k_2}} u_{k_2} \\
&\quad + \sum_{k \neq k_1, k_2} r_k u_k g_{\gamma_k} u_k \\
&= \left(r_{k_1} - r_{k_2} \frac{c_{k_2}}{c_{k_1}} \right) u_{k_1} g_{\gamma_{k_1}} v_{k_1} - S + \sum_{k \neq k_1, k_2} r_k u_k g_{\gamma_k} u_k.
\end{aligned}$$

We have two possibilities. The first is that we may have succeeded in canceling all terms with leading term α , which contradicts the minimality of α . The second is that $\mathbf{LT}(S) \ll \alpha$. Then, we have written h with no more than $|T| - 1$ terms containing α , contradicting the minimality of T . Thus, we may conclude that for such a minimal representation we must have $|T| = 1$ as desired. ■

Theorem 5. *Let (\mathcal{T}, \ll) be an admissible system on A . Let I be a two-sided ideal of A with a unital Gröbner basis \mathcal{G} . Then we have an isomorphism of R -modules:*

$$A \cong I \oplus \tilde{o}(\mathcal{G}).$$

Proof. Let f be an element of A . Then the division algorithm allows us to write:

$$f = g + \tilde{f}$$

with $g \in o(I)$ and $\tilde{f} \in I$. By (Lem. 4) we see that we can take $g \in \tilde{o}(\mathcal{G})$. As f is arbitrary in A , we then have $A = I + \tilde{o}(\mathcal{G})$. The theorem will follow if we can show that this sum is direct, which in turn will follow from showing that r is unique. Suppose that the division algorithm produces two representations for f :

$$f = \tilde{f} + g = \tilde{f}' + g'.$$

Then we have $\tilde{f} - \tilde{f}' \in I$ so that $g - g' \in I$. Now assume that $g - g' \neq 0$, then (Lem. 4) shows that if there is some $h \in I$ such that $\mathbf{LT}(h)|r - r'|$ then there is some $g_\gamma \in \mathcal{G}$ such that $\mathbf{LT}(g_\gamma)|g - g'$. But then, by construction of g and g' , we know that there is no such g_γ and we will have a contradiction by taking $h = g - g'$. ■

Proposition 6. *Let (\mathcal{T}, \ll) be an admissible system on A . Let $\alpha \in \mathcal{T}$ and suppose that $f_1, \dots, f_n \in A$ satisfy $\mathbf{LT}(f_i) = \alpha$ and $\mathbf{LC}(f_i) \in R^\times$. Then, if:*

$$f := \sum_i c_i f_i \quad c_i \in R^*$$

satisfies $\mathbf{LT}(f) < \alpha$ then we may write:

$$f = \sum_{i \neq j} d_{i,j} S_{i,j}$$

where the $S_{i,j}$ are the S -polynomials about f_i and f_j given by:

$$S_{i,j} := \frac{1}{a_i} f_i - \frac{1}{a_j} f_j \quad a_i := \mathbf{LC}(f_i), a_j := \mathbf{LC}(f_j) \in R^\times.$$

Proof. Because we have a cancellation of the terms of f_i involving α we have that $\sum_i c_i = 0$. Then:

$$\begin{aligned} f &= c_1 f_1 + \cdots + c_n f_n \\ &= c_1 a_1 \left(\frac{1}{a_1} f_1 \right) + \cdots + c_n a_n \left(\frac{1}{a_n} f_n \right) \\ &= c_1 a_1 \left(\frac{1}{a_1} f_1 - \frac{1}{a_2} f_2 \right) + (c_1 a_1 + c_2 a_2) \left(\frac{1}{a_2} f_2 - \frac{1}{a_3} f_3 \right) + \cdots \\ &\quad + (c_1 a_1 + \cdots + c_{n-1} a_{n-1}) \left(\frac{1}{a_{n-1}} f_{n-1} - \frac{1}{a_n} f_n \right) + (c_1 a_1 + \cdots + c_n a_n) \frac{1}{a_n} f_n \\ &= c_1 a_1 S_{1,2} + (c_1 a_1 + c_2 a_2) S_{2,3} + \cdots \\ &\quad + (c_1 a_1 + \cdots + c_{n-1} a_{n-1}) S_{n-1,n} + 0 \frac{1}{a_n} f_n \end{aligned}$$

which gives the desired result. ■

Theorem 7 (Buchberger). *Let $(\mathcal{T}, <)$ be an admissible system on A . Let $I \leq A$ be an ideal generated by a unital set:*

$$\mathcal{G} := \{g_\gamma \mid \gamma \in \Gamma\}$$

for some index set Γ . Then \mathcal{G} is a Gröbner basis for I if and only if all S -polynomials for \mathcal{G} have zero remainder under the division algorithm.

Proof. We show that if all S -polynomials reduce to zero and $f \in I$, then f has a Gröbner basis representation. As \mathcal{G} generates I we may choose a representation of f as:

$$f = \sum_i h_i g_{\gamma_i} h'_i \quad h_i, h'_i \in A \quad \gamma_i \in \Gamma. \quad (2)$$

As A has an R -basis given by \mathcal{T} then we may write $h_i = \sum_{k \in K} c_k t_k$, $h'_i = \sum_{k' \in K'} c'_{k'} t'_{k'}$ with $c_k, c'_{k'} \in R^*$ and $t_k, t'_{k'} \in \mathcal{T}$, so that we have:

$$f = \sum_{i,k,k'} c_k c'_{k'} t_k g_i t'_{k'}.$$

If for some representation of f as in (Eqn. 2) we have for all $t_k g_i t'_{k'} \neq 0$ that $\mathbf{LT}(t_k g_i t'_{k'}) \leq \mathbf{LT}(f)$ then we are done. Otherwise, let us suppose that

for all such representations of f we have that the maximal term appearing, $\alpha := \max \{\mathbf{LT}(h_i g_i h'_i)\}$, is such that $\alpha > \mathbf{LT}(f)$. Over all such representations we may choose one so that α is minimal. We will now produce a new representation for f whose corresponding maximal term is strictly less than α , thereby obtaining a contradiction. To this end, let us define $T := \{i | \mathbf{LT}(h_i g_i h'_i) = \alpha\}$ and:

$$g := \sum_{i \in T} \mathbf{LT}(h_i) g_i \mathbf{LT}(h'_i)$$

so that each term of $f - g$ has a leading term less than α . As \mathcal{G} is assumed to be unital, we have that $a_i := \mathbf{LC}(\mathbf{LT}(h_i) g_i \mathbf{LT}(h'_i)) \in R^\times$ so that we may apply (Prop. 6) to g and write:

$$g = \sum_{i \neq j \in T} d_{i,j} S_{i,j} \quad (3)$$

where the $S_{i,j}$'s are the the S -polynomials about $\mathbf{LT}(h_i) g_i \mathbf{LT}(h'_i)$ and $\mathbf{LT}(h_j) g_j \mathbf{LT}(h'_j)$ given by:

$$S_{i,j} := \frac{1}{a_i} \mathbf{LT}(h_i) g_i \mathbf{LT}(h'_i) - \frac{1}{a_j} \mathbf{LT}(h_i) g_j \mathbf{LT}(h'_j).$$

But then, the $S_{i,j}$'s are also S -polynomials about g_i and g_j , so that we have, by assumption, that they reduce to zero on the division algorithm, i.e. that:

$$S_{i,j} = \sum_l \lambda_{l,i,j} u_{l,i,j} g_{l,i,j} v_{l,i,j} \quad u_{l,i,j}, v_{l,i,j} \in \mathcal{T}, \quad \lambda_{l,i,j} \in R^* \quad g_{l,i,j} \in \mathcal{G}. \quad (4)$$

As $\mathbf{LT}(S_{i,j}) < \alpha$ we see that by substituting (Eqn. 4) into (Eqn. 3) we are able to write g , and thus f , in the form of (Eqn. 2) such that the leading term of each term of the sum is strictly less than α , our desired contradiction. \blacksquare

2 Deformation Quantization

We use the results of the previous section to give an algebraic proof of deformation quantization. Throughout this section we take R_0 to be a commutative ring (with unity) and $R = R_0[[\hbar]]$ to be the valuation ring with $\mathbf{val}(\hbar^k) := k$. We let V be a free (discrete) R_0 -module, and denote $B := \mathbf{S}V$ the symmetric R_0 algebra on V . We define $A := B \otimes_{R_0} R[[\hbar]]$. We denote by \cdot the commutative multiplications of B and A .

Although there are more general definitions of a Poisson structure simplified definition relevant to our situation.

Definition 8.

8.1. A *Poisson structure* on B is a R_0 -bi-linear bi-derivation:

$$B \hat{\otimes}_{R_0} B \xrightarrow{\{\cdot, \cdot\}} B$$

which is skew-symmetric and satisfies the Jacobi identity.

8.2. A *formal Poisson structure* on A is a R -linear skew-symmetric bilinear pairing $\{ , \}_{\text{for}}$ on A satisfying the Jacobi identity, such that writing:

$$\{ , \}_{\text{for}} := \sum_{k \geq 1} \hbar^k \{ , \}_{\text{for},k}$$

we have that $\{ , \}_{\text{for},k}$ is a bi-derivation.

We note that any Poisson structure on B induces a formal Poisson structure on A via $\{ , \}_{\text{for}} := \hbar \{ , \}$.

Definition 9. Let $\{ , \}$ be a Poisson structure on B . Then, a *deformation quantization* of $(B, \{ , \})$ is a unital associative R -algebra structure \star on A such that writing:

$$\star = \cdot + \sum_{k \geq 1} \star_k \hbar^k$$

one has:

$$\{b, b'\} = \star_1(b, b') - \star_1(b', b)$$

for all $b, b' \in B$.

Proposition 10 (PBW). Let $\{ , \}_{\text{for}}$ be a formal Poisson structure on A . Let \mathbf{TV} be the free R -algebra generated by V . Let I be the (closed two-sided) ideal in \mathbf{TV} :

$$I := (xx' - x'x - \{x, x'\}_{\text{for}} \mid x, x' \in V)$$

Then there is an R -module isomorphism:

$$\mathbf{TV}/I \cong A.$$

Proof. Choose a R_0 -module basis of V :

$$V = R_0\{x_i \mid i \in \Lambda\}$$

for Λ an indexing set well-ordered by $<$. We define:

$$\mathcal{T} := \{ \text{finite length words in the } x_i \text{'s} \}$$

which we give the graded lexicographic ordering (which we may also denote by $<$). The (\mathcal{T}, \ll) give an admissible system. It is clear that the set:

$$\mathcal{G} := \{g_{j,i} := x_j x_i - x_i x_j - \{x_j, x_i\}_{\text{for}} \mid i < j\}$$

generates I and is in fact a unital subset of \mathbf{TV} with $\mathbf{LT}(g_{j,i}) = x_j x_i$. The fact that it is a Gröbner basis follows from the Jacobi identity (c.f [12], [10]) by use of (Thm. 7). By virtue of (Thm. 5), it follows that we have the desired R -isomorphism given by terms $x_{i_1}^{e_1} \cdots x_{i_n}^{e_n}$ for $x_{i_1} < \cdots < x_{i_n}$. ■

Theorem 11. Let $\{ , \}_{\text{for}}$ be a formal Poisson structure on A . Then there exists a deformation quantization of A .

Proof. Let us adopt the notation of (Prop. 10) and its proof. We see that the associative algebra \mathbf{TV}/I has an R -module (pseudo)-basis given by the $x_1^{e_1} \cdots x_n^{e_n}$ with $x_1 < \cdots < x_n$. Denote the isomorphism of (Prop. 10) as:

$$A \xrightarrow{\phi_{<}} \mathbf{TV}/I$$

and denote by \star the algebra structure on \mathbf{TV}/I . We obtain by *transport* an associative R -algebra structure on A via:

$$f \star_{<} g := \phi_{<}^{-1}(\phi_{<}(f) \star \phi_{<}(g))$$

■

The division algorithm is, in effect, a rule for computing $f \star g$ for formal functions in f and g . It essentially says that one computes $f \star g$ concentrating on the lowest powers of \hbar applying the rule g_{j_i} whenever you have an $x_j x_i$ appearing with $j > i$. We now discuss some evident properties of the deformation quantization.

Remark 12.

12.1. It is clear that choosing a different ordering $<$ on Λ does not affect the algebra structure on \mathbf{TV}/I . We note, in particular, that we have for $x_i < x_j$ that the isomorphism ϕ obtained from the division algorithm gives:

$$\begin{aligned} x_i \star_{<} x_j &\equiv x_i x_j \pmod{\hbar^2} \\ x_j \star_{<} x_i &\equiv x_i x_j + \hbar \{x_j, x_i\}_{\text{for}, 1} \pmod{\hbar^2}. \end{aligned}$$

If $<'$ is another choice of ordering on Λ , we have that $\star_{<}$ and $\star_{<'}$ are *Gauge equivalent* via $\phi_{<' }^{-1} \circ \phi_{<}$.

12.2. If $\{ , \}_{\text{for}} = \hbar \{ , \}$ for some Poisson structure on A , it follows that for $f, g \in A$ we have $f \star_{<} g - g \star_{<} f = \hbar \{f, g\}$ and thus we have our deformation quantization.

12.3. The ordering $<$ for the basis x_i of V induces an embedding $A \xrightarrow{\iota_{<}} \mathbf{TV}$ which satisfies $\phi_{<} = q \circ \iota_{<}$ where $\mathbf{TV} \xrightarrow{q} \mathbf{TV}/I$ is the quotient map. From this, one sees easily that if $f \in (A, \cdot)$ satisfies $\{f, \}_{\text{for}} = 0$, then f is in the center of $(A, \star_{<})$.

12.4. Let us now assume that $\mathbb{K} = R_0$ is in fact a \mathbb{Q} -algebra. One can symmetrize the situation (c.f [2]) by defining $\phi_{\text{sym}} := A \longrightarrow \mathbf{TV}/I$ via:

$$\phi_{\text{sym}}(x_1 \cdots x_n) := \frac{1}{n!} \sum_{\sigma \in \Sigma_n} x_{\sigma(1)} \cdots x_{\sigma(n)}$$

where $x_i \in V$ and where Σ_n denotes the permutations on $\{1, \dots, n\}$. We then define:

$$\star_{\text{sym}} := \phi_{\text{sym}}^{-1} \circ \star \circ (\phi_{\text{sym}} \hat{\otimes} \phi_{\text{sym}})$$

It follows (c.f. [4], [2]) that this satisfies:

$$f \star_{\text{sym}} g \equiv fg + \hbar \frac{1}{2} \{f, g\}_{\text{for}, 1} \pmod{\hbar^2}$$

for $f, g \in \mathbf{SV}$. One sees that \star_{sym} is Gauge equivalent to $\star_{<}$. It follows that for V finite dimensional over \mathbb{K} , that the star products are independent, up to gauge equivalence, of the choice of basis of V chosen.

12.5. As we have constructed our deformation quantization in a manner completely analogous to the case of a universal enveloping algebra, our deformation quantization enjoys the analogous universal mapping properties. In particular a map:

$$(B, \{, \}) \xrightarrow{\psi} (B', \{, \}')$$

induces a unique map between their deformation quantizations.

12.6. Assume that $R_0 = \mathbb{K}$ is a \mathbb{Q} -algebra. By the work of [4], we see that the terms of \star_{sym} by expressed as bi-differential operators. We also remark that [6] examines the connections between Kontsevich's deformation quantization [7] and the Baker-Campbell-Hausdorff formula, especially in regards to the case of a linear Poisson structure.

It is not immediately evident, proceeding as above, that we obtain the stronger result of [7] where a bijection is given between formal Poisson structures on B and deformation quantizations modulo their respective gauge equivalences. What is lacking in the above is a constructive method of obtaining a formal Poisson structure from a Gauge equivalence class of a deformation quantization. If (A, \star) is a deformation quantization, and define $\{, \} := \star - \star\tau$ where $\tau(a \otimes b) = b \otimes a$ is the *transposition* map. One knows that $\{, \}$ is a Poisson structure on A with respect to \star . One also know that, writing $\{, \} := \sum_{k \geq 1} \hbar^k \{, \}_k$, that $\{, \}_1$ is a Poisson structure on B (with respect to the algebra structure \cdot). It is not evident that $\{, \}_k$ for $k > 1$ is a bi-derivation with respect to \cdot , and thus we cannot conclude $\{, \}$ is a formal Poisson structure.

12.7. Assume that $R_0 = \mathbb{K}$ is a \mathbb{Q} -algebra, and $V = \mathbb{K}\{x_1 < \dots < x_n\}$ is finite dimensional. Suppose that ψ is a *formal coordinate change* of A , i.e.:

$$\psi_i = \sum_{k \geq 0} \hbar^k \psi_{k,i}$$

with $\psi_{k,i} \in B$ such that the matrix $(\psi_{0,i})_{1 \leq i \leq n}$ is in fact given by:

$$(\psi_{0,i}) = M \begin{pmatrix} x_1 \\ \vdots \\ x_n \end{pmatrix}$$

for some $M \in \mathbf{GL}_n(\mathbb{K})$.

Now ψ induces an automorphism of \mathbf{TV}/I , which we also denote by ψ . Defining $\star_{\text{sym},\psi}$ by transport of \star via $\psi \circ \phi_{\text{sym}}$, it follows that we have a Gauge equivalence between \star_{sym} and $\star_{\text{sym},\psi}$.

12.8. As suggested by [15, Cor. 3.24], one should be able to replace B by any algebra B' admitting an étale morphism from B . For a more general situation, one may be able to make use of the notion of a splay algebra [9].

References

- [1] Bezrukavnikov, R; Kaledin, D; “Fedosov quantization in positive characteristic.” *math.AG/0501247*.
- [2] Cannas da Silva, A; Weinstein, A; “Geometric models for noncommutative algebras.” *Berkeley Mathematics Lecture Notes* **10** American Mathematical Society, Providence, 1999.
- [3] Cattaneo, S; Felder, G; Tomassini, L; “From local to global deformation quantization of Poisson manifolds.” *Duke Mathematics Journal* **115** (2002) no. 2, 329–352.
- [4] Cortiñas, G; “An explicit formula for PBW quantization.” *Communications in Algebra* **30** (2002) no. 4, 1705–1713.
- [5] Dieudonné, J; “Introduction to the theory of formal groups.” *Pure and Applied Mathematics* **20** Marcel Dekker, Inc., New York, 1973.
- [6] Kathotia, V; “Kontsevich’s universal formula for deformation quantization and the Campbell-Baker-Hausdorff formula.” *International Journal of Mathematics* **11** (2000) no. 4, 523–551.
- [7] Kontsevich, M; “Deformation quantization of Poisson manifolds.” *Letters in Mathematical Physics* **66** (2003) no. 3, 157–216.
- [8] Kontsevich, M; “Deformation quantization of algebraic varieties.” *Letters in Mathematical Physics* **56** (2001) no. 3, 271–294.
- [9] Leitner, F; “Noncommutative Formal Groups In Positive Charactersitic.” *math.RA/0602138*.

- [10] Leitner, F; Pawloski, R; “Unital Gröbner Bases over Arbitrary Commutative Rings.” *math.RA/0409565*.
- [11] Li, H; “Noncommutative Gröbner Bases and Filtered-Graded Transfer.” *Lecture Notes in Mathematics* **1795** Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2002.
- [12] Mora, T; “An Introduction to Commutative and Noncommutative Gröbner Bases”. *Theoretical Computer Science* **134** (1994) 131–173.
- [13] Nest, R; Tsygan, B; “Deformations of symplectic Lie algebroids, deformations of holomorphic symplectic structures, and index theorems.” *Asian Journal of Mathematics* **5** (2001) no. 4, 599–653.
- [14] Tamarkin, D; “Formality of Chain Operad of Little Discs.” *Letters in Mathematical Physics* **66** (2003) no. 1-2, 65–72.
- [15] Yekutieli, A; “Deformation quantization in algebratic geometry”. *Advances in Mathematics* **198** (2005) 383–432.