

## §1.2: IDEALS

**DEFINITION:** Let  $S$  be a subset of a ring  $R$ . The **ideal generated by  $S$** , denoted  $(S)$ , is the smallest ideal containing  $S$ . Equivalently,

$$(S) = \left\{ \sum r_i s_i \mid r_i \in R, s_i \in S \right\} \quad \text{is the set of } R\text{-linear combinations}^1 \text{ of elements of } S.$$

We say that  $S$  **generates** an ideal  $I$  if  $(S) = I$ .

**DEFINITION:** Let  $I, J$  be ideals of a ring  $R$ . The following are ideals:

- $IJ := (ab \mid a \in I, b \in J)$ .
- $I^n := \underbrace{I \cdot I \cdots I}_{n \text{ times}} = (a_1 \cdots a_n \mid a_i \in I) \text{ for } n \geq 1$ .
- $I + J := \{a + b \mid a \in I, b \in J\} = (I \cup J)$ .
- $rI := (r)I = \{ra \mid a \in I\}$  for  $r \in R$ .
- $I : J := \{r \in R \mid rJ \subseteq I\}$ .

**DEFINITION:** Let  $I$  be an ideal in a ring  $R$ . The **radical** of  $I$  is  $\sqrt{I} := \{f \in R \mid f^n \in I \text{ for some } n \geq 1\}$ . An ideal  $I$  is **radical** if  $I = \sqrt{I}$ .

**DIVISION ALGORITHM:** Let  $A$  be a ring, and  $R = A[X]$  be a polynomial ring. Let  $g \in R$  be a **monic** polynomial; i.e., the leading coefficient of  $f$  is a unit. Then for any  $f \in R$ , there exist unique polynomials  $q, r \in R$  such that  $f = gq + r$  and the top degree of  $r$  is less than the top degree of  $g$ .

(1) Briefly discuss why the two characterizations of  $(S)$  in Definition 2.1 are equal.

The set of linear combinations of elements of  $S$  is an ideal:

- $0 = 0s_1$  (we also consider 0 to be the empty combination);
- given two linear combinations, by including zero coefficients, we can assume our combinations involve the same elements of  $S$ , and then  $\sum_i a_i s_i + \sum_i b_i s_i = \sum_i (a_i + b_i) s_i$ ;
- $r(\sum_i a_i s_i) = \sum_i r a_i s_i$ .

Any ideal that contains  $S$  must contain all of the linear combinations of  $S$ , using the definition of ideal. These two facts mean that the set of linear combinations is the smallest ideal containing  $S$ .

(2) Finding generating sets for ideals: Let  $S$  be a subset of a ring  $R$ , and  $I$  an ideal.

- (a) To show that  $(S) = I$ , which containment do you think is easier to verify? How would you check?
- (b) To show that  $(S) = I$  given  $(S) \subseteq I$ , explain why it suffices to show that  $I/(S) = 0$  in  $R/(S)$ ; i.e., that every element of  $I$  is equivalent to 0 modulo  $S$ .
- (c) Let  $K$  be a field,  $R = K[U, V, W]$  and  $S = K[X, Y]$  be polynomial rings. Let  $\phi : R \rightarrow S$  be the ring homomorphism that is constant on  $K$ , and maps  $U \mapsto X^2, V \mapsto XY, W \mapsto Y^2$ . Show that the kernel  $\phi$  is generated by  $V^2 - UW$  as follows:
  - Show that  $(V^2 - UW) \subseteq \ker(\phi)$ .
  - Think of  $R$  as  $K[U, W][V]$ . Given  $F \in \ker(\phi)$ , use the Division Algorithm to show that  $F \equiv F_1 V + F_0$  modulo  $(V^2 - UW)$  for some  $F_1, F_0 \in K[U, W]$  with  $F_1 V + F_0 \in \ker(\phi)$ .
  - Use  $\phi(F_1 V + F_0) = 0$  to show that  $F_1 = F_0 = 0$ , and conclude that  $F \in \ker(\phi)$ .

(a) Showing  $(S) \subseteq I$  is the easier containment: it suffices to show that  $S \subseteq I$ .

(b) This follows from the Second Isomorphism Theorem.

<sup>1</sup>Linear combinations always means *finite* linear combinations: the axioms of a ring can only make sense of finite sums.

- (c)
- We check  $\phi(V^2 - UW) = (XY)^2 - X^2Y^2 = 0$ , so  $V^2 - UW \in \ker(\phi)$ . This implies  $(V^2 - UW) \subseteq \ker(\phi)$ .
  - By Division, we have  $F = (V^2 - UW)Q + R$ , with the top degree (in  $V$ ) of  $R$  at most 1. Then  $F \equiv R = F_1V + F_0$  modulo  $(V^2 - UW)$ . Since  $F, V^2 - UW \in \ker(\phi)$ , we must have  $F_1V + F_0 \in \ker(\phi)$ .
  - We have  $0 = \phi(F_1V + F_0) = F_1(X^2, Y^2)XY + F_0(X^2, Y^2)$ . The  $F_1(X^2, Y^2)XY$  terms only have monomials whose  $X$ -degree is odd, and the  $F_0(X^2, Y^2)$  terms only have monomials whose  $X$ -degree is even, so none can cancel with each other. This means that  $F_1(X^2, Y^2) = 0$  and  $F_0(X^2, Y^2) = 0$ , so  $F_1(U, W) = F_0(U, W) = 0$ . Thus,  $F \equiv 0$  modulo  $(V^2 - UW)$ , and as above, we conclude  $\ker(\phi) = (V^2 - UW)$ .

(3) Radical ideals:

(a) Fill in the blanks and convince yourself:

- $R/I$  is a field  $\iff I$  is \_\_\_\_\_
- $R/I$  is a domain  $\iff I$  is \_\_\_\_\_
- $R/I$  is reduced  $\iff I$  is \_\_\_\_\_

(b) Show that the radical of an ideal is an ideal.

(c) Show that a prime ideal is radical.

(d) Let  $K$  be a field and  $R = K[X, Y, Z]$ . Find a generating set<sup>2</sup> for  $\sqrt{(X^2, XYZ, Y^2)}$ .

(a)

- $R/I$  is a field  $\iff I$  is maximal
- $R/I$  is a domain  $\iff I$  is prime
- $R/I$  is reduced  $\iff I$  is radical

(b) Let  $f, g \in \sqrt{I}$ . Then there are  $m, n \geq 1$  such that  $f^m, g^n \in I$ . Then

$$(f + g)^{m+n-1} = \sum_{i+j=m+n-1} \binom{m+n-1}{i, j} f^i g^j,$$

and for each term in the sum either  $i \geq m$  or  $j \geq n$ , so each term is in  $I$ , hence the whole sum is in  $I$ . Now let  $r \in R$ . Then  $(rf)^m = r^m f^m \in I$ .

(c) Suppose  $I$  is prime. If  $x \in \sqrt{I}$ , then  $x^n \in I$  for some  $n$ . Then, by the definition of prime,  $x \in I$ . Thus,  $\sqrt{I} = I$ .

(d) Since  $X^2$  and  $Y^2$  are in  $(X^2, XYZ, Y^2)$ , we have  $X, Y \in \sqrt{(X^2, XYZ, Y^2)}$  by definition, so  $(X, Y) \subseteq \sqrt{(X^2, XYZ, Y^2)}$ . For the other containment, if  $F(X, Y, Z) \notin (X, Y)$ , consider  $F$  as a polynomial in  $X, Y$  with coefficients in  $K[Z]$ ; the condition means that the top degree of  $F$  is zero, and hence the top degree of  $F^n$  is zero for all  $n$ , so  $F \notin \sqrt{(X^2, XYZ, Y^2)}$ .

(4) Evaluation ideals in polynomial rings: Let  $K$  be a field and  $R = K[X_1, \dots, X_n]$  be a polynomial ring. Let  $\alpha = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n) \in K^n$ .

(a) Let  $\text{ev}_\alpha : R \rightarrow K$  be the map of evaluation at  $\alpha$ :  $\text{ev}_\alpha(f) = f(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n)$ , or  $f(\alpha)$  for short. Show that  $\mathfrak{m}_\alpha := \ker \text{ev}_\alpha$  is a maximal ideal and  $R/\mathfrak{m}_\alpha \cong K$ .

(b) Apply division repeatedly to show that  $\mathfrak{m}_\alpha = (X_1 - \alpha_1, \dots, X_n - \alpha_n)$ .

(c) For  $K = \mathbb{R}$  and  $n = 1$ , find a maximal ideal that is not of this form. Same question with  $n = 2$ .

(d) With  $K$  arbitrary again, show that every maximal ideal  $\mathfrak{m}$  of  $R$  for which  $R/\mathfrak{m} \cong K$  is of the form  $\mathfrak{m}_\alpha$  for some  $\alpha \in K^n$ . Note: this is *not* a theorem with a fancy German name.

<sup>2</sup>Hint: To show your set generates, you might consider the bottom degree of  $F$  considered as a polynomial in  $X$  and  $Y$ .

- (a) The evaluation map is surjective, since for any  $k \in K$ , the constant function  $k$  maps to  $k$ . By the First Isomorphism Theorem,  $R/\mathfrak{m}_\alpha \cong K$ , so  $\mathfrak{m}_\alpha$  is maximal.
- (b) We have  $\text{ev}_\alpha(X_i - \alpha_i) = \alpha_i - \alpha_i = 0$ , so  $(X_1 - \alpha_1, \dots, X_n - \alpha_n) \subseteq \mathfrak{m}_\alpha$ . Given some  $F \in \mathfrak{m}_\alpha$ , consider  $F$  as a polynomial in  $X_1$  and apply division by  $X_1 - \alpha_1$ , to get  $F \equiv F_1$  modulo  $(X_1 - \alpha_1, \dots, X_n - \alpha_n)$ , for some  $F_1$  not involving  $X_1$ . Continue with  $X_2 - \alpha_2, \dots$  to get the  $F$  is equivalent to a constant, which must be zero. This shows that  $F \in (X_1 - \alpha_1, \dots, X_n - \alpha_n)$ , so  $\mathfrak{m}_\alpha = (X_1 - \alpha_1, \dots, X_n - \alpha_n)$ .
- (c)  $(X^2 + 1); (X^2 + 1, Y)$ .
- (d) Let  $\phi : R \rightarrow R/\mathfrak{m} \cong K$  be quotient map followed by the given isomorphism. Set  $\alpha_i := \phi(X_i)$ . Then  $X_i - \alpha_i \in \ker(\phi)$ , so  $\mathfrak{m}_\alpha = (X_1 - \alpha_1, \dots, X_n - \alpha_n) \subseteq \ker(\phi)$ . Since  $\mathfrak{m}_\alpha$  is maximal, we must have equality.

(5) Lots of generators:

- (a) Let  $K$  be a field and  $R = K[X_1, X_2, \dots]$  be a polynomial ring in countably many variables. Explain<sup>3</sup> why the ideal  $\mathfrak{m} = (X_1, X_2, \dots)$  cannot be generated by a finite set.
- (b) Show that the ideal  $(X^n, X^{n-1}Y, \dots, XY^{n-1}, Y^n) \subseteq K[X, Y]$  cannot be generated by fewer than  $n + 1$  generators.
- (c) Let  $R = \mathcal{C}([0, 1], \mathbb{R})$  and  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ . Show that for any element  $g \in (f_1, \dots, f_n) \subseteq \mathfrak{m}_\alpha$ , there is some  $\varepsilon > 0$  and some  $C > 0$  such that  $|g| < C \max_i \{|f_i|\}$  on  $(\alpha - \varepsilon, \alpha + \varepsilon)$ . Use this to show that  $\mathfrak{m}_\alpha$  cannot be generated by a finite set.

- (a) Suppose  $\mathfrak{m} = (f_1, \dots, f_m)$ . Since each polynomial involves only finitely many variables, only finitely many variables occur in  $\{f_1, \dots, f_m\}$ , and since each  $f_i$  has no constant term, these polynomials are linear combinations of those variables  $X_1, \dots, X_n$ ; i.e.,  $(f_1, \dots, f_m) \subseteq (X_1, \dots, X_n)$ . It suffices to show that  $\mathfrak{m} \neq (X_1, \dots, X_n)$ . To see it, take  $X_{n+1}$  and note that  $X_{n+1} = \sum_{i=1}^n g_i X_i$  is impossible, since the monomial  $X_{n+1}$  can't occur in any summand of the right hand side.
- (b) Note that this ideal is the set of all polynomial whose bottom degree is at least  $n$ . Given a generating set  $f_1, \dots, f_m$  for  $I$ , consider the degree  $n$  terms of the polynomials  $f_i$ . We claim that the degree  $n$  terms of  $f_1, \dots, f_m$  must span the space of degree  $n$  polynomials as a vector space. Indeed, given  $h$  of degree  $n$ , we have  $h \in I$ , so  $h = \sum_i g_i f_i$ . But every term of  $f_i$  has degree at least  $n$ , so the only things of degree  $n$  on the right hand side come from the degree  $n$  piece of  $f_i$  and the degree zero piece of  $g_i$ . This shows the claim. Then the statement is clear, since the degree  $n$  terms form an  $n + 1$  dimensional vector space.
- (c) Let  $g = \sum g_i f_i \in (f_1, \dots, f_n)$ . By continuity, there is some  $\varepsilon > 0$  and some  $C > 0$  such that  $|g_i| < C/n$  on  $(\alpha - \varepsilon, \alpha + \varepsilon)$ , so  $|g| < |\sum_i g_i f_i| \leq \sum_i |g_i| |f_i| \leq \sum_i C/n \max_i \{|f_i|\} \leq C \max_i \{|f_i|\}$  on  $(\alpha - \varepsilon, \alpha + \varepsilon)$ .  
Now, given  $f_1, \dots, f_n \in \mathfrak{m}_\alpha$ , let  $g = \sqrt{\max_i \{|f_i|\}}$ . Then  $g$  is continuous and  $g(\alpha) = 0$ , so  $g \in \mathfrak{m}_\alpha$ , but  $g/\max_i \{|f_i|\} = 1/g \rightarrow \infty$  as  $x \rightarrow \alpha$ , so there is no constant  $C > 0$  and no interval  $(\alpha - \varepsilon, \alpha + \varepsilon)$  on which  $|g| < C \max_i \{|f_i|\}$ . Thus,  $\mathfrak{m}_\alpha$  is not finitely generated.

(6) Evaluation ideals in function rings: Let  $R = \mathcal{C}([0, 1], \mathbb{R})$ . Let  $\alpha \in [0, 1]$ .

- (a) Let  $\text{ev}_\alpha : \mathcal{C}([0, 1]) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be the map of evaluation at  $\alpha$ :  $\text{ev}_\alpha(f) = f(\alpha)$ . Show that  $\mathfrak{m}_\alpha := \ker \text{ev}_\alpha$  is a maximal ideal and  $R/\mathfrak{m}_\alpha \cong \mathbb{R}$ .
- (b) Show that  $(x - \alpha) \subseteq \mathfrak{m}_\alpha$ .

<sup>3</sup>Hint: You might find it convenient to show that  $(f_1, \dots, f_m) \subseteq (X_1, \dots, X_n)$  for some  $n$ , and then show that  $(X_1, \dots, X_n) \subsetneq \mathfrak{m}$

- (c) Show that every maximal ideal  $R$  is of the form  $\mathfrak{m}_\alpha$  for some  $\alpha \in [0, 1]$ . You may want to argue by contradiction: if not, there is an ideal  $I$  such that the sets  $U_f := \{x \in [0, 1] \mid f(x) \neq 0\}$  for  $f \in I$  form an open cover of  $[0, 1]$ . Take a finite subcover  $U_{f_1}, \dots, U_{f_t}$  and consider  $f_1^2 + \dots + f_t^2$ .

- (a)  $\text{ev}_\alpha : \mathcal{C}([0, 1]) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is a surjective ring homomorphism, since  $\text{ev}_\alpha(r) = r$  for any  $r \in \mathbb{R}$ . Thus, by the First Isomorphism Theorem,  $R/\mathfrak{m}_\alpha \cong \mathbb{R}$ , and hence  $\mathfrak{m}_\alpha$  is a maximal ideal.  
 (b) It suffices to note that  $\text{ev}_\alpha(x - \alpha) = 0$ .  
 (c) Argue by contradiction: if not, there is a proper ideal  $I$  that is not contained in some  $\mathfrak{m}_\alpha$ ; this means that for every  $\alpha$ , some element of  $I$  does not vanish at  $\alpha$ . Since for any continuous  $f$ , the set  $U_f := \{x \in [0, 1] \mid f(x) \neq 0\}$  is open, the collection  $\{U_f \mid f \in I\}$  is an open cover of  $[0, 1]$ . Since  $[0, 1]$  is compact, there is a finite subcover  $U_{f_1}, \dots, U_{f_t}$ . For these  $f_i$ 's consider  $h = f_1^2 + \dots + f_t^2$ . Each  $f_i^2$  is nonnegative, and for any  $\alpha$ , one of these is strictly positive at  $\alpha$ . This means that  $h(x) \neq 0$  for all  $x \in [0, 1]$ , so  $h$  is a unit, and hence  $I = R$ , a contradiction.

(7) Division Algorithm.

- (a) What fails in the Division Algorithm when  $g$  is not monic? Uniqueness? Existence? Both?  
 (b) Review the proof of the Division Algorithm.

- (8) Let  $K$  be a field and  $R = K[[X_1, \dots, X_n]]$  be a power series ring in  $n$  indeterminates. Let  $R' = K[[X_1, \dots, X_{n-1}]]$ , so we can also think of  $R = R'[[X_n]]$ . In this problem we will prove the useful analogue of division in power series rings:

**WEIERSTRASS DIVISION THEOREM:** Let  $r \in R$ , and write  $g = \sum_{i \geq 0} a_i X_n^i$  with  $a_i \in R'$ . For some  $d \geq 0$ , suppose that  $a_d \in R'$  is a unit, and that  $a_i \in R'$  is *not* a unit for all  $i < d$ . Then, for any  $f \in R$ , there exist unique  $q \in R$  and  $r \in R'[X_n]$  such that  $f = gq + r$  and the top degree of  $r$  as a polynomial in  $X_n$  is less than  $d$ .

- (a) Show the theorem in the very special case  $g = X_n^d$ .  
 (b) Show the theorem in the special case  $a_i = 0$  for all  $i < d$ .  
 (c) Show the uniqueness part of the theorem.<sup>4</sup>  
 (d) Show the existence part of the theorem.<sup>5</sup>

- (a) Given  $f$ , write  $f = \sum_{i \geq 0} b_i X_n^i$  with  $b_i \in R'$ . For existence, just take  $r = \sum_{i=0}^{d-1} b_i X_n^i$  and  $q = \sum_{i=d}^{\infty} b_i X_n^{i-d}$ . For uniqueness, note that if  $f = gq + r = gq' + r'$  with the top degree of  $r$  and  $r'$  as polynomials in  $X_n$  are less than  $d$ . Then  $0 = g(q - q') + (r - r')$ , so the uniqueness claim reduces to the case  $f = 0$ ; we will use this in the other parts without comment. Every term of  $r$  has  $X_n$ -degree less than  $d$ , whereas every term of  $gq$  has  $X_n$ -degree at least  $d$ , so no terms can cancel. Thus  $gq + r = 0$  implies  $q = r = 0$  (here and henceforth, we assume  $r$  is as in the statement when we write  $gq + r$ ).  
 (b) If  $a_i = 0$  for  $i < d$ , then  $g = X_n^d u$  where  $u = \sum_{i \geq 0} a_{i+d} X_n^i$ . Since the constant coefficient of  $u$  is  $a_d$ , which is a unit in  $R'$ ,  $u$  is a unit in  $R$ . Thus, we can apply (a) to  $f$  and  $X_n^d$  to get

<sup>4</sup>Hint: For an element of  $R'$  or of  $R$ , write  $\text{ord}'$  for the order in the  $X_1, \dots, X_{n-1}$  variables; that is, the lowest total  $X_1, \dots, X_{n-1}$ -degree of a nonzero term (not counting  $X_n$  in the degree). If  $gq + r = 0$ , write  $q = \sum_i b_i X_n^i$ . You might find it convenient to pick  $i$  such that  $\text{ord}'(b_i)$  is minimal, and in case of a tie, choose the smallest such  $i$  among these.

<sup>5</sup>Hint: Write  $g_- = \sum_{i=0}^{d-1} a_i X_n^i$  and  $g_+ = \sum_{i=d}^{\infty} a_i X_n^i$ . Apply (b) with  $g_+$  instead of  $g$ , to get some  $q_0, r_0$ ; write  $f_1 = f - (q_0 g_+ + r_0)$ , and keep repeating to get a sequence of  $q_i$ 's and  $r_i$ 's. Show that  $\text{ord}'(q_i), \text{ord}'(r_i) \geq i$ , and use this to make sense of  $q = \sum_i q_i$  and  $r = \sum_i r_i$ .

$f = q_0 X_n^d + r_0 = (q_0 u^{-1})g + r_0$ ; thus,  $q = q_0 u^{-1}$  and  $r = r_0$  satisfy the existence clause of the theorem. For uniqueness, if  $f = q'g + r'$ , then  $f = q'uX_n^d + r'$ , so by the uniqueness part of (a), we must have  $q'u = q_0$  and  $r' = r_0$ , and thus  $q' = q$  and  $r' = r$ .

- (c) For an element of  $R'$  or of  $R$ , write  $\text{ord}'$  for the order in the  $X_1, \dots, X_{n-1}$  variables; that is, the lowest total  $X_1, \dots, X_{n-1}$ -degree of a nonzero term (not counting  $X_n$  in the degree). Suppose that  $qg + r = 0$ , and write  $q = \sum_i b_i X_n^i$ . Suppose that  $q$  is nonzero, so  $b_i \neq 0$  for some  $i$ . Pick  $i$  such that  $\text{ord}'(b_i) \leq \text{ord}'(b_j)$  for all  $j$  with  $b_j \neq 0$ , and  $\text{ord}'(b_i) = \text{ord}'(b_j)$  implies  $i < j$ ; we can do this by well ordering of  $\mathbb{N}$ . Say  $\text{ord}'(b_i) = t$ . Consider the coefficient of  $X_n^{d+i}$  in  $0 = qg + r$ . By the degree constraint on  $r$ , this is the same as the coefficient of  $X_n^{d+i}$  in  $qg$ . Multiplying out, this is  $\sum_{j=0}^{d+i} a_{d+i-j} b_j$ . For  $j = i$ , the order of  $a_d b_i$  is  $t$ . For  $j < i$ , we have  $\text{ord}'(a_{d+i-j} b_j) \geq \text{ord}'(b_j) > t$  by choice of  $i$ . For  $j > i$ , since  $\text{ord}'(a_{d+i-j}) > 0$  and  $\text{ord}'(b_j) \geq t$ , we have  $\text{ord}'(a_{d+i-j} b_j) > t$ . Thus, the no term can cancel the  $a_d b_i$  term, so  $qg + r \neq 0$ . On the other hand, if  $q = 0$  and  $r \neq 0$ , clearly  $qg + r \neq 0$ . It follows there are unique  $q, r$  such that  $qg + r = 0$ .

- (d) First, we observe that in the context of (b), if  $\text{ord}'(f) = t$ , then  $\text{ord}'(q), \text{ord}'(r) \geq t$ . This is clear in the setting of (a), and following the proof of (b), we just need to observe that if  $u$  is a unit in  $R$ , then  $\text{ord}'(q_0 u^{-1}) \geq \text{ord}'(q_0)$ , which is clear since any coefficient of the product  $q_0 u^{-1}$  is a sum of multiples of the coefficients of  $q_0$ .

Now we begin the main proof. Write  $g_- = \sum_{i=0}^{t-1} a_i X_n^i$  and  $g_+ = \sum_{i=t}^{\infty} a_i X_n^i$ . Apply (b) with  $g_+$  to write  $f = q_0 g_+ + r_0$ , and set  $f_1 = f - (q_0 g_+ + r_0) = -q_0 g_-$ . Repeat with  $f_1$  to write  $f_1 = q_1 g_+ + r_1$ , and  $f_2 = f_1 - (q_1 g_+ + r_1) = -q_1 g_-$ . Continue like so to obtain a sequence of series  $q_0, q_1, \dots$  and  $r_0, r_1, \dots$ . From the observation above, we have that  $\text{ord}'(q_i), \text{ord}'(r_i) \geq \text{ord}'(f_i) \geq \text{ord}'(q_{i-1}) + 1$ , since the constant term of each coefficient of  $g_-$  vanishes. It follows that  $\text{ord}'(q_i), \text{ord}'(r_i) \geq i$  for each  $i$ .

For a series  $h$ , write  $[h]_i$  for the degree  $i$  part of  $h$ , and  $[h]_{\leq i}$  for the sum of all parts of degree  $\leq i$ . Define  $q$  to be the series such that  $[q]_i = \sum_{j=0}^i [q_j]_i$ , and likewise with  $r$ . Note that  $r$  is still a polynomial in  $X_n$  of top degree less than  $d$ . We claim that  $f = qg + r$ . To show this, it suffices to show that  $[f]_i = [qg + r]_i$ . Note that to compute  $[qg + r]_i$ , we can replace  $q, g, r$  by  $[q]_{\leq i}$ , and similarly for the others. But  $[q]_{\leq i} = [\sum_{j=0}^i q_j]_{\leq i}$  (and likewise with  $r$ ), so  $[qg + r]_i = [(\sum_{j=0}^i q_j)g + (\sum_{j=0}^i r_j)]_i$ . Then, by construction of the sequences  $\{q_i\}, \{r_i\}, \{f_i\}$ , we have  $[f - (qg + r)]_i = [f_{i+1}]_i$  and since  $\text{ord}'(f_{i+1}) \geq i + 1$ , we have  $[f_{i+1}]_i = 0$ . It follows that  $f - (qg + r) = 0$ ; i.e.,  $f = qg + r$ .