



planetmath.org

Math for the people, by the people.

equivalent definitions for UFD

Canonical name	EquivalentDefinitionsForUFD
Date of creation	2013-03-22 19:04:04
Last modified on	2013-03-22 19:04:04
Owner	joking (16130)
Last modified by	joking (16130)
Numerical id	4
Author	joking (16130)
Entry type	Theorem
Classification	msc 13G05
Related topic	UniqueFactorizationAndIdealsInRingOfIntegers

Let  $R$  be an integral domain. Define

$$T = \{u \in R \mid u \text{ is invertible}\} \cup \{p_1 \cdots p_n \in R \mid p_i \text{ is prime}\}.$$

Of course  $0 \notin T$  and  $T$  is a multiplicative subset (recall that a prime element multiplied by an invertible element is again prime). Furthermore  $R$  is a UFD if and only if  $T = R \setminus \{0\}$  (see the parent object for more details).

**Lemma.** If  $a, b \in R$  are such that  $ab \in T$ , then both  $a, b \in T$ .

*Proof.* If  $ab$  is invertible, then (since  $R$  is commutative) both  $a, b$  are invertible and thus they belong to  $T$ . Therefore assume that  $ab$  is not invertible. Then

$$ab = p_1 \cdots p_k$$

for some prime elements  $p_i \in R$ . We can group these prime elements in such way that  $p_1 \cdots p_n$  divides  $a$  and  $p_{n+1} \cdots p_k$  divides  $b$ . Thus  $a = \alpha p_1 \cdots p_n$  and  $b = \beta p_{n+1} \cdots p_k$  for some  $\alpha, \beta \in R$ . Since  $R$  is an integral domain we conclude that  $\alpha\beta = 1$ , which means that both  $\alpha, \beta$  are invertible in  $R$ . Therefore (for example)  $\alpha p_1$  is prime and thus  $a \in T$ . Analogously  $b \in T$ , which completes the proof.  $\square$

**Theorem. (Kaplansky)** An integral domain  $R$  is a UFD if and only if every nonzero prime ideal in  $R$  contains prime element.

*Proof.* Without loss of generality we may assume that  $R$  is not a field, because the thesis trivially holds for fields. In this case  $R$  always contains nonzero prime ideal (just take a maximal ideal).

„ $\Rightarrow$ ” Let  $P$  be a nonzero prime ideal. In particular  $P$  is proper, thus there is nonzero  $x \in P$  which is not invertible. By assumption  $x \in T$  and since  $x$  is not invertible, then there are prime elements  $p_1, \dots, p_k \in R$  such that  $x = p_1 \cdots p_k \in P$ . But  $P$  is prime, therefore there is  $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$  such that  $p_i \in P$ , which completes this part.

„ $\Leftarrow$ ” Assume that  $R$  is not a UFD. Thus there is a nonzero  $x \in R$  such that  $x \notin T$ . Consider an ideal  $(x)$ . We will show, that  $(x) \cap T = \emptyset$ . Assume that there is  $r \in R$  such that  $rx \in T$ . It follows that  $x \in T$  (by lemma). Contradiction.

Since  $(x) \cap T = \emptyset$  and  $T$  is a multiplicative subset, then there is a prime ideal  $P$  in  $R$  such that  $(x) \subseteq P$  and  $P \cap T = \emptyset$  (please, see <http://planetmath.org/MultiplicativeSubset> entry for more details). But we assumed that every nonzero prime ideal contains prime element (and  $P$  is nonzero, since  $x \in P$ ). Obtained contradiction completes the proof.  $\square$