

Introduction to Commutative Algebra

— Solution of Homework #7 —

Jeongwoo Park

Student ID : 20190262

Department of Mathematical Sciences,
Korea Advanced Institute of Science and Technology

1 Solutions

Solution of Problem 1. For a formal power series $f(x) = \sum_{i \geq 0} a_i x^i$, we define $\text{Supp} f(x) := \{i; a_i \neq 0\}$, $\text{ord} f(x) := \inf(\text{Supp} f(x))$, and $\ell(f(x)) = a_{\text{ord} f(x)}$, where a_∞ is considered as 0. Also, we define $\pi_d(f(x)) = a_d$. Let $I \trianglelefteq A[[x]]$ be an ideal, then $\ell(I) \trianglelefteq A$ because

1. It contains 0.
2. For any $f(x), g(x) \in I$, a relation $\ell(f(x) + g(x)) \in \{\ell(f(x)), \ell(g(x)), \ell(f(x) + g(x))\}$ holds, i.e., $\ell(I)$ is closed under the addition.
3. For any $f(x) \in I$, the equality $-\ell(f(x)) = \ell(-f(x))$ holds, i.e., $\ell(I)$ forms an additive subgroup.
4. The equality $\ell(f(x)) \cdot \ell(g(x)) = \ell(f(x) \cdot g(x))$ holds, i.e., $\ell(I)$ is closed under the constant multiplication.

Let $f_i(x) \in A[[x]]$ be non-zero formal power series such that $a_i := \ell(f_i(x))$ generates $\ell(I)$. We can assume that $1 \leq i \leq m$ for some natural number m , since A is Noetherian.

Let $g(x) \in A[[x]]$ be a formal power series of order at least $d := \min_i (\text{ord } f_i(x))$. Let $g_d(x) = g(x)$, then $\pi_d(g_d(x)) \in \ell(I)$ because it is either $\ell(f(x))$ or zero, so there are $c_{d,i} \in A$ such that $\ell(f(x)) = \sum_i c_{d,i} \cdot a_i$. Let $\hat{g}_d(x) := \sum_i c_{d,i} \cdot x^{d-\text{ord } f_i(x)} f_i(x)$, then the order of $g_{d+1}(x) := g_d(x) - \hat{g}_d(x)$ is at least $d+1$ because it is clearly at least d , and $\pi_d(g_d(x) - \hat{g}_d(x)) = 0$ holds. Similarly, there are $c_{d+1,i} \in A$ such that $\ell(g_{d+1}(x)) = \sum_i c_{d+1,i} \cdot a_i$, and if we define $\hat{g}_{d+1}(x) = \sum_i c_{d+1,i} \cdot x^{d+1-\text{ord } f_i(x)} f_i(x)$, then the order of $g_{d+1}(x) - \hat{g}_{d+1}(x)$ is at least $d+1$. Recursively, one can find $\hat{g}_n(x) \in \sum_i A[[x]] \cdot f_i(x)$ such that $\text{ord } g_n(x) \geq n$ and the order of $g_n(x) - \hat{g}_n(x)$ is at least $n+1$, for any $n \geq d$. The formal power series $\hat{g}(x) := \sum_n \hat{g}_n(x) \in \sum_i A[[x]] \cdot f_i(x)$ is well-defined since $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \text{ord}(\hat{g}_n(x)) = \infty$. Moreover, one can deduce that, for any natural number n ,

$$\begin{aligned} \pi_n(g(x) - \hat{g}(x)) &= \pi_n(g_d(x) - (\hat{g}_d(x) + \cdots + \hat{g}_n(x))) \\ &= \pi_n(g_{n+1}(x)) \\ &= 0 \end{aligned}$$

because $\sum_{i \geq n+1} \hat{g}_i(x)$ is of order at least $n+1$. Hence, every formal power series in I of order at least d is an element of $\sum_i A[[x]] \cdot f_i(x)$.

I'll show the equality

$$I = \left(\sum_{i=1}^m A[[x]] \cdot f_i(x) \right) + A[[x]] \cdot \left(I \cap \frac{1}{x^d} \cdot \left(\sum_{i \geq d} A \cdot x^i \cap \sum_{\substack{1 \leq i \leq m \\ 1 \leq j \leq d-1}} A \cdot x^j f_i(x) \right) \right) \quad (1)$$

The reversed inclusion can be shown easily, since each term is contained in I . So, let's focus on the direct inclusion. Let $g(x) \in I$, then $x^d \cdot g(x) \in I$ is of degree at least d . Hence, there are formal power series $c_i(x)$ such that $x^d \cdot g(x) = \sum_i c_i(x) \cdot f_i(x)$. Let $c'_i(x)$ is the sum of all terms of $c_i(x)$, of degree at most $d-1$, and $c''(x) = c_i(x) - c'_i(x)$. Then, the order of $c''(x)$ is at least x^d , so we have the equality

$$g(x) - \sum_i \frac{c''(x)}{x^d} \cdot f_i(x) = \frac{1}{x^d} \cdot \sum_i c'_i(x) \cdot f_i(x) \in I \cap \frac{1}{x^d} \cdot \left(\sum_{i \geq d} A \cdot x^i \cap \sum_{\substack{1 \leq i \leq m \\ 1 \leq j \leq d-1}} A \cdot x^j f_i(x) \right)$$

One can deduce that $g(x)$ is an element of the right hand side of (1).

Let's conclude the proof. Of course, the module $\sum_{i=1}^m A[[x]] \cdot f_i(x)$ is finite. For the another term, note that $\sum_{i,j} A \cdot x^j f_i(x)$ is Noetherian A -module, because it is a finitely generated, and A is Noetherian. Hence, the submodule $\sum_{i \geq d} A \cdot x^i \cap \sum_{i,j} A \cdot x^j f_i(x)$ is also Noetherian. However, the module

$$\frac{1}{x^d} \cdot \left(\sum_{i \geq d} A \cdot x^i \cap \sum_{\substack{1 \leq i \leq m \\ 1 \leq j \leq d-1}} A \cdot x^j f_i(x) \right)$$

is isomorphic to $\sum_{i \geq d} A \cdot x^i \cap \sum_{i,j} A \cdot x^j f_i(x)$ since x^d is a non-zero divisor, i.e., a map $\mu_{x^d} : A[[x]] \rightarrow A[[x]], f(x) \mapsto x^d \cdot f(x)$ is injective, so the restriction

$$\mu_{x^d} \left| \frac{1}{x^d} \cdot \left(\sum_{i \geq d} A \cdot x^i \cap \sum_{\substack{1 \leq i \leq m \\ 1 \leq j \leq d-1}} A \cdot x^j f_i(x) \right) \right. : \frac{1}{x^d} \cdot \left(\sum_{i \geq d} A \cdot x^i \cap \sum_{\substack{1 \leq i \leq m \\ 1 \leq j \leq d-1}} A \cdot x^j f_i(x) \right) \rightarrow \sum_{i \geq d} A \cdot x^i \cap \sum_{\substack{1 \leq i \leq m \\ 1 \leq j \leq d-1}} A \cdot x^j f_i(x)$$

is an isomorphism. Therefore, the submodule

$$I \cap \frac{1}{x^d} \cdot \left(\sum_{i \geq d} A \cdot x^i \cap \sum_{\substack{1 \leq i \leq m \\ 1 \leq j \leq d-1}} A \cdot x^j f_i(x) \right)$$

is Noetherian A -module, in particular, a finite A -module. This implies that the second term

$$A[[x]] \cdot \left(I \cap \frac{1}{x^d} \cdot \left(\sum_{i \geq d} A \cdot x^i \cap \sum_{\substack{1 \leq i \leq m \\ 1 \leq j \leq d-1}} A \cdot x^j f_i(x) \right) \right)$$

is finite $A[[x]]$ -module, and this completes the proof. \square

Solution of Problem 2. 1. We need a lemma.

Lemma 1.1. *Every Hausdorff Noetherian space is finite and discrete.*

Proof of Lemma 1.1. Let X be a Hausdorff Noetherian space. If $X = \emptyset$, then there is nothing to prove, so let's assume that X is non-empty. By **Problem 2**(3,4), every subspace of X is compact, in particular, any subset of X is closed, i.e., X is discrete.

Note that every subset of X is clopen, since its complement is closed. One can consider a non-empty collection of open sets $\{X'\}_{X' \subseteq X}$ is finite, then there is a maximal element X' . If X is infinite, then clearly there is a finite subset of X which properly containing X' , but this contradicts to the maximality of X' . Hence, X must be finite, and this completes the proof of the lemma. \square

Hence, the closed interval $[0, 1]$ is not a Noetherian space, since it is Hausdorff and not finite. Also, every sphere S^n and torus T^n are not Noetherian provided with $n \geq 1$, because they are Hausdorff spaces that are not finite.

2. Let's consider a non-empty collection of closed sets $\{V(I_i)\}_{i \in \Sigma}$ where each I_i is a radical ideal of A . Since A is Noetherian, there is a maximal element I of the non-empty collection of ideals $\{I_i\}_{i \in \Sigma}$. Since V is contravariant, $V(I)$ must be the minimal element of $\{V(I_i)\}_{i \in \Sigma}$, and this completes the proof.
3. Let X' be a subspace of a Noetherian space X , and let $\{X' \cap C_i\}_{i \in I}$ be a non-empty collection of closed subsets of X' , where each C_i is a closed subset of X . Since a collection $\{C_i\}_{i \in I}$ is non-empty, there is a minimal element C . Of course, $X' \cap C$ must be a minimal element of $\{X' \cap C_i\}_{i \in I}$, since a map $X' \rightarrow X'$ is covariant. Hence, X' is Noetherian, and this completes the proof.

4. Let X be a Noetherian space, and let $\{C_i\}_{i \in I}$ be a collection of closed sets such that $\bigcap_{i \in I} C_i = \emptyset$. One can consider a non-empty collection of closed sets $\{\bigcap_{i \in I'} C_i\}_{I' \subseteq I \text{ is finite}}$, then there is a minimal element $\bigcap_{i \in I'} C_i$ where $I' \subseteq I$ is finite. If this intersection is non-empty, then there is $i' \in I$ such that $C_{i'} \not\supseteq \bigcap_{i \in I'} C_i$ holds, because $\bigcap_{i \in I} C_i = \emptyset$ holds. However, this implies the $\bigcap_{i \in I' \cup \{i'\}} C_i \subsetneq \bigcap_{i \in I'} C_i$ holds, and this contradicts to the minimality of $\bigcap_{i \in I'} C_i$. Hence, $\bigcap_{i \in I'} C_i$ must be empty, and this shows the compactness of the space X . This is what we want to show.

□

Solution of Problem 3. Assume that X is a Noetherian space, but it can't be represented as a finite union of closed irreducible subspaces. By the assumption, X itself have to be reducible, so there are proper closed subsets C_1 and C'_1 such that $X = C_1 \cup C'_1$. Again by the assumption, at least one of C_1 and C'_1 is reducible, and we can suppose that C_1 is reducible, i.e., there are proper closed subsets C_2 and C'_2 (which are also closed in X) such that $C_1 = C_2 \cup C'_2$. Again by the assumption, we can suppose that C_2 is reducible, and so there are proper closed subsets C_3 and C'_3 satisfying the property. By repeating this process, one can obtain a chain of closed subsets

$$C_1 \supsetneq C_2 \supsetneq C_3 \supsetneq \cdots$$

but this contradicts to the fact that X is Noetherian. Hence, X can be represented as a finite union of irreducible closed subsets.

□

Solution of Problem 4. We can consider a composition

$$k \longrightarrow k[x_i]_{1 \leq i \leq n} \longrightarrow \frac{k[x_i]_i}{M}$$

Because this composition is finite by the weak nullstellensatz, and k is algebraically closed, so it must be an isomorphism. Hence, there is $a_i \in k$ such that $x_i + M = a_i + M$ for each i , that means, the ideal $\langle x_i - a_i \rangle_i \trianglelefteq k[x_i]_i$ is contained in M . To conclude the proof, it is enough to show that the ideal $\langle x_i - a_i \rangle$ is maximal.

Note that $k[x_i]_i = k[x_i - a_i]_i$ holds. One consider a surjective ring map

$$\phi : k[x_i]_i \rightarrow k; x_i \mapsto a_i$$

Every polynomial in $k[x_i]_i = k[x_i - a_i]_i$ can be represented as $\sum_{\alpha} c_{\alpha} \cdot (x - a)^{\alpha}$, where $x = (x_i)_i$ and $a = (a_i)_i$. This polynomial mapsto c_0 by the map ϕ , and this value is zero if and only if $\sum_{\alpha} c_{\alpha} \cdot (x - a)^{\alpha}$ is an element of $\langle x_i - a_i \rangle_i$, i.e., $\ker \phi = \langle x_i - a_i \rangle_i$ holds. By the first isomorphism theorem, one can conclude that

$$\frac{k[x_i]_i}{\langle x_i - a_i \rangle_i} \cong k$$

so the ideal $\langle x_i - a_i \rangle_i$ is maximal. This finishes the proof.

□

Solution of Problem 5. Let's consider an ideal $\langle x_1^2 + 1, x_i \rangle_{i \geq 2}$, then one can conclude that

$$\frac{\mathbb{R}[x_i]_i}{\langle x_1^2 + 1, x_i \rangle_{i \geq 2}} = \frac{(\mathbb{R}[x_1]) [x_i]_{i \geq 2}}{\langle \langle x_1^2 + 1 \rangle, x_i \rangle_{i \geq 2}} \cong \frac{\mathbb{R}[x_1]}{\langle x_1^2 + 1 \rangle} \cong \mathbb{C}$$

Thus, the ideal $\langle x_1^2 + 1, x_i \rangle_{i \geq 2}$ is maximal. However, it is not of the form $\langle x_i - a_i \rangle_i$, because the residue field corresponds to this maximal ideal is \mathbb{R} , but not \mathbb{C} , by the solution of **Problem 4**. This gives the result. \square