Algebra II Course Notes

Isaac Holt

December 7, 2022

1 Homomorphisms between Rings

Let R and S be two rings. A map $f : R \to S$ is called a (ring)-homomorphism if:

1. $f(1) = 1$
2. $f(a + b) = f(a) + f(b)$
3. $f(ab) = f(a)f(b)$

Lemma 1.0.1. $f(0) = 0$ and $f(-a) = -f(a)$

Proof. $f(0) = f(0 + 0) = f(0) + f(0)$
$0 = f(0) = f(a + (-a)) = f(a) + f(-a)$
Hence $-f(a) = f(-a)$ □

Definition 1.0.2. Two rings R and S are **isomorphic** if there exists a bijective homomorphism between R and S. The map between them is an **isomorphism**. We write $R \cong S$.

Lemma 1.0.3. A homomorphism $f : R \to S$ is injective iff $\ker f = 0$.

Proof. If f is injective, $f(x) = f(y) \Rightarrow x = y$. Assume f is injective. $\ker f = a \in \mathbb{R} : f(a) = 0$ so $f(a) = 0 \Rightarrow f(a) = f(0) \Rightarrow a = 0$.

For the other direction: assume $\ker f = 0$. $f(x) = f(y) \Rightarrow f(x) - f(y) = 0 \Rightarrow f(x) + f(-y) = 0 \Rightarrow f(x - y) = 0 \Rightarrow x - y \in \ker f$. Since $\ker f = 0$, $x - y = 0$ and so $x = y$. □

Definition 1.0.4. Let R and S be two rings.

- The **product** of R and S is defined as $R \times S := \{(r, s) : r \in R, s \in S\}$ which is itself a ring.
- **Addition** is defined as $(r_1, s_1) + (r_2, s_2) := (r_1 + r_2, s_1 + s_2)$.
- **Multiplication** is defined as $(r_1, s_1) \cdot (r_2, s_2) := (r_1 r_2, s_1 s_2)$
- The multiplicative identity is $(1, 1)$.

Definition 1.0.5. We have two ring homomorphisms:

1. $p_1 : R \times S \to R = (r, s) \to r$
2. $p_2 : R \times S \to S = (r, s) \to s$

$\ker p_1 = \{(r, s) \in R \times S : p_1((r, s)) = 0\} = \{(r, s) \in R \times S : r = 0\} = \{(0, s) : s \in S\}$

Remark. Note $\ker p_1$ is not a subring of $R \times S$ since $(1, 1) \notin \ker p_1$.
But we can consider $\ker p_1$ as a ring by taking $(0, 1)$ as the multiplicative identity.
Then $\ker p_1 \cong S$ as we map $(0, s) \to s$.
Similarly, $\ker p_2 \cong R$ and so $\ker p_1 \times \ker p_2 \cong S \times R \cong R \times S$.

Lemma 1.0.6. Let $f : R \to S$ be a ring homomorphism. Then $\ker f$ has the following two properties:

1. $\ker f$ is closed under addition.

2. For every $r \in R$ and $x \ker f$ we have $r \cdot x \in \ker f$ and $x \cdot r \in \ker f$.

Proof. 1. If $x, y \in \ker f$ then $f(x+y) = f(x) + f(y) = 0 + 0 = 0$. That is $x + y \in \ker f$.

2. For every $r \in R$ and $x \ker f$, $f(r \cdot x) = f(r) \cdot f(x) = f(r) \cdot 0 = 0$. Thus $r \cdot x \in \ker f$. Similarly for $x \cdot r$.

$\square$

Definition 1.0.7. Let I be an ideal in a ring R. Then for an element $x \in R$, the **coset** of I generated by x to be the set $\bar{x} := x + I := \{x + r : r \in I\} \subset R$.

x is said to be a representative of this coset.

Lemma 1.0.8. Let $x \in R$ and $y \in R$. Then the following statements are equivalent

1. $x + I = y + I$
2. $x + I \cap y + I \neq \emptyset$
3. $x - y \in I$

Proof. ((1) $\Rightarrow$ (2)) is obvious

((2) $\Rightarrow$ (3)): if $x + I \cap y + I \neq \emptyset$, for some $r_1 \in I, r_2 \in I$, $x + r_1 = y + r_2$ and so $x - y = r_2 - r_1 \in I$.

((3) $\Rightarrow$ (1)): since $x - y \in I$, for some $r' \in I$, $x = y + r'$. Then $x + I = \{x + r : r \in I\} = \{y + r' + r : r \in I\} \subseteq y + I$ as ideals are closed under addition, and $r' + r \in I$. $y + I = \{y + r : r \in I\} = x - r' + r : r \in I \subseteq x + I$ and so $x + I = y + I$. $\square$

Notation: $\bar{x} = \bar{y} \Leftrightarrow x + I = y + I \Leftrightarrow x \equiv y \pmod{I} \Leftrightarrow x - y \in I$

Definition 1.0.9. $R/I := \{\bar{x} : x \in R\} = \{x + I : x \in R\}$ is the set of all distinct cosets of $R \pmod{I}$

Remark. If $R = \mathbb{Z}$ and $I = (n)$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $R/I = \mathbb{Z}/n = \{\bar{0}, \ldots, n \bar{-} 1\}$.

Definition 1.0.10.

- Addition: $(x + I) + (y + I) = x + y + I$
- Multiplication: $(x + I) \cdot (y + I) = xy + I$

A coset $x + I$ has many representatives, for example $x + r$ with $r \in I$ gives the same coset, since $x + r - x = r \in I$.

Assume $x, x' \in R$ such that $x + I = x' + I$ and $y, y' \in R$ such that $y + I = y' + I$.

Proof.
- Addition: $x + I = x' + I \Leftrightarrow x - x' \in I$ and similarly $y - y' \in I$. I is closed under addition so $(x - x') + (y - y') \in I \Leftrightarrow (x + y) - (x' + y') \in I \Leftrightarrow x + y + I = x' + y' + I$.
- $x - x' \in I$ and $y - y' \in I$, so $(x - x')y \in I$ and $x(y - y') \in I$. $(x - x')y + x(y - y') = xy - x'y' \in I \Leftrightarrow xy + I = x'y' + I$.

$\square$

R/I with the two binary operations of addition and multiplication is a ring:

- The zero element is $0 + I$ as $(x + I) + (0 + I) = x + I$.

- The multiplicative identity is $1 + I$.
- All properties follow from the corresponding properties of R:
- e.g. distributivity: $\bar{x} = x + I$, $\bar{y} = y + I$, $\bar{z} = z + I$. $\bar{x}(\bar{y} + \bar{z}) = \bar{x}(\overline{y+z}) = \overline{x(y+z)} = \overline{xy + xz} = \overline{xy} + \overline{xz} = \overline{xy} + \overline{xz}$.

Definition 1.0.11. Let R be a ring, and $I \subseteq R$ be an ideal of R. Then the ring R/I is called the **quotient** of R by I (R mod I). Its elements, $x + I$, $x \in R$ are called cosets (or residue classes or equivalence classes) and we denote them $\bar{x}$.

R/I may be commutative or non-commutative, but if R is commutative, so is R/I.

If $I = R$, then R/R consists of a single element, since for every $x \in R$, $y \in R$, we have $x - y \in R$ and hence $x + R = y + R$.

If $I = 0 = 0$ is the zero ideal, if $x \in R$, $x + I = x + 0 = x$. Hence $R/I = R$.

Definition 1.0.12. Given R, $I \subseteq R$ an ideal, the **quotient map** (or **canonical homomorphism**) is defined as $\Pi : R \to R/I = x \to \overline{x} = x + I$ and is a ring hoomomorphism.

$\ker \Pi = \{r \in R : \overline{r} = \overline{0}\} = \{r \in R : r - 0 = r \in I\} = I$.

Hence, given a ring R and an ideal $I \subseteq R$, there exists a ring homomorphism (Π) such that $\ker \Pi = I$.

Theorem 1.0.13. (First Isomorphism Theorem - FIT) Let $\phi : R \to S$ be a ring homomorphism. The map $\bar{\phi} : R/\ker\phi \to \text{Im } \phi = \bar{x} \to \phi(x)$ is well-defined and it is a ring isomorphism: $R/\ker\phi \cong \text{Im } \phi$.

Proof. Let $x, x' \in R$ such that $\overline{x} = \overline{x'}$, i.e. $x + \ker\phi = x' + \ker\phi$. So $x - x' \in \ker\phi$, hence $\phi(x - x') = 0 \Leftrightarrow \phi(x) - \phi(x') = 0 \Leftrightarrow \phi(x) = \phi(x')$. Hence $\overline{\phi}$ is well-defined.

1. $\overline{\phi}(\overline{1}) = \phi(1) = 1$
2. $\overline{\phi}(\bar{x} + \bar{y}) = \overline{\phi}(\overline{x+y}) = \phi(x + y) = \phi(x) + \phi(y) = \bar{\phi}(\bar{x}) + \bar{\phi}(\bar{y})$.
3. Similarly, $\bar{\phi}(\bar{x} \cdot \bar{y}) = \bar{\phi}(\bar{x}) \cdot \bar{\phi}(\bar{y})$.

Hence $\bar{\phi}$ is a ring homomorphism.

$\bar{\phi}(\bar{x}) = 0 \Leftrightarrow \phi(x) = 0 \Leftrightarrow x \in \ker\phi \Leftrightarrow \bar{x} = 0$, hence $\ker\bar{\phi} = \{\bar{0}\}$. Let $y \in \text{Im } \phi \Leftrightarrow$ for some $x \in R$, $\phi(x) = y$. Hence $\bar{\phi}(\bar{x}) = \phi(x) = y$, hence $\bar{\phi}$ is also surjective, hence it is bijective. $\square$

Definition 1.0.14. Let R be a commutative ring. An ideal $I \subseteq R$ is a **prime ideal** if $I \neq R$ (I is proper) and for every $a, b \in R$ such that $a \cdot b \in I$ then $a \in I$ or $b \in I$.

The ideal $I \neq R$ is **maximal** if the only ideals that contain I is I itself and R. i.e. there is no ideal J such that $I \subsetneq J \subsetneq R$.

Theorem 1.0.15. Recall $x \in R$ is prime if $0 \neq x \notin R^\times$ and $x|ab \Rightarrow x|a$ or $x|b$.

If x is a prime element then (x) is a prime ideal.

Proof. $ab \in (x) \Rightarrow$ for some $r \in R$, $ab = rx \Rightarrow x|ab$ so because x is prime, $x|a$ or $x|b$ so $a \in (x)$ or $b \in (x)$. $\square$

Lemma 1.0.16. Let (x) be a non-zero prime ideal. The x is a prime element.

Proof. If $x|ab$, $ab \in (x)$, so because (x) is a prime ideal, $a \in (x)$ or $b \in (x)$, so $x|a$ or $x|b$. $\square$

Remark. $x|a \Leftrightarrow a \in (x) \Leftrightarrow (a) \subseteq (x)$.

This can be described as "to divide is to contain".

Corollary 1.0.17. The zero ideal $(0) = 0$ is a prime ideal iff R is an integral domain, since an integral means $ab = 0 \Rightarrow a = 0$ or $b = 0$.

Theorem 1.0.18. Let R be a commutative ring and $I \subseteq R$ an ideal.

1. I is prime iff R/I is an integral domain.
2. I is maximal iff R/I is a field.

Proof.

1. Assume I is prime. Assume $\bar{a}\bar{b} = \bar{0}$ with $a, b \in R$, $\bar{a}, \bar{b} \in R/I$. $\bar{a}\bar{b} = \bar{0} \Rightarrow \overline{ab} = \bar{0} \Rightarrow ab \in I \Rightarrow a \in I$ or $b \in I \Rightarrow \bar{a} = \bar{0}$ or $\bar{b} = 0$, hence R/I is an integral domain.

   Now assume R/I is an integral domain. $ab \in I \Rightarrow \overline{ab} = \bar{0}$. Since R/I is an integral domain, $\bar{a} = \bar{0}$ or $\bar{b} = \bar{0} \Rightarrow a \in I$ or $b \in I$.

2. $(\Rightarrow)$: Assume that I is maximal. Let $\bar{x} \neq \bar{0}$, $\bar{x} \in R/I$, then $x \in R$ with $x \notin I$. Consider $(I, x) := \{r + r'x : r \in I, r' \in R\}$. This is an ideal, as $r_1 + r_1'x + r_2 + r_2'x = (r_1 + r_2) + (r_1' + r_2')x \in R$, and $r''(r + r'x) = r''r + r''r'x \in R$.

   $I \subsetneq (I, x) \subseteq R$. I is maximal so $(I, x) = R \Rightarrow 1 \in (I, x)$. Hence for some $y \in R$, $yx + m = 1$ for some $m \in I$.

   Hence $yx - 1 \in I \Rightarrow \overline{yx} = \bar{y}\bar{x} = \bar{1}$ hence $\bar{x}$ is invertible, so R/I is a field.

   $(\Leftarrow)$: Assume R/I is a field. If $\bar{0} \neq \bar{x} \in R/I$, then for some $y \in R/I$, $\bar{x}\bar{y} = 1 \Rightarrow xy - 1 \in I \Rightarrow xy = 1 + m$ for some $m \in I$. That is, $1 = xy - m$ hence $1 \in (I, x) \Rightarrow (I, x) = R$.

   Now let J be an ideal such that $I \subsetneq J \subseteq R$. Since $I \subsetneq J$, for some $x \in J$, $x \notin I$. Then $I \subsetneq (I, x) \subseteq J \subseteq R$. But $(I, x) = R$, hence $J = R$. Hence there is no ideal J such that $I \subsetneq J \subsetneq R$, hence I is maximal.

$\square$

Corollary 1.0.19. If I is maximal then I is prime.

Proof. I is maximal $\Rightarrow R/I$ is a field $\Rightarrow R/I$ is an integral domain $\Rightarrow I$ is a prime ideal. $\square$

1.1 Principal Ideal Domains (PIDs)

Example 1.1.1. Let $a, b \in \mathbb{Z}$. Then let $d = (a, b) = \gcd(a, b)$. $(a, b) \subseteq (d)$ since $d|a$ and $d|b \Leftrightarrow a = dr_1$ and $b = dr_2$, $r_1, r_2 \in \mathbb{Z} \Rightarrow a \in (d)$ and $b \in (d)$.

Moreover, for some $r_1, r_2 \in \mathbb{Z}$, $d = r_1 + r_2 b \Rightarrow d \in (a, b) \Rightarrow (d) \subseteq (a, b)$.

The same argument holds for $F[x]$ with F a field.

i.e. $(f(x), g(x)) = (\gcd(f(x), g(x)))$.

Definition 1.1.2. An integral domain in which **all** ideals are principle is called a **principle ideal domain (PID)**.

Theorem 1.1.3. Let R be a either $\mathbb{Z}$ or $F[x]$ with F a field. Then R is a PID.

Proof. Define the following "degree" function $d : R\backslash\{0\} \to \mathbb{N}$ by

$$d(a) := \begin{cases} |a| & \text{if } a \in \mathbb{Z} \\ \deg(a) & \text{if } a \in F[x] \end{cases}$$

By division, for every $a, m \in R\backslash\{0\}$, we can find unique $q, R \in R$ such that $a = qm + r$ with $r = 0$ of $d(r) < d(m)$.

Let $I \subseteq R$ be an ideal. If $I = 0 = \{0\}$ we are done. So now let $I \neq 0$. Let $0 \neq m \in I$ such that $d(m)$ is minimal among elements of I. We claim that $I = (m)$.

Let $a \in I$. $a \in (m) \Leftrightarrow m|a$. Dividing a by m, we get $a = qm + r$, with $r = 0$ or $d(r) < d(m)$. But since $r = a - qm \in I$, $d(r) < d(m)$ would contradict the minimality of $d(m)$. Hence $r = 0$, so $m|a \Leftrightarrow a \in (m)$. $(m) \subseteq I$ so $a \in I \Leftrightarrow a \in (m)$. $\square$

Theorem 1.1.4. (Stated without proof) Any PID is a UFD.

Remark. There are integral domains which are not PIDs, e.g. $\mathbb{Z}[\sqrt{-5}]$ which is not a UFD and hence not a PID.

Proposition 1.1.5. Let R be a PID and $a, b \in R$. Then $\gcd(a, b)$ exists and $(a, b) = (\gcd(a, b))$.

Proof. Since R is a PID, for some $d \in R$, $(a, b) = (d)$. We claim that $d = \gcd(a, b)$.

$(a, b) = (d) \Rightarrow a \in (d)$ and $b \in (d) \Rightarrow d|a$ and $d|b$. Suppose $e \in R$ such that $e|a \Rightarrow a \in (e)$ and $e|b \Rightarrow b \in (e)$. $(d) = (a, b) \subseteq (e) \Rightarrow e|d$. Therefore $d = \gcd(a, b)$. $\square$

Theorem 1.1.6. (Stated without proof): $\mathbb{Z}[i], \mathbb{Z}[\pm\sqrt{2}]$ are PID's.

Lemma 1.1.7. Let R be a PID and let $a \in R$ be irreducible. Then the principle ideal genereated by a is a maximal ideal.

Proof. Suppose $(a) \subseteq I$, with I an ideal. We must show $I = (a)$ or $I = R$. Since R is a PID, for some $t \in R$, $I = (t)$. So $(a) \subseteq (t)$ so for some $m \in R$, $a = tm$. But a is irreducible, so either t is a unit or m is a unit.

If $t \in R^\times$ then $I = (t) = R$. If $m \in R^\times$ then $(a) = (t) = I$ (last question of assignment 3). $\square$

1.2 Fields on quotients

Theorem 1.2.1. Let F be a field and $f(x) \in F[x]$, with $f(x)$ irreducible. Then $F[x]/(f(x))$ is a field and a vector space over F with basis

$$B := \{\bar{1}, \bar{x}, \bar{x}^2, \ldots, \bar{x}^{n-1}\}$$

where $n = \deg f$.

That is, every element of $F[x]/(f(x))$ can be uniquely written as

$$\overline{a_0 1 + a_1 x + \cdots + a_{n-1} x^{n-1}}$$

Proof. Since $f(x)$ is irreducible, $F[x]/(f(x))$ is a field. $F[x]/(f(x))$ is a vector space over F and an abelian group with respect to addition and scalar multiplication with elements of F: if $\overline{g(x)} \in F[x]/(f(x))$ and $\alpha \in F$ then $\alpha\overline{g(x)} = \overline{\alpha g(x)} \in F[x]/(f(x))$.

We must prove B spans $F[x]/(f(x))$. For every $\overline{g(x)} \in F[x]/(f(x))$, $g(x) = q(x)f(x) + r(x)$ with $\deg(r) < \deg(f) = n \Rightarrow g(x) - r(x) = q(x)f(x) \in (f(x)) \Rightarrow \overline{g(x)} = \overline{r(x)}$, $\deg(r) < n$. Hence $\overline{g(x)} = \overline{r(x)} = a_0 + a_1\bar{x} + \cdots + a_{n-1}\bar{x}^{n-1}$ with $a_i \in F$. Hence B spans $F[x]/(f(x))$.

We must show B is linearly independent over F, i.e. show if $\sum_{i=0}^{n-1} a_i\bar{x}^i = \bar{0}$ then $\forall i, a_i = 0$.

$\sum_{i=0}^{n-1} a_i\bar{x}^i = \bar{0} \Leftrightarrow \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} a_i x^i \in (f(x)) \Rightarrow f(x) | \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} a_i x^i$. But $\deg(f) = n$ and $\deg(\sum_{i=0}^{n-1} a_i x^i) < n$ so $\sum_{i=0}^{n-1} a_i x^i$ is the zero polynomial so $\forall i, a_i = 0$. Therefore B is linearly independent.

So B is a basis. $\square$

2 Finite fields

Theorem 2.0.1. For every prime p and $n \in \mathbb{N}$, for some irreducible polynomial $f(x) \in (\mathbb{Z}/p)[x]$, $\deg(f) = n$. Thus $(\mathbb{Z}/p)[x]/(f(x))$ is a field with p^n elements (since there are p choices for each a_i in $a_0 + a_1\bar{x} + \cdots + a_{n-1}\bar{x}^{n-1}$).

Any two such fields are isomorphic and we denote the unique, up to isomorphism, field with p^n elements with $\mathbb{F}_{p^n}$.

Proof. Not examinable. □

Remark. If $n = 1$ then $\mathbb{F}_p \cong \mathbb{Z}/p$ with p prime. However if $n > 1$ then $\mathbb{F}_{p^n} \ncong \mathbb{Z}/p^n$ since $\mathbb{Z}/p^n$ is not a field.

Example 2.0.2. Find an irreducible polynomial f in $(\mathbb{Z}/3)[x]$ of degree 3.

$f(x) = x^3 + x^2 + x + \bar{2}$. This has no roots in $\mathbb{Z}/3$ so $f(x)$ is irreducible since $\deg(f) = 3$. Then $\mathbb{F}_{27} = \mathbb{F}_{3^3} \cong (\mathbb{Z}/3)[x]/(f(x))$. All elements can be written as $a_0 + a_1\bar{x} + a_2\bar{x}^2$, $a_i \in \mathbb{Z}/3$.

$\overline{f(x)} = \bar{0} = \overline{x^3 + x^2 + x + \bar{2}} \Rightarrow \bar{x}^3 = -\bar{x}^2 - \bar{x} - \bar{2}$.

2.1 The Chinese Remainder Theorem (CRT)

Definition 2.1.1. Let $a, b \in R$. a and b are **coprime** if $\nexists r$ irreducible in R such that $r|a$ and $r|b$.

Lemma 2.1.2. Let R be a PID and $a, b \in R$ be coprime. Then $(a, b) = R$ and hence $\exists x, y \in R$ such that $xa + yb = 1$.

Proof. Since R is a PID, $(a, b) = (r)$ for some $r \in R$. So $a, b \in (r) \Rightarrow r|a$ and $r|b$. So $a = rn$ and $b = rm$ for some $n, m \in R$. r must be a unit in R since otherwise, $r = p_1 \cdots p_k$ for some p_i irreducible, but then $a = p_1 \cdots p_k n$, $b = p_k \cdot p_k m$, which would contradict a and b being coprime.

So $r \in R^\times \Rightarrow (r) = R \Rightarrow (a, b) = R$. □

Corollary 2.1.3. For $a, b \in R$ coprime, any $\gcd(a, b) \in R^\times$.

Proof. In a PID, $(a, b) = (\gcd(a, b))$. By the lemma above, if a and b are coprime, $(a, b) = R \Rightarrow (\gcd(a, b)) = R = (1) \Rightarrow \gcd(a, b) \in R^\times$. □

Theorem 2.1.4. (CRT for PID's) Let R be a PID and let $a_1, \ldots, a_k \in R$ be pairwise coprime elements. Then the map from $R/(a_1, \ldots, a_k) \to R/(a_1) \times \cdots \times R/(a_k)$ given by $r + (a_1, \ldots, a_k) \to (r + (a_1), \ldots, r + (a_k))$ is a ring isomorphism.

Proof. Let $\psi : R \to R/(a_1) \times \cdots \times R/(a_k)$, $\psi(r) = (r + (a_1), \ldots, r + (a_k))$. Clearly, ψ is a ring homomorphism.

For every $i = 1, 2, \ldots, k$, the elements a_i and $a_1 \ldots a_{i-1}a_{i+1} \ldots a_k$ are coprime. (If not, there exists an irreducible p such that $p|a_i$ and $p|a_1 \ldots a_{i-1}a_{i+1} \ldots a_k$. But then $p$irreducible $\Leftrightarrow p$ prime hence $p|a_j$ for some $j \neq i$, but this contradicts that a_i and a_j are coprime).

By the above lemma, for some $x_i, y_i \in R$, $x_i a_i + y_i(a_1 \ldots a_{i-1}a_{i+1} \ldots a_k) = 1$. Set $e_i := 1 - a_i x_i$ for each $i = 1, \ldots, k$. Then $e_i = 1 + (a_i)$ and $e_i = 0 + (a_j)$ for $j \neq i$, since $e_i = 1 - a_i x_i = y_i(a_1 \ldots a_{i-1}a_{i+1} \ldots a_k)$.

Let $(r_1 + (a_1), \ldots, r_k + (a_k))$ be any element in $R/(a_1) \times \cdots \times R/(a_k)$. We claim that

$$\psi\left(\sum_{i=1}^{k} r_i e_i\right) = (r_1 + (a_1), \dots, r_k + (a_k))$$

$$\psi\left(\sum_{i=1}^{k} r_i e_i\right) = \sum_{i=1}^{k} \psi(r_i e_i) = \sum_{i=1}^{k} \psi(r_i)\psi(e_i)$$

$$\psi(e_1) = (0 + (a_1), \dots, 1 + (a_i), 0 + (a_{i+1}), \dots, 0 + (a_k))$$

since $e_i = 1 + (a_i)$ and $e_i = 0 + (a_j)$ for $j \neq i$ and

$$\psi(r_i) = (r_i + (a_1), \dots r_i + (a_k))$$

so

$$\psi(e_i)\psi(r_i) = TODO finish and check this proof$$

Thus ψ is surjective. $\ker\psi = \{r \in R : r \in (a_i), i = 1, \dots, k\} = \{r \in R : a_i | r, i = 1, \dots, k\} = \{r \in R : a_1 \dots a_k | r\}$ since a_i and a_j are coprime. $\ker\psi = (a_1 a_2 \dots a_k)$. Then by the FIT, $R/\ker\psi \cong R/(a_1) \times \dots \times R/(a_k)$. $\square$