

MathOverflow is a question and answer site for professional mathematicians. It only takes a minute to sign up.

Anybody can ask a question



Anybody can answer

Sign up to join this community

The best answers are voted up and rise to the top



## Classification of finite commutative rings

Asked 14 years, 1 month ago   Modified 8 years, 1 month ago   Viewed 11k times



41



Is there a classification of finite commutative rings available? If not, what are the best structure theorem that are known at present? All I know is a result that every finite commutative ring is a direct product of local commutative rings (this is correct, right?) in some paper which computes the size of the general linear group over that ring.

ac.commutative-algebra

Share   Cite   Improve this question   Follow

asked Nov 29, 2009 at 13:22



Puraṭci Vinnani

6 I'd guess you know this already, but Wedderburn's little theorem provides a nice dichotomy (every finite commutative ring is either a field or has zero divisors) although it's far from a complete structure theorem. – [Harrison Brown](#) Nov 29, 2009 at 19:32

Some progress has been made: [doi.org/10.2140/involve.2023.16.151](https://doi.org/10.2140/involve.2023.16.151) – [Thrash](#) Jun 18, 2023 at 21:22

### 4 Answers

Sorted by: Highest score (default)



17



Yes, a finite ring  $R$  is a finite direct sum of local finite rings. As a first step, for each prime  $p$  there is a subring  $R_p$  of  $R$  corresponding to the elements annihilated by the powers of  $p$ .  ~~$R_p$  is then an algebra over  $\mathbb{Z}/p$ .~~  $R_p$  then resembles an algebra over  $\mathbb{Z}/p$  and it could be one, but it can also have a more complicated structure as an abelian  $p$ -group (see below). This step generalizes to maximal ideals: For each maximal ideal  $m$ ,  $R_m$  is the subring of elements annihilated by  $m^n$  for some  $n$ , and  $R$  is the direct sum of these subrings, which are local rings.



It is not difficult to write down a rough partial classification of local finite rings. If  $R$  is local with maximal ideal  $m$ , it resembles an algebra over the finite field  $F = R/m$ ; the associated graded ring is such an algebra. If you choose a basis  $x_1, \dots, x_n$  for  $m/m^2$ , then  $R$  or its associated graded is a quotient of the polynomial ring  $F[\vec{x}]$  in which only finitely many monomials are non-zero. You can make a diagram of these non-zero monomials; they can be any order ideal in the  $n$ -dimensional orthant. Or, in basis-independent form,  $R$  has a length, which is the largest nonvanishing power of  $m$ , and each  $m^k/m^{k+1}$  is some quotient of the  $k$ th symmetric power of the generating vector space  $V = m/m^2$ .

After that, the non-zero monomials may be linearly dependent (and never mind that  $R$  might be more complicated than its associated graded). Informally, there will be an endless stream of partial results and there will never be a complete classification when the length of the local ring is 3 or more. To see this, suppose that  $m^4 = 0$ , and suppose that  $m^3$  is only one dimension shy of  $S^3(V)$ . Then the ring is defined by an arbitrary symmetric trilinear form in  $V$ . These make a "wild" sequence of algebraic varieties, in the same sense that people say that the representation theories of certain rings are wild. For instance, I think (not quite sure) that it is NP-hard to determine when two such trilinear forms are equivalent. NP-hardness is not by itself rigorously equivalent to no classification, but informally the classification is an intractable mess.

If the nonvanishing monomials in  $R$  are linearly independent, then it is a toric local ring. Toric local rings are certainly a tractable class of finite rings.

The situation is similar to non-commutative  $p$ -groups, which are also wild and will never be classified. In both cases, certain classes have a nice structure. It is also interesting to make estimates for how many there are.

**Note:** Corrected per comment.

Share Cite Improve this answer

Follow

edited Nov 28, 2015 at 14:46



Matemáticos Chibchas

answered Nov 29, 2009 at 17:44



Greg Kuperberg

- 3 These two assertions: " $R_p$  is then an algebra over  $\mathbb{Z}/p$ ." and "If  $R$  is local with maximal ideal  $m$ , it is an algebra over the finite field  $F=R/m$ ." -- are obviously wrong, as applied to finite rings, in general. Take  $R = R_p = R_m = \mathbb{Z}/p^n\mathbb{Z}$ ,  $n > 1$ . – [Leonid Positselski](#) Nov 29, 2009 at 18:23

Oh blech, I forgot all about non-split extensions. Thank you for that correction. – [Greg Kuperberg](#) Nov 29, 2009 at 18:53



20



This is a very interesting question related to the Hilbert scheme  $\text{Hilb}^n(\mathbb{A}^d)$  classifying  $n$  points in affine space  $\mathbb{A}^d$ . I don't think there is a classification but there is an estimate for the number of commutative rings of order  $\leq N$ . It is

$$\exp\left[\frac{2}{27} \frac{\log(N)^3}{(\log 2)^2} + O(\log(N)^{\frac{8}{3}})\right] \quad \text{for } N \rightarrow \infty$$



The proof of this result due to Bjorn Poonen and of many related interesting theorems is in [his article](#)

You will also find astonishing conjectures in the article like:

The fraction of local rings of order  $\leq N$  among all commutative rings  $A$  of order  $\leq N$  tends to 1. Same limit 1 for the fraction of rings "of characteristic 8" in the sense that  $8 \cdot 1_A = 0$  but  $4 \cdot 1_A \neq 0$ .

Share Cite Improve this answer

edited Jan 5, 2010 at 9:17

answered Nov 29, 2009 at 15:32

Follow



Georges Elencwajg



The characterization of [Artinian rings](#) is relevant of course. See also the book "Finite commutative rings and their applications" and [this web page](#).

11

Share Cite Improve this answer

edited Nov 29, 2009 at 14:26

answered Nov 29, 2009 at 13:57

Follow



lhf



As always one should check out the OEIS for questions of this type. In this case see <http://oeis.org/A027623>

6

Share Cite Improve this answer Follow

answered Dec 1, 2010 at 6:22



Edwin Clark



4 Rather see [oeis.org/A037289](http://oeis.org/A037289) which is specific to commutative rings. – Charles Jul 10, 2012 at 13:38

3 Or even see [oeis.org/A127707](http://oeis.org/A127707) which is specific to commutative *unital* rings. – Watson Apr 28, 2021 at 17:43