Title

D. Zack Garza

Thursday 10th September, 2020

Contents

	Thursday, September 10			
	1.1	Proof of Dimension Proposition		1
		1.1.1	Proof that P_1 is principle	1

1 Thursday, September 10

Recall that the dimension of a ring R is the length of the longest chain of prime ideals. Similarly, for an affine variety X, we defined dim X to be the length of the longest chain of irreducible closed subsets.

These notions of dimension of the same when taking R = A(X), i.e. dim $\mathbb{A}^n/k = n$.

Proposition 1.1(Dimensions).

Let $k = \bar{k}$.

- a. The dimension of $k[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ is n.
- b. All maximal chains of prime ideals have length n.

1.1 Proof of Dimension Proposition

The case for n = 0 is trivial, just take $P_0 = \langle 0 \rangle$. For n = 1, easy to see since the only prime ideals in k[x] are $\langle 0 \rangle$ and $\langle x - a \rangle$, since any polynomial factors into linear factors.

Let $P_0 \subsetneq \cdots \subsetneq P_m$ be a maximal chain of prime ideals in $k[x_1, \cdots, x_n]$; we then want to show that m = n. Assume $P_0 = \langle 0 \rangle$, since we can always extend our chain to make this true (using maximality). Then P_1 is a minimal prime and P_m is a maximal ideal (and maximals are prime).

Claim: P_1 is principle, i.e. $P_1 = \langle f \rangle$ for some irreducible f.

1.1.1 Proof that P_1 is principle

Claim: $k[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ is a unique factorization domain. This follows since k is a UFD since it's a field, and R a UFD $\implies R[x]$ is a UFD for any R.

See Gauss' lemma.

Claim: In a UFD, minimal primes are principal. Let $r \in P$, and write $r = u \prod p_i^{n_i}$ with p_i irreducible and u a unit. So some $p_i \in P$, and p_i irreducible implies $\langle p_i \rangle$ is prime. Since $0 \subsetneq \langle p_i \rangle \subset P$, but P was prime and assumed minimal, so $\langle p_i \rangle = P$.

The idea is to now transfer the chain $P_0 \subsetneq \cdots \subsetneq P_m$ to a maximal chain in $k[x_1, \cdots, x_{n-1}]$. The first step is to make a linear change of coordinates so that f is monic in the variable x_n .

Example 1.1.

Take $f = x_1 x_2 + x_3^2 x_4$ and map $x_3 \mapsto x_3 + x_4$.

So write

$$f(x_1,\dots,x_n)=x_n^d+f_1(x_1,\dots,x_{n-1})x_n^{d-1}+\dots+f_d(x_1,\dots,x_{n-1}).$$

We can then descend to $k[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ to $k[x_1, \dots, x_n]/\langle f \rangle$:

The first set of downward arrows denote taking the quotient, and the upward is taking inverse images, and this preserves strict inequalities.

Definition 1.1.1 (Integral Extension).

An *integral* ring extension $R \hookrightarrow R'$ of R is one such that all $r' \in R'$ satisfying a monic polynomial with coefficients in R, where R' is finitely generated.

In this case, also implies that R' is a finitely-generated R module.

In this case, $k[x_1, \dots, x_{n-1}] \hookrightarrow k[x_1, \dots, x_n]/\langle f \rangle$ is an integral extension. We want to show that the intersection step above also preserves strictness of inclusions, since it preserves primality.

Lemma 1.2.

Suppose $P', Q' \subset R'$ are distinct prime ideals with $R \hookrightarrow R'$ an integral extension. Then if $P' \cap R = Q' \cap R$, neither contains the other, i.e. $P' \not\subset Q'$ and $Q' \not\subset P'$.

Proof.

Toward a contradiction, suppose $P' \subset Q'$, we then want to show that $Q' \supset P'$. Let $a \in Q' \setminus P'$ (again toward a contradiction), then

$$R/(P'\cap R)\hookrightarrow R'/P'$$

is integral.

Then $\bar{a} \neq 0$ in R'/P', and there exists a monic polynomial of minimal degree that \bar{a} satisfies,

 $p(x)=x^n+\sum_{i=2}^n \bar{c}_i x^{n-i}$. This implies $\bar{c}_n\in Q'/P'$ (which will contradict $c_n\in P'$), since if $\bar{c}_n=0$ then factoring out x yields a lower degree polynomial that \bar{a} satisfies. But then $\bar{a}_n\in Q'\cap R$, so ???

Question: Given $R \hookrightarrow R'$ is an integral extension, can we lift chains of prime ideals?

Answer: Yes, by the "Going Up" Theorem: given $P \subset R$ prime, there exists $P' \subset R'$ prime such that $P' \cap R = P$. Furthermore, we can lift $P_1 \subset P_2$ to $P'_1 \subset P'_2$, as well as "lifting sandwiches"