Symbolic powers of ideals defining F-pure rings joint work with Craig Huneke Michigan Commutative Algebra Seminar January 12, 2016

R RLR, containing a field

I ER nadical ideal

h = max hight of an associated prime of I

Symbolic Powers of I:

I prime ~ P(n) = PR ∩ R = {f ∈ R: f s ∈ P, fa some s € P}

$$\underline{T}^{(n)} = \bigcap (\underline{T}^n R_{\underline{r}} \cap R)$$

$$\underline{R} \in AW(R/\underline{T})$$

Note: I's I'n general, I'n & I'n

Example (recaulary)  $I = (\chi_Z - y^2, \chi^3 - y^2, \chi^3 y - z^2) \subseteq k[\chi, y, Z]$ Can show that  $fh - g^2 = \chi_2 = g \in Z^2$ , but  $g \notin Z^2$  for degree 9easons

Pioaperme, H7=2~~7=Ker(R-K[t],x+t3y++4,2++5)

Example not in polynomial rung: p=(x,y) in  $R=\frac{\kappa(x,y,z)}{(x^n-yz)}:y \notin p^n$ ,  $y \in p^{(n)}$ Check:  $yz=x^n \in p^n$ ,  $z \notin p \Rightarrow y \in p^{(n)}$ 

Question When is I'm I'm?

Theorem (Ein-Lazersfeld-Smith 2001, Hochster-Huneke 2002)

I (An) C In

Comments: ELS forst proved the theorem in char O

HH used char p>0 techniques (tight closure), reduction to char p.

this does not completely answer the guestion.

Example (\*)  $h=2 \text{ no } P^{(4)} \subseteq P^2$  by the theorem But actually  $P^{(3)} \subseteq P^2$ 

Conjecture (Harbonome, < 2008) I(kn-h+1) < In

Note: When h=2, the Connecture says  $T^{(2n-1)} \subseteq T^n$ 

Note there are examples of star configurations of points. With  $T^{(hn-h)} \notin T^n$ 

Facts: the conjecture holds for:

- · I in char 2 (Huneke)
- · Monomial ideals in any characteristic
- · General points in  $\mathbb{P}^2(Hattu)$  and  $\mathbb{P}^3(Dumnicki)$

other exist ideals of points in k[x,y,z] with k=q,  $T^{(3)} \notin T^2$  (first example found by Dumnicki, Szemberg, Tutaj-Gasińska)

However, there are good reasons to believe the Conjecture holds for nice classes of ideals in char p>0:

theorem (HH, 2007)  $R/_{I}$  F-pure,  $h=2 \Rightarrow I^{(3)} \subseteq I^{2}$ theorem (Takogi-Yoshida, 2007, Hodhster-Huneke, 2007)  $R/_{I}$  F-pure  $\Rightarrow I^{(4n-1)} \subseteq I^{n}$ 

In posticular, Harbourne's Conjecture holds when h=2. So what is an T-pure ring?

R of charp>0, reduced (no nilpotents), F-finite

R in F-pure if MOR 10F, MOR is injective YR-word M

Fedder's Guterian (83) (R,m) RLR, charp>0, IER ideal.

R/I F-pure  $\iff$   $T^{[q]}: T \not\in m^{[q]} \quad \forall q=p^e >> 0$ 

theorem (-, Huneke) R/T F-price  $\Rightarrow Vn>1$   $T^{(Rn-R+1)} \subseteq T^n$ . T dea of proof: show that  $(T^{[q]}:T) \subseteq (T^n:T^{(Rn-R+1)})^{[q]}, q>0$ . This was several technical lemmas by Hodster-Huneke.

Remark: Stanley-Reioner rings (own a field of char p>0)

We I pure, so we recover the result for (squarefree) monomial ideals.

Remark Is the Containment But the proof is.

Can we expecialize R/I more and get highter containments R of charp >0, reduced (no nilpotents), F-finite R in  $\overline{T}$ -pure if  $H \otimes R$   $\xrightarrow{1 \otimes F} H \otimes R$  is injective  $\forall R$ -mixed M R is strongly  $\overline{T}$ -regular if for C not in a minused prime of R  $\exists \phi: R^{1/4} \rightarrow R$   $\phi(c^{1/4})=1$  for all/some/large enough  $q=p^e$ .

## Flassbrenner's Guterian (96)

(R,m) RLR, char p>0, I radical ideal.

R/I strongly F-regular => C(I<sup>[q]</sup>:I) & m<sup>[q]</sup> Vq>>0

theorem (-, Humeke) R/I strongly I-regular => I = Intl

or  $\underline{T}^{(h-1)n+1)} \subseteq \underline{T}^{n+1}$  for all n.

Cordlary P prime of height 2, R/2 Strongly F-regular then  $I^{(n)} = I^n \forall n \geq 1$ 

Example (single)  $T = I_{\mathcal{A}} \left( \begin{bmatrix} a^2 & b & d_{-d} \\ c & a^2 & b^{-d} \end{bmatrix} \right) \subseteq K[a,b,c,d] = R$   $R_{T} \text{ Strongly } F\text{-regular} \implies I^{(n)} = I^n \text{ } \forall n \geq a.$ 

## Proof of theorem (sketch)

Qaim (Id (d)) (I<sup>[q]</sup> I) ≤ (II (d-h+1) : I<sup>(d)</sup>)<sup>[q]</sup> ∀q. ∀d≥R-1

If the claim holds, take  $t \in (\mathbb{I}^d, \mathbb{I}^d)$  not in any minimal prime of I then  $t(\mathbb{I}^{[q]}, \mathbb{I}) \subseteq (\mathbb{I}, \mathbb{I}^{[d-h+1)}, \mathbb{I}^{(d)})^{[q]}$  We the cutorism!

they use induction.