

MATH 502 Notes

Jiantong Liu

November 7, 2023

These notes are live-texed from a commutative algebra course (MATH 502) taught by Professor S.P. Dutta in Fall 2023 at University of Illinois. Any mistakes and inaccuracies would be my own. This course mainly follows Serre's *Local Algebra* ([Ser12]), with a few other books, listed in the references, as supplements. An older (but more polished) version of notes from the same course can be found [here](#).

Throughout these notes, we assume a ring has a multiplicative identity 1 and is commutative.

CONTENTS

Table of Contents	1
0 Noetherian, Artinian, and Localization	2
1 Primary Decomposition Theorem	8
1.1 For Finitely-generated Modules	8
1.2 For Infinitely-generated Modules	15
2 Filtered Rings and Modules, Completions	16
2.1 Filtrations of Rings and Modules	16
2.2 Topology and metric on Filtered Rings and Modules	18
2.3 (I -adic) Completion	19
2.4 Faithfully Flat Modules	27
3 Dimension Theory	32
3.1 Graded Rings and Hilbert-Samuel Polynomial	32
3.2 Dimension over Zariski Topology	37
4 Integral Extensions	43
4.1 Going-up and Going-down	43
4.2 Discrete Valuation Ring (DVR) and Dedekind Domain	49
5 Noether's Normalization Lemma	52
6 Homological Algebra	58
6.1 Complexes, Homotopy, Homology	58
6.2 Resolutions	59
Index	61
References	63

0 NOETHERIAN, ARTINIAN, AND LOCALIZATION

Proposition 0.1. Let R be a (commutative) ring, and let M be an A -module, then the following are equivalent:

- (i) Given an infinite increasing chain of submodules of M

$$M_1 \subseteq M_2 \subseteq \cdots \subseteq M_n \subseteq M_{n+1} \subseteq \cdots$$

then there exists some $N \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $M_N = M_{N+1} = \cdots$, i.e., for all $n \geq N$, $M_n = M_{n+1}$.

- (ii) Every non-empty family of submodules has a maximal element.

- (iii) Every submodule of M is finitely-generated.

Proof. (i) \Rightarrow (ii): This is a direct result of Zorn's lemma.

(ii) \Rightarrow (i): Obvious.

(i), (ii) \Rightarrow (iii): Take any submodule N of M and take $x_1 \in N$. If $(x_1) \neq N$, then there exists $x_2 \in N \setminus (x_1)$, so $(x_1, x_2) \subseteq N$, now we proceed inductively, but by the given property we know this stops in finite number of steps, hence we have $N = (x_1, \dots, x_n)$ for some $n \in \mathbb{N}$, thus N is finitely-generated.

(iii) \Rightarrow (i): Note that the property implies M is finitely-generated, but that means the chain of submodules must be finite. \square

Definition 0.2 (Noetherian Module). If any of the conditions in [Proposition 0.1](#) holds, then M is said to be a Noetherian module. Alternatively, we say M satisfies the ascending chain condition.

Proposition 0.3. Let R be a (commutative) ring, and let M be an A -module, then the following are equivalent:

- (i) Given an infinite decreasing chain of submodules of M

$$M_1 \supseteq M_2 \supseteq \cdots \supseteq M_n \supseteq M_{n+1} \supseteq \cdots$$

then there exists some $N \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $M_N = M_{N+1} = \cdots$, i.e., for all $n \geq N$, $M_n = M_{n+1}$.

- (ii) Every non-empty family of submodules has a minimal element.

Proof. Again, Zorn's lemma. \square

Definition 0.4 (Artinian Module). If any of the conditions in [Proposition 0.3](#) holds, then M is said to be an Artinian module. Alternatively, we say M satisfies the descending chain condition.

Example 0.5. • \mathbb{Z} is Noetherian.

- \mathbb{Q}/\mathbb{Z} is not Noetherian.
- Let p be a prime. Let $\mathbb{Z}(p^\infty)$ be the union of chains (as direct limits)

$$\left\langle \frac{\bar{1}}{p} \right\rangle \subseteq \left\langle \frac{\bar{1}}{p^2} \right\rangle \subseteq \cdots \subseteq \left\langle \frac{\bar{1}}{p^n} \right\rangle \subseteq \cdots$$

then there is an embedding $\mathbb{Z}(p^\infty) \subseteq \mathbb{Q}/\mathbb{Z}$, where \bar{a} is the image of a in \mathbb{Q}/\mathbb{Z} . With this construction, $\mathbb{Z}(p^\infty)$ is Artinian.

Exercise 0.6. Show that $\mathbb{Q}/\mathbb{Z} \cong \bigoplus_p \mathbb{Z}(p^\infty)$ where p traverses through all the primes.

Proposition 0.7. Let N be a submodule of M . Suppose M satisfies ascending (respectively, descending) chain condition, then N and M/N also satisfy ascending (respectively, descending) chain condition. If, for some submodule N of M , we know N and M/N satisfy ascending (respectively, descending) chain condition, then M also satisfies ascending (respectively, descending) chain condition.

Proof. Suppose M satisfies ascending (respectively, descending) chain condition, and let N be a submodule of M . Let $\{N_i\}$ be an increasing (respectively, decreasing) sequence of submodules of N , then they can be regarded as submodules of M , therefore by the Noetherian (respectively, Artinian) condition, we know N satisfies ascending (respectively, descending) chain condition. Now let $\bar{M} = M/N$, and take $\{\bar{M}_i\}$ be an increasing (respectively, decreasing) sequence of submodules of \bar{M} . Let $\pi : M \rightarrow M/N$ be the quotient map, then the preimages give an increasing (respectively, decreasing) sequence $\{M_i\}$ of submodules of M , where $M_i = \pi^{-1}(\bar{M}_i)$, but by the Noetherian (respectively, Artinian) condition, we know the sequence stops in finite steps, therefore the original sequence stops in finite steps as well, hence \bar{M} satisfies the ascending (respectively, descending) chain condition.

Suppose a submodule N of M is such that N and M/N both satisfy ascending chain condition. Take a submodule T of M , then we have a short exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow T \cap N \hookrightarrow T \longrightarrow T/(T \cap N) \longrightarrow 0$$

Now $T \cap N$ is finitely-generated as N is finitely-generated, therefore we have an embedding $T/(T \cap N) \hookrightarrow M/N$, thus $T/(T \cap N)$ is finitely-generated, therefore T is also finitely-generated by a vector space argument.

Suppose we have a decreasing sequence $\{M_n\}$ of M , then we have a decreasing sequence $\{N \cap M_n\}$. Let $\bar{M} = M/N$, then $\bar{M}_n := (M_n + N)/N$ defines a decreasing sequence of submodules in \bar{M} , but N satisfies the descending chain condition, so the sequence $\{N \cap M_n\}$ stops in finite number of steps, say n_0 . Moreover, the sequence of \bar{M}_n 's also stops in finite number of steps, so by definition the sequence of $(M_n + N)/N$ stops in finite number of steps, say m_0 , but by the isomorphism theorem this shows that the sequence of $M_n/(N \cap M_n)$ stops in m_0 steps. Therefore, whenever $n \geq m_0, n_0$, then $N \cap M_n = N \cap M_{n+1}$, hence $M_n = M_{n+1} = \dots$ for such n . \square

Remark 0.8. The final argument should also work in the Noetherian case.

Definition 0.9 (Simple Module). An A -module M is simple if the submodules of M are either 0 or M .

Exercise 0.10. Let A be a commutative ring, and M is an A -module, then M is simple if and only if $M \cong A/\mathfrak{m}$ for some maximal ideal \mathfrak{m} of A .

Definition 0.11 (Jordan-Hölder Chain). Let A be a commutative ring and M be an A -module. We say M has a Jordan-Hölder chain if there exists a decreasing chain of submodules $\{M_i\}$ such that

$$M = M_0 \supsetneq M_1 \supsetneq \dots \supsetneq M_{n-1} \supsetneq M_n = 0$$

such that M_i/M_{i+1} is simple. In such a situation, we know n is the length of the Jordan-Hölder chain, and such n is unique. We say M is a module of finite length, and the length is $\ell_A(M) = n$.

Exercise 0.12. Let A be a commutative ring, and let M be an A -module, then M is of finite length if and only if M is both Noetherian and Artinian.

Theorem 0.13. Let A be a commutative ring, then A is Artinian if and only if A is Noetherian and every prime ideal of A is maximal.

Proof. (\Leftarrow):

Lemma 0.14. Let A be Noetherian, then every ideal of A contains a product of prime ideals.

Subproof. Suppose, towards contradiction, that there exists some ideal I of A that does not contain a product of prime ideals. Let \mathcal{J} be the set of such ideals of A , then $\mathcal{J} \neq \emptyset$, and we can take a maximal element of \mathcal{J} , namely J .¹ By definition, J is not prime, therefore there exists $a, b \in A$ such that $a \notin J$ and $b \notin J$, but $ab \in J$. Now $J \subsetneq J + Aa$ and $J \subsetneq J + Ab$, therefore $J + Aa, J + Ab \notin \mathcal{J}$, therefore $J + Aa$ and $J + Ab$ both contain product of prime ideals. But now $(J + Aa)(J + Ab)$ should also contain products of prime ideals, but by distribution this is just $J^2 + Ja + Jb + Aab$, which is contained in J because every term is contained in J , so J contains a product of prime ideals as well, contradiction. \blacksquare

¹The existence of this maximal element is the result of Zorn's lemma and ACC condition.

In particular, (0) contains a product of prime ideals, in particular (0) equals to this product, but every prime ideal is maximal, therefore $(0) = \mathfrak{m}_1 \cdots \mathfrak{m}_n$ becomes the product of maximal ideals (which may not necessarily be distinct), hence we have a descending chain of ideals

$$A \supseteq \mathfrak{m}_1 \supseteq \mathfrak{m}_1 \mathfrak{m}_2 \supseteq \cdots \supseteq \mathfrak{m}_1 \cdots \mathfrak{m}_n = (0),$$

and in particular $(\mathfrak{m}_1 \cdots \mathfrak{m}_{i-1})/(\mathfrak{m}_1 \cdots \mathfrak{m}_i)$ is a finite-dimensional since A is Noetherian, and it has a natural structure as a A/\mathfrak{m}_i -vector space. From the short exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow \mathfrak{m}_1 \cdots \mathfrak{m}_i \longrightarrow \mathfrak{m}_1 \cdots \mathfrak{m}_{i-1} \longrightarrow (\mathfrak{m}_1 \cdots \mathfrak{m}_{i-1})/(\mathfrak{m}_1 \cdots \mathfrak{m}_i) \longrightarrow 0$$

we know the two sides of the sequence are Artinian, hence the central term is Artinian. Proceeding inductively, we know that \mathfrak{m}_1 is Artinian, and R/\mathfrak{m}_1 would also be Artinian, hence A is Artinian.

(\Rightarrow): Now suppose A is Artinian, and we want to show that every prime ideal is maximal, and (0) is a product of maximal ideals. The result then follows from the argument above.

Lemma 0.15. Every Artinian domain is a field.

Subproof. Let $0 \neq a \in A$, then consider the chain

$$(a) \supseteq (a^2) \supseteq \cdots \supseteq (a^n) \supseteq \cdots$$

and by the Artinian property, for some large enough n the descending chain stops. Hence, we have $a^n = \lambda a^{n+1}$ for some large enough n and some $\lambda \in A$. Hence, $a^n(1 - \lambda a) = 0$, by the cancellation property of a domain, since $a \neq 0$, we must have $\lambda a = 1$, therefore a is a unit, as desired. ■

Corollary 0.16. Let A be Artinian, then every prime ideal of A is maximal.

Finally, it suffices to show that $(0) = \mathfrak{m}_1 \cdots \mathfrak{m}_n$. Let \mathfrak{J} be the set of finite products of maximal ideals, then \mathfrak{J} has a minimal element, and it suffices to show that this element is (0) . Suppose not, let $I \neq (0)$ be a minimal element of R . For any two ideals α, β of A , let $(\alpha : \beta) = \{a \in A \mid a\beta \subseteq \alpha\}$. Note that this has a natural structure as an ideal of A . Let $J = ((0) : I)$, and suppose $J = A$, then $I = 0$, contradiction, so $J \neq A$ is a proper ideal of A , now consider A/J which is Artinian, then let \mathfrak{G} be the set of all non-zero ideals of A/J , so \mathfrak{G} has a minimal element as well, call it \bar{H} . Let $H = \pi^{-1}(\bar{H})$ where $\pi : A \rightarrow A/J$, so we have $J \subsetneq H$, thus let $P = (J : H)$.

Claim 0.17. P is a prime ideal.

Subproof. Given $c, d \notin P$, we want to show that $cd \notin P$. Indeed, consider $J \subsetneq J + cH \subseteq H$, then since H is minimal, then $J + cH = H$, and similarly we have that $J + dH = H$. Therefore, we have that $J + cdH = J + c(dH + J) = J + cH = H$, hence we know $cd \notin P$, as desired. ■

Now $P = (J : H)$ and $J = (0 : I)$, the by definition we have $PHI = (0)$. Since P is a prime ideal, then P is maximal, and now

$$(0 : PI) \supseteq H \supsetneq J = (0 : I)$$

Therefore $PI \subsetneq I$, where I is a minimal element, contradiction, hence (0) is a product of maximal ideals. □

Definition 0.18 (Short Exact Sequence). Consider the sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow N \xrightarrow{f} M \xrightarrow{g} T \longrightarrow 0$$

This is called a short exact sequence if $\ker(f) = 0$, $\text{im}(g) = T$, and $\ker(g) = \text{im}(f)$. In particular, one slot of the sequence is said to be exact if the kernel of the previous map equals to the image of the subsequent map.

Definition 0.19 (Flat Module). Let M be an A -module, then we say M is a flat A -module if for every short exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow N_1 \longrightarrow N_2 \longrightarrow N_3 \longrightarrow 0$$

the tensored sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow M \otimes_A N_1 \longrightarrow M \otimes_A N_2 \longrightarrow M \otimes_A N_3 \longrightarrow 0$$

remains exact.

Remark 0.20. Recall that the properties of modules have the following implications: free \Rightarrow projective \Rightarrow flat \Rightarrow torsion-free, and in the case of finitely-generated modules, torsion-free \Rightarrow free.

Remark 0.21. We already know that the tensor functor is right exact, namely given the short exact sequence above, then

$$M \otimes_A N_1 \longrightarrow M \otimes_A N_2 \longrightarrow M \otimes_A N_3 \longrightarrow 0$$

is exact.

Exercise 0.22. Let M be an A -module, and if there exists a short exact sequence of A -modules

$$0 \longrightarrow N_1 \longrightarrow N_2 \longrightarrow N_3 \longrightarrow 0$$

where N_1 and N_2 are finitely-generated as A -modules, and such that tensoring M preserves the short exact sequence, then M is flat.

Definition 0.23 (Multiplicatively Closed Subset). Let A be a commutative ring and M be an A -module. Let $S \subseteq A$ be a subset. We say S is a multiplicatively closed subset of A if $1 \in S$, $0 \notin S$, and whenever $s_1, s_2 \in S$, then $s_1 s_2 \in S$.

Definition 0.24 (Localization). Let $S \subseteq A$ be a multiplicatively closed subset, and let M be an A -module, then $S^{-1}M = (M \times S)/\sim$, where \sim is an equivalence relation defined by the following: $(m_1, s_1) \sim (m_2, s_2)$ if and only if there exists $t \in S$ such that $t(m_1 s_2 - m_2 s_1) = 0$. $S^{-1}M$ is said to be the localization of M at S .

Given $(m, s) \in M \times S$, we write $\overline{(m, s)}$ to be the equivalence class in $S^{-1}M$ represented by (m, s) .

Exercise 0.25. Similarly, one can define the localization $S^{-1}A$ of A at S . In fact, $S^{-1}A$ inherits a ring structure from A , namely

- $\frac{a_1}{s_1} + \frac{a_2}{s_2} = \frac{a_1 s_2 + a_2 s_1}{s_1 s_2}$,
- $\frac{a_1}{s_1} \cdot \frac{a_2}{s_2} = \frac{a_1 a_2}{s_1 s_2}$,
- $\frac{1}{s} \cdot \frac{s}{1} = \frac{1}{1} = 1$.

Remark 0.26. Note that a ring structure does not guarantee every element to have a multiplicative inverse. The localization of A at S ensures that every element of S now becomes invertible in the new ring $S^{-1}A$. In particular, this induces a ring homomorphism

$$\begin{aligned} f : A &\rightarrow S^{-1}A \\ a &\mapsto \frac{a}{1} \end{aligned}$$

This homomorphism is injective if A is a domain.

Remark 0.27. Let I be an ideal of A .

- Consider the ring homomorphism $f : A \rightarrow S^{-1}A$ above, then

$$S^{-1}I = IS^{-1}A = f(I)S^{-1}A.$$

In particular, $f^{-1}(IS^{-1}A) \supseteq I$.

- If $I \cap S \neq \emptyset$, then $IS^{-1}A = S^{-1}A$.
- If P is a prime ideal of A such that $P \cap S = \emptyset$, then $f^{-1}(PS^{-1}A) = P$.
- Let M be an A -module, then if $N \subseteq M$ is a submodule, then $S^{-1}N \subseteq S^{-1}M$. That is, given an exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow N \longrightarrow M$$

then we obtain an exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow S^{-1}N \longrightarrow S^{-1}M$$

Indeed, given $0 \rightarrow N \xrightarrow{f} M$, say we have it sending $\frac{n}{1} \mapsto \frac{f(n)}{1} = 0$, then there exists $s \in S$ such that $sf(n) = 0$, so $f(sn) = 0$, therefore $sn = 0$ by injection, hence $\frac{n}{1} = 0$ in $S^{-1}N$ as well.

Exercise 0.28. The localization functor is exact.

Lemma 0.29. Let A be a commutative ring and S be a multiplicatively closed subset of A , then $S^{-1}A \otimes_A M \cong S^{-1}M$.

Proof. We define

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi : S^{-1}A \otimes_A M &\rightarrow S^{-1}M \\ \frac{a}{s} \otimes m &\mapsto \frac{am}{s}. \end{aligned}$$

For any $\frac{m}{s} \in S^{-1}M$, we have $\varphi\left(\frac{1}{s} \otimes m\right) = \frac{m}{s}$, so the map is onto. Now suppose $\varphi\left(\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{a_i}{s_i} \otimes m_i\right) = 0$ (since this is a finite sum), then $\varphi\left(\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{a_i}{s_i} \otimes m_i\right) = \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{a_i m_i}{s_i} = 0$. We make $s = s_1 \cdots s_n$, so

$$\frac{a_i}{s_i} \otimes m_i = \frac{a_i s_1 \cdots s_{i-1} s_{i+1} \cdots s_n}{s} \otimes m_i =: \frac{b_i}{s} \otimes m_i,$$

then $\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{a_i}{s_i} \otimes m_i = \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{b_i}{s} \otimes m_i$, therefore

$$\varphi\left(\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{a_i}{s_i} \otimes m_i\right) = \varphi\left(\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{b_i}{s} \otimes m_i\right) = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n b_i m_i}{s} = 0,$$

so there exists $t \in S$ such that $t \sum_{i=1}^n b_i m_i = 0$, now

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{a_i}{s_i} \otimes m_i &= \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{b_i}{s} \otimes m_i \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{s} \otimes b_i m_i \\ &= \frac{1}{s} \otimes \sum_{i=1}^n b_i m_i \\ &= \frac{t}{ts} \otimes \sum_{i=1}^n b_i m_i \\ &= \frac{1}{ts} \otimes t \sum_{i=1}^n b_i m_i \\ &= \frac{1}{ts} \otimes 0 \\ &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

□

Proposition 0.30. The map $A \rightarrow S^{-1}A$ is A -flat, i.e., $S^{-1}A$ is a flat A -module.

Proof. Consider

$$0 \longrightarrow N \longrightarrow M \longrightarrow T \longrightarrow 0$$

By [Lemma 0.29](#) (since the isomorphism is functorial), it suffices to show the exactness of

$$0 \longrightarrow S^{-1}N \longrightarrow S^{-1}M \longrightarrow S^{-1}T \longrightarrow 0$$

and this follows from [Exercise 0.28](#). □

Definition 0.31 (Quasi-local, Local). Let A be a commutative ring. We say A is quasi-local if A has exactly one maximal ideal. In particular, if A is also Noetherian, then we say A is a local ring.

Definition 0.32 (Localization). Let A be a commutative ring and \mathfrak{p} be a prime ideal of A . Note that $S = A \setminus \mathfrak{p}$ is a multiplicatively closed subset, then we write $S^{-1}A = A_{\mathfrak{p}}$ (in general, we have $S^{-1}M = M_{\mathfrak{p}}$, where $M \otimes_A A_{\mathfrak{p}} \cong M_{\mathfrak{p}}$) to denote the localization of A away from the prime ideal \mathfrak{p} .

Exercise 0.33. $A_{\mathfrak{p}}$ is quasi-local with unique maximal ideal $\mathfrak{p}A_{\mathfrak{p}}$.

Remark 0.34. Take $x \in M$, then the following are equivalent:

- $x = 0$;
- $\frac{x}{1} = 0$ in $M_{\mathfrak{m}}$ for any maximal ideal \mathfrak{m} of A ;
- $\frac{x}{1} = 0$ in $M_{\mathfrak{p}}$ for any prime ideal \mathfrak{p} of A .

Proof. We will prove the first two are equivalent. The (\Rightarrow) direction is obvious. Conversely, let $I = \{a \in A \mid ax = 0\}$ to be the annihilator of x in A . Suppose, towards contradiction, that $I \neq A$, then I is contained in some maximal ideal \mathfrak{m} of A , then consider $M_{\mathfrak{m}}$. Since $\frac{x}{1} = 0$ in $M_{\mathfrak{m}}$, then there exists $t \in A \setminus \mathfrak{m}$ such that $tx = 0$, but $I \subseteq \mathfrak{m}$ and $t \notin \mathfrak{m}$, then we reach a contradiction, hence $I = A$, and obviously we are done. \square

Exercise 0.35. 1. Given the sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow M \xrightarrow{f} N \xrightarrow{g} T \longrightarrow 0$$

the following are equivalent:

- the sequence is exact;
- the sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow M_{\mathfrak{m}} \xrightarrow{f_{\mathfrak{m}}} N_{\mathfrak{m}} \xrightarrow{g_{\mathfrak{m}}} T_{\mathfrak{m}} \longrightarrow 0$$

is exact for all maximal ideals \mathfrak{m} of A ;

- the sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow M_{\mathfrak{p}} \xrightarrow{f_{\mathfrak{p}}} N_{\mathfrak{p}} \xrightarrow{g_{\mathfrak{p}}} T_{\mathfrak{p}} \longrightarrow 0$$

is exact for all prime ideals \mathfrak{p} of A .

To see this, apply [Remark 0.34](#).

2. Let A be a commutative ring and M be an A -module, then the following are equivalent:

- M is A -flat;
- $M_{\mathfrak{m}}$ is $A_{\mathfrak{m}}$ -flat for all maximal ideals \mathfrak{m} of A ;
- $M_{\mathfrak{p}}$ is $A_{\mathfrak{p}}$ -flat for all prime ideals \mathfrak{p} of A ;

Hence, exactness is a local property.

Exercise 0.36. Let A be a commutative ring, then A is Artinian if and only if A as an A -module is of finite length, i.e., $\ell_A(A) < \infty$. Indeed, note that $(0) = \mathfrak{m}_1 \cdots \mathfrak{m}_n$, and write down the Jordan-Hölder series.

1 PRIMARY DECOMPOSITION THEOREM

Throughout [Section 1](#), the commutative ring A is always Noetherian. In [Section 1.1](#), M is a finitely-generated A -module; in [Section 1.2](#), we drop this assumption.

1.1 FOR FINITELY-GENERATED MODULES

Definition 1.1 (Coprimary). We say M is a coprimary module if for all $a \in A$, the left multiplication $m_a : M \rightarrow M$ is either injective or nilpotent (i.e., there exists $n > 0$ such that $a^n M = 0$).

Remark 1.2. (i) If M is coprimary, then N is coprimary for all $N \subseteq M$.

(ii) If M is coprimary, let $P = \{a \in A \mid a : M \rightarrow M \text{ is nilpotent}\}$, then P is a prime ideal of A .

Proof. For $a, b \notin P$, $a, b : M \rightarrow M$ are injective maps, so $ab : M \rightarrow M$ is injective, hence $ab \notin P$. □

Hence, we usually say M is P -coprimary, i.e., M is coprimary with respect to this ideal P .

(iii) Let M be P -coprimary, then there exists an injection (as M -linear map) $A/P \hookrightarrow M$.

Proof. Take any $x \neq 0$ in M , then consider

$$\begin{aligned} a_x : A &\rightarrow M \\ 1 &\mapsto x \end{aligned}$$

Let $I = \ker(a_x)$, then we have

$$\begin{aligned} A/I &\hookrightarrow M \\ \bar{1} &\mapsto x \end{aligned}$$

Now $I \subseteq P$ since I already kills x . Since A is Noetherian, P is finitely-generated, thus consider $P = (a_1, \dots, a_r)$, then $a_i^{t_i} \cdot x = 0$ for all i and some t_i 's. Let $t = t_1 + \dots + t_r$, then $P^t \cdot x = 0$ by binomial theorem, so $P^t \subseteq I \subseteq P$, hence there exists j such that $P^j \subseteq I \subsetneq P^{j-1}$. Take $y \in P^{j-1} \setminus I$, so $\bar{y} \neq 0$ in A/P , taking the injection into M , then $\text{Ann}_A(\bar{y}) = P$. We now have the composition

$$\begin{aligned} A/P &\hookrightarrow A/I \hookrightarrow M \\ \bar{1} &\mapsto \bar{y} \end{aligned}$$

to be injective. □

(iv) Suppose M is P -coprimary, and Q is a prime ideal such that $A/Q \hookrightarrow M$, then $P = Q$.

Proof. By definition of P , $Q \subseteq P$ is obvious: Q kills elements in M , therefore the mapping becomes nilpotent. The other direction is also easy. □

Definition 1.3 (Primary). Let $N \subseteq M$ be a submodule. We say N is a primary submodule of M if M/N is coprimary. If M/N is P -coprimary, we say N is P -primary.

Remark 1.4. Let \mathfrak{p} be a prime ideal of A . We claim that \mathfrak{p}^t is P -primary. Consider

$$m_x : A/\mathfrak{p}^t \rightarrow A/\mathfrak{p}^t$$

then $x^t = 0$ on A/\mathfrak{p}^t .

Example 1.5. Let $A = k[X, Y, Z]/(Z^2 - XY)$, let $\mathfrak{p} = (x, z)$ where $x = \text{im}(X)$ and $z = \text{im}(Z)$. Now $A/\mathfrak{p} = k[Y]$. \mathfrak{p}^2 is not P -primary. Indeed, note that $A/\mathfrak{p}^2 = k[X, Y, Z]/(z^2 - xy, x^2, z^2) \cong k[X, Y, Z]/(X^2, XY, Z^2, XZ)$. Now the mapping given by multiplication by y on this map is not injective, so \mathfrak{p}^2 is not P -primary.

In particular, the represented surface is not smooth, since the origin $(0, 0, 0)$ is a singularity.

Theorem 1.6 (Primary Decomposition Theorem). By assumption, A is Noetherian and M is finitely-generated. Let $N \subseteq M$ be a submodule, then there exists a decomposition

$$N = \bigcap_{i=1}^r N_i$$

where each N_i is P_i -primary, and such that

1. all P_i 's are distinct, and
2. this decomposition is irredundant, i.e., minimal. In particular, this means removing any of the N_i 's gives a different intersection, i.e., $\bigcap_{j \neq i} N_j \not\subseteq N_i$.

This is called a primary decomposition of N . Moreover, the primary decomposition is unique up to permutation of modules, that is, if there exists another primary decomposition, i.e., $N = \bigcap_{i=1}^s N'_i$ where N'_i 's are P'_i -primary, then $r = s$ and $\{N_1, \dots, N_r\} = \{N'_1, \dots, N'_s\}$.

Proof.

Definition 1.7 (Irreducible). A submodule $T \subsetneq M$ is called irreducible if $T \neq T_1 \cap T_2$, where T_1, T_2 are distinct proper submodules of M .

Claim 1.8. Every submodule T of M can be expressed by $T = T_1 \cap \dots \cap T_l$ where each T_i is irreducible.

Subproof. Suppose, towards contradiction, that there exists some T for which the claim fails, then the set of all such submodules T is a non-empty set \mathcal{T} . Since M is Noetherian, then \mathcal{T} has a maximal element W , therefore W is not irreducible. By definition, $W = W_1 \cap W_2$ where W_1, W_2 are distinct proper submodules of M , so $W_1 \notin \mathcal{T}$ and $W_2 \notin \mathcal{T}$, therefore $W_1 = T_1 \cap \dots \cap T_r$ for irreducible T_i 's, and $W_2 = T'_1 \cap \dots \cap T'_s$ where T'_i are irreducible. Therefore, W becomes an intersection of irreducible submodules, a contradiction. ■

Claim 1.9. Suppose T is irreducible in M , then T is a primary submodule of M . That is, we need to show $\bar{M} := M/T$ is coprimary.

Subproof. It suffices to show the following: for all $a \neq 0$ in A , the multiplication map $a : \bar{M} \rightarrow \bar{M}$ is either nilpotent or injective. Note that (0) in \bar{M} is irreducible. To see this, we take the ascending chain

$$\ker(a) \subseteq \ker(a^2) \subseteq \ker(a^3) \subseteq \dots$$

and since A is Noetherian we know $\ker(a^n) = \ker(a^{n+1}) = \dots$ for some large enough n , therefore for $g = a^n$ we know $\ker(g) = \ker(g^2)$.

Claim 1.10. $\ker(g) \cap \text{im}(g) = (0)$ in \bar{M} .

Subproof of Subclaim. Let $x \in \ker(g) \cap \text{im}(g)$, then $g(x) = 0$, and there exists $y \in \bar{M}$ such that $x = g(y)$, so $0 = g(x) = g^2(y)$, but that means $y \in \ker(g^2) = \ker(g)$, so $x = 0$. ■

Therefore, (0) is irreducible in \bar{M} , so either $\ker(g) = (0)$ or $\ker(g) = \bar{M}$. If $\ker(g) = (0)$, we have g to be injective, hence multiplication by a is injective; if $\ker(g) = \bar{M}$, we have $a^n \bar{M} = 0$, so a becomes nilpotent. ■

Claim 1.11. If N_1 and N_2 are both P -primary as submodules, then $N_1 \cap N_2$ is also P -primary.

Subproof. By definition, M/N_1 and M/N_2 are both P -coprimary, then it is easy to see that $M/N_1 \oplus M/N_2$ is also P -coprimary. We know there is an obvious inclusion

$$\begin{aligned} M/(N_1 \cap N_2) &\hookrightarrow M/N_1 \oplus M/N_2 \\ \bar{x} &\mapsto (\bar{x}, \bar{x}) \end{aligned}$$

so $M/(N_1 \cap N_2)$ is also coprimary by the inclusion, therefore $N_1 \cap N_2$ is P -primary. ■

Now by [Claim 1.8](#) we have an irreducible decomposition $N = N_1 \cap \cdots \cap N_r$ and without loss of generality let it be of the smallest length, that is, the N_i 's are irreducible modules that are irredundant. By [Claim 1.9](#), we know each of the N_i 's is primary with respect to some prime ideal. Now for any two P -primary modules N_i and N_j , we know the intersection is still P -primary according to [Claim 1.11](#), therefore we obtain an irredundant intersection $N = N'_1 \cap \cdots \cap N'_s$ where each N'_i is P_i -primary (where P_i 's are now distinct!), and this proves the existence.

For the uniqueness, suppose we have $N = N_1 \cap \cdots \cap N_r$ where N_i is P_i -primary, where P_i 's are distinct, and suppose we have $N = N'_1 \cap \cdots \cap N'_s$ where N'_i is P'_i -primary, where all P'_i are distinct as well. It is enough to show the following:

Claim 1.12. For any prime ideal p of A , $p \in \{P_1, \dots, P_r\}$ if and only if there exists an injection $A/p \hookrightarrow M/N$.

Subproof. Let $p \in \{P_1, \dots, P_r\}$, without loss of generality denote $p = P_1$, then we have an injection $A/p \hookrightarrow M/N_1$ by [Remark 1.2](#). In $\bar{M} = M/N$, we have $(0) = N_1/N \cap \cdots \cap N_r/N =: \bar{N}_1 \cap \cdots \cap \bar{N}_r$, therefore $\bar{N}_2 \cap \cdots \cap \bar{N}_r \hookrightarrow \bar{M}/\bar{N}_1 = M/N_1$. But $M/N_1 = \bar{M}/\bar{N}_1$, so this gives an injection $\bar{N}_2 \cap \cdots \cap \bar{N}_r \hookrightarrow M/N_1$, but M/N_1 is P_1 -coprimary, so $\bar{N}_2 \cap \cdots \cap \bar{N}_r$ is also P_1 -coprimary, therefore $A/P_1 \hookrightarrow \bar{N}_2 \cap \cdots \cap \bar{N}_r \hookrightarrow \bar{M} = M/N$ by [Remark 1.2](#).

Now suppose $A/p \hookrightarrow M/N$, to show $p \in \{P_1, \dots, P_r\}$, it suffices to show $A/p \hookrightarrow M/N_i$ is injective for some $1 \leq i \leq r$. We have

$$\begin{array}{c} \varphi_i \\ \curvearrowright \\ A/p \xrightarrow{\varphi} M/N = \bar{M} \xrightarrow{\eta_i} \bar{M}/\bar{N}_i = M/N_i \end{array}$$

and we want to show there exists some injective φ_i . Suppose not, then $\ker(\varphi_i) \neq 0$ in A/p for all $1 \leq i \leq r$. But A/p is an integral domain, therefore $\bigcap_{i=1}^r \ker(\varphi_i) \neq 0$. Therefore, we have

$$A/p \xrightarrow{\varphi} M/N \xrightarrow{(\eta_1, \dots, \eta_r)} \bigoplus_{i=1}^r M/N_i$$

Thus, the defined composition above is the injection $(\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_r)$. This implies $\bigcap_{i=1}^r \ker(\varphi_i) = \ker(\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_r) = 0$, a contradiction. Thus, there exists some injective φ_i , and therefore $p \in \{P_1, \dots, P_r\}$. ■

□

Definition 1.13 (Zero-divisor). Let A be Noetherian and M be a finitely-generated A -module. We say $0 \neq a \in A$ is a zero-divisor on M if there exists $0 \neq x \in M$ such that $ax = 0$. Otherwise, we say a is a non-zero-divisor on M .

Definition 1.14 (Essential prime ideal, Associated prime ideal). Given a primary decomposition $N = \bigcap_{i=1}^r N_i$, the corresponding prime ideals $\{P_1, \dots, P_r\}$ are called the essential prime ideals of N . In particular, if $N = (0)$, we say these are the associated prime ideals of M , denoted by $\text{Ass}_A(M) = \{P_1, \dots, P_r\}$.

Corollary 1.15. Let A be Noetherian and M be a finitely-generated A -module, and let $\text{Ass}_A(M) = \{P_1, \dots, P_r\}$, then $\bigcup_{i=1}^r P_i$ is the set of all zero-divisors on M .

Proof. If $p \in \text{Ass}_A(M)$, then there exists an injection $A/p \hookrightarrow M$ mapping $\bar{1} \mapsto x$ by [Claim 1.12](#). Therefore, $px = 0$, so elements of p are zero-divisors of M . Let a be a zero-divisor on M , i.e., let $0 \neq x \in M$ be such that $ax = 0$. Take the primary decomposition $(0) = N_1 \cap \cdots \cap N_r$ in M , where N_i is P_i -primary, then there exists i such that $x \notin N_i$. Since $\bar{x} \neq 0$ in M/N_i , then $a : M/N_i \rightarrow M/N_i$ is such that $a\bar{x} = 0$, so a is nilpotent on M/N_i . Therefore, M/N_i is P_i -coprimary, and by definition $a \in P_i$. □

Exercise 1.16. Let $\text{Ass}_A(M) = \{P_1, \dots, P_r\}$, then the set of all nilpotent elements of M is $\bigcap_{i=1}^r P_i$.

Corollary 1.17. Suppose $N \subseteq M$ is a submodule, then

$$\text{Ass}_A(N) \subseteq \text{Ass}_A(M) \subseteq \text{Ass}_A(N) \cup \text{Ass}_A(M/N).$$

Proof. The first inclusion is obvious by $A/p \hookrightarrow N \hookrightarrow M$. We now show the second inclusion. Let $p \in \text{Ass}_A(M)$, and suppose $p \notin \text{Ass}_A(N)$, and we have an inclusion $i : A/p \rightarrow M$.

Claim 1.18. $i(A/p) \cap N = (0)$.

Subproof. Suppose not, then let $0 \neq x \in i(A/p) \cap N$, then $x \in N$ and $x \in i(A/p)$, but A/p is an integral domain and is p -coprimary, so $i(A/p) \cap N$ is p -coprimary. Therefore, we have

$$A/p \hookrightarrow i(A/p) \cap N \hookrightarrow N$$

and so $p \in \text{Ass}_A(N)$, a contradiction. ■

Therefore, we have the composition $A/p \rightarrow M \rightarrow M/N$ to be injection, thus $p \in \text{Ass}_A(M/N)$. □

Corollary 1.19. Let M be finitely-generated, and let $I = \text{Ann}_A(M)$, then the essential prime ideals of I is an associated prime of M .

Proof. Note that the essential prime ideals of I are just $\text{Ass}_A(A/I)$, so if we write $I = I_1 \cap \cdots \cap I_r$ where I_i is a P_i -primary. Therefore, we have $A/I = \bar{I}_1 \cap \cdots \cap \bar{I}_r$, where $\bar{I}_i = I_i/I$, and \bar{I}_i is P_i -primary.

Now let $M = \langle \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n \rangle$ be given by a set of generators, so $M = \{\sum a_i \alpha_i \mid a_i \in A\}$, now we look at the map

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi : A &\rightarrow \bigoplus_{i=1}^n M \\ 1 &\mapsto (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n) \end{aligned}$$

then the kernel $\ker(\varphi) = I$, so $\bar{\varphi} : A/I \hookrightarrow \bigoplus_{i=1}^n M$ is an injection. By [Corollary 1.17](#), $\text{Ass}_A(M_1 \oplus M_2) = \text{Ass}_A(M_1) \cup \text{Ass}_A(M_2)$, hence we know

$$\text{Ass}(A/I) \subseteq \bigcup_{i=1}^n \text{Ass}_A(M) = \text{Ass}_A(M).$$

□

Definition 1.20 (Support). The support of M over A , denoted $\text{Supp}_A(M)$, is the set $\{P \mid P \text{ prime ideal such that } P \supseteq I = \text{Ann}_A(M)\}$.

Theorem 1.21 (Prime Filtration). Let M be finitely-generated, then we have a descending chain

$$M = M_0 \supseteq M_1 \supseteq \cdots \supseteq M_{n-1} \supseteq M_n = (0)$$

of prime ideals such that $M_i/M_{i+1} \cong A/P_{i+1}$, $0 \leq i \leq n-1$, where P_i 's are prime ideals of A , and $\text{Ass}_A(M) \subseteq \{P_1, \dots, P_n\}$.

Proof. Note that $P \in \text{Ass}_A(M)$ if and only if $i : A/P \hookrightarrow M$, therefore $i(A/P)$ satisfies the condition stated in the theorem. Therefore, take $\mathcal{A} = \{N \subseteq M \mid N \text{ satisfies the condition of the theorem}\}$. Since A is Noetherian, we take a maximal element T of \mathcal{A} .

Claim 1.22. $T = M$.

Subproof. Suppose, towards contradiction, that $T \neq M$, then we have a short exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow T \longrightarrow M \longrightarrow M/T \longrightarrow 0$$

such that $M/T \neq (0)$.

Exercise 1.23. Let L be a finitely-generated A -module, then $L = 0$ if and only if $\text{Ass}_A(L) = \emptyset$.

Let $q \in \text{Ass}_A(M/T)$, then we have

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} & & & & A/q & & \\ & & & & \downarrow j & & \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & T & \longrightarrow & M & \xrightarrow{\eta} & M/T \longrightarrow 0 \end{array}$$

and take $W = \eta^{-1}(j(A/q))$, so we have a new short exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow T \longrightarrow W \longrightarrow j(A/q) \cong A/q \longrightarrow 0$$

Thus, $W \supsetneq T$ satisfies the condition in the theorem. By the maximality of T , we have a contradiction. ■

□

Remark 1.24. Let A be Noetherian and $\mathfrak{m} \subseteq A$ be a maximal ideal, then for any ideal $I \subseteq A$ such that there exists n with $\mathfrak{m}^n \subseteq I \subseteq \mathfrak{m}$, then I is \mathfrak{m} -primary.

Proof. Consider the map

$$A/I \xrightarrow{\cdot x^n} A/I$$

for $x \in \mathfrak{m}$, then this is the zero map. Therefore, multiplication by x is nilpotent. Now suppose $x \notin \mathfrak{m}$, then we want to show that $A/I \xrightarrow{\cdot x} A/I$ is injective. Indeed, since $x \notin \mathfrak{m}$, then $\mathfrak{m} + Ax = A$, hence we have that $y + ax = 1$ for some $y \in \mathfrak{m}$ and $a \in A$, so $(y + ax)^n = 1$, $y^n + \mu x = 1$, but that means the map $A/I \rightarrow A/I$ is given by multiplication by μx , so $\bar{\mu}\bar{x} = \bar{1}$ since y vanishes. That is, \bar{x} is invertible over A/I , hence multiplication by x is an isomorphism. □

Exercise 1.25. Let A be a ring and S be a multiplicatively closed subset of A , and let M be an A -module, then $S^{-1}M$ is an $S^{-1}A$ -module. Let $T \subseteq S^{-1}M$ be an $S^{-1}A$ -submodule, then there exists $N \subseteq M$ such that $T = S^{-1}N$.

Remark 1.26. Localization functor is fully faithful.

Remark 1.27. Let A be Noetherian and S be a multiplicatively closed subset of A .

1. Let M be P -coprimary, then
 - if $S \cap P = \emptyset$, then $S^{-1}M$ is $S^{-1}P$ -coprimary;
 - if $S \cap P \neq \emptyset$, then $S^{-1}M = 0$.

Proof. Indeed, suppose $S \cap P \neq \emptyset$, let $a : M \rightarrow M$ be the multiplication map by a , so $a \in P$ gives $a^n M = 0$ for some n , and if $a \notin P$, then this is injective. Let $\frac{a}{s} : S^{-1}M \rightarrow S^{-1}M$ be the multiplication map, but $\frac{a}{s}$ is a unit, so multiplication by s or $\frac{1}{s}$ is an isomorphism, hence we can take this to be $\frac{a}{1}$ with $s = 1$. If $s \in P$, then $s^n : M \rightarrow M$ is the zero map, therefore $s^n : S^{-1}M \rightarrow S^{-1}M$ is also the zero map, so s is a unit. This only happens if $S^{-1}M = 0$. □

2. Let N be P -primary, then
 - if $S \cap P = \emptyset$, then $S^{-1}N$ is $S^{-1}P$ -primary in $S^{-1}M$;
 - if $S \cap P \neq \emptyset$, then $S^{-1}N = S^{-1}M$.

Remark 1.28. Consider the localization $S^{-1}M$. Take a submodule T of $S^{-1}M$, then by [Exercise 1.25](#), $T = S^{-1}N$ for some $N \subseteq M$. There is now a primary decomposition on N given by $N = N_1 \cap \cdots \cap N_t$ where N_i is P_i -primary.

Exercise 1.29. Let $W_1, W_2 \subseteq M$, then $S^{-1}(W_1 \cap W_2) = S^{-1}(W_1) \cap S^{-1}(W_2)$ in $S^{-1}M$.

Remark 1.30. This is true whenever we have a flat ring extension.

Therefore, we have

$$\begin{aligned} T &= S^{-1}N \\ &= S^{-1}N_1 \cap \cdots \cap S^{-1}N_t \\ &= S^{-1}N_{i_1} \cap \cdots \cap S^{-1}N_{i_r} \end{aligned}$$

where $S^{-1}N_{i_j}$ is $S^{-1}P_{i_j}$ -primary, and P_{i_1}, \dots, P_{i_r} are prime ideals for which $S \cap P_j = \emptyset$, where $P_j \in \{P_1, \dots, P_t\}$.

Exercise 1.31. Let N be P -primary in M .

- if $S \cap P = \emptyset$, then $i_M : M \rightarrow S^{-1}M$ and $i_N : N \rightarrow S^{-1}N$ gives $i_M^{-1}(S^{-1}N) = N$;
- if $S \cap P \neq \emptyset$, then $i_M^{-1}(S^{-1}N) = i_M^{-1}(S^{-1}M) = M$.

Corollary 1.32. Consider a primary decomposition $N = N_1 \cap \cdots \cap N_t$ where N_i is P_i -primary. Suppose we have a different primary decomposition $N = N'_1 \cap \cdots \cap N'_t$ where N'_i is also P_i -primary. Suppose P_1 is a minimal element in $\{P_1, \dots, P_t\}$, then $N_1 = N'_1$.

Proof. Let $S = A \setminus P_1$, then $S^{-1}N = S^{-1}N_1 = S^{-1}N'_1$. Now consider $i_M : M \rightarrow S^{-1}M$, this descends to $N_1 \rightarrow S^{-1}N_1 = S^{-1}N'_1$ and $N'_1 \rightarrow S^{-1}N'_1$, so $i_M^{-1}(S^{-1}N_1 = S^{-1}N'_1) = N_1 = N'_1$. \square

Consider flat ring maps (as a ring extension) like $A \rightarrow A[x]$ and $A \rightarrow A[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ since as A -modules they are free, since we have a basis $\{x_1^{i_1}, \dots, x_n^{i_n}\}$.

Lemma 1.33. Let $A \rightarrow B$ be a flat map, and let M be an A -module. Let N_1 and N_2 be A -submodules of M , then $(N_1 \otimes_A B) \cap (N_2 \otimes_A B) = (N_1 \cap N_2) \otimes_A B$.

Proof. Consider the chain complex

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} & & 0 & & 0 & & 0 \\ & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & N_1 \cap N_2 & \longrightarrow & N_1 & \longrightarrow & N_1/(N_1 \cap N_2) \longrightarrow 0 \\ & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & N_2 & \longrightarrow & M & \longrightarrow & M/N_2 \longrightarrow 0 \\ & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & N_2/(N_1 \cap N_2) & \longrightarrow & M/N_1 & \longrightarrow & M/(N_1 + N_2) \longrightarrow 0 \\ & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ & & 0 & & 0 & & 0 \end{array}$$

with exact rows and columns. We tensor this complex by $- \otimes_A B$, then since B is flat we obtain a new chain complex

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} & & 0 & & 0 & & 0 \\ & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & (N_1 \cap N_2) \otimes_A B & \longrightarrow & N_1 \otimes_A B & \longrightarrow & (N_1/(N_1 \cap N_2)) \otimes_A B \longrightarrow 0 \\ & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & N_2 \otimes_A B & \longrightarrow & M \otimes_A B & \longrightarrow & M/N_2 \otimes_A B \longrightarrow 0 \\ & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & N_2/(N_1 \cap N_2) \otimes_A B & \longrightarrow & M/N_1 \otimes_A B & \longrightarrow & (M/(N_1 + N_2)) \otimes_A B \longrightarrow 0 \\ & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ & & 0 & & 0 & & 0 \end{array}$$

Via diagram chasing, if $x \in (N_1 \otimes_A B) \cap (N_2 \otimes_A B)$, then $x \in (N_1 \cap N_2) \otimes_A B$. \square

Corollary 1.34. Suppose we have a primary decomposition $N = N_1 \cap \cdots \cap N_t$ in M , let $A \rightarrow A[x]$, then $N[x] = N_1[x] \cap \cdots \cap N_t[x]$ in $M[x]$ where $N_i[x] = N_i \otimes_A A[x]$.

Proof. We want to show that if N_i is P_i -primary, then $N_i[x]$ is $P_i[x]$ -primary. Take a short exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow P \longrightarrow A \longrightarrow A/P \longrightarrow 0$$

then we tensor it by $-\otimes_A A[x]$, then we obtain a new short exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow P \otimes_A A[x] \longrightarrow A[x] \longrightarrow A/P \otimes_A A[x] \longrightarrow 0$$

(Note that we are working over the commutative case, so the left tensor and the right tensor are canonically isomorphic.) We have $B \otimes_A A[x] = B[x]$, now we have $A[x] \otimes_A A/P = A[x]/PA[x] = (A/P)[x]$ which is a domain, so $PA[x]$ is a prime ideal. It now suffices to show that if M is P -coprimary, then $M[x]$ is $P[x]$ -coprimary. This simplifies to showing that:

- if $f(x) \in P[x]$, then the multiplication map $M[x] \xrightarrow{f(x)} M[x]$ is nilpotent;
- if $f(x) \notin P[x]$, $M[x] \xrightarrow{f(x)} M[x]$ is an injection.

Note that $M[x] = \sum_{i \geq 0} m_i x^i$ for some m_i 's. Since $P[x]$ is a prime ideal, then $A[x]/P[x] \cong A/P[x]$. If $f(x) \in P[x]$, we have $f(X) = p_0 + p_1 x + \cdots + p_t x^t$ for p_i 's in P . Consider the multiplication map via $[f(x)]^p : M[x] \rightarrow M[x]$, where $n = n_0 + n_1 + \cdots + n_t$ such that $p_i^{n_i} M = 0$ by the binomial theorem. Now suppose $f(x) \notin P[x]$, then let us write $f(x) = a_0 + a_1 x + \cdots + a_t x^t$, and we have two cases:

- if no a_i 's are in P , then for all i , multiplication by a_i on M is an injection. If we multiply $f(x)$ by $m_0 + m_1 x + \cdots$, then the constant term would be $a_0 m_0$, and for each term to be zero, we must have $f(x)$ equivalent to zero, hence that means multiplication by $f(x)$ on $M[x]$ would be injective as well.
- Now suppose there exists some a_i that is contained in P . We can write down $f(x) = u + v$ where u has coefficients in P and v does not have any coefficients in P . If possible, let $f(\alpha) = 0$ for $\alpha \in M[x]$, then we have $u\alpha = -v\alpha$, and so $u^2\alpha = v^2\alpha$ since $u^2\alpha = u(-v\alpha) = v(-u\alpha) = v^2\alpha$, and by induction we have $u^n\alpha = (-1)^n v^n\alpha$. Therefore, for large enough n such that $u^n\alpha = 0$, we know $v^n\alpha = 0$, and therefore we have a contradiction since v does not contain any coefficients in P .

□

Remark 1.35. Remark 1.24 would fail if P is not a maximal ideal: P^2 may not be P -primary in this case.

Let R be a Noetherian ring, we let $i_P : R \rightarrow R_P$ be the localization away from P , from R to the local ring with maximal ideal PR_P , then we have $(PR_P)^n = P^n R_P$ to be PR_P -primary. Therefore, this gives a mapping from P^n to $P^n R_P = (PR_P)^n$. We now denote $P^{(n)} := i_P^{-1}(P^n R_P)$ to be the n th symbolic power of P , then $P^{(n)}$ is P -primary. (Indeed, we note that P is disjoint from $R \setminus P$, so given $M \rightarrow S^{-1}M$ pulling $S^{-1}P$ -primary module $S^{-1}N$ back to M gives a P -primary module.) In particular, $P^{(n)} \supseteq P^n$.²

Exercise 1.36. 1. • Let R be Noetherian and M be finitely-generated. Show that $\ell_R(M) < \infty$ if and only if $\text{Ass}_R(M)$ consists of maximal ideals only.

- If $\ell_A(M) < \infty$, then M is a direct sum of coprimary submodules of M .

Moreover, M is a direct sum of P -coprimary submodules where P runs through $\text{Ass}_A(M)$.

2. Now let R be a Noetherian ring and P be a prime ideal. Prove that the following are equivalent:

- P is an essential prime ideal of some submodule N of M .
- $M_P \neq 0$.

² $P^{(n)}$ is the unique P -primary component in the primary decomposition of P^n , and is the smallest P -primary ideal containing P^n . Therefore, $P^{(n)} = P^n$ if and only if P^n is primary.

- (iii) $P \supseteq \text{Ann}_R(M)$.
 - (iv) P contains some $Q \in \text{Ass}(M)$.
3. Let $R = k[x, y, z]$ for some field k , and let $P = (xz - y^2, x^3 - yz, z^2 - x^2y)$.
- Prove that P is a prime ideal of R .
 - Is P^2 P -primary?

Hint: consider

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi : k[x, y, z] &\rightarrow k[t] \\ x &\mapsto t^3 \\ y &\mapsto t^4 \\ z &\mapsto t^5 \end{aligned}$$

and show that $\ker(\varphi) = P$.

1.2 FOR INFINITELY-GENERATED MODULES

Now let R be a Noetherian ring, and M is not finitely-generated.

Definition 1.37 (Coprimary). M is called coprimary if for any $a \in R$, we have multiplication map $a : M \rightarrow M$ to be either injective, or locally nilpotent, i.e., for all $x \in M$, there exists n_x such that $a^{n_x}x = 0$.

Therefore, any submodule of M is coprimary. Now we define the associated primes to be $\text{Ass}_R(M)$ to be the set of prime ideals in R such that there exists an injection $A/p \hookrightarrow M$, i.e., R/p is a cyclic submodule of M .

Theorem 1.38. Let R and M be as above. For any $P \in \text{Ass}_R(M)$, there exists a P -primary submodule $N(P)$ of M such that $(0) = \bigcap_{P \in \text{Ass}_R(M)} N(P)$, which may be infinite.

Example 1.39. Let A and B be Noetherian rings and M be a finitely-generated A -module, and we say have a ring homomorphism $\varphi : B \rightarrow A$. Via the pullback over φ , we make M into a B -module, but M may not be finitely-generated as a B -module. For instance, take $A = \mathbb{Z}$ and $B = \mathbb{Z}[x]$.

Exercise 1.40. Let $\varphi : B \rightarrow A$ be a homomorphism of Noetherian rings. If M is a finitely-generated A -module, then via the pullback of φ , M is a B -module. We write it as ${}_{\varphi}M$. Prove that $\text{Ass}_A({}_{\varphi}M) = \varphi^{-1}(\text{Ass}_A(M))$.

2 FILTERED RINGS AND MODULES, COMPLETIONS

2.1 FILTRATIONS OF RINGS AND MODULES

Definition 2.1 (Topological Ring). Let R be a ring with addition φ and multiplication ψ . Suppose R has a topology such that φ and ψ are continuous, then we say R is a topological ring with respect to the given topology. That is, the topology respects the algebraic structure.

Similarly, we can define a topological group with respect to multiplication and inverse, and a topological module with respect to addition and scalar multiplication.

Remark 2.2. A topological ring R (respectively, topological group G , topological module M) is Hausdorff if and only if (0) is closed in R (respectively, (e) is closed in G , (0) is closed in M).

Let M be a topological module, consider

$$\begin{aligned}\varphi : M \times M &\rightarrow M \\ (x, y) &\mapsto x - y\end{aligned}$$

then the diagonal is given by $\varphi^{-1}(0) = \{(x, x) \mid x \in M\} = \Delta_M$. Now suppose (0) is closed, which gives Δ_M to be closed, hence M is Hausdorff.

Definition 2.3 (Pseudo-metric Space). We say (X, d) is a pseudo-metric space if we have a function $d : X \times X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{\geq 0}$ such that

1. $d(x, y) + d(y, z) \geq d(x, z)$,
2. $d(x, y) = d(y, x)$,
3. $d(x, x) = 0$.

This becomes a metric space if $d(x, y) = 0$ if and only if $x = y$.

Remark 2.4. A pseudo-metric space is a Hausdorff if and only if it is a metric space.

Definition 2.5 (Completion). Let (X, d) be a (pseudo-)metric space, then the completion (\hat{X}, \hat{d}) of (X, d) is a complete (all Cauchy sequences converge) metric space \hat{X} with a metric \hat{d} with a map $\varphi : X \rightarrow \hat{X}$ such that

1. φ respects both d and \hat{d} ,
2. $\varphi(X)$ is dense in \hat{X} , and
3. We have

$$\begin{array}{ccc} X & \xrightarrow{\varphi} & \hat{X} \\ & \searrow \psi & \swarrow \theta \\ & Y & \end{array}$$

that is, given any complete metric space Y and a continuous map $\psi : X \rightarrow Y$, there exists a unique map $\theta : \hat{X} \rightarrow Y$ such that the diagram commutes.

Remark 2.6. If $W \subseteq X$, then $\hat{W} \cong \overline{\varphi(W)}$.

For what we care, a complete space is Hausdorff complete.

Definition 2.7 (Directed Set). Let (I, \leq) be a poset, then I is called a directed set if for all pairs of $\alpha, \beta \in I$, there exists $\gamma \in I$ such that $\alpha \leq \gamma$ and $\beta \leq \gamma$.

Definition 2.8 (Inverse Limit). We say $\{X_\alpha\}_{\alpha \in I}$ is an inverse family indexed by I if for all $\alpha \leq \beta$, there exists maps $\varphi_{\alpha, \beta} : X_\beta \rightarrow X_\alpha$ such that for all $\alpha \leq \beta \leq \gamma$, we have a commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} X_\gamma & \xrightarrow{\varphi_{\alpha\gamma}} & X_\alpha \\ & \searrow \varphi_{\beta\gamma} & \swarrow \varphi_{\alpha\beta} \\ & X_\beta & \end{array}$$

An inverse limit of $\{X_\alpha\}_{\alpha \in I}$ is an object X with maps $\varphi_\alpha : X \rightarrow X_\alpha$ for all $\alpha \in I$ such that the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} X & \xrightarrow{\varphi_\alpha} & X_\alpha \\ & \searrow \varphi_\beta & \nearrow \varphi_{\alpha\beta} \\ & X_\beta & \end{array}$$

commutes for all $\alpha, \beta \in I$, and for all Y such that the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} Y & \xrightarrow{\psi_\alpha} & X_\alpha \\ & \searrow \psi_\beta & \nearrow \varphi_{\alpha\beta} \\ & X_\beta & \end{array}$$

commutes for all $\alpha, \beta \in I$, then there exists $f : Y \rightarrow X$ such that

$$\begin{array}{ccc} Y & \xrightarrow{f} & X \\ & \searrow \psi_\alpha & \nearrow \varphi_\alpha \\ & X_\beta & \end{array}$$

commutes for all α .

Remark 2.9. To construct such inverse limits, we take $\tilde{X} = \prod_{\alpha \in I} X_\alpha$, then we have an embedding $X \hookrightarrow \tilde{X}$ where

$$X = \left\{ \prod_{\alpha \in I} X_\alpha \mid \forall \alpha \leq \beta, \varphi_\alpha(X_\beta) = X_\alpha \right\}.$$

We denote the inverse limit to be $X = \varprojlim X_\alpha$.

Exercise 2.10. Consider $X_0 \supseteq X_1 \supseteq \cdots \supseteq X_n \supseteq \cdots$, then the inverse limit $\varprojlim X_n = \bigcap_{n \geq 0} X_n$.

Exercise 2.11. Let A be a commutative ring, and consider $A[x]$ or $A[x_1, \dots, x_n]$. Let $I = (x)$, or respectively the maximal ideal (x_1, \dots, x_n) . Then we have a map $\cdots \rightarrow A[x]/I^{n+1} \rightarrow A[x]/I^n \rightarrow A[x]/I^{n-1} \rightarrow \cdots \rightarrow A[x]/I$, so $\varprojlim A[x]/I^n \cong A[[x]]$.

Remark 2.12. By Hilbert's theorem, we know if A is Noetherian, then so is $A[x]$; similarly, if A is Noetherian, then so is $A[[x]]$.

Definition 2.13 (Graded Ring). We say a commutative ring A is graded if A contains a sequence of $\{A_n\}_{n \geq 1}$ of subgroups such that

- $A_i \cdot A_j \subseteq A_{i+j}$,
- $A = \bigoplus_{i \geq 0} A_i$.

By definition, this implies A_0 is a subring of A , and $A_+ = \bigoplus_{i \geq 1} A_i$ is an ideal, usually called the irrelevant ideal.

Exercise 2.14. 1. $1 \in A_0$,

2. A is Noetherian if and only if A_0 is Noetherian and A_+ is a finitely-generated ideal of A .

Let A be a commutative ring, not necessarily Noetherian, and let M be an A -module.

Definition 2.15 (Filtered Ring). A is called a filtered ring if it admits a filtration $\{A_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ where A_i 's form a descending sequence of subgroups of A .

Since the descending chain satisfies $A_i \cdot A_j \subseteq A_{i+j}$, then each A_i for $i > 0$ is an ideal of A . We now write $A \sim \{A_n\}_{n \geq 0}$, associating A with its filtration.

Definition 2.16 (Filtered Module). M is called a filtered A -module if there exists a descending chain of subgroups $M_0 \supseteq M_1 \supseteq \cdots$ of M such that $A_i \cdot M_j \subseteq M_{i+j}$.

This implies each M_j is an A -submodule.

Example 2.17. Let I be an ideal of A , and let $A_n = I^n$. Let M be an A -module, with $M_n = I^n M$. The associated filtrations are called the I -adic filtration of A and of M .

Definition 2.18 (Induced Filtration, Image Filtration). Let $A \sim \{A_n\}$ and $M \sim \{M_n\}$. Let $N \subseteq M$ be a submodule. The induced filtration on N is given by $N_n = N \cap M_n$ for all n .

Let $f : M \rightarrow T$ be a surjective A -linear map of modules, then the filtration defined by $T_n = f(M_n)$ is the image filtration of T .

Definition 2.19 (Filtered Map, Strict Morphism). Let $M \sim \{M_n\}$ and $N \sim \{N_n\}$ be filtrations. A map $f : M \rightarrow N$ is called a filtered map if for all n , $f(M_n) \subseteq N_n$.

If $f : M \rightarrow N$ is a filtered map, suppose $f(M)$ has an induced filtration with $f(M)_n = f(M) \cap N_n$, as well as an image filtration of $\{f(M_n)\}$. We say f is a strict morphism if for any n , $f(M_n) = f(M) \cap N_n = f(M)_n$. Note that by definition we have $f(M_n) \subseteq f(M) \cap N_n$.

2.2 TOPOLOGY AND METRIC ON FILTERED RINGS AND MODULES

Definition 2.20 (Fundamental System). Let $A \sim \{A_n\}$ and $M \sim \{M_n\}$. We declare $\{A_n\}$ (respectively, $\{M_n\}$) as a fundamental system of open neighborhoods of (0) in A (respectively, M). For any $x \in A$ (respectively, $x \in M$), $x + A_n$ (respectively, $x + M_n$) form a fundamental system of neighborhoods of x . This presumption defines a topology on A corresponding to $\{A_n\}$ (respectively, M corresponding to $\{M_n\}$).

Remark 2.21. A is a topological ring and M is a topological A -module with respect to this filtration.

Lemma 2.22. Let $M \sim \{M_n\}$ with $N \subseteq M$, and let \bar{N} be the closure of N in M , then this is just $\bigcap_{n \geq 0} N + M_n$.

Proof. Let $x \in \bar{N}$, then there exists n such that $(x + M_n) \cap N \neq \emptyset$. Therefore, there exists $y_n \in M_n$ and $z \in N$ such that $x + y_n = z$, therefore $x = z - y_n \in N + M_n$ for all n . Conversely, let $x \in \bigcap_{n \geq 0} N + M_n$. When $x \in N + M_n$, then we can write $x = z + y_n$ for $z \in N$ and $y_n \in M_n$. Therefore, $x - y_n = z$, so $(x + M_n) \cap N \neq \emptyset$. \square

Corollary 2.23. $\overline{(0)} = \bigcap_{n \geq 0} M_n = \bigcap_{n \geq 0} A_n$. Therefore, A (respectively, M) is Hausdorff if and only if $\bigcap_{n \geq 0} A_n = 0$ (respectively, $\bigcap_{n \geq 0} M_n = 0$).

Exercise 2.24. Let $f : M \rightarrow N$ be a filtered map, then f is continuous.

Let $0 < c < 1$.

If we assume A (or M) is Hausdorff, i.e., $\bigcap_{n \geq 0} A_n = 0$ ($\bigcap_{n \geq 0} M_n = 0$). Denote $d(x, y) = c^n$, where n is the largest integer such that $x - y \in M_n$.

If we assume A (or M) is not Hausdorff, i.e., $\bigcap_{n \geq 0} A_n \neq 0$ ($\bigcap_{n \geq 0} M_n \neq 0$). We can still define the notion of distance as above, but in addition we need: if $x - y \in \bigcap_{n \geq 0} M_n$, then $d(x, y) = 0$.

Recall that a sequence $\{x_n\}$ is Cauchy if for any $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists N such that $d(x_n, x_m) < \varepsilon$ for all $n, m \geq N$. Therefore, given by M_n , there exists N such that for all $s, r \geq N$, then $x_r - x_s \in M_N$. Note that it suffices to have $x_{N+1} - x_N \in M_N$, since by telescoping we get what we want over the additive structure of the module. Hence, $\{x_n\}$ is Cauchy if and only if $\{x_n - x_{n-1}\} \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

Exercise 2.25. Let M be a complete metric space with respect to $\{M_n\}$, then $\{x_n\} \in M$ has a convergent sum $\sum_{n \geq 0} x_n$ if and only if $x_n \rightarrow 0$.

Theorem 2.26. Let $M \sim \{M_n\}$ be filtered and Hausdorff. Suppose M is complete with respect to $\{M_n\}$. Let N be a closed submodule of M , then $\bar{M} = M/N$ with respect to the image filtration $\{\bar{M}_n\}$ is also complete (Hausdorff).

Proof. \bar{M} is Hausdorff since $N = \bar{N} = \bigcap_{n \geq 0} (N + M_n)$. Consider $\eta : M \rightarrow \bar{M}$, then this is Hausdorff and we want to show this is complete. Let $\{\bar{x}_n\}$ be a Cauchy sequence in \bar{M} , then $\bar{x}_{n+1} - \bar{x}_n \in \bar{M}_{i(n)}$ for all $n \geq N$, for some $i(n)$ corresponding to n . In particular, $i(n) \rightarrow \infty$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Let x_i be the lift of \bar{x}_i in M , then we have $x_{n+1} - x_n = y_n + z_n$ for some $y_n \in M_{i(n)}$ and $z_n \in N$. By telescoping, we have $x_n - x_1 = \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} y_i + \tilde{z}$ for some $\tilde{z} \in N$. But for $n \rightarrow \infty$, we have large enough $i(n) \gg 0$, therefore the sequence $\{y_n\}$ satisfies $y_n \in M_{i(n)}$, therefore $y_n \rightarrow 0$ for $n \rightarrow \infty$, thus the sequence $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} y_n$ converges. Hence, as $n \rightarrow \infty$, we have $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \bar{x}_n = \bar{x}_1 + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \bar{y}_n + \tilde{z} = \bar{x}_1 + \bar{y}$. \square

2.3 (I-ADIC) COMPLETION

Definition 2.27 (Null Sequence, Completion). A Cauchy sequence $\{x_n\}$ with $x_n \rightarrow 0$ is called a null sequence.

Let $M \sim \{M_n\}$ not necessarily be Hausdorff, then we obtain the completion \hat{M} of M with respect to $\{M_n\}$ (or the metric defined on $\{M_n\}$) by defining \hat{M} as the set of equivalence classes of all Cauchy sequences in M , over the submodules generated by null sequences.

Remark 2.28. Recall that we define the completion \hat{X} of a space X as the equivalence class of sets of all Cauchy sequences over the relation $x = (x_n) \sim y = (y_n)$ if and only if $d(x_n, y_n) \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. In our case, we have $\{x_n - y_n\}$ forming a null sequence.

Similarly, we can define the completion \hat{A} of a ring A to be the equivalence class of the sets of all Cauchy sequences over the ideal generated by the null sequences.

Remark 2.29. \hat{M} is a topological \hat{A} -module. In particular, if $\{a_n\}$'s define a Cauchy sequence in A and $\{m_n\}$'s define a Cauchy sequence in M , then $\{a_n m_n\}$'s define a Cauchy sequence in M .

The corresponding mapping is given by

$$\begin{aligned} i : M &\rightarrow \hat{M} \\ x &\mapsto \{x\}, \end{aligned}$$

that is, the image is the constant sequence defined by $x_n = x$ for all n . Note that this is not necessarily injective. However, $i(M)$ is dense in \hat{M} .

Remark 2.30. The completion \hat{M} of M satisfies the following property: given any complete space T , there is $g : M \rightarrow T$ and $f : \hat{M} \rightarrow T$ such that $g = f \circ i$ is a commutative diagram. In particular, if $\{x_n\}$ is Cauchy in M , then the image $g(x_n)$ is Cauchy in T . If we define $f(x = (x_n)) = y$, then $g(x_n) \rightarrow y$ in T .

Note that given any M_n in M , we have $\overline{i(M_n)} = \hat{M}_n$.

Definition 2.31 (Hausdorffication). The quotient $M/\ker(i)$ is called the hausdorffication of M .

Remark 2.32. By Theorem 2.26, \hat{M}/\hat{M}_n is complete, then there is an induced mapping $\bar{i}_n : M/M_n \rightarrow \hat{M}/\hat{M}_n$. Now $\text{im}(\bar{i}_n)$ is dense in \hat{M}/\hat{M}_n , then $\overline{\text{im}(\bar{i}_n)} = \hat{M}/\hat{M}_n$. Recall that M_n is defined to be open in M via the fundamental system, now cosets of M_n are of the form $x + M_n \cong M_n$ with respect to a homeomorphism, hence M/M_n is open, so M_n is also closed in M . Therefore, M/M_n is discrete, so $\overline{(0)}$ is clopen, therefore M/M_n is complete, therefore $M/M_n \cong \hat{M}/\hat{M}_n$, i.e., isomorphic to the completion. In particular, $i^{-1}(\hat{M}_n) = M_n$ (with $M \cap \hat{M}_n = M_n$).

Remark 2.33. $\bigcap \hat{M}_n = (0)$ and $\{\hat{M}_n\}$ constitutes a fundamental system of open neighborhoods in \hat{M} .

Definition 2.34. Let $A \sim \{A_n\}$ and $M \sim \{M_n\}$, with $\bar{A} \sim \{\bar{A}_n\}$ and $\bar{M} \sim \{\bar{M}_n\}$. We define $E_0(A) = A/A_1 \oplus A_1/A_2 \oplus \cdots \oplus A_n/A_{n+1} \oplus \cdots$ as a graded ring, and similarly we can define $E_0(M)$. This is called the graded ring (respectively, module) associated to the filtration.

Remark 2.35. In particular, $E_0(M)$ is a graded $E_0(A)$ -module. We have

$$\begin{aligned} A_i/A_{i+1} \times A_i/A_{j+1} &\rightarrow A_{i+j}/A_{i+j+1} \\ (\bar{\lambda}, \bar{\mu}) &\mapsto \overline{\lambda\mu} \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} A_i/A_{i+1} \times M_i/M_{j+1} &\rightarrow M_{i+j}/M_{i+j+1} \\ (\bar{\lambda}, \bar{x}) &\mapsto \overline{\lambda x} \end{aligned}$$

We have $E_0(A) \cong E_0(\hat{A})$ and $E_0(M) \cong E_0(\hat{M})$ since $A_i/A_{i+1} \cong \hat{A}_i/\hat{A}_{i+1}$ and $M_i/M_{i+1} \cong \hat{M}_i/\hat{M}_{i+1}$.

Remark 2.36. Note that $k[x]$ has transcendental degree 1 over k and $k[[x]]$ has infinite transcendental degree over k , but by [Remark 2.35](#) we know

$$\bigoplus \frac{x^n \cdot k[x]}{x^{n+1} \cdot k[x]} \cong \bigoplus \frac{x^n \cdot k[[x]]}{x^{n+1} \cdot k[[x]]}.$$

Definition 2.37 (Inverse Limit). Let $A \sim \{A_n\}$ and $M \sim \{M_n\}$, then we can construct the completion of A (and similarly of M) via inverse limit. We denote $M^* = \varprojlim M/M_n = \{\prod \bar{x}_n : (\bar{x}_n) \in \prod M/M_n, \eta_{n+1}(\bar{x}_{n+1}) = \bar{x}_n \forall n\}$ associated with the directed system

$$\cdots \longrightarrow M/M_{n+1} \xrightarrow[\bar{x}_{n+1} \mapsto \bar{x}_n]{\eta_{n+1}} M/M_n \xrightarrow{\eta_n} M/M_{n-1} \longrightarrow \cdots$$

Therefore this is true if and only if $x_{n+1} - x_n \in M_n$ for any n , so we obtain a Cauchy sequence as mentioned previously. Now M/M_n is discrete hence complete, therefore the associated topology $\prod M/M_n$ of countable products is complete in the product topology. Therefore, since each M/M_n is a metric space, then the countable product is still a metric space $\prod M/M_n$.

Exercise 2.38. Show that M^* is a closed submodule of $\prod M/M_n$. In particular, since $\prod M/M_n$ is complete, then M^* is also complete.

Remark 2.39. The associated map is

$$\begin{aligned} i : M &\rightarrow M^* \\ x &\mapsto (\bar{x}, \bar{x}, \bar{x}, \dots) \end{aligned}$$

and $i(M)$ is dense in M^* . For any M_n , the image $i(M_n) = (\bar{0}, \dots, \bar{0}, \bar{x}, \bar{x}, \dots)$ for some $x \in M_n$ with the first n coordinates as 0. In general, we have the mapping

$$M^* \xleftarrow{j} \prod M/M_n \xrightarrow{\pi_n} M/M_n$$

and $\overline{i(M_n)} = (\pi_n j)^{-1}(\bar{0}) = j^{-1}\pi_n^{-1}(\bar{0})$. For any $Z_n \in M/M_n$, the preimage

$$\pi_n^{-1}(Z_n) = M/M_1 \times M/M_{n-1} \times Z_n \times M/M_{n+1} \times \cdots,$$

so

$$j^{-1}(\pi_n^{-1}(0)) = j^{-1}(M/M_1 \times M/M_{n-1} \times \bar{0} \times M/M_{n+1} \times \cdots) = \overline{j(M_n)} = M_n^*.$$

It now follows that $\bigcap M_n^* = (0)$.

Remark 2.40. We now have the following universal property: for any $M \rightarrow M^*$ and mapping $f : M \rightarrow N$ for some complete Hausdorff space N , then there exists a unique $g : M^* \rightarrow N$ such that the diagram commutes.

$$\begin{array}{ccc} M & \xrightarrow{\quad} & M^* \\ & \searrow f & \swarrow \exists! g \\ & & N \end{array}$$

Indeed, M^* is the set of elements (\bar{x}_n) with $\eta_{n+1}(\bar{x}_{n+1}) = \bar{x}_n$, therefore this is the set of elements (x_n) with $x_{n+1} - x_n \in M_n$ for all n , therefore $\{x_n\}$ is a Cauchy sequence, so for $y = \varprojlim f(x_n)$, therefore $g((\bar{x}_n)) = y$. Now if $\{x'_n\}$ is another lift of $(\bar{x}_n) \in M^*$, then we can check that $\{x_n - x'_n\} \rightarrow 0$ for $n \rightarrow \infty$, hence $\varprojlim f(x_n) = \varprojlim f(x'_n)$, so $M^* = \bar{M}$, $M_n^* = \bar{M}_n$ and so on.

Lemma 2.41. Let $R = A[x_1, \dots, x_n]$, $I = (x_1, \dots, x_n)$, then the I -adic completion is equivalent to the completion with respect to I -adic filtration corresponding to the topology. i.e., the completion of $A[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ is $\hat{A}[[x_1, \dots, x_n]]$.

Lemma 2.42. Say $A \sim \{A_n\}$, and suppose A is Hausdorff, i.e., $\bigcap A_n = (0)$, then if $E_0(A)$ is a domain, then A is also a domain.

Proof. Suppose not, then we can pick $x \neq 0$ and $y \neq 0$ such that $xy = 0$, then $x \in A_n \setminus A_{n+1}$ and $y \in A_m \setminus A_{m+1}$ for some n, m , then considering the decomposition of $E_0(A)$ we have $\bar{x} \neq 0$ in A_n/A_{n+1} and $\bar{y} \neq 0$ in A_m/A_{m+1} , so $\bar{y}\bar{x} = \overline{yx} = 0$, this is a contradiction to the fact that $E_0(A)$ is a domain, therefore A is a domain. \square

Definition 2.43. Let A and M be filtered and Hausdorff, say $x \in M$ be such that $x \in M_n \setminus M_{n+1}$ with largest such n , then we say n is the filtered degree of x .

Theorem 2.44. Let $A \sim \{A_n\}$ and $M \sim \{M_n\}$ and $N \sim \{N_n\}$, and $f : M \rightarrow N$ be a filtered map. Suppose that M is complete, N is Hausdorff, and $E_0(f) : E_0(M) \rightarrow E_0(N)$ is onto, so we can write $E_0(M) = M/M_1 \oplus M_1/M_2 \oplus \dots \oplus M_n/M_{n+1}$ and $E_0(N) = N/N_1 \oplus N_1/N_2 \oplus \dots \oplus N_n/N_{n+1}$, then we have corresponding maps

$$E_0(f)_n : M_n/M_{n+1} \rightarrow N_n/N_{n+1} \\ (\bar{x}) \mapsto \overline{f(x)},$$

then f is onto, N is complete, and f is strict.

Proof. Since $E_0(f)$ is onto, take $x \in N$ and since N is Hausdorff, then $x \in N_n \setminus N_{n+1}$ for some n . Therefore, the induced mapping $E_0(f)_n : M_n/M_{n+1} \rightarrow N_n/N_{n+1}$ is onto. Therefore, for $\bar{x} \in N_n/N_{n+1}$, we can pick $y_n \in M_n$ such that $x - f(y_n) \in N_{n+1}$. Therefore, on the level of $E_0(f)_{n+1}$, we know $x - f(y_n) \in N_{n+1}/N_{n+2}$, therefore we can pick $y_{n+1} \in M_{n+1}$ such that $x - f(y_n) - f(y_{n+1}) \in N_{n+2}$. Proceeding inductively, we have a sequence of elements with $y_{n+t} \in M_{n+t}$ such that $x - \sum_{k=0}^t f(y_{n+k}) \in N_{n+t+1}$. Hence, we have a Cauchy sequence in M , and so this is a Cauchy sequence in M_n , so $y_{n+t} \rightarrow 0$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$, then $\sum_t y_{n+t}$ converges, thus the sum $y \in M_n$. One can check that $f(y) = \bar{x}$, so f is onto. But that means $f(M_n) = N_n$, so f is strict. We also note that $f^{-1}(0)$ is a closed submodule of M since N is Hausdorff, therefore by [Theorem 2.26](#) we know N is complete. \square

Corollary 2.45. Let A be complete with respect to the filtration, let M be Hausdorff. Suppose $E_0(M)$ is a finitely-generated graded module over $E_0(A)$, that is, there exists x_1, \dots, x_t , where the degree of \bar{x}_i is r_i , such that $E_0(M)$ is a graded module over $E_0(A)$ generated by $\bar{x}_1, \dots, \bar{x}_t$. If this is the case, then M is generated by x_1, \dots, x_t over A .

Proof. Denote $F = \bigoplus_{i=1}^t Ae_i$, then this induces a mapping

$$\varphi : F \rightarrow M \\ e_i \mapsto x_i$$

defined on the generators. Since this is a finite sum over complete ring A , then F is complete. Let r_i be the degree of x_i , then this imposes a filtration on Ae_i as follows:

$$(Ae_i)_j = \begin{cases} 0, & j \leq r_i \\ A_{j-r_i}e_i, & j > r_i \end{cases}$$

We implement this on all i 's, then the filtered degree of e_i is just r_i . Using this filtration, we induce a filtration on F , then we have a commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} E_0(F) & \xrightarrow{E_0(\varphi)} & E_0(M) \\ \parallel & & \parallel \\ E_0\left(\bigoplus_{i=1}^t Ae_i\right) & \xrightarrow{\varphi'} & E_0(M) \end{array}$$

with induced map φ' , where φ' sends $\bar{\varphi}_i \mapsto \bar{x}_i$ for all $1 \leq i \leq t$. Therefore, φ is onto as a $E_0(A)$ -module map. By [Theorem 2.44](#) we are done. \square

Corollary 2.46. Let $A \sim \{A_n\}$ be complete with respect to filtration, let M be Hausdorff with filtration $\{M_n\}$, and suppose $E_0(M)$ is Noetherian, then M is Noetherian as well.

Proof. Take submodule $N \subseteq M$, define $N_n = N \cap M_n$, then we have an induced filtration of N , therefore $E_0(N)$ is a submodule of $E_0(M)$ with $N_n/N_{n+1} \hookrightarrow M_n/M_{n+1}$ for all n . Hence, N is Hausdorff with respect to $\{N_n\}$, and $E_0(N)$ is a finitely-generated $E_0(A)$ -module, since $E_0(N)$ is a submodule of $E_0(M)$. By [Corollary 2.45](#), this implies N is finitely-generated and complete. \square

Corollary 2.47. Under the same assumptions as in [Corollary 2.46](#), every submodule N of M is a closed submodule.

Proof. By [Corollary 2.46](#), N is complete, and every complete subspace of a Hausdorff space is closed, thus N is closed. \square

Corollary 2.48. Let (A, \mathfrak{m}) be quasi-local, i.e., \mathfrak{m} is the unique maximal ideal of a commutative ring (not necessarily Noetherian) A . In addition, suppose A is complete and Hausdorff with a \mathfrak{m} -adic filtration, i.e., $\bigcap \mathfrak{m}^n = (0)$. Let M be an A -module with respect to the filtration $\{\mathfrak{m}^n M\}$, and assume M is Hausdorff. If $\dim_{A/\mathfrak{m}}(M/\mathfrak{m}M)$ is finite, and suppose \mathfrak{m} is a finitely-generated ideal in A , then M is a finitely-generated A -module.

Proof. We write down the decomposition

$$E_0(M) = M/\mathfrak{m}M \oplus \frac{\mathfrak{m}M}{\mathfrak{m}^2M} \oplus \cdots \oplus \frac{\mathfrak{m}^n M}{\mathfrak{m}^{n+1}M} \oplus \cdots$$

and

$$E_0(A) = A/\mathfrak{m} \oplus \frac{\mathfrak{m}}{\mathfrak{m}^2} \oplus \cdots \oplus \frac{\mathfrak{m}^n}{\mathfrak{m}^{n+1}} \oplus \cdots$$

Denote $\mathfrak{m} = (x_1, \dots, x_n)$ to be the finitely-generated ideal, and since $A/\mathfrak{m} \cong k$ is a field, then we have a ring homomorphism

$$\begin{aligned} \eta : k[x_1, \dots, x_n] &\rightarrow E_0(A) \\ x_i &\mapsto \bar{x}_i \in \mathfrak{m}/\mathfrak{m}^2 \end{aligned}$$

then η is onto, hence $E_0(A)$ is Noetherian. If we write $M/\mathfrak{m}M = k\{\bar{\alpha}_1, \dots, \bar{\alpha}_r\}$, then one can check that $E_0(M)$ is generated by $\bar{\alpha}_1, \dots, \bar{\alpha}_r$ for $\bar{\alpha}_i \in M/\mathfrak{m}M$ over $E_0(A)$. This implies $E_0(M)$ is Noetherian and thus M is finitely-generated over A by [Corollary 2.46](#). \square

Corollary 2.49. Let A be a commutative ring and I be a finitely-generated ideal over A such that A/I is Noetherian. Suppose A is I -adically complete, i.e., A is complete with respect to the filtration $\{I^n\}$, then A is Noetherian.

Proof. We write down

$$E_0(A) = A/I \oplus I/I^2 \oplus \cdots \oplus I^n/I^{n+1} \oplus \cdots$$

for $I = (x_1, \dots, x_n)$, then using the same argument we have a ring homomorphism

$$\begin{aligned} \eta : A/I[x_1, \dots, x_n] &\rightarrow E_0(A) \\ x_i &\mapsto \bar{x}_i \in I/I^2 \end{aligned}$$

which is also surjective. Since A/I is Noetherian, then $A/I[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ is also Noetherian, thus $E_0(A)$ is Noetherian, and by [Corollary 2.46](#), we conclude that A is Noetherian. \square

Remark 2.50. Suppose A is Noetherian, and consider the completion $B = A[[x_1, \dots, x_n]]$ of $A[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ with respect to the I -adic filtration where $I = (x_1, \dots, x_n)$. Therefore, $A[[x_1, \dots, x_n]] = \varprojlim A[x_1, \dots, x_n]/I^n$. Now B/IB is A -Noetherian, so by [Corollary 2.49](#) we conclude that $A[[x_1, \dots, x_n]]$ is also Noetherian.

Exercise 2.51. Let A be a commutative ring, and we assume it is Noetherian. Let $I \subsetneq J$ be ideals of A , and that $\bigcap J^n = (0)$. Suppose A is complete with respect to the J -adic topology. Prove that A is complete with respect to the I -adic topology as well.

Remark 2.52. We saw in [Remark 2.50](#) that $A[[x_1, \dots, x_n]]$ is complete with respect to (x_1, \dots, x_n) , then the completeness holds for any $I \subseteq (x_1, \dots, x_n)$.

Proposition 2.53. Let A be commutative ring and M be a finitely-generated A -module, and suppose I is an ideal of A such that $M = IM$, then there exists $a \in I$ such that $(1 - a)M = 0$.

Remark 2.54. Proposition 2.53 itself is a direct application of Cayley-Hamilton Theorem, and the proof below follows the same approach. This is also sometimes referred to as Nakayama Lemma (c.f., Corollary 2.55).

Proof. We write $M = \langle \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n \rangle$ and let I be such that $IM = M$, then

$$\alpha_1 = a_{11}\alpha_1 + \dots + a_{1n}\alpha_n$$

where $a_{1i} \in I$. In general, we have

$$\alpha_j = a_{j1}\alpha_1 + \dots + a_{jn}\alpha_n$$

for $a_{ji} \in I$. Therefore,

$$\begin{cases} (1 - a_{11})\alpha_1 - a_{12}\alpha_2 - \dots - a_{1n}\alpha_n &= 0 \\ -a_{21}\alpha_1 + (1 - a_{22})\alpha_2 - \dots - a_{2n}\alpha_n &= 0 \\ &\vdots \\ -a_{n1}\alpha_1 - a_{n2}\alpha_2 - \dots + (1 - a_{nn})\alpha_n &= 0 \end{cases}$$

and this gives a matrix

$$C = \begin{pmatrix} 1 - a_{11} & -a_{12} & \dots & -a_{1n} \\ -a_{21} & 1 - a_{22} & \dots & -a_{2n} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ -a_{n1} & -a_{n2} & \dots & 1 - a_{nn} \end{pmatrix}$$

such that

$$CX := C \begin{pmatrix} \alpha_1 \\ \alpha_2 \\ \vdots \\ \alpha_n \end{pmatrix} = 0.$$

If we do the cofactor decomposition with respect to the first column, we have $\det(C) \cdot \alpha_1 + 0 \cdot \alpha_2 + \dots + 0 \cdot \alpha_n = 0$, hence $\det(C) \cdot \alpha_1 = 0$. If we do this for each column, we have $\det(C) \cdot \alpha_i = 0$ for all i , hence $\det(C) \cdot M = 0$. But note that $\det(C) = 1 - a$ for some $a \in I$, therefore $(1 - a)M = 0$.³ \square

Corollary 2.55 (Nakayama Lemma). Suppose I is an ideal of A contained in the Jacobson radical of A , and M is a finitely-generated A -module such that $M = IM$, then $M = 0$.

Proof. By Proposition 2.53, there exists $a \in I$ such that $(1 - a)M = 0$. Note that the Jacobson radical is the intersection of all maximal ideals of A , so I is contained in all maximal ideals of A . Since $a \in I$, then $1 - a$ is a unit in A , so $M = 0$. \square

Exercise 2.56. Let A be a commutative ring and M be a finitely-generated A -module. Suppose $f : M \rightarrow M$ is a surjective A -linear map, then f is an isomorphism. *Hint:* use Proposition 2.53.

From now on, we assume A is Noetherian, M is a finitely-generated A -module. Usually, we assume A and M have I -adic filtrations for some ideal $I \subseteq A$.

Lemma 2.57 (Artin-Rees). Let A be Noetherian and M is a finitely-generated A -module, and $I \subseteq A$ is an ideal. Given submodule $N \subsetneq M$, suppose there exists $k > 0$ such that for every n we have $N \cap I^{n+k}M = I^n(N \cap I^kM)$.

Remark 2.58. The proof essentially refers to the blow-up algebra, i.e., Rees algebra.

³The cleanest way to finish the proof would be to observe that $I \cdot \det(C) = (\text{adj}(C))C$ and so $I \cdot \det(C)X = (\text{adj}(C))CX = 0$. In particular, $\det(C) \cdot X = 0$ and since X generates M , then $\det(C) \cdot M = 0$. Note that this is equivalent to the given approach since the cofactor matrix induces $\text{adj}(C)$.

Proof. Note that the (\supseteq) direction is true by definition, so we only need to show the (\subseteq) direction. Let us write $\tilde{A} = A \oplus I \oplus I^2 \oplus \cdots$, more formally this is $A \oplus It \oplus I^2 t^2 \oplus \cdots \oplus I^n t^n \oplus \cdots \subseteq A[t]$.⁴ This is a graded ring. Similarly, we write $\tilde{M} = M \oplus IM \oplus I^2 M \oplus \cdots \oplus I^n M \oplus \cdots$.

Claim 2.59. \tilde{A} is a graded Noetherian ring.

Subproof. Let $I = (x_1, \dots, x_n)$, then the ring homomorphism

$$\eta : A[x_1, \dots, x_n] \rightarrow \tilde{A}$$

$$x_i \mapsto x_i,$$

is onto. Since A is Noetherian, then $A[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ is also Noetherian. Therefore, \tilde{A} is a graded Noetherian ring. \blacksquare

Suppose M is generated by $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_r$, then \tilde{M} is a finitely-generated graded \tilde{A} -module, generated by $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_r \in M$ by the surjectivity of η . This implies that \tilde{M} is a graded Noetherian module. Now define

$$\tilde{N} = N \oplus (N \cap IM) \oplus (N \cap I^2 M) \oplus \cdots \oplus (N \cap I^k M) \oplus \cdots \oplus (N \cap I^{n+k} M) \oplus \cdots,$$

then $\tilde{N} \subseteq \tilde{M}$, so \tilde{N} is a finitely-generated graded \tilde{A} -module. Now each generator is a finite sum given by decomposition above, so each of the generating set must be a graded element. Hence, \tilde{N} is generated by finitely many elements, which are graded elements, say β_1, \dots, β_t where $\deg(\beta_i) = r_i$. Let $k = \max_{1 \leq i \leq t} r_i$, and we think of ways to obtain elements in $N \cap I^{n+k} M$. Considering the multiplicity of the degree, we know $I^{n+k-r_i} \beta_i \subseteq N \cap I^{n+k} M$ for each $1 \leq i \leq t$. Therefore, we have

$$N \cap I^{n+k} M = I^{n+k} N + I^{n+k-1} (N \cap IM) + \cdots + I^n (N \cap I^k M) = \sum_{j=0}^k I^{n+k-j} (N \cap I^j M).$$

Each $I^{n+k-j} (N \cap I^j M) = I^n \cdot I^{k-j} (N \cap I^j M) \subseteq I^n (N \cap I^k M)$, so the sum $N \cap I^{n+k} M \subseteq I^n (N \cap I^k M)$. \square

Corollary 2.60. Using the same assumption as in Lemma 2.57, let I be an ideal of A contained in the Jacobson radical of Noetherian ring A , then $\bigcap I^n M = (0)$.

Proof. Let $N = \bigcap I^n M$, then by Lemma 2.57, $I^n N = N = N \cap I^{n+k} M = I^n (N \cap I^k M)$, then by Corollary 2.55, $N = 0$. \square

Remark 2.61. In particular, Corollary 2.60 implies M is Hausdorff with respect to the I -adic topology, so the map $M \hookrightarrow \hat{M}$ is an injection by the mapping

$$M \rightarrow \varprojlim M/I^n M \subseteq \prod M/M^n M$$

$$x \mapsto (x, x, \dots)$$

Corollary 2.62. Using the same assumption as in Lemma 2.57, let A be a domain with ideal I , then $\bigcap I^n = (0)$.

Proof. Let $J = \bigcap I^n$, then $J \cap I^{n+k} A = I^n (J \cap I^k)$, so $J = I^n J$, then by Proposition 2.53 there exists $a \in I^n$ such that $(1-a)J = 0$, and since A is a domain, then $J = 0$. \square

Remark 2.63. Corollary 2.62 implies that under I -adic topology, the map $A \rightarrow \hat{A}$ is injective.

Definition 2.64. Let $A \sim \{I^n\}$ and $M \sim \{M_n\}$, not necessarily with respect to the I -adic filtration, then $\{M_n\}$ is called I -good if there exists $h > 0$ such that $M_{n+h} = I^n M_h$.

Remark 2.65. By Lemma 2.57, induced filtration is I -good. Topologically, given $A \sim \{I^n\}$ and $M \sim \{M_n\}$ such that $\{M_n\}$ is I -good, then $I^n M \subseteq M_h$ for some $h > 0$, so $M_{n+h} = I^n M_h \subseteq I^n M$. In this case, $\{I^n M\}$ and $\{M_n\}$ are cofinal with respect to each other and hence give the same topology on M . Moreover,

$$\varprojlim M/I^n M \cong \varprojlim M/M_n.$$

That is, the I -adic completion of M is equivalent to the completion of M with respect to $\{M_n\}$.

⁴For instance, we usually write $A[t]$ for $A \oplus At \oplus At^2 \oplus \cdots$.

Remark 2.66. Given an I -good filtration and a submodule N of M , $\{I^n N\}$ and $\{N \cap I^n M\}$ define the same topology on N , and hence the I -adic completion of N is equivalent to the completion of M with respect to $\{M_n\}$.

Proposition 2.67. Let A be Noetherian and a short exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow N \xrightarrow{f} M \xrightarrow{g} T \longrightarrow 0$$

of finitely-generated A -modules, and let I be an ideal of A , then we have a short exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow \hat{N} \xrightarrow{\hat{f}} \hat{M} \xrightarrow{\hat{g}} \hat{T} \longrightarrow 0$$

where all completions are I -adic completions.

Proof. By Lemma 2.57, we know $\hat{N} = \varprojlim N/I^n N = \varprojlim N/(N \cap I^n M)$, then we have a short exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow N/(N \cap I^n M) \longrightarrow M/I^n M \longrightarrow T/I^n T \longrightarrow 0$$

for every $n > 0$. It now suffices to show that

$$0 \longrightarrow \varprojlim N/(N \cap I^n M) \longrightarrow \varprojlim M/I^n M \longrightarrow \varprojlim T/I^n T \longrightarrow 0$$

Exercise 2.68. $\ker(\bar{f}) = 0$ and $\text{im}(\hat{f}) = \ker(\hat{f})$.

We now show that \hat{g} is onto. Taking $\{z_n\}$ in $\varprojlim T/I^n T$, we want to show that there exists $\{y_n\}$ in $\varprojlim M/I^n M$ with image $\{z_n\}$, and we proceed inductively. Suppose we have constructed $\{y_i\}_{i \leq n}$ such that $\text{im}(y_i) = z_i$ with system $y_n \rightarrow y_{n-1} \rightarrow \cdots \rightarrow y_1$, then there is a commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & N/(N \cap I^{n+1}M) & \xrightarrow{f_{n+1}} & M/I^{n+1}M & \xrightarrow{g_{n+1}} & T/I^{n+1}T \longrightarrow 0 \\ & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & N/(N \cap I^n M) & \longrightarrow & M/I^n M & \longrightarrow & T/I^n T \longrightarrow 0 \end{array}$$

where $y_n \in M/I^n M$ and $z_n \in T/I^n T$. Here all rows are exact and the vertical mappings are surjective. We proceed by diagram chasing. To find $y_{n+1} \in M/I^{n+1}M$ such that $\text{im}(y_{n+1}) = z_{n+1}$, since $g_{n+1} : M/I^{n+1}M \rightarrow T/I^{n+1}T$ is onto, then we lift it back to $x_{n+1} \in M/I^{n+1}M$ such that $g_{n+1}(x_{n+1}) = z_{n+1}$, and now there is x_n landing in $M/I^n M$ by the vertical mapping. Note that by definition x_n now lands in z_n by the vertical mapping, so we have both $y_n \mapsto z_n$ and $x_n \mapsto z_n$, therefore $y_n - x_n \rightarrow 0$, now we lift it back to w_n in $N/(N \cap I^n M)$, which lifts to $w_{n+1} \in N/(N \cap I^{n+1}M)$, and let the image of w_{n+1} with respect to f_{n+1} be x'_{n+1} , then the element $x'_{n+1} + x_{n+1}$ in $M/I^{n+1}M$ is now such that we have

$$\begin{array}{ccc} x'_{n+1} + x_{n+1} & \longrightarrow & z_{n+1} \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ y_n & \longrightarrow & z_n \end{array}$$

via diagram chasing as desired. This is the element y_{n+1} we want. \square

Remark 2.69. Refer to the Mittag-Leffler condition, as well as the complex analysis analogue, i.e., Mittag-Leffler Theorem.

Proposition 2.70. Let A be Noetherian and M be a finitely-generated A -module, and let I be an ideal of A . Let \hat{A} and \hat{M} be I -adic completions of A and M , respectively, then

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi : \hat{A} \otimes_A M &\xrightarrow{\sim} \hat{M} \\ \{a_n\} \otimes x &\mapsto \{a_n x\} \end{aligned}$$

Remark 2.71. If we are working over direct limits, we would note

$$(\varinjlim M_\alpha) \otimes_A N = \varinjlim M_\alpha \otimes_A N.$$

This is not the case here, we do not necessarily have

$$(\varprojlim M_\alpha) \otimes_A N = \varprojlim M_\alpha \otimes_A N.$$

Proof. Since M is finitely-generated over Noetherian ring A , then we have an exact sequence

$$A^r \xrightarrow{\psi} A^s \xrightarrow[e_i \mapsto m_i]{\eta} M \longrightarrow 0$$

where M is generated by m_1, \dots, m_s . Tensoring by \hat{A} , we have an exact sequence

$$\hat{A} \otimes A^r \longrightarrow \hat{A} \otimes A^s \longrightarrow \hat{A} \otimes M \longrightarrow 0$$

Let $K = \ker(\eta)$ and take L to be the kernel of $A^r \rightarrow K$, then we have exact sequences

$$0 \longrightarrow L \longrightarrow A^r \longrightarrow K \longrightarrow 0$$

and

$$0 \longrightarrow K \longrightarrow A^s \longrightarrow M \longrightarrow 0$$

By [Proposition 2.67](#), the I -adic filtration gives exact sequences

$$0 \longrightarrow \hat{L} \longrightarrow \hat{A}^r \longrightarrow \hat{K} \longrightarrow 0$$

and

$$0 \longrightarrow \hat{K} \longrightarrow \hat{A}^s \longrightarrow \hat{M} \longrightarrow 0$$

therefore

$$\hat{A}^r \longrightarrow \hat{A}^s \longrightarrow \hat{M} \longrightarrow 0$$

is exact and we have a diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} \hat{A} \otimes A^r & \longrightarrow & \hat{A} \otimes A^s & \longrightarrow & \hat{A} \otimes M & \longrightarrow & 0 \\ \varphi_{A^r} \downarrow & & \downarrow \varphi_{A^s} & & \downarrow \varphi_M & & \\ \hat{A}^r & \longrightarrow & \hat{A}^s & \longrightarrow & \hat{M} & \longrightarrow & 0 \end{array}$$

Now

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{A} \otimes A^s &= \hat{A} \otimes (A \oplus \dots \oplus A) \\ &= (\hat{A} \otimes_A A) \oplus \dots \oplus (\hat{A} \otimes_A A) \\ &= (\hat{A})^s \end{aligned}$$

and similarly $\hat{A} \otimes A^r = (\hat{A})^r$. One can check that φ_{A^r} and φ_{A^s} are isomorphisms. Now the mapping $A^s = \bigoplus_s A \rightarrow \bigoplus_s \hat{A}$ has dense image, which implies φ_M is an isomorphism by diagram chasing. \square

Theorem 2.72. Let A be Noetherian and I be an ideal, then $A \rightarrow \hat{A}$, the mapping into the I -adic completion, is a flat map, that is, \hat{A} is a flat A -module.

Proof. For flatness, we can assume that

$$0 \longrightarrow N \xrightarrow{f} M \xrightarrow{g} T \longrightarrow 0$$

is a short exact sequence of finitely-generated modules (since we are working over Noetherian rings), and we want to show that

$$0 \longrightarrow \hat{A} \otimes_A N \xrightarrow{\hat{f}} \hat{A} \otimes_A M \xrightarrow{\hat{g}} \hat{A} \otimes_A T \longrightarrow 0$$

is a short exact sequence as well. But we know this is just

$$0 \longrightarrow \hat{N} \longrightarrow \hat{M} \longrightarrow \hat{T} \longrightarrow 0$$

by [Proposition 2.70](#), which is exact by [Proposition 2.67](#). □

Corollary 2.73. The map

$$A[x_1, \dots, x_n] \rightarrow A[[x_1, \dots, x_n]]$$

is flat.

2.4 FAITHFULLY FLAT MODULES

Proposition 2.74. Let A be a commutative ring and M be an A -module, then the following are equivalent:

1.

$$N_1 \xrightarrow{f} N_2 \xrightarrow{g} N_3$$

is exact if and only if

$$M \otimes N_1 \xrightarrow{f} M \otimes N_2 \xrightarrow{g} M \otimes N_3$$

is exact;

2.

$$0 \longrightarrow N_1 \xrightarrow{f} N_2 \xrightarrow{g} N_3 \longrightarrow 0$$

is exact if and only if

$$0 \longrightarrow M \otimes N_1 \xrightarrow{f} M \otimes N_2 \xrightarrow{g} M \otimes N_3 \longrightarrow 0$$

is exact;

3. M is an A -flat module and for any A -module N , $M \otimes_A N = 0$ implies $N = 0$;

4. M is an A -flat module and for any ideal I of A , $M \otimes_A A/I = 0$ implies $A = I$.

Proof. The equivalence of (1) and (2) is obvious.

(1), (2) \Rightarrow (3): the flatness is obvious. Suppose $M \otimes_A N = 0$, then consider

$$0 \longrightarrow N \longrightarrow 0$$

and we tensor it with M , then we have

$$0 \longrightarrow M \otimes N \longrightarrow 0$$

which is exact, so

$$0 \longrightarrow N \longrightarrow 0$$

is exact and so $N = 0$.

(3) \Rightarrow (4): obvious, take $N = A/I$.

(4) \Rightarrow (3): let $N = \varinjlim N_\alpha$ where each N_α is a finitely-generated submodule of N , then $N = \bigcup_\alpha N_\alpha$. We know $M \otimes_A N = \varinjlim M \otimes_A N_\alpha$, and by flatness this is just $\bigcup_\alpha (M \otimes_A N_\alpha)$. It is now enough to show that if N is finitely-generated, then $M \otimes N = 0$ implies $N = 0$. We proceed by induction. This is obvious when N is cyclic; suppose N is generated by a minimal set of generators $\{x_1, \dots, x_n\}$, then let N' be generated by $\{x_1, \dots, x_{n-1}\}$, so $N' \neq N$, now we have a short exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow N' \longrightarrow N \longrightarrow A/I \cong N/N' \longrightarrow 0$$

for some ideal I of A , and since M is A -flat, then we have a short exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow M \otimes N' \longrightarrow M \otimes N \longrightarrow M \otimes (A/I) \cong 0 \longrightarrow 0$$

but that means $A = I$, so $N' = N$, which is a contradiction unless $M \otimes_A N = 0$ implies $N = 0$.

Exercise 2.75. Show that (3) \Rightarrow (1), (2). □

Definition 2.76 (Faithfully Flat). Let A be a commutative ring, an A -module M is called faithfully flat if M satisfies one of the (equivalent) conditions in [Proposition 2.74](#).

Definition 2.77 (Faithful). Let A be a commutative ring, an A -module M is called faithful if $\text{Ann}_A(M) = \{a \in A \mid aM = 0\} = (0)$.

Remark 2.78. Faithfully flat implies faithful. Indeed, let M be faithfully flat, let $I = \text{Ann}_A(M)$, then consider the short exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow I \longrightarrow A \longrightarrow A/I \longrightarrow 0$$

and therefore

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & I \otimes_A M & \longrightarrow & A \otimes_A M & \cong & M \longrightarrow A/I \otimes_A M \longrightarrow 0 \\ & & \searrow x \otimes m \mapsto xm & & \downarrow a \otimes m \mapsto am & & \\ & & & & M & & \end{array}$$

is a short exact sequence. In particular, $I \otimes_A M = 0$ by definition, therefore $I = 0$ since M is flat, hence M is faithful.

Example 2.79. Note that M being flat and faithful does not imply M is faithfully flat. Let $A = \mathbb{Z}$ and $M = \mathbb{Q}$, so \mathbb{Q} is faithful and is \mathbb{Z} -flat, but \mathbb{Q} is not faithfully flat over \mathbb{Z} since $\mathbb{Q} \otimes \mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z} = 0$ but $\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z} \neq 0$ for $n > 1$.

Theorem 2.80. Let $f : A \rightarrow B$ be a homomorphism of commutative rings. The following are equivalent:

- (i) B is a faithfully flat A -module via f ;
- (ii) B is A -flat, and for every ideal I of A , $f^{-1}(IB) = I$;
- (iii) B is A -flat, and for every A -module M , $M \rightarrow M \otimes_A B$ is injective;
- (iv) f is injective and $B/f(A) \cong B/A$ is A -flat.

Proof. (i) \Rightarrow (ii): B being A -flat is obvious; let $J = f^{-1}(IB)$, then there is a short exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow I \longrightarrow J \longrightarrow J/I \longrightarrow 0$$

and tensoring it with B gives

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & I \otimes_A B & \longrightarrow & J \otimes_A B & \longrightarrow & J/I \otimes_A B \longrightarrow 0 \\ & & \searrow & & \downarrow j \otimes b \mapsto jb & & \\ & & & & B & & \end{array}$$

where $J \otimes_A B \cong B \cong A \otimes_A B$, and so $\text{im}(J \otimes_A B) = JB$, and $\text{im}(I \otimes_A B) = IB$, therefore having $J = f^{-1}(IB)$ implies $JB = IB$. We have $I \otimes_A B = J \otimes_A B$, so $J/I \otimes_A B = 0$. Since B is faithfully flat, then $J/I = 0$, so $I = J$.

(ii) \Rightarrow (iii): we want to show that $i_M : M \rightarrow M \otimes_A B$ is injective. Suppose, towards contradiction, that there exists some element $0 \neq x \in M$ such that $i_M(x) = x \otimes 1 = 0$, then define $I = \{a \in A \mid ax = 0\}$. We have a commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} A/I & \xrightarrow{\bar{f}} & A/I \otimes_A B \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ M & \longrightarrow & M \otimes_A B \end{array}$$

Note that $A/I \otimes_A B \hookrightarrow M \otimes_A B$ is injective since B is A -flat. This gives a diagram chasing

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \bar{1} & \xrightarrow{\bar{f}} & \bar{1} \otimes 1 \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ x & \longrightarrow & x \otimes 1 = 0 \end{array}$$

By the commutative diagram, $\bar{f}(A/I) = 0$, so \bar{f} is the zero map, and since $A/I \otimes_A B = B/IB$, then $f^{-1}(IB) = A \supsetneq I$, contradiction.

(iii) \Rightarrow (iv): let B be A -flat and suppose every A -module M , every map $M \rightarrow M \otimes_A B$ is an injection, then $A \rightarrow A \otimes_A B = B$ is injective. Consider

$$0 \longrightarrow A \longrightarrow B \longrightarrow B/A \longrightarrow 0$$

to show that B/A is A -flat, take the following short exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow N \longrightarrow T \longrightarrow M \longrightarrow 0$$

and by tensoring via the first short exact sequence we obtain

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} & 0 & & 0 & & 0 & \\ & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & N & \longrightarrow & T & \longrightarrow & M \longrightarrow 0 \\ & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & N \otimes_A B & \longrightarrow & T \otimes_A B & \longrightarrow & M \otimes_A B \longrightarrow 0 \\ & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ & & N \otimes_A B/A & \longrightarrow & T \otimes_A B/A & \longrightarrow & M \otimes_A B/A \longrightarrow 0 \\ & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ & & 0 & & 0 & & 0 \end{array}$$

and it suffices to show exactness at $N \otimes_A B/A$. Let $x \in N \otimes_A B/A$ map to 0 in $T \otimes_A B/A$, then lift it to $y \in N \otimes_A B$, send it to z in $T \otimes_A B$, by exactness it sends to 0 in $M \otimes_A B$. Now z has a preimage of w in T , sending it to m in M , but injectivity of $M \rightarrow M \otimes_A B$ implies $m = 0$, therefore w lifts to some $n \in N$, here $n \in N$ is mapped to y' in $N \otimes_A B$, but that means n is mapped to 0 in $T \otimes_A B$ as well, by injectivity of $N \otimes_A B \rightarrow T \otimes_A B$, we have $y' = y$. Hence, n maps to $y' = y$ maps to x in the column, and by exactness this forces $x = 0$.⁵

(iv) \Rightarrow (iii): it suffices to show the following lemma.

Lemma 2.81. Let

$$0 \longrightarrow N \longrightarrow M \longrightarrow T \longrightarrow 0$$

be a short exact sequence of A -modules, and suppose T is A -flat, then for all A -module L , we have the short exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow L \otimes_A N \longrightarrow L \otimes_A M \longrightarrow L \otimes_A T \longrightarrow 0$$

to be exact.

⁵Instead of diagram chasing, one can apply the snake lemma instead.

Subproof. Suppose we have a short exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow V \longrightarrow F \longrightarrow L \longrightarrow 0$$

where F is free. Then consider

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} & & 0 & & 0 & & \\ & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & V \otimes N & \longrightarrow & F \otimes N & \longrightarrow & L \otimes N \longrightarrow 0 \\ & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & V \otimes M & \longrightarrow & F \otimes M & \longrightarrow & L \otimes M \longrightarrow 0 \\ & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & V \otimes T & \longrightarrow & F \otimes T & \longrightarrow & L \otimes T \longrightarrow 0 \\ & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ & & 0 & & 0 & & 0 \end{array}$$

We want to show $L \otimes N$ is exact in the column, i.e., $L \otimes N \rightarrow L \otimes M$ is injective. Note that the last row is exact since T is A -flat. We can use a similar argument. Take x in $L \otimes N$ mapping to 0 in $L \otimes M$, lift it to y in $F \otimes N$, map it to z in $F \otimes M$ with image 0 in $L \otimes M$, lift it to w in $V \otimes M$, send it to $t \in V \otimes T$ which maps into 0 in $F \otimes T$ by exactness of middle row, by injectivity we know $t = 0$, then lift it to n in $V \otimes N$, send it to y' in $F \otimes N$ which maps to z in $F \otimes M$. The middle row is exact since F is free, so $y' = y$ by injectivity, so by exactness of the row we know $x = 0$. ■

Therefore, consider

$$0 \longrightarrow A \longrightarrow B \longrightarrow B/A \longrightarrow 0$$

where B/A is A -flat.

Exercise 2.82. If A and B/A are both A -flat, then B is also A -flat.

By [Lemma 2.81](#), we know the exact sequence

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & M \otimes_A A & \longrightarrow & M \otimes_A B & \longrightarrow & M \otimes_A B/A \longrightarrow 0 \\ & & \parallel & \nearrow & & & \\ & & M & & & & \end{array}$$

is exact, therefore $M \rightarrow M \otimes_A B$ is injective.

(iii), (iv) \Rightarrow (i): let B be A -flat and $M \rightarrow M \otimes_A B$ be injective. We want to show that for any N such that $N \otimes_A B = 0$, we have $N = 0$. Consider

$$0 \longrightarrow A \longrightarrow B \longrightarrow B/A \longrightarrow 0$$

to be a short exact sequence, and we know B/A is A -flat, so we now know that

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & N \otimes_A A & \longrightarrow & N \otimes_A B & \longrightarrow & N \otimes_A B/A \longrightarrow 0 \\ & & \parallel & \nearrow & & & \\ & & N & & & & \end{array}$$

is exact, therefore $N \otimes_A B = 0$ implies $N = 0$ by injectivity. □

Theorem 2.83. Let A be a Noetherian ring and I be an ideal of A . Then $A \rightarrow \hat{A}$ is faithfully flat if and only if I is contained in the Jacobson radical of A .

Proof. Suppose I is contained in the Jacobson radical of A , then I is contained in the intersection of all maximal ideals of A . For any finitely-generated A -module M , we know $\bigcap_{n \geq 1} I^n M = (0)$. Therefore, $M \hookrightarrow \tilde{M} \cong M \otimes_A \hat{A}$ is an injection by Theorem 2.80. Suppose M is not necessarily finitely-generated, then M is the union (hence direct limit) of finitely-generated A -modules M_α 's. We want to show that $M \rightarrow M \otimes_A \hat{A}$ is an injection. Suppose $x \in M$ is mapped to 0, so let $N = Ax = A/J$ where $J = \text{Ann}_A(x)$, then we have a diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} 1 \in N & \hookrightarrow & y \in N \otimes_A \hat{A} \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ x \in M & \longrightarrow & 0 \in M \otimes_A \hat{A} \end{array}$$

Since $N \hookrightarrow M$ and since \hat{A} is A -flat, so $N \otimes_A \hat{A} \hookrightarrow M \otimes_A \hat{A}$ is injective as well. By chasing the diagram, we know $y = 0$, therefore by the injection we know $N = 0$, hence $x = 0$.

Suppose I is not contained in the Jacobson radical of A , then there exists some maximal ideal \mathfrak{m} of A such that $I \not\subseteq \mathfrak{m}$. Consider A/\mathfrak{m} with I -adic topology of filtration, then $\mathfrak{m} + IA = A$, therefore $\mathfrak{m} + I^n A = A$, hence $A/(\mathfrak{m} + I^n) = 0$. Therefore, $(\widehat{A/\mathfrak{m}}) = \varprojlim (A/(\mathfrak{m} + I^n)) = 0$. But note that $(\widehat{A/\mathfrak{m}}) = A/\mathfrak{m} \otimes_A \hat{A} = 0$, with $A/\mathfrak{m} \neq 0$, therefore \hat{A} is not faithfully flat. \square

Example 2.84. The map $k[x_1, \dots, x_n] \rightarrow k[[x_1, \dots, x_n]]$ is flat but not faithfully flat. Indeed, the ideal (x_1, \dots, x_n) , the ideal is not contained in $(x_1 - a_1, \dots, x_n - a_n)$ whenever a_i 's are non-zero.

However, if we factor it via the localization

$$\begin{array}{ccc} k[x_1, \dots, x_n] & \longrightarrow & k[[x_1, \dots, x_n]] \\ \downarrow & \nearrow & \\ k[x_1, \dots, x_n]_{(x_1, \dots, x_n)} & & \end{array}$$

then $k[x_1, \dots, x_n]_{(x_1, \dots, x_n)} \rightarrow k[[x_1, \dots, x_n]]$ is faithfully flat.

Exercise 2.85. Let k be a field, fix n . Define $R_i = k[[X_1, \dots, X_i]]$ for $i \leq n$. We say $0 \neq f \in R_n$ is *regular* of order h with respect to X_n if h is the smallest integer such that a_h , the coefficient of X_n^h in f , is non-zero in k . Let $f \in R_n$ be regular with respect to X_n of order h . Prove that $R_n/(f)$ is a free R_{n-1} -module with basis $1, \bar{X}_n, \dots, \bar{X}_n^{h-1}$, where $\bar{X}_n = \text{im}(\bar{X}_n)$ in $R_n/(f)$. Also prove that $R_n/(f)$ is complete with respect to (X_1, \dots, X_{n-1}) -adic topology.

Remark 2.86. In $\mathbb{C}[[z]]$, f being regular of degree h implies $f(z) = a_h z^h + a_{h+1} z^{h+1} + \dots$, so $\mathbb{C}[[z]]/(f(z)) = \mathbb{C}[[z]]/(z^h(a_h + a_{h+1}z + \dots))$, where $a_h + a_{h+1}z + \dots$ is a unit, so this is just $\mathbb{C}[[z]]/(z^h)$, which is just a pole of order h .

3 DIMENSION THEORY

3.1 GRADED RINGS AND HILBERT-SAMUEL POLYNOMIAL

Definition 3.1. Let \mathcal{F} be the set of functions $f : \mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$, let \mathcal{P} be the set of functions $f : \mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ such that there exists a polynomial $g \in \mathbb{Q}[x]$ such that $f(n) = g(n)$ for $n \gg 0$.

Remark 3.2. Obviously such g is unique, since any such choices would agree for all sufficiently large values.

Definition 3.3. $f \in \mathcal{P}$ is called an essentially polynomial, or an essentially polynomial function.

Definition 3.4 (Degree). We define the degree of f to be the degree of function g .

Remark 3.5. If $f = 0$ for $n \gg 0$, then $\deg(f) = -1$; if $f = a$ is a non-zero constant function, then $\deg(f) = 0$.

Example 3.6. Say $f(n) = \binom{n}{i}$ where we fix i . For $n \geq i$, $f(n)$ is an integer; for $n < i$, $f(n) = 0$. Therefore, the function $f(x) = \binom{x}{i}$ is a function with rational coefficients.

Definition 3.7. For $f \in \mathcal{F}$, we define $\Delta f : \mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ to be a function such that $\Delta f(n) = f(n+1) - f(n)$.

Remark 3.8. If $f \in \mathcal{P}$, then $\Delta f \in \mathcal{P}$. For $n \gg 0$, $f(n) = a_0 n^r + a_1 n^{r-1} + \cdots + a_r$ for $a_i \in \mathbb{Q}$, then $\Delta f(n) = r a_0 n^{r-1} + \cdots$. Hence, $\Delta^r(f) = r! a_0$. But we know $\Delta^r : \mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ if we proceed inductively, so $r! a_0$ is an integer. Note that $\Delta^{r+1}(f) = 0$.

Definition 3.9 (Multiplicity). We say $\Delta^r(f) \equiv \mu(f)$ is the multiplicity of f , that is, $\mu(f) = r! a_0$.

Lemma 3.10. Let $f : \mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$, then the following are equivalent:

- (i) $f \in \mathcal{P}$;
- (ii) $\Delta(f) \in \mathcal{P}$;
- (iii) there exists $r > 0$ such that either $\Delta^{r+1}f = 0$ for $n \gg 0$, or $\Delta^r(f)$ is constant.

Proof. It is enough to show that $\Delta f \in \mathcal{P}$ implies $f \in \mathcal{P}$, and we will induct on degree of Δf . If the degree of Δf is -1 , then $\Delta f(n) = 0$ for $n \gg 0$, so if $f(n+1) - f(n) = 0$ for $n \gg 0$, then $f(n+1) = f(n)$ for $n \gg 0$, thus f is constant for $n \gg 0$, by definition $f \in \mathcal{P}$. Now suppose this holds for polynomial f with degree of Δf at most $r-1$. Suppose Δf is of the form $a_0 n^r + a_1 n^{r-1} + \cdots + a_r$, then $r! a_0 = \Delta^{r+1}f = \Delta^r(\Delta f) = r! a_1$ which are integers. We write $g(x) = r! a_0 \binom{x}{r+1}$ then $\Delta g(n)$ is dominated by the term $r! a_0 \frac{(r+1)}{(r+1)!} n^r$, which is just $a_0 n^r$. We know $\Delta(f - g) = \Delta(f) - \Delta(g)$ which is a polynomial of degree at most $r-1$, so by induction $f - g \in \mathcal{P}$, hence $f = g + h$ for some $h \in \mathcal{P}$, hence $f \in \mathcal{P}$. \square

Exercise 3.11. Show that \mathcal{P} is a free abelian group with basis $\binom{x}{i}$ where $i \geq 0$.

Recall that A is Artinian if and only if A is Noetherian and A has finitely many prime ideals such that each of which is maximal. Note that $(0) = \mathfrak{m}_1^{i_1} \cdots \mathfrak{m}_r^{i_r}$ is a decomposition of maximal ideals, if and only if $\ell_A(A) < \infty$. Moreover, if M is a finitely-generated A -module, then $\ell_A(M) < \infty$.

Definition 3.12. Suppose A has a decomposition $A = A_0 \oplus A_1 \oplus \cdots \oplus A_n \oplus \cdots$ and M is a graded module $M = M_0 \oplus M_1 \oplus \cdots \oplus M_n \oplus \cdots$ where $A_i M_j \subseteq M_{i+j}$. Suppose $N \subseteq M$ is a submodule. Let $x \in N$ be written as $x = x_{i_1} + \cdots + x_{i_r}$, then we say N is a graded submodule if every $x_{i_j} \in N$. In particular, this is equivalent to $N = \bigoplus_i M \cap N_i$.

Remark 3.13. Under this definition, M/N is also a graded module over A . Moreover, let $B = A[X_1, \dots, X_n]$, and suppose I is a graded ideal of B , then B/I is graded. Moreover, we view B as an A -module generated by the x_i 's, i.e., $B = A[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ where each x_i has degree 1.

Theorem 3.14 (Hilbert-Serre). Let A_0 be an Artinian ring and $A = A_0[x_1, \dots, x_r]$ be a finitely-generated graded ring over A_0 with $\deg(x_i) = 1$ for all i .⁶ Let M be a finitely-generated A -module, and denote $M = M_0 \oplus M_1 \oplus \cdots$, then we have the following:

⁶Alternatively, we have $A = A_0 \oplus (x_1, \dots, x_r) \oplus (x_1, \dots, x_r)^2 \oplus \cdots$

- (i) each M_n is a module of finite length over A_0 ;
- (ii) let $\chi(M, n) = \ell_{A_0}(M_n)$ be the Hilbert function, then $\chi(M, n)$ is essentially polynomial of degree at most $r - 1$;
- (iii) suppose M_0 generates M over A , then $\Delta^{r-1}\chi(M, n) \leq \ell_{A_0}(M_0)$. Moreover, the equality holds if and only if

$$\begin{aligned} M_0[X_1, \dots, X_r] &\rightarrow M \\ mX_1^{i_1} \cdots X_r^{i_r} &\mapsto mx_1^{i_1} \cdots x_r^{i_r}, \end{aligned}$$

where $m \in M_0$, is an isomorphism. It is obvious that φ is an onto graded map.

Proof. (i) Let m_1, \dots, m_t be the graded homogeneous generators of M over A . For each M_n , we can write $x = \sum_{i,j} c_{i_1, \dots, i_r} x_1^{i_1} x_2^{i_2} \cdots x_r^{i_r} m_j$ where $c_{i_1, \dots, i_r} \in A_0$, such that each x_i has degree 1. Suppose $\deg(m_j) = h_j$, then $n = \sum_{j,k} i_k + h_j$. The solution of this equation consists of finite number of (i_1, \dots, i_r) and h_j 's. Therefore, M_n is finitely-generated over A_0 , hence $\ell_{A_0}(M_n) < \infty$.

- (ii) We proceed by induction on r . Suppose $r = 0$, then $A = A_0$, and $M = M_0 \oplus M_1 \oplus \cdots \oplus M_t \oplus 0 \oplus 0 \oplus \cdots$. This means $\chi(M, n) = 0$ for $n \gg 0$, so the degree of $\chi(M, n) = -1$. Suppose this is true degree at most $r - 1$, then let $N = \ker(x_r)$ and $\bar{M} = M/x_r M$, then

$$0 \longrightarrow N \longrightarrow M \xrightarrow{x_r} M \longrightarrow \bar{M} \longrightarrow 0$$

Now \bar{M} and N are finitely-generated modules over $A_0[x_1, \dots, x_r]/x_r A_0[x_1, \dots, x_r] = A_0[\bar{x}_1, \dots, \bar{x}_{r-1}]$. For any n , we have

$$0 \longrightarrow N_n \longrightarrow M_n \longrightarrow \bar{M}_n \longrightarrow 0$$

therefore

$$\begin{aligned} \ell(\bar{M}_n) - \ell(N_n) &= \ell_{A_0}(M_{n+r}) - \ell_{A_0}(M_n) \\ &= \Delta\chi(M, n) \\ &= \chi(\bar{M}_n) - \chi(N, n). \end{aligned}$$

By induction, $\chi(\bar{M}, n)$ and $\chi(N, n)$ are essentially polynomials of degree at most $r - 1$, so $\Delta\chi(M, n)$ is essentially polynomial of degree at most $r - 2$, therefore $\chi(M, n)$ is essentially polynomial of degree at most $r - 1$.

- (iii) Suppose M_0 generates M over A , then it is obvious that

$$\begin{aligned} M_0[X_1, \dots, X_r] &\rightarrow M \\ mX_1^{i_1} \cdots X_r^{i_r} &\mapsto mx_1^{i_1} \cdots x_r^{i_r} \end{aligned}$$

is an onto graded map where $m \in M_0$. This implies $\varphi_n : (M_0[X_1, \dots, X_r])_n \twoheadrightarrow M_n$ is onto as well. Hence, $\ell_{A_0}(M_n) \leq \ell_{A_0}(M_0[X_1, \dots, X_r])_n$. (Note that $k[x, y]$ has a basis given by $x^n, x^{n-1}y, \dots, xy^{n-1}, y^n$.) We observe that $(M_0[X_1, \dots, X_r])_n$ is just $M_0 \otimes_{A_0} [A_0[X_1, \dots, X_r]]_n$ (where $[-]_n$ is the completion on the n th grading), so $\ell_{A_0}(M_0[X_1, \dots, X_r])_n$ is just $\ell_{A_0}(M_0)$ multiplied by the number of monomials of (total) degree n in X_1, \dots, X_r , and by stars-and-bars that is just $\ell_{A_0}(M_0) \binom{n+r-1}{r-1}$. By part (ii), we know that the degree of $\chi(M, n)$ is at most $r - 1$. Also, we have $\chi(M_0[X_1, \dots, X_r], n) = \ell_{A_0}(M_0) \binom{n+r-1}{r-1}$, which is a polynomial of degree $r - 1$. We then conclude that $\Delta^{r-1}\chi(M_0[X_1, \dots, X_r], n) = \ell_{A_0}(M_0)$. Hence, $\Delta^{r-1}\chi(M, n) \leq \ell_{A_0}(M_0)$.

Now suppose φ is an isomorphism, then $\chi(M, n) = \chi(M_0[X_1, \dots, X_r], n) = \ell_{A_0}(M_0) \binom{n+r-1}{r-1}$, therefore $\Delta^{r-1}\chi(M, n) = \ell_{A_0}(M_0)$. Conversely, if $\Delta^{r-1}\chi(M, n) = \ell_{A_0}(M_0)$, then we want to show φ is an isomorphism. Since φ is onto, the kernel L gives a short exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow L \longrightarrow M_0[X_1, \dots, X_r] \longrightarrow M \longrightarrow 0$$

where all terms are all graded components, so have positive lengths. Now we know $\chi(M_0[X_1, \dots, X_r], n) = \chi(M, n) + \chi(L, n)$, so $\Delta^{r-1}\chi(M_0[X_1, \dots, X_r], n) = \Delta^{r-1}\chi(M, n) + \Delta^{r-1}\chi(L, n)$, therefore $\Delta^{r-1}\chi(L, n) =$

0 since $\Delta^{r-1}\chi(M, n) = \ell_{A_0}(M_0)$. We claim that this is not true if $L \neq 0$. Induct on $\ell_{A_0}(M_0)$. If $\ell_{A_0}(M_0) = 1$, then $M_0 = k$ a field, so

$$0 \longrightarrow L \longrightarrow B = k[X_1, \dots, X_n] \longrightarrow M \longrightarrow 0$$

If $L \neq 0$, then L is a graded ideal of B , then for some $d > 0$ we have $L_d \neq 0$. Let $0 \neq f \in L_d$ be homogeneous of degree d , then $B_{n-d}f \in L_n$. This implies $\chi(L_n) = \dim_k(L_n) \geq \dim_k(B_{n-d}) = \binom{n-d+r-1}{r-1}$. This gives $\Delta^{r-1}\chi(L, n) \geq 1$, contradiction. Now suppose $\ell_{A_0}(M_0) > 1$, then take a Jordan-Hölder series

$$M_0 \supset M_0^{(1)} \supset M_0^{(2)} \supset \dots \supset M_0^{(n)} = 0,$$

such that $M_0^{(i)}/M_0^{(i+1)} \cong A/\mathfrak{m}_i \cong k_i$, where \mathfrak{m}_i is maximal and k_i is a field (but is only isomorphic as modules). Therefore,

$$M_0[X_1, \dots, X_r] \supset M_0^{(1)}[X_1, \dots, X_r] \supset M_0^{(2)}[X_1, \dots, X_r] \supset \dots$$

is a series such that $M_0^{(i)}[X_1, \dots, X_r]/M_0^{(i+1)}[X_1, \dots, X_r] \cong k_i[X_1, \dots, X_r]$.⁷ If we now denote $L^{(i)} = L \cap M_0^{(i)}[X_1, \dots, X_r]$, then there is a filtration $L \supset L^{(1)} \supset L^{(2)} \supset \dots$, so

$$L^{(i)}/L^{(i+1)} \hookrightarrow M_0^{(i)}[X_1, \dots, X_r]/M_0^{(i+1)}[X_1, \dots, X_r] \cong k_i[X_1, \dots, X_r].$$

Hence, $\chi(L, n) = \sum_i \chi(L^{(i)}/L^{(i+1)}, n)$, therefore $\Delta^{r-1}\chi(L, n) = \sum_i \Delta^{r-1}\chi(L^{(i)}/L^{(i+1)}, n)$. But $L \neq 0$, so there exists some i such that $L^{(i)}/L^{(i+1)} \neq 0$. By the base case (of the induction on $\ell_{A_0}(M_0)$), we know $\Delta^{r-1}\chi(L^{(i)}/L^{(i+1)}, n) > 0$, therefore $\Delta^{r-1}\chi(L, n) > 0$, contradiction. \square

Definition 3.15 (Hilbert Multiplicity). Suppose $\deg(\chi(M, n)) = d$, then $\chi(M, n) = a_0 n^d +$ linear terms with higher degrees, where $n \gg 0$. Then $A^d = \chi(M, n) = d!a_0$. We say $e_d(M) = d!a_0$ is the Hilbert multiplicity of M over A , i.e., $a_0 = \frac{e_d(M)}{d!}$.

Remark 3.16. 1. Let A be Noetherian and M and N be (non-zero) finitely-generated A -modules, then the support of M is $\text{supp}(M) = V(M)$, the set of prime ideals P of A such that $M_P \neq 0$, which is equivalent to the set of prime ideals P of A where $P \supseteq \text{Ann}_A(M)$.

In particular, if $I = \text{Ann}_A(M)$, then $\text{supp}(M) = \text{supp}(A/I) = V(A/I) \approx V(I)$.

2. Under the above assumption, $\text{supp}(M \otimes_A N) = \text{supp}(M) \cap \text{supp}(N)$. Indeed, let P be in the support of $M \otimes_A N$, then $(M \otimes_A N)_P \neq 0$, so $(M \otimes_A N)_P = M_P \otimes_{A_P} N_P \neq 0$, so $M_P \neq 0$ and $N_P \neq 0$, therefore $P \in \text{supp}(M) \cap \text{supp}(N)$. Now suppose $P \in \text{supp}(M) \cap \text{supp}(N)$, then $M_P \neq 0$ and $N_P \neq 0$.

Lemma 3.17. Let A be a local ring and M, N be (non-zero) finitely-generated A -modules, then $M \otimes_A N \neq 0$.

Remark 3.18. We know $\mathbb{Q} \otimes \mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z} = 0$, but \mathbb{Q} is not finitely-generated as a \mathbb{Z} -module.

Proof. Let \mathfrak{m} be the maximal ideal of A . If $M \otimes_A N = 0$, then $A/\mathfrak{m} \otimes_A (M \otimes_A N) = 0$, therefore $M/\mathfrak{m}M \otimes_{A/\mathfrak{m}} M/\mathfrak{m}N = 0$. We run a dimension argument on the vector space, then either $M/\mathfrak{m}M = 0$ or $N/\mathfrak{m}N = 0$. By [Corollary 2.55](#), either $M = 0$ or $N = 0$. \square

This implies $\text{supp}(M) \cap \text{supp}(N) = \text{supp}(M \otimes N)$.

3. (a) Let \mathfrak{q} be an ideal of A , and M be a finitely-generated A -module. Suppose $\ell(M/\mathfrak{q}M) < \infty$, then $\ell(M/\mathfrak{q}^n M) < \infty$ for all n .
 (b) Consider the short exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow N \longrightarrow M \longrightarrow T \longrightarrow 0$$

and \mathfrak{q} is an ideal of A such that $\ell(M/\mathfrak{q}M) < \infty$, then $\ell(N/\mathfrak{q}N) < \infty$ and $\ell(T/\mathfrak{q}T) < \infty$.

⁷Consider the quotient of modules as a short exact sequence, and then tensor it by the polynomial ring structure, then we retrieve a short exact sequence represented by this quotient.

Proof. (a) Note that $\ell(M/\mathfrak{q}M) < \infty$ if and only if $\text{supp}(M/\mathfrak{q}M)$ consists of finitely many maximal ideals only, therefore $\text{supp}(M/\mathfrak{q}M) = \text{supp}(A/\mathfrak{q} \otimes_A M) = \text{supp}(A/\mathfrak{q}) \cap \text{supp}(M)$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}\text{supp}(M/\mathfrak{q}^n M) &= \text{supp}(A/\mathfrak{q}^n) \cap \text{supp}(M) \\ &= \text{supp}(A/\mathfrak{q}) \cap \text{supp}(M),\end{aligned}$$

so it consists of maximal ideals only as well, therefore $\ell(M/\mathfrak{q}^n M) < \infty$ for all $n > 0$.

(b) Note that $\text{supp}(N/\mathfrak{q}N) = \text{supp}(A/\mathfrak{q}) \cap \text{supp}(N) \subseteq \text{supp}(A/\mathfrak{q}) \cap \text{supp}(M)$, which consists of maximal ideals only, therefore $\text{supp}(N/\mathfrak{q}N)$ consists of maximal ideals only as well. That is, $\ell(N/\mathfrak{q}N) < \infty$. \square

Theorem 3.19. Let A be a Noetherian ring, \mathfrak{q} be an ideal of A , and let M be a finitely-generated A -module. Suppose $A \sim \{\mathfrak{q}^n\}$ and $M \sim \{M_n\}$ where the filtration is given by $\mathfrak{q}^i M_j \subseteq M_{i+j}$. We further assume that $\ell(M/\mathfrak{q}M) < \infty$, and that $\{M_n\}$ is \mathfrak{q} -good. Define $P_{\mathfrak{q}}((M_n), n) := \ell_A(M/M_n)$, then $\mathfrak{q}^n M \subseteq M_n$, therefore there is a surjection $M/\mathfrak{q}^n M \twoheadrightarrow M/M_n$. Then

- $P_{\mathfrak{q}}((M_n), n)$ is essentially polynomial that depends on $E_0(M)$, and
- if $\ell_A(M/\mathfrak{q}^n M) < \infty$, then $\ell_A(M/M_n)$ is finite.

Proof. We have

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta P_n((M_n), n) &= \ell_A(M/M_{n+1}) - \ell_A(M/M_n) \\ &= \ell_A(M_n/M_{n+1}),\end{aligned}$$

and take the decomposition $E_0(M) = M/M_1 \oplus M_1/M_2 \oplus \cdots$, and $E_0(A) = A/\mathfrak{q} \oplus \mathfrak{q}/\mathfrak{q}^2 \oplus \cdots$, then $E_0(M)$ is an $E_0(A)$ -module. Since A is Noetherian, then \mathfrak{q} is finitely-generated and so we write $\mathfrak{q} = (x_1, \dots, x_n)$, and so

$$\begin{aligned}\varphi : A/\mathfrak{q}[x_1, \dots, x_n] &\rightarrow E_0(A) \\ x_i &\mapsto \bar{x}_i \in \mathfrak{q}/\mathfrak{q}^2\end{aligned}$$

is an onto map. Note that $A/\mathfrak{q}[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ is Noetherian, so $E_0(A)$ is Noetherian as well. Since $\{M_n\}$ is \mathfrak{q} -good, then there exists some h such that $M_{n+h} = \mathfrak{q}^n M_h$ for all $n > 0$. Therefore, $M/M_1 \oplus M_1/M_2 \oplus \cdots \oplus M_h/M_{h+1}$ generates $E_0(M)$ over $E_0(A)$. For $x \in M_n$, we have $0 \neq \bar{x} \in M_n/M_{n+1}$, and $M_n = \mathfrak{q}^{n-h} M_h$, so $x = \sum y_i w_i$ where $y_i \in \mathfrak{q}^{n-j}$ and $w_i \in M_h$. Therefore, $\bar{x} = \sum \bar{y}_i \bar{w}_i$ in $E_0(M)$ for $\bar{y}_i \in \mathfrak{q}^{n-h}/\mathfrak{q}^{n-h+1}$ and $\bar{w}_i \in M_h/M_{h+1}$. This shows that $E_0(M)$ is a finitely-generated $E_0(A)$ -module with generators from $M/M_1, \dots, M_h/M_{h+1}$, where each of them is a finitely-generated A/\mathfrak{q} -module.

Remark 3.20. Note that A/\mathfrak{q} is not necessarily Artinian, so we cannot apply [Theorem 3.14](#) right now.

Recall $\ell(M/\mathfrak{q}M) < \infty$, if we denote $I = \text{Ann}_A(M)$, then

$$\begin{aligned}\text{supp}(M/\mathfrak{q}M) &= \text{supp}(A/\mathfrak{q}) \cap \text{supp}(M) \\ &= \text{supp}(A/\mathfrak{q}) \cap \text{supp}(A/I) \\ &= \text{supp}(A/\mathfrak{q} \otimes_A A/I) \\ &= \text{supp}(A/(\mathfrak{q} + I)).\end{aligned}$$

If we denote $\bar{A} = A/I$, then $\bar{A}/\bar{\mathfrak{q}} = A/(\mathfrak{q} + I)$, therefore $\ell_{\bar{A}}(\bar{A}/\bar{\mathfrak{q}}) < \infty$. We write down $E_0(\bar{A}) = \bar{A}/\bar{\mathfrak{q}} \oplus \bar{\mathfrak{q}}/\bar{\mathfrak{q}}^2 \oplus \cdots$.

Claim 3.21. $E_0(M)$ is a finitely-generated $E_0(\bar{A})$ -module.

Subproof. Since $IM = 0$, then for any i , $(\mathfrak{q} + I)^n M_i = \mathfrak{q}^n M$. \blacksquare

Since $\ell_{\bar{A}}(\bar{A}/\bar{\mathfrak{q}}) < \infty$, then $\bar{A}/\bar{\mathfrak{q}}$ is Artinian, and now by [Theorem 3.14](#) we know $\Delta P_{\mathfrak{q}}((M_n), n)$ is essentially polynomial. Therefore, $P_{\mathfrak{q}}((M_n), n)$ is essentially polynomial.

Let $M_n = \{\mathfrak{q}^n M\}$, then $E_0(M) = M/\mathfrak{q}M \oplus \mathfrak{q}M/\mathfrak{q}^2 M \oplus \cdots$, and $E_0(\bar{A}) = \bar{A}/\bar{\mathfrak{q}} \oplus \bar{\mathfrak{q}}/\bar{\mathfrak{q}}^2 \oplus \cdots$, then $E_0(M)$ is generated by $M/\mathfrak{q}M$ over $E_0(\bar{A})$. Write $P_{\mathfrak{q}}(M, n) = \ell(M/\mathfrak{q}^n M)$, then $\Delta P_{\mathfrak{q}}(M, n) = \ell(\mathfrak{q}^n M/\mathfrak{q}^{n+1} M)$. Suppose

$(\mathfrak{q} + I)/I$, that is, \bar{q} in \bar{A} , is minimally generated by r elements $\bar{x}_1, \dots, \bar{x}_r$, so $E_0(\bar{A}) = \bar{A}[\bar{x}_1, \dots, \bar{x}_r]$, then $\Delta P_{\mathfrak{q}}(M, n)$ is of degree at most $r - 1$, and $\Delta^{r-1}(\Delta P_{\mathfrak{q}}(M, n)) \leq \ell(M/\mathfrak{q}M)$, and note that the equality holds if and only if

$$\varphi : M/\mathfrak{q}M \otimes_{\bar{A}/\bar{\mathfrak{q}}} \bar{A}/\bar{\mathfrak{q}}[x_1, \dots, x_n] \rightarrow E_0(M) = M/\mathfrak{q}M \oplus \mathfrak{q}M/\mathfrak{q}^2M \oplus \dots$$

is an isomorphism. In particular, $\Delta^r(P_{\mathfrak{q}}(M, n)) \leq \ell(M/\mathfrak{q}M)$ therefore $\ell_A(M/M_n)$ is finite. \square

Corollary 3.22. Under the same assumption, $\ell(M/\mathfrak{q}^n M) \geq \ell(M/M_n)$. Moreover, if we write down the polynomials of $P_{\mathfrak{q}}(M, n)$ and $P_{\mathfrak{q}}((M_n), n)$, then

- the degree of $P_{\mathfrak{q}}(M, n)$ is the degree of $P_{\mathfrak{q}}((M_n), n)$, the leading coefficient of $P_{\mathfrak{q}}(M, n)$ is the leading coefficient of $P_{\mathfrak{q}}((M_n), n)$, hence $\Delta^r(P_{\mathfrak{q}}(M, n)) = \Delta^r(P_{\mathfrak{q}}((M_n), n))$ where r is the degree of $P_{\mathfrak{q}}(M, n)$;
- $P_{\mathfrak{q}}(M, n) = P_{\mathfrak{q}}((M_n), n) + R(n)$ where $R(n)$ is essentially polynomial whose degree is less than the degree of $P_{\mathfrak{q}}(M, n)$, and the leading coefficient is non-negative.

Proof. • Let $P_{\mathfrak{q}}(M, n)$ has degree d and leading coefficient a_0 , and let $P_{\mathfrak{q}}((M_n), n)$ has degree d' and leading coefficient b_0 . Since $\ell(M/\mathfrak{q}^n M) \geq \ell(M/M_n)$ for all n , then $d \geq d'$. Now $M_{n+h} = \mathfrak{q}^n M_h \subseteq \mathfrak{q}^n M$ since this is a good filtration, therefore $\ell(M/M_{n+h}) \geq \ell(M/\mathfrak{q}^n M)$, therefore $d' \geq d$, hence $d = d'$. Similarly, the argument above implies $a_0 \geq b_0$ and $b_0 \geq a_0$, so $a_0 = b_0$.

This implies $\Delta^d(P_{\mathfrak{q}}(M, n)) = \Delta^d(P_{\mathfrak{q}}((M_n), n)) = a_0 \cdot d!$.

- Consider

$$0 \longrightarrow M_n/\mathfrak{q}^n M \longrightarrow M/\mathfrak{q}^n M \longrightarrow M/M_n \longrightarrow 0$$

therefore $\ell(M/\mathfrak{q}^n M) = \ell(M/M_n) + \ell(M_n/\mathfrak{q}^n M)$. Let $R(n) = \ell(M_n/\mathfrak{q}^n M)$, then $P_{\mathfrak{q}}(M, n) = P_{\mathfrak{q}}(M_n, n) + R(n)$, therefore the degree of $R(n)$ is less than d , the degree of $P_{\mathfrak{q}}(M, n)$, and by definition of $R(n)$, the coefficient of the leading term of $R(n)$ is non-negative. \square

Definition 3.23 (Hilbert-Samuel Polynomial). Let A be a Noetherian ring, \mathfrak{q} be an ideal of A , M be a finitely-generated A -module, with $\ell(M/\mathfrak{q}M) < \infty$, then $P_{\mathfrak{q}}(M, n)$ is called the Hilbert-Samuel polynomial of M with respect to \mathfrak{q} . We define the degree of $P_{\mathfrak{q}}(M, n) = a_0 n^d + a_1 n^{d-1} + \dots$ to be d , then $\Delta^d(P_{\mathfrak{q}}(M, n)) = d!a_0$ is called the Hilbert-Samuel multiplicity of M with respect to \mathfrak{q} .

Proposition 3.24. Let A be a Noetherian ring, \mathfrak{q} be an ideal of A , M be a finitely-generated A -module, with $\ell(M/\mathfrak{q}M) < \infty$. Let \mathfrak{q}' be another ideal of A such that $\ell(M/\mathfrak{q}'M) < \infty$. Suppose $\text{supp}(M/\mathfrak{q}M) = \text{supp}(M/\mathfrak{q}'M)$, then the degree of $P_{\mathfrak{q}}(M, n)$ equals to the degree of $P_{\mathfrak{q}'}(M, n)$.

Proof. Let $I = \text{Ann}_A(M)$. Recall that

$$\begin{aligned} \text{supp}(M/\mathfrak{q}M) &= A/\mathfrak{q} \otimes_A M \\ &= \text{supp}(A/\mathfrak{q}) \cap \text{supp}(M) \\ &= \text{supp}(A/\mathfrak{q}) \cap \text{supp}(A/I) \\ &= \text{supp}(A/\mathfrak{q} \otimes A/I) \\ &= \text{supp}(A/\mathfrak{q} + I), \end{aligned}$$

then similarly $\text{supp}(M/\mathfrak{q}'M) = \text{supp}(A/(\mathfrak{q}' + I))$. Since $I = \text{Ann}_A(M)$, then $IM = 0$, so we can assume M to be an A/I -module, that is, M is an A -module such that $\text{Ann}_A(M) = 0$. In that case, then $\text{supp}(M/\mathfrak{q}M) = \text{supp}(A/\mathfrak{q})$ and $\text{supp}(M/\mathfrak{q}'M) = \text{supp}(A/\mathfrak{q}')$. Recall that $\ell(M/\mathfrak{q}M) < \infty$, so $\text{supp}(A/\mathfrak{q})$ consists of maximal ideals only. (Since it is Artinian, there are finitely many of them.) Similarly, $\ell(M/\mathfrak{q}'M) < \infty$, so $\text{supp}(A/\mathfrak{q}')$ consists of maximal ideals only as well. In particular, $\text{supp}(A/\mathfrak{q})$ is the set of prime ideals containing \mathfrak{q} , and $\text{supp}(A/\mathfrak{q}')$ is the set of prime ideals containing \mathfrak{q}' , but they are the same, so the radicals agree, i.e., $\sqrt{\mathfrak{q}} = \sqrt{\mathfrak{q}'}$. Since A is Noetherian, then $\mathfrak{q}^r \subseteq \mathfrak{q}'$ for some $r > 0$ and $\mathfrak{q}'^{r'} \subseteq \mathfrak{q}$ for some $r' > 0$ as well.

Claim 3.25. The degree of $P_{\mathfrak{q}}(M, n)$ equals to the degree of $P_{\mathfrak{q}^r}(M, n)$.

Subproof. If we write $P_q(M, n) = a_0 n^d + \dots$, with lower degree terms, and $P_{q^r}(M, n) = \ell(M/q^{r^n}M) = P_q(M, rn) = a_0(rn)^d + \dots = a_0 r^d n^d + \dots$, with lower degree terms. Therefore, the degree of $P_q(M, n)$ is the degree of $P_{q^r}(M, n)$, and the degree of $P_{q^r}(M, n)$ is the degree of $P_{q^{r^r}}(M, n)$. ■

Recall that $q^r \subseteq q'$ for some $r > 0$ and $q^{r'} \subseteq q$ for some $r' > 0$, therefore the degree of $P_q(M, n)$ is at least the degree of $P_{q'}(M, n)$, and the degree of $P_{q'}(M, n)$ is at least the degree of $P_q(M, n)$, therefore the degree of $P_q(M, n)$ is the degree of $P_{q'}(M, n)$. □

Remark 3.26. If $\ell(M/qM) < \infty$, then we can assume that $\text{Ann}_A(M) = q$. Therefore, $\text{supp}(M/qM) = \text{supp}(A/q)$, consists of maximal ideals only.

If we write $q = I_1 \cap I_2 \cap \dots \cap I_r$ where each I_i is \mathfrak{m}_i -primary for maximal ideal \mathfrak{m}_i . By the Chinese Remainder Theorem, we have $q = I_1 I_2 \dots I_r$. Thus, $q^n = I_1^n I_2^n \dots I_r^n$, and $A/q \cong A/I_1 \oplus \dots \oplus A/I_r$, and so $A/q^n \cong A/I_1^n \oplus \dots \oplus A/I_r^n$. Therefore, $I_i = qA_{\mathfrak{m}_i}$, and $M/q^n M \cong \bigoplus_i M/I_i^n M$ by tensoring M . Therefore, $P_q(M, n) = \sum_i P_{qA_{\mathfrak{m}_i}}(M_{\mathfrak{m}_i}, n)$. Therefore, it suffices to understand the Hilbert-Samuel polynomials in the local case (assuming M/qM has finite length).

Proposition 3.27. Let A be Noetherian, q be an ideal. Consider the short exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow N \longrightarrow M \longrightarrow T \longrightarrow 0$$

of finitely-generated A -modules. Suppose $\ell(M/qM) < \infty$, (so $\ell(T/qT)$ and $\ell(N/qN)$ are also finite,) then $P_q(M, n) = P_q(T, n) + P_q(N, n) - R(n)$, where $R(n)$ is an essentially polynomial of degree less than degree of $P_q(N, n)$, and the leading term of $R(n)$ has non-negative coefficient.

Proof. Consider

$$0 \longrightarrow N/(N \cap q^n M) \longrightarrow M/q^n M \longrightarrow T/q^n T \longrightarrow 0$$

The corresponding filtrations $\{N_n = N \cap q^n M\}$ and $\{q^n N\}$ are q -good. By Corollary 3.22, $P_q(N, n) = P_q(N_n, n) + R(n)$. From the short exact sequence above, $P_q(M, n) = P_q(T, n) + P_q(N_n, n)$, thus $\ell(M/q^n M) = \ell(T/q^n T) + \ell(N/N_n)$, so one can write $P_q(M, n) = P_q(T, n) + P_q(N, n) - R(n)$ with $R(n)$ as specified above. □

3.2 DIMENSION OVER ZARISKI TOPOLOGY

Definition 3.28 (Zariski Topology). Let A be a commutative ring, then the Zariski spectrum is the set $\text{Spec}(A) = \{P \mid P \text{ is a prime ideal in } A\}$. This becomes a topological space $X = \text{Spec}(A)$ with the following (Zariski) topology: we declare the closed sets of X to be $V(I) = \{P \in \text{Spec}(A) \mid P \supseteq I\}$, i.e., the vanishing set of an ideal I .

Exercise 3.29. • $\bigcap_{i \in I} V(I_i) = V(\sum_{i \in I} I_i)$,

• $V(I) \cup V(J) = V(I \cap J) = V(IJ)$.

If $I = (f_i)_{i \in I}$, then $V(I) = V(\sum_{i \in I} A f_i) = \bigcap_{i \in I} V(f_i)$, so $X \setminus V(I) = X \setminus \bigcap_{i \in I} V(f_i) = \bigcup_{i \in I} (X \setminus V(f_i)) = \bigcup_{i \in I} D(f_i)$, where we define $D(f_i) = X \setminus V(f_i) = \{p \in \text{Spec}(A) \mid f_i \notin p\}$. Therefore, $\{D(f_i)\}$ forms a family of basic open subsets of X . Therefore, $D(f_i)$ corresponds to $\text{Spec}(A_{f_i})$.

Exercise 3.30. Let $Y \subseteq X$ be a subset, then $\bar{Y} = V(I)$ where $I = \bigcap_{p \in Y} p$. Therefore, $V(I) = V(\sqrt{I})$. In particular,

$V(I) \subsetneq V(J)$ if and only if $\sqrt{J} \subsetneq \sqrt{I}$. One can check that there exists a one-to-one inclusion-reversing correspondence between closed subsets of X and radical ideals of A .

Exercise 3.31. $[p] \in X$ is a closed point if and only if p is a maximal ideal of A . In particular, the spectrum as a topological space is non-Hausdorff.

Definition 3.32 (Irreducible Subset). Let X be a topological space and $Y \subseteq X$ be a subset. Then Y is called irreducible if Y cannot be expressed as a union of two proper closed subsets of Y .

Exercise 3.33. • Y is irreducible if and only if any two non-empty open subsets of Y has a non-empty intersection.

- Y being irreducible implies \bar{Y} irreducible.

Example 3.34. Let $X = \text{Spec}(A)$ be a topological space and Y be a closed subset of X , with $Y = V(I)$. Then Y is irreducible if and only if \sqrt{I} is a prime ideal of A .

Therefore, we have an increasing sequence of closed subsets $Y_0 \subsetneq Y_1 \subsetneq Y_2 \subsetneq \cdots \subseteq Y_r$ in $X = \text{Spec}(A)$ if and only if $P_r \subsetneq P_{r-1} \subsetneq \cdots \subsetneq P_0$ for $V(P_i) = Y_i$ for all $0 \leq i \leq r$.

Remark 3.35. • Let X be a topological space and let \mathcal{F} be the family of irreducible closed subsets Y of X , then \mathcal{F} has a maximal element. Let $Y_0 \subseteq Y_1 \subseteq Y_2 \subseteq \cdots$ be an increasing chain of irreducible closed subsets, then one can check that $Y = \bigcup_{i \geq 0} Y_i$ is irreducible and closed. By Zorn's lemma, there exists a maximal element of \mathcal{F} .

- For any $x \in X$, $\{x\}$ irreducible does not imply $\overline{\{x\}}$ irreducible. (In contrast, in Hausdorff spaces, every singleton set is closed.)

Definition 3.36 (Component). A maximal irreducible closed subset of a space X is called a component of X . Therefore, a space X is the union of its components.

Definition 3.37 (Noetherian). Let X be a topological space, then X is Noetherian if

- (i) every non-empty of open subsets of X has a maximal element, or equivalently,
- (ii) every non-empty of closed subsets of X has a minimal element.

Remark 3.38. (i) If X is Noetherian, then any subset Y of X is Noetherian as well.

- (ii) Conversely, if $X = \bigcup_{i=1}^n X_i$ where each X_i is Noetherian, then X is Noetherian.

- (iii) If X is Noetherian, then every subset of X is quasi-compact.

Example 3.39. If A be a Noetherian ring, then $\text{Spec}(A)$ is Noetherian. The converse is not necessarily true.

Remark 3.40. Suppose A is Noetherian, then $(0) = \mathfrak{q}_1 \cap \cdots \cap \mathfrak{q}_r$ where \mathfrak{q}_i is P_i -primary. Let $\{P_1, \dots, P_t\} = \min\{P_1, \dots, P_r\}$ be the minimal primes, then $\text{Spec}(A) = V(0) = V(\mathfrak{q}_1) \cup \cdots \cup V(\mathfrak{q}_r)$, but since \mathfrak{q}_i is P_i -primary for all i , then $V(\mathfrak{q}_i) = V(P_i)$, so $P_i = \text{Ass}(A/\mathfrak{q}_i) = V(P_1) \cup \cdots \cup V(P_r)$. But if $P_i \subsetneq P_j$, then $V(P_j) \subsetneq V(P_i)$, so the union is just $V(P_1) \cup \cdots \cup V(P_t)$, where each $V(P_i)$ is a component of $\text{Spec}(A)$ for $1 \leq i \leq t$.

Proposition 3.41. A Noetherian space X has finite components, i.e., $X = X_1 \cup \cdots \cup X_n$ is a finite union.

Proof. Let \mathcal{F} be the collection of closed subsets Z of X for which the proposition is not true, that is, each Z is a finite union of its components. Suppose, towards contradiction, that \mathcal{F} is non-empty. Since X is Noetherian, then there exists a minimal element Z_0 of \mathcal{F} , therefore Z_0 is not irreducible, otherwise $Z_0 \notin \mathcal{F}$, so $Z_0 = W_0 \cup V_0$ is the union of two proper closed subsets. By minimality $W_0, V_0 \notin \mathcal{F}$, therefore W_0 and V_0 should be the finite union of their (finitely many) irreducible components, but that means \mathcal{F} is also a finite union of irreducible components, contradiction. \square

Definition 3.42 (Dimension). Let X be a topological space, then the dimension of X , denoted $\dim(X)$, is defined as

$$\dim(X) = \sup\{r \mid \text{there exists a decreasing chain of irreducible closed subsets } X_r \supsetneq X_{r-1} \supsetneq \cdots \supsetneq X_1 \supsetneq X_0\}.$$

Exercise 3.43. Let A be a commutative ring, $X = \text{Spec}(A)$. Show that X is quasi-compact, i.e., every open cover has a finite subcover.

Definition 3.44 (Dimension). Let A be a commutative ring and $X = \text{Spec}(A)$, then

$$\dim(X) = \sup\{r \mid \text{there exists an increasing chain of prime ideals } P_0 \subsetneq P_1 \subsetneq \cdots \subsetneq P_r\}.$$

This follows from the definition above.

Definition 3.45 (Krull Dimension). The Krull dimension of a commutative ring A , denoted $\dim(A)$, is $\dim(\text{Spec}(A))$.

Remark 3.46. For any space X , $\dim(X) = \sup_i (\dim(X_i))$ where each X_i is a component of X .

Remark 3.47. Let A be a commutative ring, $X = \text{Spec}(A)$, then

$$\dim(X) = \sup\{\dim(A/P_i) \mid P_1, \dots, P_t \text{ are minimal prime ideals of } A\}.$$

Remark 3.48 (Nagata). There exists Noetherian rings A such that $\dim(A) = \infty$.

Definition 3.49 (Krull Dimension). Let A be a Noetherian ring (this would probably be the implicit assumption from now on) and let M be an A -module, then the Krull dimension of M is $\dim(M) = \dim(A/I)$ where $I = \text{Ann}_A(M)$.

Exercise 3.50. $\dim(M) = \sup_{\mathfrak{m}}(\dim(M_{\mathfrak{m}}))$ where \mathfrak{m} is a maximal ideal. Note that now the dimension of M can be studied locally. This is similar to the case of studying the degree of $P_{\mathfrak{q}}(M, n)$, where $\text{supp}(\mathfrak{q} + I) = \{\mathfrak{m}_1, \dots, \mathfrak{m}_n\}$ we just need to study $P_{\mathfrak{q}A_{\mathfrak{m}}}(M_{\mathfrak{m}}, n)$ for maximal ideals \mathfrak{m} in the support.

Definition 3.51 (Length). Let (A, \mathfrak{m}) be a local ring, i.e., A is Noetherian with a unique maximal ideal \mathfrak{m} , and let M be a finitely-generated A -module. We denote the length $s(M) = \inf\{n \mid \exists x_1, \dots, x_n \in \mathfrak{m} \text{ such that } \ell(M/(x_1, \dots, x_n)M) < \infty\}$. Note that since M is finitely-generated, then $\dim_{A/\mathfrak{m}}(M/\mathfrak{m}M) < \infty$, so $s(M)$ is always finite.

Definition 3.52 (System of Parameters). We say $x_1, \dots, x_r \in \mathfrak{m}$ is a system of parameters of M if $r = s(M)$ and $\ell(M/(x_1, \dots, x_r)M) < \infty$.

Let (A, \mathfrak{m}) be a local ring, M be a finitely-generated A -module, then we denote $d(M) = \deg(P_{\mathfrak{m}}(M, n))$

Remark 3.53. For Noetherian ring A (but not necessarily quasi-local), we have $\dim(A) = \sup(\dim(A_{\mathfrak{m}}))$ and $d(M) = \sup(d(M_{\mathfrak{m}}))$.

Theorem 3.54 (Dimension Theorem). Let (A, \mathfrak{m}) be a local ring, M be a finitely-generated A -module, then $\dim(M) = d(M) = s(M)$.

Proof. We will show that $\dim(M) \leq d(M) \leq s(M) \leq \dim(M)$.

- To show $\dim(M) \leq d(M)$, we will induct on $d(M)$. If $d(M) = 0$, then $P_{\mathfrak{m}}(M, n) = \ell(M/\mathfrak{m}^n M)$, and since $d(M) = 0$ is the degree of $P_{\mathfrak{m}}(M, n)$, then $\ell(M/\mathfrak{m}^n M) = \ell(M/\mathfrak{m}^{n+1} M) = \dots$, therefore $\ell(\mathfrak{m}^n M/\mathfrak{m}^{n+1} M) = 0$, hence we have a short exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow \mathfrak{m}^n M/\mathfrak{m}^{n+1} M \longrightarrow M/\mathfrak{m}^{n+1} M \longrightarrow M/\mathfrak{m}^n M \longrightarrow 0$$

therefore $\mathfrak{m}^n M/\mathfrak{m}^{n+1} M = 0$, so $\mathfrak{m}^n M = \mathfrak{m}^{n+1} M = \mathfrak{m}(\mathfrak{m}^n M)$, then by Nakayama Lemma ([Corollary 2.55](#)), we have $\mathfrak{m}^n M = 0$, so $\text{supp}(M) = \{\mathfrak{m}\}$. Therefore, $\dim(M) = 0$.

Now suppose $d(M) > 0$, and we have shown the case for dimension $0, \dots, d(M) - 1$. Since (A, \mathfrak{m}) is local, then it has finitely many components. Let $P_0 \subsetneq P_1 \subsetneq \dots \subsetneq P_n$ be a chain of prime ideals in $\text{supp}(M)$ such that P_0 is a minimal prime ideal in $\text{supp}(M)$. We need to show that $n \leq d(M)$. Denote $N = A/P_0$ and take $x \in P_1 \setminus P_0$, then x is a non-zero-divisor of N , therefore

$$0 \longrightarrow N \xrightarrow{x} N \longrightarrow N/xN \longrightarrow 0$$

is a short exact sequence. By [Proposition 3.27](#), $d(N/xN) \leq d(N) - 1$. By the inductive hypothesis, $\dim(N/xN) \leq d(N/xN) \leq d(N) - 1$, then note that $N/xN = A/(P_0 + x_1 A)$, so $P_0 + x_1 A \subseteq P_1 \subseteq P_2 \subseteq \dots \subseteq P_n$, therefore $n - 1 \leq \dim(N/xN) \leq d(N/xN) \leq d(N) - 1$, therefore $n \leq d(N) \leq d(M)$.

- To show $d(M) \leq s(M)$, let x_1, \dots, x_n be a system of parameters of M , i.e., $n = s(M)$ and $\ell(M/(x_1, \dots, x_n)M) < \infty$. This implies $\deg(P_{(x_1, \dots, x_n)}(M, n)) \leq n$, but $V(M/(x_1, \dots, x_n)M) = V(M/\mathfrak{m}M)$, therefore we have $\text{supp}(M/(x_1, \dots, x_n)M) = \{\mathfrak{m}\} = \text{supp}(M/\mathfrak{m}M)$, thus by [Proposition 3.24](#) we conclude $\deg(P_{\mathfrak{m}}(M, n)) = \deg(P_{(x_1, \dots, x_n)}(M, n))$, so $d(M) \leq s(M) = n$.
- To show $s(M) \leq \dim(M)$, we proceed by induction on $\dim(M)$. If $\dim(M) = 0$, then $\text{supp}(M) = \{\mathfrak{m}\}$, so $\ell_A(M) < \infty$, therefore $s(M) = 0$. Let $\{P_1, \dots, P_r\}$ be the minimal primes of $\text{supp}(M)$. Take $x \in \mathfrak{m} \setminus \bigcup_{i=1}^r P_i$, then $s(M) - 1 \leq s(M/xM) \leq \dim(M/xM) \leq \dim(M - 1)^8$, hence $s(M) \leq \dim(M)$.

⁸The first inequality follows from definition, and the second inclusion follows from the inductive hypothesis.

□

Remark 3.55. If A is a PID, then every prime has height 1, therefore $\dim(A) = 1$. For instance, $\dim(\mathbb{Z}) = \dim(k[x]) = 1$. For $A = k[x_1, \dots, x_n]$, we have $(x_1, \dots, x_n) \supseteq (x_1, \dots, x_{n-1}) \supseteq \dots \supseteq (x_1) \supseteq (0)$, so $\dim(A) \geq n$.

Corollary 3.56. Let (A, \mathfrak{m}) be a local ring with M a finitely-generated A -module, then $\dim_A(M) = \dim_{\hat{A}}(\hat{M})$.

Proof. Note $\dim_A(M) = d(M) = \deg(P_{\mathfrak{m}}(M, n))$, $P_{\mathfrak{m}}(M, n) = \ell(M/\mathfrak{m}^n M)$; similarly $\dim_{\hat{A}}(\hat{M}) = d(\hat{M}) = \deg(P_{\hat{\mathfrak{m}}}(\hat{M}, n)) = \ell(\hat{M}/\hat{\mathfrak{m}}^n \hat{M})$, therefore $M/\mathfrak{m}^n M \cong \hat{M}/\hat{\mathfrak{m}}^n \hat{M}$. □

Corollary 3.57. Let (A, \mathfrak{m}) be a local ring, then $\dim(A)$ is the minimal number of elements required to generate an \mathfrak{m} -primary ideal.

Proof. Note $\dim(A) = s(A)$ is the minimal number n such that $x_1, \dots, x_n \in \mathfrak{m}$ gives $\ell(A/(x_1, \dots, x_n)) < \infty$. Since $s(A) = d$, then there exists x_1, \dots, x_d such that $\ell(A/(x_1, \dots, x_d)) < \infty$, so $\{\mathfrak{m}\} = \text{Ass}_A(A/(x_1, \dots, x_d))$, i.e., (x_1, \dots, x_d) is \mathfrak{m} -primary. □

Corollary 3.58. Let A be Noetherian, any descending chain of prime ideals must stop after a finite number of steps.

Proof. Take a descending chain $P = P_0 \supseteq P_1 \supseteq P_2 \supseteq \dots$, then taking the localization at P , we have $PA_P \supseteq P_1 A_P \supseteq P_2 A_P \supseteq \dots$ in A_P . But A_P is a local ring with maximal ideal PA_P , therefore $\dim(A_P) < \infty$, so there exists some $r > 0$ such that $P_r A_P = P_{r+1} A_P = \dots$. This implies $P_r = P_{r+1} = \dots$, by pulling back via $i_P : A \rightarrow A_P$. (One needs to check that $i_P^{-1}(P_r A_P) = P_r$.) □

Definition 3.59 (Height). Let A be Noetherian, $P \subseteq A$ be a prime ideal. The height of P , denoted $\text{ht}(P)$, is $\dim(A_P)$. Alternatively, it is $\sup\{r \mid \exists \text{ a chain of prime ideals } P_0 \subsetneq P_1 \subsetneq \dots \subsetneq P_r \subsetneq P_r = P\}$.

Let I be an ideal of A , then $\text{ht}(I) = \inf_{P \supseteq I} \text{ht}(P) = \inf_{\text{minimal } P \supseteq I} \text{ht}(P)$. By the primary decomposition, if we write down $I = \mathfrak{q}_1 \cap \dots \cap \mathfrak{q}_r$ with minimal primes P_1, \dots, P_r , then this is just $\inf_{\text{minimal primes } P_i} \text{ht}(P_i)$ in a primary decomposition of I .

Corollary 3.60 (Generalized Krull's Principal Ideal Theorem). Let A be a Noetherian ring and P be a prime ideal, then $\text{ht}(P) \leq n$ if and only if there exists $a_1, \dots, a_n \in P$ such that P contains (a_1, \dots, a_n) minimally.

Proof. (\Rightarrow): note that $\text{ht}(P) \leq n$ if and only if $\dim(A_P) \leq n$, which implies $s(A_P) \leq n$. Let $\frac{a_1}{1}, \dots, \frac{a_d}{1}$ be a system of parameters for A_P where $d \leq n$. Therefore, $\text{Ass}_{A_P}(A_P/(a_1, \dots, a_d)A_P) = PA_P$, that is, PA_P contains $(a_1, \dots, a_d)_{A_P}$ minimally. This implies $P \supseteq (a_1, \dots, a_d)$ minimally.

(\Leftarrow): suppose $P \supseteq (a_1, \dots, a_n)$ minimally, then $PA_P \supseteq (a_1, \dots, a_n)A_P$ minimally, therefore we have $PA_P = \text{Ass}_{A_P}(A_P/(a_1, \dots, a_n)A_P)$, therefore $\ell(A_P/(a_1, \dots, a_n)A_P) < \infty$, thus $\dim(A_P) \leq n$. □

Exercise 3.61. Let (A, \mathfrak{m}) be a local ring. Suppose there exists a principal prime ideal P , then A is a domain.

Exercise 3.62. Let A be a Noetherian ring with $\dim(A) \geq 2$. Show that A has infinitely many prime ideals of height 1.

Exercise 3.63. Let (A, \mathfrak{m}) be a local ring and M be a finitely-generated A -module. Let $x_1, \dots, x_i \in \mathfrak{m}$, then show that $\dim(M/(x_1, \dots, x_i)) \geq \dim(M) - i$. The equality holds if and only if x_1, \dots, x_i form a part of a system of parameters of M .

Theorem 3.64. Let A be a Noetherian ring, then $\dim(A[x]) = \dim(A) + 1$.

Proof. First, we need two lemmas.

Lemma 3.65. Let $\mathfrak{p} \supsetneq \mathfrak{q}$ be two prime ideals in $A[x]$ such that $\mathfrak{q}_0 = \mathfrak{q} \cap A = P \cap A$, then $\mathfrak{q} = \mathfrak{q}_0[x]$.

Remark 3.66. In particular, this implies there is no prime ideal between \mathfrak{p} and \mathfrak{q} . Otherwise, say $\mathfrak{p} \supsetneq \mathfrak{q}' \supsetneq \mathfrak{q}$, then $\mathfrak{q}' = \mathfrak{q}_0[x]$, so $\mathfrak{q} = \mathfrak{q}'$.

Subproof. Suppose, towards contradiction, that $\mathfrak{q}_0[x] \subsetneq \mathfrak{q} \subsetneq \mathfrak{p}$, then $\bar{A} := A/\mathfrak{q}_0 \rightarrow A/\mathfrak{q}_0[x] = A[x]/\mathfrak{q}_0[x] = \bar{A}[x]$. Now $\bar{A}[x]$ has a strict chain:

$$\bar{0} \subsetneq \bar{\mathfrak{q}} \subsetneq \bar{\mathfrak{p}}$$

where $\bar{\mathfrak{q}}$ is the image of \mathfrak{q} in $\bar{A}[x]$ and $\bar{\mathfrak{p}}$ is the image of \mathfrak{p} in $\bar{A}[x]$. Also note that $(\bar{0}) = (\bar{0}) \cap \bar{A} = \bar{\mathfrak{q}} \cap \bar{A} = \bar{\mathfrak{p}} \cap \bar{A}$. Let $k = S^{-1}\bar{A}$ for $S = \bar{A} \setminus \{0\}$, then by tensoring with \bar{A} on $k \rightarrow k[x]$ (as $\bar{A} \hookrightarrow \bar{A}[x]$ where $S^{-1}\bar{A}$ is \bar{A} -flat), we have a strict chain

$$\bar{0} \subsetneq S^{-1}\bar{\mathfrak{q}} \subsetneq S^{-1}\bar{\mathfrak{p}}$$

of length 2. Therefore $\dim(k[x]) \geq 2$, but $\dim(k[x]) = 1$, contradiction. Therefore $\mathfrak{q} = \mathfrak{q}_0[x]$. ■

Lemma 3.67. Let A be a Noetherian ring and I be an ideal, then $\text{ht}(I) = \text{ht}(I[x])$.

Subproof. We have $I = \inf_{P \supseteq I} \text{ht}(P) = \inf_{\text{minimal } P \supseteq I} \text{ht}(P)$ and $I[x] = \inf_{A[x] \supseteq \mathfrak{q} \supseteq I[x]} \text{ht}(\mathfrak{q}) = \inf_{\text{minimal } P[x] \supseteq I[x]} \text{ht}(P)$, therefore it is enough to show that $\text{ht}(P) = \text{ht}(P[x])$.

Given any chain $P_0 \subsetneq P_1 \subsetneq \cdots \subsetneq P_r = P$, then $P_0[x] \subsetneq P_1[x] \subsetneq \cdots \subsetneq P_r[x] = P[x]$. This says $\text{ht}(P[x]) \geq \text{ht}(P)$. Also, suppose $\text{ht}(P) = t$, then there exists $a_1, \dots, a_t \in P$ such that $P \supseteq (a_1, \dots, a_t)$ minimally. By the primary decomposition, we know $P[x] \supseteq (a_1, \dots, a_t)[x]$ minimally, then $\text{ht}(P[x]) \leq t = \text{ht}(P)$, thus $\text{ht}(P) = \text{ht}(P[x])$. ■

Suppose $\dim(A) = \infty$, then take a strict chain of prime ideals in A , i.e., $P_0 \subsetneq \cdots \subsetneq P_r$, so $P_0[x] \subsetneq \cdots \subsetneq P_r[x]$ is also a strict chain in $A[x]$, so $\dim(A[x]) = \infty$.

Now suppose $\dim(A) < \infty$. Take any chain $P_0 \subsetneq \cdots \subsetneq P_r$, then we have another chain $P_0[x] \subsetneq P_1[x] \subsetneq \cdots \subsetneq P_r[x] \subsetneq (P_r[x], x)$, so $\dim(A[x]) \geq \dim(A) + 1$. We now proceed by induction on $\dim(A)$. Suppose $\dim(A) = 0$, then it is equivalent to $\ell_A(A) < \infty$, i.e., all the associated primes of A are maximal. By Lemma 3.65, $\dim(A) = 1$.⁹

We now want to show that $\dim(A[x]) \leq \dim(A) + 1$. Take a strict chain of ideals in $A[x]$ of any length (say r), that is $P_r \supsetneq \cdots \supsetneq P_1 \supsetneq P_0$, then by intersecting with A we have another chain $\mathfrak{p}_r \supsetneq \cdots \supsetneq \mathfrak{p}_1 \supsetneq \mathfrak{p}_0$, where $\mathfrak{p}_i = P_i \cap A$. We now want to show that $r \leq \dim(A) + 1$. We have two cases:

- suppose $\mathfrak{p}_r \neq \mathfrak{p}_{r-1}$, so $\text{ht}(P_{r-1}) < \dim(A)$. By induction, $\dim(A_{\mathfrak{p}_{r-1}}[x]) = \dim(A_{\mathfrak{p}_{r-1}}) + 1$, so $\dim(A_{\mathfrak{p}_{r-1}}[x]) \leq \dim(A)$, and by localization we have a chain $A_{\mathfrak{p}_{r-1}}[x] \supsetneq P_{r-1}A_{\mathfrak{p}_{r-1}}[x] \supsetneq \cdots \supsetneq P_0A_{\mathfrak{p}_{r-1}}[x]$, therefore $r - 1 \leq \dim(A_{\mathfrak{p}_{r-1}}[x]) \leq \dim(A)$, so $r \leq \dim(A) + 1$.
- suppose $\mathfrak{p}_r = \mathfrak{p}_{r-1}$, so $P_{r-1} = \mathfrak{p}_{r-1}[x]$ by Lemma 3.65, with $\text{ht}(P_{r-1}) = \text{ht}(\mathfrak{p}_{r-1})$. Therefore, $r - 1 \leq \text{ht}(P_{r-1}) = \text{ht}(P_{r-1}) \leq \dim(A)$, so $r \leq \dim(A) + 1$.

□

Corollary 3.68. • Let A be a Noetherian ring, then $\dim(A[x_1, \dots, x_n]) = \dim(A) + n$.

- Let k be a field, then $\dim(k[x_1, \dots, x_n]) = n$.
- $\dim(\mathbb{Z}[x_1, \dots, x_n]) = n + 1$.

Exercise 3.69. Let A be a Noetherian ring, then $\dim(A[[x]]) = \dim(A) + 1$.

Hint: is X contained in the Jacobson radical of $A[[x]]$?

Corollary 3.70. • For a Noetherian ring A , $\dim(A[[x]]) = \dim(A) + n$.

- For a field k , $\dim(k[[x]]) = n$.
- $\dim(\mathbb{Z}[[x_1, \dots, x_n]]) = n + 1$.

Remark 3.71. For rings like $k[x_1, \dots, x_n]$, the dimension and the transcendental degree are both n . For rings like $k[[x]]$, the degree is still n , but the transcendental degree is ∞ .

⁹Indeed, take the primary decomposition $0 = I_1 \cap \cdots \cap I_r$ where I_i is \mathfrak{m}_i -primary, then pushing it out to the polynomial ring, we have $0 = I_1[x] \cap \cdots \cap I_r[x]$, where $I_r[x]$ is $\mathfrak{m}_i[x]$ -primary. Take the chain given by $P = (\mathfrak{m}_1[x], x) \supsetneq \mathfrak{m}_1[x]$, but they both collapse onto \mathfrak{m}_1 , so by Lemma 3.65 this is the maximal chain, thus has length 1.

Remark 3.72. If $f : A \rightarrow B$ is a ring homomorphism, then

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{Spec}(f) : \mathrm{Spec}(B) &\rightarrow \mathrm{Spec}(A) \\ [p] &\mapsto [f^{-1}(p)]\end{aligned}$$

is a continuous map with respect to the Zariski topology.

Exercise 3.73. $\mathrm{im}(\mathrm{Spec}(f)(\mathrm{Spec}(B)))$ is dense in $\mathrm{Spec}(A)$ if and only if $f^{-1}(0)$ consists of nilpotent elements in A .

4 INTEGRAL EXTENSIONS

4.1 GOING-UP AND GOING-DOWN

Definition 4.1 (Integral). Let $A \hookrightarrow B$ be an inclusion of commutative rings, sending multiplicative identity to multiplicative identity. An element $0 \neq x \in B$ is called integral over A if x satisfies a monic equation $x^n + a_1x^{n-1} + \cdots + a_n = 0$ for $a_i \in A$. If every element of B is integral over A , we say B is integral over A .

Proposition 4.2. Suppose $A \hookrightarrow B$, and let $x \in B$, then the following are equivalent:

- (i) x is integral over A ;
- (ii) $A[x]$ is a finitely-generated A -module;
- (iii) $A[x] \subseteq C$, a subring of B , such that C is a finitely-generated A -module.
- (iv) There exists an $A[x]$ -submodule M of B such that M is a finitely-generated A -module and M is faithful as an $A[x]$ -module.

Proof. (i) \Rightarrow (ii): since x is integral over A , then we have $x^n + a_1x^{n-1} + \cdots + a_n = 0$, so $x^n = -a_1x^{n-1} - \cdots - a_n$, therefore $x^{n+1} = -a_1x^n - \cdots - a_nx = -a_1(x^{n-1} + \cdots + a_n) - a_2x^{n-1} - \cdots$, but this is a linear combination of the set $\{1, x, \dots, x^{n-1}\}$ over A , hence $A[x]$ is a finitely-generated A -module with generators $1, x, \dots, x^{n-1}$.

(ii) \Rightarrow (iii): take $C = A[x]$.

(iii) \Rightarrow (iv): take $M = C$.

(iv) \Rightarrow (i): let M be the said finitely-generated A -module, so we write m_1, \dots, m_n to be the generator of M . Since M is an $A[x]$ -module, then we write

$$\begin{aligned} xm_1 &= a_{11}m_1 + \cdots + a_{1n}m_n \\ xm_2 &= a_{21}m_1 + \cdots + a_{2n}m_n \\ &\vdots \\ xm_n &= a_{n1}m_1 + \cdots + a_{nn}m_n \end{aligned}$$

and we write

$$\begin{aligned} (x - a_{11})m_1 - a_{12}m_2 - \cdots - a_{1n}m_n &= 0 \\ -a_{21}m_1 + (x - a_{22})m_2 - \cdots - a_{2n}m_n &= 0 \\ &\vdots \\ -a_{n1}m_1 - a_{n2}m_2 - \cdots + (x - a_{nn})m_n &= 0 \end{aligned}$$

then we can write it down as a matrix

$$M = \begin{pmatrix} x - a_{11} & -a_{12} & \cdots & -a_{1n} \\ -a_{21} & x - a_{22} & \cdots & -a_{2n} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ -a_{n1} & -a_{n2} & \cdots & x - a_{nn} \end{pmatrix}$$

The following the same procedure as in [Proposition 2.53](#). We do cofactorization of $x - a_{11}$ on the first row, cofactorization of $-a_{21}$ on the second row, and so on, until we do cofactorization of $-a_{n1}$ on the last row. By adding them together, we get $\det(N) \cdot m_1 = 0$, and similarly $\det(N) \cdot m_n = 0$, therefore $\det(N) \cdot M = 0$, but $\det(N) \in A[x]$, but M is faithful as an $A[x]$ -module, so $\det(C) = 0$ gives us a monic equation of degree n with respect to x , therefore x is integral over A . \square

Corollary 4.3. Suppose $A \hookrightarrow B$. Suppose $B = A[x_1, \dots, x_n]$, we view this as an algebra generated by n elements, i.e., as $A[X_1, \dots, X_n]/I$ for some ideal I . Suppose each x_i is integral over A , then B is integral over A .

Proof. We have

$$A \hookrightarrow A[x_1] \subseteq A[x_1, x_2] \subseteq \cdots \subseteq A[x_1, \dots, x_n] \hookrightarrow A[x_1, \dots, x_n]$$

where each extension is a finitely-generated module, then $A[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ is a finitely-generated A -module. We can then apply [Proposition 4.2](#). \square

Corollary 4.4. Suppose $A \hookrightarrow B$, and suppose b_1, b_2 are integral elements over A , then $b_1 \pm b_2$ and $b_1 b_2$ are integral over A . If we write B' as the set of all elements in B that are integral over A , then B' is a subring of B that contains A , therefore B' is an A -subalgebra of B . Therefore, $A[b_1, b_2]$ is a finitely-generated A -algebra.

Definition 4.5 (Integral Closure, Integrally Closed). B' is called the integral closure of A in B . We say A is integrally closed in B if $B' = B$.

Definition 4.6 (Integrally Closed). Let A be an integral domain. We say A is integrally closed if the integral closure of A in $\text{Frac}(A)$ is A itself, i.e., A is integrally closed in $\text{Frac}(A)$.

Example 4.7. Let $A = k[x, y]/(y^2 = x^3)$ be a domain¹⁰, then we know $\text{Frac}(A) \ni \left(\frac{y}{x}\right)^2 = x \in A$, so $\frac{y}{x} \in \text{Frac}(A)$. Since $\frac{y}{x}$ is integral over A , then A is not integrally closed.

Exercise 4.8. Let A be a UFD, then A is integrally closed.

Exercise 4.9. Suppose $A \hookrightarrow B$ is an integral extension, let S be a multiplicatively closed subset of A , then $S^{-1}A \hookrightarrow S^{-1}B$ is also an integral extension.

Exercise 4.10. Let A be an integral domain, A is integrally closed if and only if $A_{\mathfrak{m}}$ is integrally closed for every maximal ideal \mathfrak{m} in A .

Hint: since A is an integral domain, then A is exactly the intersection of all $A_{\mathfrak{m}}$'s where \mathfrak{m} is a maximal ideal of A .

Corollary 4.11. Let $A \hookrightarrow B \hookrightarrow C$ be a composition of integral extensions, then $A \hookrightarrow C$ is also an integral extension.

Proof. For $c \in C$, we have $c^n + b_1 c^{n-1} + \cdots + b_n = 0$ for $b_i \in B$ to be integral over A . Looking at the extension $A \hookrightarrow A[b_1, \dots, b_n] \hookrightarrow A[b_1, \dots, b_n, c]$, we know the first extension is a finitely-generated A -module, and since c is integral in B , then the second extension is a finitely-generated $A[b_1, \dots, b_n]$ -module, so $A[b_1, \dots, b_n, c]$ is a finitely-generated A -module as well. \square

Remark 4.12 (Facts about integral extensions). Let $A \hookrightarrow B$ be an integral extension.

1. Suppose B is a (integral) domain, then B is a field if and only if A is a field.

Proof. Suppose B is a field, then A is a domain as well, therefore for $a \neq 0$, we want to show that $\frac{1}{a} \in A$. Since B is a field, then $\frac{1}{a} \in B$, but that means it satisfies an equation

$$\left(\frac{1}{a}\right)^n + \lambda_1 \left(\frac{1}{a}\right)^{n-1} + \cdots + \lambda_n = 0.$$

Multiply it by a^{n-1} , we get

$$\left(\frac{1}{a}\right) + \lambda_1 + \lambda_2 a + \cdots + \lambda_n a^{n-1} = 0,$$

therefore $\frac{1}{a} = -(\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 a + \cdots + \lambda_n a^{n-1})$, therefore $\frac{1}{a} \in A$.

Suppose A is a field, let $0 \neq b \in B$, so we want to show $\frac{1}{b} \in B$. Since B is integral, then we can choose the smallest n such that $b^n + a_1 b^{n-1} + \cdots + a_n = 0$, then $b(b^{n-1} + a_1 b^{n-2} + \cdots + a_{n-1}) + a_n = 0$, so $b(b^{n-1} + a_1 b^{n-2} + \cdots + a_{n-1}) = -a_n$, but A is a field, then a_n is invertible by minimality, then b has to be a unit. \square

Definition 4.13 (Lying Over). Let $A \hookrightarrow B$ be a ring extension, let \mathfrak{p} be a prime ideal in B , and let \mathfrak{q} is a prime ideal in A . We say \mathfrak{p} lies over \mathfrak{q} if $\mathfrak{q} = \mathfrak{p} \cap A$.

¹⁰To see this, use the fact that $x^m - y^n$ is irreducible in $A[x, y]$ if and only if $\gcd(x, y) = 1$.

2. Let $A \hookrightarrow B$ be an integral extension, and suppose $\mathfrak{p} \in \text{Spec}(B)$ lies over $\mathfrak{q} \in \text{Spec}(A)$, then \mathfrak{p} is a maximal ideal if and only if \mathfrak{q} is a maximal ideal.

Proof. Since $A \hookrightarrow B$ is integral, then $A/\mathfrak{q} \hookrightarrow B/\mathfrak{p}$ is also integral, but B/\mathfrak{p} is a domain, so we are done after applying the previous fact. \square

3. Let $A \hookrightarrow B$ be an integral extension, suppose $0 \neq x \in B$ is a non-zero-divisor in B , then $Bx \cap A \neq (0)$.

Proof. Since x is a non-zero-divisor, we can choose the smallest n such that $x^n + a_1x^{n-1} + \cdots + a_n = 0$.

Claim 4.14. $a_n \neq 0$.

Subproof. Suppose not, then $a_n = 0$, then $x(x^{n-1} + \cdots + a_{n-1}) = 0$, but x is a non-zero-divisor, which forces $x^{n-1} + \cdots + a_{n-1} = 0$, a contradiction to the minimality of n . \blacksquare

Therefore $x(x^{n-1} + \cdots + a_{n-1}) = -a_n \neq 0$ in A , so $-a_n \in xB \cap A$. \square

4. Suppose $P \subseteq \mathcal{L}$ are ideals of B , where P is a prime ideal. Suppose $P \cap A = \mathcal{L} \cap A$, then $P = \mathcal{L}$.

Proof. Let $\mathfrak{q} = P \cap A = \mathcal{L} \cap A$, then $A/\mathfrak{q} \hookrightarrow B/\mathfrak{p}$ is an integral extension, and B/\mathfrak{p} is a domain. If $P \subsetneq \mathcal{L}$, then $\tilde{\mathcal{L}} := \mathcal{L}/\mathfrak{p} \neq 0$, therefore by the second fact we know $A/\mathfrak{q} \cap \tilde{\mathcal{L}} \neq (0)$, contradiction to the fact that $P \cap A = \mathcal{L} \cap A$. \square

5. Suppose $P_1 \subsetneq P_2 \subsetneq \cdots \subsetneq P_n$ is a strict chain of prime ideals in B . Let $\mathfrak{p}_i = P_i \cap A$, then $\mathfrak{p}_1 \subsetneq \mathfrak{p}_2 \subsetneq \cdots \subsetneq \mathfrak{p}_n$ is a strict chain of prime ideals in A .
6. Using the notation above, $\dim(B) \leq \dim(A)$, $\text{ht}(P_n) \leq \text{ht}(\mathfrak{p}_n)$.

Theorem 4.15 (Going-up). Let $A \hookrightarrow B$ be an integral extension. Given a prime \mathfrak{q} in A , there exists a prime \mathfrak{p} in B such that \mathfrak{p} lies over \mathfrak{q} .

Proof. Let $S = A \setminus \mathfrak{q}$, then we have

$$\begin{array}{ccc} B & \xrightarrow{i_S} & S^{-1}B \\ \uparrow & & \uparrow \\ A & \longrightarrow & S^{-1}A = A_{\mathfrak{q}} \end{array}$$

Since $A \hookrightarrow B$ is integral, then $S^{-1}A \hookrightarrow S^{-1}B$ is also integral, so $S^{-1}B \neq 0$, with $1 \in S^{-1}B$, so it is a commutative ring with multiplicative identity, then $S^{-1}B$ has a maximal ideal \mathfrak{m} . Since $S^{-1}B$ is integral over $S^{-1}A$, then \mathfrak{m} must lie over $\mathfrak{q}A_{\mathfrak{q}}$, so we pick $\mathfrak{p} = i_S^{-1}(\mathfrak{m})$, such that $\mathfrak{p} \cap A = \mathfrak{q}$.

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathfrak{q} & \xleftarrow{i_S^{-1}} & \mathfrak{m} \\ \uparrow & & \uparrow \\ \mathfrak{q} & \longrightarrow & \mathfrak{q}A_{\mathfrak{q}} \end{array}$$

\square

Corollary 4.16. Suppose $A \hookrightarrow B$ is an integral extension, then $\dim(B) = \dim(A)$.

Proof. Consider the strict chain of prime ideals $\mathfrak{q}_1 \subsetneq \cdots \subsetneq \mathfrak{q}_r$ in A . We proceed by induction on r . If $r = 1$, this is just [Theorem 4.15](#). Suppose $r > 1$. Let \mathfrak{p}_1 in $\text{Spec}(B)$ lie over \mathfrak{q}_1 by [Theorem 4.15](#), then $A/\mathfrak{q}_1 \hookrightarrow B/\mathfrak{p}_1$ is an integral extension, therefore we have a strict chain $\bar{\mathfrak{q}}_2 \subsetneq \bar{\mathfrak{q}}_3 \subsetneq \cdots \subsetneq \bar{\mathfrak{q}}_r$, then by induction we know there exists a chain $\bar{\mathfrak{p}}_2 \subsetneq \cdots \subsetneq \bar{\mathfrak{p}}_r$ in B/\mathfrak{p}_1 such that $\bar{\mathfrak{p}}_i$ lies over $\bar{\mathfrak{q}}_i$. Consider the mapping $\eta : B \rightarrow B/\mathfrak{p}_1$, then let $\mathfrak{p}_i = \eta^{-1}(\bar{\mathfrak{p}}_i)$, so we have a strict chain $\mathfrak{p}_1 \subsetneq \cdots \subsetneq \mathfrak{p}_r$ such that $\mathfrak{p}_i \cap A = \mathfrak{q}_i$ for all i . In particular, $\dim(B) = \dim(A)$. \square

Example 4.17. Suppose $A \hookrightarrow B$ is an integral extension, suppose J is an ideal in B , let $I = J \cap A$, then $\text{ht}(J) \subseteq \text{ht}(I)$.

Remark 4.18. 1. Consider the usual AKLB setup, that is, let A be an integral domain, let $K = \text{Frac}(A)$ be the field of fractions of A , let L/K be an algebraic extension, and let B be the integral closure of A in L , so we have the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} B & \hookrightarrow & L \\ \uparrow & & \uparrow \\ A & \hookrightarrow & K \end{array}$$

Then every element of L is of the form $\frac{b}{a}$ for $b \in B$ and $0 \neq a \in A$. To see this, for any element $x \in L$, we have $x^n + \lambda_1 x^{n-1} + \cdots + \lambda_n = 0$ for $\lambda_i \in K$, so $\lambda_i = \frac{a_i}{s}$ for $0 \neq s \in A$ and $a_i \in A$, so $sx^n + a_1 x^{n-1} + \cdots + a_n = 0$, by multiplication of s^{n-1} , we know sx is integral over A , so $sx \in B$, thus $x = \frac{b}{s}$.

Implicitly, this means for $S = A \setminus \{0\}$, we have $L = S^{-1}B$.

2. Let $\sigma \in \text{Aut}(L/K)$, then $\sigma(B) \subseteq B$. If x is integral over A , then $\sigma(x)$ is integral over A .

Claim 4.19. $\sigma(B) = B$.

Proof. Note $\sigma^{-1}(B) \subseteq B$, then $B \subseteq \sigma(B)$, so $B = \sigma(B)$. □

Let P be a prime ideal in B lying over p in A , then $\sigma(P) \cap A = p$. This implies $\sigma(B)$ lies over p as well.

Theorem 4.20. Let A be an integrally closed domain, let K be the field of fractions of A , let L/K be a normal extension. Let B be the integral closure of A in L . Let $G = \text{Aut}(L/K)$ and let \mathfrak{p} be a prime ideal in A , then G acts transitively on the primes in B lying over \mathfrak{p} . That is, if P and Q both lie over \mathfrak{p} , then there exists $\sigma \in G$ such that $\sigma(P) = Q$.

Proof. To show there exists such σ , it suffices to show that there exists σ such that $\sigma(P) \subseteq Q$, then since both $\sigma(P)$ and Q lie over \mathfrak{p} , we have equality.

We have two cases:

- suppose $[L : K] < \infty$, let $G = \{\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_n\}$ where $\sigma_1 = \text{id}$, and suppose for no σ_i we have $P \subseteq \sigma_i^{-1}(Q)$, then $P \not\subseteq \bigcup_{i=1}^n \sigma_i^{-1}(Q)$.

Exercise 4.21. If $I \subseteq \bigcup_{i=1}^n P_i$, then $I \subseteq P_i$ for some i .

Let $z \in P \setminus \bigcup_{i=1}^n \sigma_i^{-1}(Q)$, so let $w = z\sigma_2(z) \cdots \sigma_n(z)$, then by choice of z we know $w \in P \setminus Q$, therefore $\sigma_i(w) = w$ for $1 \leq i \leq n$, therefore w is fixed under the action of G .

- If $\text{char}(K) = 0$, then L/K is a Galois extension since L/K is separable and normal. Therefore, the fixed field of L under the action of G is K , so $w \in K$, but w is integral over A , and since A is integrally closed, then $w \in A$, therefore $w \in P \cap A = \mathfrak{p}$, so $w \in Q$, contradiction.
- If $\text{char}(K) = p > 0$, recall that we know there exists intermediate extension $L/F/K$ such that L/F is purely separable and F/K is separable. In fact, when L/K is a normal extension, then we can find intermediate extension $L/F/K$ such that L/F is separable and F/K is purely inseparable. Therefore, L/F is both separable and normal, hence L/F is Galois, and so $w \in F$ by construction. Since F/K is purely inseparable, then $w^l \in K$ for some $l = p^t > 0$. Since w^l is integral over A , then $w^l \in A$, thus $w^l \in P \cap A = \mathfrak{p}$, thus $w^l \in Q$, so $w \in Q$, contradiction.

Therefore, we must be able to find some σ such that $\sigma(P) \subseteq Q$.

Remark 4.22. The fact that F being bijective to $G(L/F)$ only holds for finite extension L/F . In general, if we have an infinite extension, then $F \rightarrow G(L/F)$ is only an injection.

- suppose $[L : K] = \infty$, let \mathcal{F} be the family of pairs (L_i, φ_i) where L_i/K is a normal extension where $L_i \subseteq L$, and for $B_i = B \cap L_i$, $P_i = P \cap B_i$, $Q_i = Q \cap B_i$, $\sigma_i \in G$ is such that $\sigma_i(P_i) = Q_i$. In this family, there is a poset relation given by $(L_i, \sigma_i) \leq (L_j, \sigma_j)$ defined by $L_i \subseteq L_j$ and $\sigma_j|_{L_i} = \sigma_i$. By Zorn's lemma, \mathcal{F} has a maximal element, which we call (L_0, σ_0) .

Claim 4.23. $L_0 = L$.

Subproof. Consider

$$\begin{array}{ccc} B & \text{---} & L \\ | & & | \\ B_0 & \text{---} & L_0 \\ | & & | \\ A & \text{---} & K \end{array}$$

where $B_0 = B \cap L_0$, $\sigma(P_0) = Q_0$, and $P_0 = P \cap B_0$, $Q_0 = Q \cap B_0$. That is, P, Q in B lie over $P_0, Q_0 \in B_0$. Suppose $L_0 \neq L$, then we can get a finite maximal extension $L/L'/L_0$ given by L' over L_0 , where $P' = P \cap B'$, $Q' = Q \cap B'$, where $B' = B \cap L'$.

$$\begin{array}{ccc} P, Q & & B \text{ --- } L \\ & & | \quad \quad | \\ P', Q' & & B' \text{ --- } L' \\ & & | \quad \quad | \\ P_0, Q_0 & & B_0 \text{ --- } L_0 \\ & & | \quad \quad | \\ P, Q & & A \text{ --- } K \end{array}$$

This extends to an automorphism σ' of L'/K where $\sigma'(P')$ and Q' both lie over Q_0 . Since $[L' : L_0]$ is finite, then by the previous case, we know there exists $\sigma'' \in \text{Aut}(L'/L_0)$, so $\sigma''(\sigma'(P')) = Q'$, therefore we have an automorphism $\varphi = \sigma''\sigma'$ such that $\varphi(P') = Q'$, but that means $(L'/\varphi) \in \mathcal{F}$, a contradiction to the maximality of (L_0, σ_0) . ■

□

Remark 4.24. Suppose L/K is Galois with

$$\begin{array}{ccc} B & \text{---} & L \\ | & & | \\ A & \text{---} & K \end{array}$$

Let X be the set of all primes in $\text{Spec}(B)$ lying over $p \in A$. We have a group action

$$\begin{aligned} G \times X &\rightarrow X \\ (\sigma, P) &\mapsto \sigma(P) \end{aligned}$$

and by fixing $P \in X$, we have a map

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi : G &\rightarrow X \\ \sigma &\mapsto \sigma(P) \end{aligned}$$

The stabilizer, also known as the isotropy subgroup of P under the action of G , is $G_P = \{\sigma \in G \mid \sigma(P) = P\}$. This is usually known as the decomposition subgroup of G with respect to P in algebraic number theory.

Let F be the fixed field of G_P over L/K , and let $C = B \cap F$, then there is $\tilde{P} = P \cap C$, with diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} P & & B & \text{---} & L \\ & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \tilde{P} & & C & \text{---} & F \\ & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ p & & A & \text{---} & K \end{array}$$

In fact, P is the unique prime lying over \tilde{P} .

Theorem 4.25 (Going-down). Let A be an integrally closed domain, B be integral over A and is torsion-free as an A -module. Let $\mathfrak{q} \subseteq \mathfrak{p}$ be two prime ideals in A , and let P be a prime ideal in B lying over \mathfrak{p} , then there exists a prime ideal Q in B such that $Q \subseteq P$ and Q lies over \mathfrak{q} .

Remark 4.26. Let \mathfrak{p} be a prime in $\text{Spec}(A)$ with Zariski topology, then $\mathfrak{p} \in U$ for some open subset U , therefore $\mathfrak{p} \in \text{Spec}(A_f)$, therefore looking at the mapping $A \rightarrow A_f$, it sends \mathfrak{p} to some prime ideal in A_f , which means \mathfrak{p} does not vanish in A_f , thus \mathfrak{p} does not contain f , and that means any prime $\mathfrak{q} \subseteq \mathfrak{p}$ does not contain f as well.

Proof. First suppose B is an integral domain, then let $K = \text{Frac}(A)$, $L = \text{Frac}(B)$. Let \bar{L} be the normal closure of L and let \bar{B} be the integral closure of B in \bar{L} , then by [Theorem 4.15](#), there is \bar{P} in \bar{B} . In particular, \bar{P} lies over \mathfrak{p} . It suffices to show that there exists $\bar{Q} \subseteq \bar{P}$ over \bar{B} , with $\bar{Q} \cap A = \mathfrak{q}$.

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} \bar{P} & & \bar{B} & \text{---} & \bar{L} \\ & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ P & & B & \text{---} & L \\ & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \mathfrak{q} \subseteq \mathfrak{p} & & A & \text{---} & K \end{array}$$

Since $\mathfrak{q} \subseteq \mathfrak{p}$, then there exists $\mathfrak{q}' \subseteq \mathfrak{p}'$ in \bar{B} such that \mathfrak{q}' lies over \mathfrak{q} , \mathfrak{p}' lies over \mathfrak{p} . but since P also lies over \mathfrak{p} , then by [Theorem 4.20](#), there exists $\sigma \in \text{Aut}(\bar{L}/K)$ such that $\sigma(\mathfrak{p}') = \bar{P}$. Therefore, $\sigma(\mathfrak{q}') \subseteq \sigma(\mathfrak{p}')$, and $\sigma(\mathfrak{q}') =: \bar{Q}$ lies over \bar{Q} , as desired.

Now suppose B is not necessarily an integral domain, so we want to find a prime ideal \mathfrak{q}_0 in B such that $\mathfrak{q}_0 \cap A = (0)$ and $\mathfrak{q}_0 \subseteq P$, then $A \rightarrow B/\mathfrak{q}_0$ allows us to reduce it to the previous case. Let $S_1 = A \setminus \{0\}$ and $S_2 = B \setminus P$, take $S = S_1 S_2$, which is multiplicatively closed since B is torsion-free over A , then we have

$$\begin{array}{ccc} B & \xrightarrow{i_S} & S^{-1}B \\ \uparrow & & \uparrow \\ A & \xrightarrow{i} & K \end{array}$$

In particular, $S^{-1}B \neq 0$, with $1 \in S^{-1}B$, so there exists a prime ideal \mathfrak{m} in $S^{-1}B$, then $i_S^{-1}(\mathfrak{m}) =: \mathfrak{q}_0$ is such that $\mathfrak{q}_0 \cap A = (0)$ and $\mathfrak{q}_0 \subseteq P$. \square

Definition 4.27. Let $f : A \rightarrow B$ be a ring homomorphism as an extension.

- We say such an extension has a going-up property if given any prime \mathfrak{p} in A , there exists prime P in B such that $f^{-1}(P) = \mathfrak{p}$.
- We say such an extension has a going-down property if given any primes $\mathfrak{q} \subseteq \mathfrak{p}$ in A and prime ideal P in B such that $f^{-1}(P) = \mathfrak{p}$, then there exists a prime ideal $Q \subseteq P$ in B such that $f^{-1}(Q) = \mathfrak{q}$.

Exercise 4.28. (i) Let $f : A \rightarrow B$ be faithfully flat, then f has the going-up property.

(ii) Let $f : A \rightarrow B$ be flat, then f has the going-down property.

Theorem 4.29 (Serre). Let A be Noetherian and let $f : A \rightarrow B$ be a ring homomorphism where B is a finitely-generated A -algebra such that going-down property holds, then $\tilde{f} : \text{Spec}(B) \rightarrow \text{Spec}(A)$ is an open map.

Proof. Omitted. □

Corollary 4.30. Let $f : A \rightarrow B$ be a flat map between rings A, B as in [Theorem 4.29](#), then \tilde{f} is an open map.

4.2 DISCRETE VALUATION RING (DVR) AND DEDEKIND DOMAIN

Definition 4.31 (Normal, DVR). We say a domain is normal if it is Noetherian and integrally closed. We say a local PID is called a discrete valuation ring (DVR).¹¹

Proposition 4.32. Let (A, \mathfrak{m}) be a local domain, the following are equivalent:

- (i) A is a DVR;
- (ii) A is normal with $\dim(A) = 1$;
- (iii) A is normal and there exists $x \in \mathfrak{m}$ such that $x \in \text{Ass}(A/Ax)$;
- (iv) $\mathfrak{m} \neq 0$ is principal.

Proof. (i) \Rightarrow (ii): Since A is a local PID, then A is integrally closed, with $\text{ht}(\mathfrak{m}) = 1$ since $\mathfrak{m} = (x)$, so $\dim(A) = 1$.

(ii) \Rightarrow (iii): let $x \neq 0$, the prime ideals are (0) and \mathfrak{m} , so $\mathfrak{m} \in \text{Ass}(A/Ax)$ where Ax is \mathfrak{m} -primary.

(iii) \Rightarrow (iv): let $\mathfrak{m} \in \text{Ass}(A/Ax)$, then there exists an injection

$$\begin{aligned} A/\mathfrak{m} &\hookrightarrow A/Ax \\ \bar{1} &\mapsto \bar{y} \end{aligned}$$

and so there exists $y \notin Ax$ such that $\mathfrak{m}y \in Ax$, thus $\mathfrak{m}yx^{-1} \subseteq A$, which is an ideal in A . There are two possibilities:

- if $\mathfrak{m}yx^{-1} = A$, then $\mathfrak{m} = Axy^{-1}$, i.e., \mathfrak{m} is principal generated by xy^{-1} ;
- if $\mathfrak{m}yx^{-1} \subseteq \mathfrak{m}$, then say \mathfrak{m} is generated by y_1, \dots, y_n , then write $z = yx^{-1}$, so we have

$$\begin{cases} zy_1 &= a_{11}y_1 + \dots + a_{1n}y_n \\ \vdots &= \vdots \\ zy_n &= a_{n1}y_1 + \dots + a_{nn}y_n \end{cases}$$

where $a_{ij} \in A$. Using the same trick as in [Proposition 2.53](#) and in [Proposition 4.2](#), we have $\det(C) \cdot y_i = 0$ for all i , thus $\det(C) \cdot \mathfrak{m} = 0$, thus $\det(C) = 0$ since $\mathfrak{m} \subseteq A$ is in a domain, thus z satisfies an integral equation over A . Since A is integrally closed, then $z \in A$, so $yx^{-1} \in A$, thus $y \in xA$, which is a contradiction to the fact that $y \notin Ax$. Therefore, we must have $\mathfrak{m}yx^{-1} = A$ instead, so \mathfrak{m} is principal.

(iv) \Rightarrow (i): suppose $I = (a_1, \dots, a_m)$ for $a_i \in \mathfrak{m}$, then since $\mathfrak{m} = (x)$, we have $0 = \bigcap_n \mathfrak{m}^n = \bigcap_n (x^n)$, so for $a_i \in (x^{t_i}) \setminus (x^{t_i+1})$, we have $a_i = \lambda_i x^{t_i}$ where λ_i is a unit. Let t be the smallest t_i among them, then $I = (x^t)$. □

Theorem 4.33 (Serre). Let A be a Noetherian domain, then A is normal if and only if

- (i) for any prime ideal \mathfrak{p} with $\text{ht}(\mathfrak{p}) = 1$, $A_{\mathfrak{p}}$ is a DVR, and
- (ii) for any $0 \neq x \in A$, $xA = \mathfrak{q}_1 \cap \dots \cap \mathfrak{q}_n$ where \mathfrak{q}_i is \mathfrak{p}_i -primary, where each prime \mathfrak{p}_i has $\text{ht}(\mathfrak{p}_i) = 1$, i.e., there is no embedded prime.

¹¹In our case, we take the canonical discrete valuation, so we do not specify it.

Proof. Suppose A is normal, then $\text{ht}(\mathfrak{p}) = 1$, then $A_{\mathfrak{p}}$ is normal of dimension 1. By Proposition 4.32, $A_{\mathfrak{p}}$ is a DVR. This proves (i). Now suppose $xA = \mathfrak{q}_1 \cap \cdots \cap \mathfrak{q}_r$ where \mathfrak{q}_i is \mathfrak{p}_i -primary. If possible, let one of \mathfrak{p}_i 's be of height at least 2, say \mathfrak{p}_1 . Since \mathfrak{q}_1 is \mathfrak{p}_1 -primary with height at least 2, localizing at \mathfrak{p}_1 , we have $A_{\mathfrak{p}_1}$ with $\mathfrak{p}_1 A_{\mathfrak{p}_1}$ is associated to $xA_{\mathfrak{p}_1}$. Since $A_{\mathfrak{p}_1}$ is normal, then it has unique maximal ideal $\mathfrak{p}_1 A_{\mathfrak{p}_1}$. Therefore, $\mathfrak{p}_1 A_{\mathfrak{p}_1}$ is the associated prime of $A_{\mathfrak{p}_1}/xA_{\mathfrak{p}_1}$. By Proposition 4.32, we know $A_{\mathfrak{p}_1}$ is a DVR, since $\text{ht}(\mathfrak{p}_1) > 1$, then $\dim(A_{\mathfrak{p}_1}) > 1$, contradiction. Therefore, every associated prime of xA has height 1.

Now suppose both (i) and (ii) holds, it suffices to show that $A = \bigcap_{\text{ht}(\mathfrak{p})=1} A_{\mathfrak{p}} \hookrightarrow \text{Frac}(A)$. Suppose $z \in \bigcap_{\text{ht}(\mathfrak{p})=1} A_{\mathfrak{p}}$, then by the embedding we have $z = \frac{x}{y}$ for $x, y \in A$. We want to show that $x \in yA$. We can write $yA = \mathfrak{q}_1 \cap \cdots \cap \mathfrak{q}_n$ where \mathfrak{q}_i is \mathfrak{p}_i -primary for $\text{ht}(\mathfrak{p}_i) = 1$. Therefore, we have $yA_{\mathfrak{p}_1} = \mathfrak{q}_1 A_{\mathfrak{p}_1}$, so $x \in yA_{\mathfrak{p}_1}$ for all height-1 prime \mathfrak{p} . This means $x \in yA_{\mathfrak{p}_i} = \mathfrak{q}_i A_{\mathfrak{p}_i}$, so $x \in \mathfrak{q}_i$ ¹², then $x \in yA$. \square

Example 4.34. • $k[x, y]/(y^2 - x^3)$ and $k[x, y]/(y^2 - x^2(1 + x))$ are not normal.

• $k[x, y, u, v]/(xy - uv)$ is the coordinate ring of $\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1$, then A is normal.

Definition 4.35 (Dedekind). A normal domain of dimension 1 is called a Dedekind domain.

Exercise 4.36. Let A be a Dedekind domain with $I \neq 0$ an ideal of A . Show that I is a product of prime ideals. This follows from primary decomposition. The converse is also true: suppose A is a domain such that every ideal $I \neq 0$ is a product of prime ideals, then A is a Dedekind domain.

Remark 4.37. Consider the AKLB setup where A is normal, $K = \text{Frac}(A)$, $[L : K] < \infty$, and B is the integral closure of A in L . Is B a finitely-generated A -module? Not necessarily.

1. In the case of $\dim(A) = 1$, we have

Theorem 4.38 (Krull-Akizuki). Let A be a Noetherian domain with $\dim(A) \leq 1$, $K = \text{Frac}(A)$, $[L : K] < \infty$, and $A \subseteq B \subseteq L$ where B is a subring of L , then B is Noetherian with dimension at most 1.

By Nagata, even if A is normal in this case, and if B is the integral closure of A in L , B may not be a finitely-generated A -module.

2. In the case of $\dim(A) = 2$, by a very hard proof, one can show that B is Noetherian, but Nagata also showed that B may not be a finitely-generated A -module.

3. In the case of $\dim(A) \geq 3$, Nagata showed that B may not be Noetherian.

Remark 4.39 (Hilbert's 14th Problem). Let $K \subseteq k(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ be a subfield, is $K \cap k[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ Noetherian? By Zariski, this is true for $n = 1$ and 2; by Nagata, this is false in general.

Theorem 4.40. Consider the AKLB setup, where A is normal, $K = \text{Frac}(A)$, $[L : K] < \infty$, B is the integral closure of A in L . Moreover, suppose L is separably algebraic over K , then B is a finitely-generated A -module.

Remark 4.41 (Prerequisites). 1. Suppose L/K is an algebraic finite extension, take $x \in L$. We know $L = K \langle e_1, \dots, e_n \rangle$ where e_1, \dots, e_n gives a basis. Now $x : L \rightarrow L$ is a K -linear map, so $xe_i = \sum a_{ij}e_j$, where we write $A = (a_{ij})$. Then $\text{Tr}_{L/K}(x) = \text{Tr}(A) = \sum a_{ii}$.

2. Suppose L/K is an extension such that $L = K(x)$ where x is algebraic over K . Let f be the minimal polynomial of x , i.e., with $f(x) = 0$, then we can write $f(X) = X^n + a_1X^{n-1} + \cdots + a_n$ for $a_i \in K$. Therefore, $K(x)$ is a k -vector space with basis $1, x, \dots, x^{n-1}$. One can show that $\text{Tr}_{K(x)/K}(x) = -a_1$, which is the sum of all the roots. Moreover, one can show that if x is not separable over K (so $\text{char}(K) = p > 0$), then $\text{Tr}_{K(x)/K}(x) = 0$.

3. Suppose $L/F/K$ is a field extension with $[L : K] < \infty$. Suppose $[L : F] = m$, and let $x \in F$, then $\text{Tr}_{L/K}(x) = m \cdot \text{Tr}_{F/K}(x)$.

4. Suppose $[L : K] < \infty$, then L/K is separable if and only if there exists $0 \neq x \in L$ such that $\text{Tr}_{L/K}(x) \neq 0$.

¹²We can pullback $i_{\mathfrak{p}_i} : A \rightarrow A_{\mathfrak{p}_i}$ sending \mathfrak{q}_i to $\mathfrak{q}_i A_{\mathfrak{p}_i}$, i.e., $i_{\mathfrak{p}_i}^{-1}(\mathfrak{q}_i A_{\mathfrak{p}_i}) = \mathfrak{q}_i$.

Proof. Consider the AKLB setup. Say $[L : K] = n$, we can choose $e_1, \dots, e_n \in B$ such that e_1, \dots, e_n form a basis of L over K . (Recall that $L = S^{-1}B$ for $S = A \setminus \{0\}$.) Note that this does not mean B is a free module. Consider

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Tr} : L \times L &\rightarrow K \\ (x, y) &\mapsto \text{Tr}_{L/K}(xy). \end{aligned}$$

as a non-degenerate bilinear form.

Claim 4.42. Given any $x \in L$, there exists $y \in L$ such that $\text{Tr}(x, y) \neq 0$.

Subproof. Since L/K is separable, then there exists $0 \neq \xi \in L$ such that $\text{Tr}(\xi) \neq 0$ (by the fourth fact). Let $y = \frac{\xi}{x}$, then $\text{Tr}(x, \frac{\xi}{x}) = \text{Tr}(\xi) \neq 0$. ■

Consider

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\text{Tr}} : L &\rightarrow L^* = \text{Hom}_K(L, K) \\ x &\mapsto (y \mapsto \text{Tr}(x, y) = \text{Tr}(xy) := \text{Tr}_{L/K}(xy)) \end{aligned}$$

Thus, one can also write this as $\tilde{\text{Tr}}(x)(y) = \text{Tr}(x, y) = \text{Tr}(xy)$. Now the assignment $x \mapsto \tilde{\text{Tr}}(x)$ is a K -linear map which is injective, and since $[L : K] < \infty$, then $\tilde{\text{Tr}} : L \rightarrow L^*$ is an K -isomorphism.

Let $e_1, \dots, e_n \in B$ be a basis of L/K , with dual basis $e_1^*, \dots, e_n^* \in L^*$, so

$$e_i^*(e_j) = \begin{cases} 0, & i \neq j \\ 1, & i = j. \end{cases}$$

Let $\tilde{e}_i = \tilde{\text{Tr}}^{-1}(e_i^*)$ be the pullback on L . One can show that

$$\text{Tr}(\tilde{e}_i e_j) = \begin{cases} 0, & i \neq j \\ 1, & i = j. \end{cases}$$

Therefore, $\{\tilde{e}_1, \dots, \tilde{e}_n\}$ forms a basis of L over K . Let $\tilde{B} = \{\lambda \in L \mid \text{Tr}(\lambda B) \subseteq A\}$.

Claim 4.43. $B \subseteq \tilde{B} \subseteq A\{\tilde{e}_1, \dots, \tilde{e}_n\}$, the free A -module generated by $\tilde{e}_1, \dots, \tilde{e}_n$.

Remark 4.44. Claim 4.43 implies B is a finitely-generated A -module.

Subproof of Claim 4.43. For any $b \in B$, b is integral over A , so let $f(x) = x^n + \lambda_1 x^{n-1} + \dots + \lambda_n$ be the minimal polynomial of $b \in K[x]$, i.e., $\lambda_i \in K$ for $1 \leq i \leq n$.

Claim 4.45. $\lambda_i \in A$ for all i .

Subproof of Claim 4.45. Note $b^n + \lambda_1 b^{n-1} + \dots + \lambda_n = 0$, then let $b = c_1, \dots, c_n$ be the roots of $f(x)$, then $\lambda_1 = \sum e_i$, and each λ_i is a symmetric polynomial in c_1, \dots, c_n of degree i . But any $c_i = \sigma_i(b)$ for $\sigma_i : L \rightarrow \bar{K}$ embedding, and the coefficients are now fixed by $\sigma'_i s$, so whatever integral equation b satisfies, c_i 's also satisfy. Therefore, since b is integral over A , then every c_i has to be integral over A , therefore λ_i 's are integral over A . Since A is normal, then $\lambda_i \in K$, therefore λ_i 's are all in A . ■

Therefore, $\text{Tr}(b) = -\lambda_1 \in A$, so $B \subseteq \tilde{B}$ by definition.

We will now show that $\tilde{B} \subseteq A\{\tilde{e}_1, \dots, \tilde{e}_n\}$. Let $\tilde{b} \in \tilde{B}$, then $\tilde{b} = \mu_1 \tilde{e}_1 + \dots + \mu_n \tilde{e}_n$ for μ_i 's in K . Therefore, $\tilde{b} e_i = \sum_j \mu_j \tilde{e}_j e_i$ for $e_i \in B$, therefore

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Tr}(\tilde{b} e_i) &= \sum_j \mu_j \text{Tr}(\tilde{e}_j e_i) \\ &= \mu_i. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\text{Tr}(\tilde{b} e_i) \in A$, then $\mu_i \in A$ for all $1 \leq i \leq n$, therefore $\tilde{B} \subseteq A\{\tilde{e}_1, \dots, \tilde{e}_n\}$. ■

□

5 NOETHER'S NORMALIZATION LEMMA

Definition 5.1 (Affine Algebra). Let k be a field, A be a finitely-generated k -algebra. We say A is an affine k -algebra. That is, A is of the form $k[X_1, \dots, X_n]/I$ for some ideal I of k .

Theorem 5.2 (Noether's Normalization Lemma). Let A be an affine k -algebra, and let $\mathfrak{a}_1 \subsetneq \mathfrak{a}_2 \subsetneq \dots \subsetneq \mathfrak{a}_r$ be a finite increasing chain of ideals in A .

- (i) There exists $x_1, \dots, x_n \in A$ such that x_1, \dots, x_n are algebraically independent over k .
- (ii) A is integral over $k[x_1, \dots, x_n]$.
- (iii) There exists a function $h : \{1, \dots, r\} \rightarrow \{0, 1, \dots, n\}$ such that
 - $h(i) \geq 0$ for all $i \in \{1, \dots, r\}$;
 - $h(i) \leq h(j)$ whenever $i < j$ in $\{1, \dots, r\}$, satisfying

$\mathfrak{a}_i \cap k[x_1, \dots, x_n] = (x_1, \dots, x_{h(i)})$. In particular, if $h(i) = 0$, then the ideal is zero.

Exercise 5.3. Given the setup in the going-down theorem (Theorem 4.25), if \mathfrak{b} is an ideal in B and $\mathfrak{b} \cap A = \mathfrak{a}$, then $\text{ht}(\mathfrak{b}) = \text{ht}(\mathfrak{a})$.

Proof. Step 1: Reduction to the case where A is a polynomial ring. Consider

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi : B = k[Y_1, \dots, Y_d] &\rightarrow A = k[y_1, \dots, y_d] \\ Y_i &\mapsto y_i \end{aligned}$$

to be the surjection. Note that here $y_1, \dots, y_d \in A$ are elements that may not be algebraically independent of each other. Consider $\varphi^{-1}(0) \subsetneq \varphi^{-1}(\mathfrak{a}_1) \subsetneq \dots \subsetneq \varphi^{-1}(\mathfrak{a}_r)$ as a strict chain in B because φ is surjective. Suppose we prove the theorem in B , then there exists z_1, \dots, z_d algebraically independent over k such that B is integral over $C = k[Z_1, \dots, Z_d]$, $\varphi^{-1}(0) \cap C = (Z_1, \dots, Z_{h(0)})$, and $\varphi^{-1}(\mathfrak{a}_i) \cap C = (Z_1, \dots, Z_{h(0)}, \dots, Z_{h(i)})$ for all i . We now mod out $\varphi^{-1}(0)$, then let $x_1 = \bar{Z}_{h(0)+1}, \dots, x_n = \bar{Z}_d$ in $A \cong B/\varphi^{-1}(0)$, and one can check that A is integral over $k[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ and $\mathfrak{a}_i \cap k[x_1, \dots, x_n] = (x_1, \dots, x_{h(i)})$.¹³

Step 2: We can write $A = k[Y_1, \dots, Y_n]$, then let $\mathfrak{a}_1 \subsetneq \mathfrak{a}_2 \subsetneq \dots \subsetneq \mathfrak{a}_r$ be a chain of ideals in A . We will prove this for $r = 1$. In this case, we have $\mathfrak{a} = \mathfrak{a}_1$ as a principal ideal $\mathfrak{a} = (x_1)$, then x_1 is algebraically independent over k . Let $x_2 = Y_2 - Y_1^{\alpha_2}, \dots, x_n = Y_n - Y_1^{\alpha_n}$, and we will postpone the choice of $\alpha_2, \dots, \alpha_n$. We can write

$$\begin{aligned} x_1 &= f(Y_1, \dots, Y_n) \\ &= \sum a_{i_1 \dots i_n} Y_1^{i_1} \dots Y_n^{i_n} \\ &= \sum a_{i_1 \dots i_n} Y_1^{i_1} (x_2 + Y_1^{\alpha_2})^{i_2} \dots (x_n + Y_1^{\alpha_n})^{i_n} \end{aligned}$$

where $a_{i_1 \dots i_n} \in k$. This represents a polynomial equation in Y_1 and $k[x_1, \dots, x_n]$. For each term $a_{i_1 \dots i_n} Y_1^{i_1} (x_2 + Y_1^{\alpha_2})^{i_2} \dots (x_n + Y_1^{\alpha_n})^{i_n}$, the highest power of Y_1 is $i_1 + i_2\alpha_2 + \dots + i_n\alpha_n$, given by the term $a_{i_1 \dots i_n} Y_1^{i_1 + i_2\alpha_2 + \dots + i_n\alpha_n}$. We need to show that if (i_1, \dots, i_n) and (j_1, \dots, j_n) appearing as powers in the exponent of f , then $i_1 + i_2\alpha_2 + \dots + i_n\alpha_n \neq j_1 + j_2\alpha_2 + \dots + j_n\alpha_n$ for our choice of α_i 's, otherwise they cancel each other (e.g., by characteristic argument, etc.).¹⁴ Now f has in its expression finitely many (i_1, \dots, i_k) appearing as powers. Let s be larger than the maximal of i_j for any (i_1, \dots, i_n) appearing as powers in the expression of f . Take $\alpha_2 = s, \alpha_3 = s^2$, and so on, until $\alpha_n = s^{n-1}$.

Claim 5.4. With this choice of α_i 's, $i_1 + i_2\alpha_2 + \dots + i_n\alpha_n \neq j_1 + j_2\alpha_2 + \dots + j_n\alpha_n$ whenever $(i_1, \dots, i_n) \neq (j_1, \dots, j_n)$.

Subproof. Otherwise, we have $(i_1 - j_1) = -\alpha_2(i_2 - j_2) - \dots - \alpha_n(i_n - j_n)$, but $i_1, j_1 < s$ and $\alpha_i > s^{i-1}$, so such an equation cannot hold.¹⁵ ■

¹³Basically, because we have an extension $k[Z_1, \dots, Z_d] \hookrightarrow B$, then by modding out $\varphi^{-1}(0)$ we have $k[x_1, \dots, x_n] = k[Z_1, \dots, Z_d]/(\varphi^{-1}(0) \cap k[Z_1, \dots, Z_d])$ which has an integral extension into $A = B/\varphi^{-1}(0)$.

¹⁴Even if the powers have the same sum, they may not cancel each other because the coefficient a 's, but we want to guarantee that would not happen. We want the coefficient to be with respect to k only, that way we can divide the coefficient from the field k and get an integral equation; if the highest degree terms cancel, then the new highest degree term of the expression of x_1 may involve x_2, \dots, x_n 's, making it not an integral equation of x_1 .

¹⁵Basically, this is saying an integer has a unique s -adic expansion.

Therefore, Y_1 is integral in $k[x_1, \dots, x_n]$, so by construction Y_2, \dots, Y_n are all integral over $k[x_1, \dots, x_n]$. Hence, $A = k[Y_1, \dots, Y_n]$ is integral over $k[x_1, \dots, x_n]$. We know $A = k[Y_1, \dots, Y_n]$ has dimension n , and that means $\dim(k[x_1, \dots, x_n]) \geq n$ by the property of lying over, but having only n variables it has dimension at most n , so it has dimension exactly n , hence $k[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ is a polynomial ring, i.e., x_1, \dots, x_n are algebraically independent over k .

Claim 5.5. $\mathfrak{a} \cap C = x_1 C$ for $C = k[x_1, \dots, x_n]$.

Subproof. Obviously $\mathfrak{a} \cap C \supseteq x_1 C$. If $\mathfrak{a} \cap C \neq x_1 C$, then $\mathfrak{a} \cap C \supsetneq x_1 C$ which is a prime ideal of height 1 in C . Therefore, $\text{ht}(\mathfrak{a} \cap C) \geq 2$, but $\text{ht}(\mathfrak{a}) = 1$, contradiction. \blacksquare

Step 3: Again, we assume $r = 1$, but now \mathfrak{a} is not assumed to be principal.

Exercise 5.6. For $n = 1$, we have $A = k[Y]$, and prove Noether's normalization lemma in this case.

Choose any $0 \neq x \in \mathfrak{a}$, then there exists $x_1 = x, x_2, \dots, x_n$ algebraically independent over k such that A is integral over $B = k[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ and $xA \cap B = xB$. One can check that $\mathfrak{a} \cap B = xB + \mathfrak{a} \cap (x_2, \dots, x_n)$. Due to [Exercise 5.6](#), by induction on n , we can find $z_2, \dots, z_n \in C = k[x_2, \dots, x_n]$ such that C is integral over $D = k[z_2, \dots, z_n]$, and $\mathfrak{a} \cap C \cap D = \mathfrak{a} \cap (x_2, \dots, x_n) \cap D = (z_2, \dots, z_h)$ for $h \leq n$ in D . Consider the extension

$$\begin{array}{c} A = k[y_1, \dots, y_n] \\ \downarrow \\ B = k[x_1 = x, x_2, \dots, x_n] \\ \downarrow \\ D[x_1] = k[x_1, z_2, \dots, z_n] \end{array}$$

such that A is integral over $D[x_1]$, and $\mathfrak{a} \cap D = (x_1, z_2, \dots, z_h)$ in $D[x_1]$ for $h \leq n$.

Step 4: Suppose $A = k[y_1, \dots, y_n]$ with strict chain $\mathfrak{a}_1 \subsetneq \mathfrak{a}_2 \subsetneq \dots \subsetneq \mathfrak{a}_r$. We proceed by induction on r . If $r = 1$, this is just step 3. Suppose we know this holds for $\mathfrak{a}_1 \subsetneq \mathfrak{a}_2 \subsetneq \dots \subsetneq \mathfrak{a}_{r-1}$, then there exists x_1, \dots, x_n algebraically independent over k such that A is integral over $B = k[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ and $\mathfrak{a}_i \cap B = (x, \dots, x_{h(i)})$ in B where $i \leq j$ implies $h(i) \leq h(j)$ for $1 \leq i, j \leq r-1$. Note that $\mathfrak{a}_r \cap B = (x_1, \dots, x_{h(r-1)}) + \mathfrak{a}_r \cap k[x_{h(r-1)+1}, \dots, x_n]$. Let $C = k[x_{h(r-1)+1}, \dots, x_n]$, and consider the ideal $\mathfrak{a}_r \cap C$. By step 3, there exists $z_{h(r-1)+1}, \dots, z_n$ algebraically independent over k such that C is integral over $D = k[z_{h(r-1)+1}, \dots, z_n]$, and note the ideal $(\mathfrak{a}_r \cap C) \cap D = \mathfrak{a}_r \cap D = (z_{h(r-1)+1}, \dots, z_{h(r)})$ for $h(r) \leq n$. Consider the extensions

$$\begin{array}{c} A = k[y_1, \dots, y_n] \\ \downarrow \\ B = k[x_1, \dots, x_n] \\ \downarrow \\ \tilde{D} = k[x_1, \dots, x_{h(r-1)}, z_{h(r-1)+1}, \dots, z_n] \end{array}$$

which is a composition of integral extensions, hence integral. Note that $\mathfrak{a}_i \cap \tilde{D} = (x_1, \dots, x_{h(i)})$ for $1 \leq i \leq r$ and $h(i) \leq h(j)$ for all $i \leq j$, therefore $\mathfrak{a}_r \cap \tilde{D} = (x_1, \dots, x_{h(r-1)}, z_{h(r-1)+1}, \dots, z_{h(r)})$ for $h(r) \leq n$. \square

Corollary 5.7. Let A be an affine k -domain, i.e., an affine k -algebra that is also a domain, then $\dim(A) = \text{trdeg}_k(\text{Frac}(A))$.

Proof. Suppose A is a domain of dimension d , by [Theorem 5.2](#), there exists x_1, \dots, x_d such that A is integral over $B = k[x_1, \dots, x_d]$. One can check that $\text{Frac}(A)$ is algebraic over $\text{Frac}(B) = k(x_1, \dots, x_d)$. Since $d = \dim(A)$, then $\text{trdeg}_k(\text{Frac}(A)) = \text{trdeg}_k(k(x_1, \dots, x_d)) = d$. \square

Remark 5.8. Although $\dim(k[[x_1, \dots, x_n]]) = n$ as well, we have $\text{trdeg}_k(k((x_1, \dots, x_n))) = \infty$ for any $n > 0$.

Corollary 5.9. Let A be an affine k -algebra, let \mathfrak{m} be a maximal ideal of A , then $k \hookrightarrow A/\mathfrak{m}$ is a finite extension.

Proof. Choose x_1, \dots, x_n in A that are algebraically independent over k , such that $k[x_1, \dots, x_n] \hookrightarrow A$ is an integral extension, and suppose $\mathfrak{m} \cap k[x_1, \dots, x_n] = (x_1, \dots, x_h)$. The claim is that $h = n$. To see this, consider the integral extension $k[x_1, \dots, x_h]/(\mathfrak{m} \cap k[x_1, \dots, x_n]) \hookrightarrow A/\mathfrak{m}$ which is a field, so this forces $k[x_1, \dots, x_n]/(\mathfrak{m} \cap k[x_1, \dots, x_n])$ to be a field as well. Therefore, $\mathfrak{m} \cap k[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ has to be a maximal ideal, but that means $\mathfrak{m} = (x_1, \dots, x_n)$ where $h = n$. In particular, this means we have an integral extension $k = k[x_1, \dots, x_n]/(x_1, \dots, x_h) \hookrightarrow A/\mathfrak{m}$, but that means A/\mathfrak{m} is finitely-generated over k , that is, $\dim_k(A/\mathfrak{m}) < \infty$. \square

Corollary 5.10 (Hilbert's Nullstellensatz). Let $A = k[X_1, \dots, X_n]$, then every maximal ideal \mathfrak{m} of A is generated of the form

$$\mathfrak{m} = (f_1(X_1), f_2(X_1, X_2), \dots, f_n(X_1, \dots, X_n)).$$

Proof. By Corollary 5.9, $k \hookrightarrow A/\mathfrak{m}$ is a finite extension. Recall that if x_1, \dots, x_i are algebraic over k , then $k[x_1, \dots, x_i] = k(x_1, \dots, x_i)$. Let x_i be the image of X_i in A/\mathfrak{m} , then $A/\mathfrak{m} = k[x_1, \dots, x_n] = k(x_1, \dots, x_n)$. Note that x_1 is integral and algebraic over k , then let $f_1(Y)$ be the minimal polynomial of x_1 in $k[Y]$, then $f_1(x_1) = 0$, so $f_1(x_1) \in \mathfrak{m}$. Since x_2 is now integral and algebraic over $k[x_1] = k(x_1)$, then let $g(Z)$ be the minimal polynomial for x_2 over $k[x_1]$, then $g(x_2) = 0$ in A/\mathfrak{m} . But g has coefficients in $k[x_1]$, then g can be written as $\sum_i g_i(x_1)Z^i$ for $g_i(x_1) = \sum_j a_j x_1^j \in k[x_1]$, where $a_j \in k$. From the integral extension, we define $f_2(X_1, X_2) = \sum_i g_i(X_1)X_2^i$, then the evaluation at (x_1, x_2) is in A/\mathfrak{m} . Indeed, for $g_i(x_1) = \sum_j a_j x_1^j$, we have $f_2(x_1, x_2) = \sum_{i,j} a_j x_1^j x_2^i$ and $f_2(x_1, x_2) = 0$, hence $f_2(X_1, X_2) \in \mathfrak{m}$. We proceed inductively, and this gives $k[x_1, \dots, x_{i-1}] \hookrightarrow k[x_1, \dots, x_i]$ for any i , hence producing $f_i(X_1, \dots, X_i) \in \mathfrak{m}$.

Claim 5.11. $\mathfrak{m} = (f_1(X_1), \dots, f_n(X_1, \dots, X_n))$.

Subproof. Note that

$$\begin{aligned} k[X_1, \dots, X_n]/(f_1(X_1), \dots, f_n(X_1, \dots, X_n)) &\cong k[X_1]/(f_1(X_1)) \cdot k[X_2, \dots, X_n]/(f_2(X_2), \dots, f_n(X_2, \dots, X_n)) \\ &\cong k[x_1] \cdot k[X_2, \dots, X_n]/(f_2(X_2), \dots, f_n(X_2, \dots, X_n)) \\ &\dots \\ &\cong k[x_1, \dots, x_n] \\ &\cong A/\mathfrak{m}. \end{aligned}$$

\square

Corollary 5.12. Let k be algebraically closed, i.e., $k = \bar{k}$, then every maximal ideal of $A = k[X_1, \dots, X_n]$ is of the form $(X_1 - a_1, \dots, X_n - a_n)$ for some $a_i \in k$.

Proof. Let \mathfrak{m} be a maximal ideal of A , then $k \hookrightarrow A/\mathfrak{m}$ is a finite extension, since $k = \bar{k}$, then $k \cong A/\mathfrak{m}$, therefore pick x_1, \dots, x_n to be images of X_1, \dots, X_n in A/\mathfrak{m} , so every x_i lands in k , therefore set $a_i = x_i$, therefore $X_i - a_i \in \mathfrak{m}$, hence $\mathfrak{m} = (X_1 - a_1, \dots, X_n - a_n)$. \square

Remark 5.13. There exists a one-to-one correspondence between tuples of k^n and the maximal ideals in $k[X_1, \dots, X_n]$. In particular, there is an embedding of $k^n \hookrightarrow \text{Spec}(k[x_1, \dots, x_n])$, so the Zariski topology of k^n is induced by the Zariski topology on this spectrum.

Exercise 5.14. One can say that $\text{Spec}(k[x_1, \dots, x_n])$ is just k^n attached with all the irreducible closed subsets of k^n . In particular, show that k^n is dense in $\text{Spec}(k[x_1, \dots, x_n])$.

Remark 5.15. In particular, in the case $k = \mathbb{C}$, then $\mathbb{C}^n \hookrightarrow \text{Spec}(\mathbb{C}[x_1, \dots, x_n])$. There are now two topological structures on \mathbb{C}^n , namely the induced Zariski topology and the complex topology. The complex topology is finer than the Zariski topology. However, when studying coherent sheaves and cohomologies, they converge.

Corollary 5.16. Let A be an affine k -domain, let \mathfrak{p} be a prime ideal in A , then $\dim(A/\mathfrak{p}) + \text{ht}(\mathfrak{p}) = \dim(A)$.

Proof. Suppose $\dim(A) = n$. Given $\mathfrak{p} \subseteq A$, there exists $x_1, \dots, x_n \in A$ that are algebraically independent, gives an integral extension $k[x_1, \dots, x_n] \hookrightarrow A$, and $\mathfrak{p} \cap k[x_1, \dots, x_n] = (x_1, \dots, x_h)$. By the going-down theorem ([Theorem 4.25](#)), since A is an affine domain, then $\text{ht}(\mathfrak{p}) = h = \text{ht}(x_1, \dots, x_h)$. Now $k[x_1, \dots, x_n]/(\mathfrak{p} \cap k[x_1, \dots, x_n]) \hookrightarrow A/\mathfrak{p}$ is integral, then

$$\dim(A/\mathfrak{p}) = \dim(k[x_1, \dots, x_n]/(\mathfrak{p} \cap k[x_1, \dots, x_n])) = \dim(k[x_1, \dots, x_n]/(x_1, \dots, x_h)) = n - h,$$

therefore $\dim(A/\mathfrak{p}) + \text{ht}(\mathfrak{p}) = n - h + h = n = \dim(A)$. \square

Corollary 5.17 (Catenary Property). Let A be an affine k -algebra, let $\mathfrak{p} \subseteq \mathfrak{q}$ be primes. Consider the strict chains of prime ideals

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{p} = \mathfrak{p}_0 \subsetneq \mathfrak{p}_1 \subsetneq \dots \subsetneq \mathfrak{p}_r = \mathfrak{q} \\ \mathfrak{p} = \mathfrak{q}_0 \subsetneq \mathfrak{q}_1 \subsetneq \dots \subsetneq \mathfrak{q}_s = \mathfrak{q} \end{aligned}$$

that is, there is no prime in between \mathfrak{p}_i and \mathfrak{p}_{i+1} , as well as \mathfrak{q}_j and \mathfrak{q}_{j+1} for any i, j . If this is the case, then $r = s$.

Proof. Note that $\text{ht}(\mathfrak{p}_{i+1}/\mathfrak{p}_i) = \text{ht}(\mathfrak{q}_{j+1}/\mathfrak{q}_j) = 1$, by applying [Corollary 5.16](#) to A/\mathfrak{p} , we have $\text{ht}(\mathfrak{p}_1/\mathfrak{p}_0) + \dim(A/\mathfrak{p}_1) = \dim(A/\mathfrak{p}_0) = \dim(A/\mathfrak{p})$, thus $1 + \dim(A/\mathfrak{p}_1) = \dim(A/\mathfrak{p})$. Now apply [Corollary 5.16](#) to A/\mathfrak{p}_1 , we have $\dim(\mathfrak{p}_2/\mathfrak{p}_1) + \dim(A/\mathfrak{p}_2) = \dim(A/\mathfrak{p}_1)$, therefore $1 + \dim(A/\mathfrak{p}_2) = \dim(A/\mathfrak{p}_1)$. Proceeding inductively, we have $1 + \dim(A/\mathfrak{p}_r) = \dim(A/\mathfrak{p}_{r-1})$. Therefore, $\dim(A/\mathfrak{q}) + r = \dim(A/\mathfrak{p}_r) + r = \dim(A/\mathfrak{p})$. Similarly, we have $\dim(A/\mathfrak{q}_s) + s = \dim(A/\mathfrak{q}_0) = \dim(A/\mathfrak{q})$, that is, $\dim(A/\mathfrak{q}) + s = \dim(A/\mathfrak{p})$. Therefore, $r = s$. \square

Remark 5.18. A ring A with this property, i.e., every saturated chain of ideals $\mathfrak{p} = \mathfrak{p}_0 \subsetneq \mathfrak{p}_1 \subsetneq \dots \subsetneq \mathfrak{p}_r = \mathfrak{q}$ has the same length, is called catenary. A ring is called universally catenary if all finitely generated algebras over it are catenary rings.

Exercise 5.19. Let A and B be affine k -algebras, and let $f : A \rightarrow B$ be an k -algebra homomorphism, i.e., a ring homomorphism with the property $f|_k = \text{id}_k$. Let \mathfrak{m} be a maximal ideal in B , then $f^{-1}(\mathfrak{m})$ is a maximal ideal of A .

Corollary 5.20. Let A be an affine k -algebra and I be an ideal, then the radical of I ,

$$\sqrt{I} = \{x \in A \mid x^n \in I \text{ for some positive integer } n\},$$

is the intersection of all maximal ideals containing I , i.e., $\sqrt{I} = \bigcap_{\text{maximal } \mathfrak{m} \supseteq I} \mathfrak{m}$.

Remark 5.21. By definition, in any commutative ring A , the radical \sqrt{I} is the intersection of all prime ideals containing I , i.e., $\sqrt{I} = \bigcap_{\text{prime } \mathfrak{p} \supseteq I} \mathfrak{p}$. In particular, let $\sqrt{0}$ be the nilradical of A , i.e., the set of all nilpotent elements in A , then $\sqrt{I} = \sqrt{0}$ in A/I .

Proof. It suffices to show that $\sqrt{0} = \bigcap_{\text{maximal } \mathfrak{m}} \mathfrak{m}$. One inclusion is clear, and suppose, towards contradiction, that $\sqrt{0} \subsetneq \bigcap_{\text{maximal } \mathfrak{m}} \mathfrak{m}$. Take some element x in the intersection of maximal ideals but not in $\sqrt{0}$, then $x^n \neq 0$ for any n . Consider the set $S = \{1, x, x^2, \dots, x^n, \dots\}$, which is a multiplicatively closed subset of A . Therefore $A_x = A\left[\frac{1}{x}\right] = S^{-1}A$, is a finitely-generated affine k -algebra. Consider the map

$$\begin{aligned} i_x : A &\rightarrow A_x \\ 1 &\mapsto \frac{a}{1} \end{aligned}$$

Let \mathfrak{m}' be a maximal ideal in A_x , then by [Exercise 5.19](#), $i_x^{-1}(\mathfrak{m}') = \mathfrak{m}$, a maximal ideal of A . By construction, $x \notin \mathfrak{m}$, a contradiction. \square

Corollary 5.22. Consider the following AKLB setup: let A be an affine k -domain, let $K = \text{Frac}(A)$, $[L : K] < \infty$, and B is the integral closure of A in L :

$$\begin{array}{ccc} B & \text{---} & L \\ | & & | \\ A & \text{---} & K \end{array}$$

then B is a finitely-generated A -module.

Remark 5.23. Compare this to [Theorem 4.40](#): this comes into play in the proof.

Proof. Consider

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 & & \bar{L} \\
 & & \downarrow \\
 B & \xrightarrow{\quad} & L \\
 \downarrow & & \downarrow \\
 A & \xrightarrow{\quad} & K \\
 \downarrow & & \downarrow \\
 k[x_1, \dots, x_n] & \xrightarrow{\quad} & k(x_1, \dots, x_n)
 \end{array}$$

where A is integral over $k[x_1, \dots, x_n]$, and \bar{L} is the normal closure of L over $K := k(x_1, \dots, x_n)$. By [Theorem 5.2](#), $h = \dim(A)$. If $L/k(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ is a finite separable extension then we are done. This is the case if $\text{char}(k) = 0$, since every algebraic extension in characteristic 0 is separable. Therefore, we assume $\text{char}(k) = p > 0$. Consider

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 B & \xrightarrow{\quad} & L \\
 \downarrow & & \downarrow \\
 k[x_1, \dots, x_n] & \xrightarrow{\quad} & k(x_1, \dots, x_n) =: K
 \end{array}$$

Here $L/k(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ is still integral. Let σ_i 's be the embeddings $L \hookrightarrow \bar{k}$ over K , since the extension is finite, then there are finitely many such embeddings, say $\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_r$. We have $\bar{L} = \sigma_1(\bar{L}) \cdots \sigma_r(L)$, so $[\bar{L} : L] < \infty$, therefore $[\bar{L} : K] < \infty$. Let \bar{B} be the integral closure of B in \bar{L} , i.e., \bar{B} is the integral closure of $k[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ in \bar{L} .

If we can show that \bar{B} is a finitely-generated $k[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ -module, we are done. We can assume that

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 B & \xrightarrow{\quad} & L \\
 \downarrow & & \downarrow \\
 k[x_1, \dots, x_n] & \xrightarrow{\quad} & k(x_1, \dots, x_n) =: K
 \end{array}$$

by replacing $L := \bar{L}$, where L/K is a normal finite extension of A in L , and B is the integral closure of A in L . Note that L/K is not separable over characteristic p . We now want to show that B is a finitely-generated $k[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ -module. Since L/K is normal, then there exists intermediate extension $L/F/K$ where L/F is separable and F/K is purely inseparable, with

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 B & \xrightarrow{\quad} & L \\
 \downarrow & & \downarrow \\
 C := B \cap F & \xrightarrow{\quad} & F \\
 \downarrow & & \downarrow \\
 k[x_1, \dots, x_n] & \xrightarrow{\quad} & k(x_1, \dots, x_n) =: K
 \end{array}$$

If we can show that C , the integral closure of $k[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ in F , is a finitely-generated $k[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ -module, then we are done. Indeed, since C is a finitely-generated $k[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ -module, then C is normal, so by [Theorem 4.40](#), B is a finitely-generated C -module, so B is a finitely-generated $k[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ -module.

We have reduced the proof to the following case:

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 C & \xrightarrow{\quad} & F \\
 \downarrow & & \downarrow \\
 k[x_1, \dots, x_n] & \xrightarrow{\quad} & k(x_1, \dots, x_n) =: K
 \end{array}$$

where F/K is purely inseparable, and C is the integral closure of $k[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ over F , and we want to show that C is a finitely-generated $k[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ -module. Since the extension is finite, we write $F = K(y_1, \dots, y_d)$ where each y_i is algebraic over K and is purely inseparable over K . Since this is a purely inseparable extension, then there exists i and

$t_i > 0$ such that $y_i^{p^{t_i}} \in K$. Since the extension of y_i 's is finite, then there exists some large enough $t > 0$ such that $y_i^{p^t} \in K$. Therefore, $y_i^{p^t}$ is of the form $\frac{f_i(x_1, \dots, x_n)}{g_i(x_1, \dots, x_n)} = \frac{\sum_i a_{j_1 \dots j_n}^{(i)} x_1^{j_1} \dots x_n^{j_n}}{\sum_i b_{j_1 \dots j_n}^{(i)} x_1^{j_1} \dots x_n^{j_n}}$ for $1 \leq i \leq d$. Consider the set of elements of the form

$$\left(\left(a_{j_1 \dots j_n}^{(i)} \right)^{\frac{1}{p^t}}, \left(b_{j_1 \dots j_n}^{(i)} \right)^{\frac{1}{p^t}} \right)$$

for all j_1, \dots, j_n 's appearing in the above extension with $1 \leq i \leq d$. Let k' be the extension of k by this set of elements, then this is a finite extension. Now consider

$$z_i = \frac{\sum_i a_{j_1 \dots j_n}^{(i)} (x_1^{\frac{1}{p^t}})^{j_1} \dots (x_n^{\frac{1}{p^t}})^{j_n}}{\sum_i b_{j_1 \dots j_n}^{(i)} (x_1^{\frac{1}{p^t}})^{j_1} \dots (x_n^{\frac{1}{p^t}})^{j_n}} \in k'(x_1^{\frac{1}{p^t}}, \dots, x_n^{\frac{1}{p^t}}).$$

We have

$$\begin{array}{ccc} k'[x_1^{\frac{1}{p^t}}, \dots, x_n^{\frac{1}{p^t}}] & \xrightarrow{\quad} & k'(x_1^{\frac{1}{p^t}}, \dots, x_n^{\frac{1}{p^t}}) \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ C & \xrightarrow{\quad} & F \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ k[x_1, \dots, x_n] & \xrightarrow{\quad} & k(x_1, \dots, x_n) =: K \end{array}$$

and since $z_i^{p^t} = y_i^{p^t}$ for all i , then $(z_1 - y_1)^{p^t} = 0$, so $z_i = y_i$. This means $k'[x_1^{\frac{1}{p^t}}, \dots, x_n^{\frac{1}{p^t}}]$ is a polynomial ring in variables $x_i^{\frac{1}{p^t}}$'s, therefore it is a normal domain. Moreover, it is integral over $k[x_1, \dots, x_n]$, and this is a finitely-generated $k[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ -module given by $(x_1^{\frac{1}{p^t}})^{i_1} \dots (x_n^{\frac{1}{p^t}})^{i_n}$ for $1 \leq i_j < p^t$ where $1 \leq j \leq n$ as generator of k' over k . Therefore, C is a finitely-generated $k[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ -module and we are done. \square

Exercise 5.24. Let A be an integral domain and B be a finitely-generated A -algebra, show that there exists an A -subalgebra $B' \subseteq B$ such that

- (i) $B' \cong A[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ where x_1, \dots, x_n are algebraically independent over A (this set can be empty), and
- (ii) there exists $a \neq 0$ such that $B[\frac{1}{a}]$ is integral over $B'[\frac{1}{a}]$.

Exercise 5.25. Let $A \hookrightarrow B$ be an (not necessarily integral) extension where B is a finitely-generated domain¹⁶ over A , and suppose there exists a ring homomorphism $f : A \rightarrow L$ where L is algebraically closed, such that $f(a) \neq 0$ for any $a \in A$. Show that there exists a ring homomorphism $g : B \rightarrow L$ such that $g(a) \neq 0$.

Exercise 5.26. Let k be a field, and L be a field extension over k . Take $x_1, \dots, x_n \in L$, then show that $k[x_1, \dots, x_n] = k(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ if and only if $k[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ is a finite-dimensional k -vector space.

Exercise 5.27. Let A be a finitely-generated \mathbb{Z} -algebra, with an associated mapping $Z \rightarrow A$ given by $1 \mapsto 1$. Show that if \mathfrak{m} is a maximal ideal in A , then $\mathfrak{m} \cap \mathbb{Z} \neq (0)$.

Exercise 5.28. Let $f_1, \dots, f_m \in \mathbb{Z}[x_1, \dots, x_n]$. Show that the system of equations $\{f_i = 0, 1 \leq i \leq m\}$ has a solution in \mathbb{C} if and only if $\{f_i = 0, 1 \leq i \leq m\}$ has a solution in a finite field of characteristic $p > 0$ for infinitely many primes $p > 0$.

¹⁶This assumption can be removed.

6 HOMOLOGICAL ALGEBRA

6.1 COMPLEXES, HOMOTOPY, HOMOLOGY

Definition 6.1 (Chain Complex, Exact Sequence). Consider a sequence $\{X_n, d_n : X_n \rightarrow X_{n-1}\}_{n \in \mathbb{Z}}$ of A -modules, we say it is a complex if we have a sequence

$$X_* : \quad \cdots \longrightarrow X_{n+1} \xrightarrow{d_{n+1}} X_n \longrightarrow X_{n-1} \longrightarrow \cdots$$

such that $d_n d_{n+1} = 0$ for all n . Therefore, $\text{im}(d_{n+1}) \subseteq \ker(d_n)$.

We say X_* is a right complex if $X_n = 0$ for $n < 0$; we say it is a left complex if $X_n = 0$ for $n > 0$.

We say $f_* : X_* \rightarrow Y_*$ is a morphism of chain complexes if $f_n : X_n \rightarrow Y_n$ is an A -module homomorphism, such that the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} X_n & \xrightarrow{f_n} & Y_n \\ d_n^X \downarrow & & \downarrow d_n^Y \\ X_{n-1} & \xrightarrow{f_{n-1}} & Y_{n-1} \end{array}$$

commutes for all n . We say f_* is injective if f_n is injective for all n , and f_* is surjective if f_n is surjective for all n .

We say

$$0 \longrightarrow X_* \xrightarrow{f_*} Y_* \xrightarrow{g_*} Z_* \longrightarrow 0$$

is an exact sequence of complexes if for all n

$$0 \longrightarrow X_n \xrightarrow{f_n} Y_n \xrightarrow{g_n} Z_n \longrightarrow 0$$

is exact.

Definition 6.2 (Homotopy). Let $f_*, g_* : X_* \rightarrow Y_*$ be two morphisms, we say they are homotopic $f_* \sim g_*$ if there exists $h_* : X_* \rightarrow Y_{*+1}$ such that the following holds:

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} \cdots & \longrightarrow & X_{n+1} & \xrightarrow{d_{n+1}^X} & X_n & \xrightarrow{d_n^X} & X_{n-1} \longrightarrow \cdots \\ & & \downarrow f_{n+1} & \swarrow g_{n+1} & \downarrow f_n & \swarrow g_n & \downarrow f_{n-1} \\ \cdots & \longrightarrow & Y_{n+1} & \xrightarrow{d_{n+1}^Y} & X_n & \xrightarrow{d_n^Y} & Y_{n-1} \longrightarrow \cdots \end{array}$$

$\quad \quad \quad \downarrow h_{n+1} \quad \quad \downarrow h_n \quad \quad \downarrow h_{n-1}$

such that for all n , $h_n : X_n \rightarrow Y_{n+1}$ is such that $f_n - g_n = d_n \circ h_n + h_{n-1} \circ d_{n-1}^X$.

Definition 6.3 (Homology, Exact). The sequence $\{H_n(X_*)\}_{n \in \mathbb{Z}}$ where $H_n(X_*) = \ker(d_n)/\text{im}(d_{n+1})$ is called the homology of X . We say X_* is exact if $H_n(X_*) = 0$ for all n .

Remark 6.4. For any morphism $f_* : X_* \rightarrow Y_*$ there is the commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} \cdots & \longrightarrow & X_{n+1} & \xrightarrow{d_{n+1}^X} & X_n & \xrightarrow{d_n^X} & X_{n-1} \longrightarrow \cdots \\ & & \downarrow f_{n+1} & & \downarrow f_n & & \downarrow f_{n-1} \\ \cdots & \longrightarrow & Y_{n+1} & \xrightarrow{d_{n+1}^Y} & X_n & \xrightarrow{d_n^Y} & Y_{n-1} \longrightarrow \cdots \end{array}$$

Homology is a functor, therefore $H_n(f_*) : H_n(X_*) \rightarrow H_n(Y_*)$ is a morphism as well, given by

$$\begin{aligned} H_n(f_*) : H_n(X_*) &\rightarrow H_n(Y_*) \\ \bar{x} &\mapsto \overline{f_n(x)} \end{aligned}$$

One can show that if $f_* \sim g_*$, then $H_n(f_*) = H_n(g_*)$ for all n .

Proposition 6.5. Suppose

$$0 \longrightarrow X_* \xrightarrow{f_*} Y_* \xrightarrow{g_*} Z_* \longrightarrow 0$$

is exact, then there exists a long exact sequence of homology

$$\cdots \longrightarrow H_{n+1}(Z_*) \xrightarrow{\partial_{n+1}} H_n(X_*) \xrightarrow{H_n(f_*)} H_n(Y_*) \xrightarrow{H_n(g_*)} H_n(Z_*) \xrightarrow{\partial_n} H_{n-1}(X) \longrightarrow \cdots$$

where ∂_n 's are called the connecting homomorphisms.

Proof. We do diagram chasing as follows:

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & X_{n+1} & \longrightarrow & Y_{n+1} & \longrightarrow & Z_{n+1} \longrightarrow 0 \\ & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & X_n & \longrightarrow & Y_n & \longrightarrow & Z_n \longrightarrow 0 \\ & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & X_{n-1} & \longrightarrow & Y_{n-1} & \longrightarrow & Z_{n-1} \longrightarrow 0 \end{array}$$

Let $z \in Z_n$, then this lifts to $z' \in Z_{n+1}$ and $y \in Y_n$. Consider $\bar{y} \in H_n(Y_*)$ so it is in the kernel of $H_n(g_*)$, then $g_n(y) \in d_{n+1}^Z(Z_{n+1})$, therefore $g_n(y) = d_{n+1}^Z(z')$. But $z' \in Z_{n+1}$ lifts to $y' \in Y_{n+1}$, therefore let the image of y' in Y_n be y'' . Now both y'' and y go to z , therefore $y' - y$ goes to 0. Therefore, there exists $x \in X_n$ such that $f_n(x) = y'' - y$, and let $x' \in X_{n-1}$ be the image of x , then since $y'' - y$ goes to 0, it lands in 0 in Y_{n-1} since it is in the kernel, therefore x' should also land in 0 in Y_{n-1} , but that means $x' = 0$ by injectivity, therefore $x \in \ker(d_n^X)$. We now define the connecting homomorphism $\partial_n : H_n(Z_*) \rightarrow H_{n-1}(X_*)$ as follows: take $z' \in Z_n$ such that $d_n^Z(z') = 0$, then find $x \in \ker(d_n^X)$ as described, and define the mapping according to this lift. One should check that the induced sequence is exact indeed. \square

Exercise 6.6. Given two exact sequence of chain complexes

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} \cdots & \longrightarrow & X_* & \xrightarrow{f_*} & Y_* & \xrightarrow{g_*} & Z_* \longrightarrow \cdots \\ & & \alpha_* \downarrow & & \beta_* \downarrow & & \gamma_* \downarrow \\ \cdots & \longrightarrow & X'_* & \xrightarrow{h_*} & Y'_* & \xrightarrow{k_*} & Z'_* \longrightarrow \cdots \end{array}$$

one can show the functoriality of connecting homomorphisms ∂_n 's. We have a commutative diagram of long exact sequences

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} \cdots & \longrightarrow & H_{n+1}(Z_*) & \xrightarrow{\partial_{n+1}} & H_n(X_*) & \xrightarrow{H_n(f_*)} & H_n(Y_*) \xrightarrow{H_n(g_*)} H_n(Z_*) \xrightarrow{\partial_n} H_{n-1}(X) \longrightarrow \cdots \\ & & \downarrow H_{n+1}(\gamma_*) & & \downarrow H_n(\alpha_*) & & \downarrow H_n(\beta_*) & & \downarrow H_n(\gamma_*) & & \downarrow H_{n-1}(\alpha_*) \\ \cdots & \longrightarrow & H_{n+1}(Z'_*) & \xrightarrow{\partial_{n+1}} & H_n(X'_*) & \xrightarrow{H_n(f_*)} & H_n(Y'_*) \xrightarrow{H_n(g_*)} H_n(Z'_*) \xrightarrow{\partial_n} H_{n-1}(X) \longrightarrow \cdots \end{array}$$

Remark 6.7. One can define cohomology in a dual manner, with numberings going up other than going down.

6.2 RESOLUTIONS

Definition 6.8 (Projective Module). Let P be an A -module, we say P is a projective module over A if given any exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow M' \longrightarrow M \longrightarrow M'' \longrightarrow 0$$

then

$$0 \longrightarrow \text{Hom}(P, M') \longrightarrow \text{Hom}(P, M) \longrightarrow \text{Hom}(P, M'') \longrightarrow 0$$

is exact as well. That is, the contravariant hom functor with respect to P is an exact functor. Note that in general, the hom functor is only left exact.

Remark 6.9. Any free module is projective.

Lemma 6.10. P is a projective module if and only if P is a direct summand of a free module.

Proof. (\Leftarrow): obvious.

(\Rightarrow): suppose P is a projective module, then let F be the free module generated by the generators of P , then this defines a surjective morphism of modules $\varphi : F \rightarrow P$. Therefore we have a diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} & & P \\ & \swarrow \alpha & \parallel \\ F & \xrightarrow{\varphi} & P \longrightarrow 0 \end{array}$$

Since P is projective, then $\text{Hom}(P, F) \rightarrow \text{Hom}(P, P)$ is onto, therefore for the identity map in $\text{Hom}(P, P)$, we lift to $\alpha \in \text{Hom}(P, F)$. By definition, this means $\text{id} = \varphi \circ \alpha$.

Exercise 6.11. Suppose

$$M \xrightarrow{f} N \xrightarrow{g} M$$

where $g \circ f$ is an isomorphism on M , then $N = \ker(g) \oplus \text{im}(f)$.

Hence P is a direct summand of F . □

Example 6.12. Let $F = R \oplus R \cong (R, 0) \oplus (0, R)$.

Example 6.13. Let $R = \mathbb{R}[x, y, z]/(x^2 + y^2 + z^2 - 1)$, then define $\varphi : R^3 \rightarrow R$ by sending $e_1 \mapsto x, e_2 \mapsto y$ and $e_3 \mapsto z$, then φ is into with kernel P . In particular, P is a projective module but not free over R . This is the R -module of a tangent field on a sphere. From the point of view of topology, if the base field $F = \mathbb{R}$, then there is no everywhere non-zero tangent vector field on the sphere. Note that if the base field is \mathbb{C} , then it is free, but P is not free over any subfield of \mathbb{R} .

Remark 6.14 (Serre's Conjecture). Let k be a field, then any projective module over $k[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ is free. There is an algebraic proof given by Suslin and a geometric proof given by Quillen.

Definition 6.15 (Projective Resolutions). Let M be an A -module, consider $(P_*, d_*)_{n \geq 0}$ as a complex of projective modules with an augmentation map $\varepsilon : P_0 \rightarrow M$ such that

$$\cdots \longrightarrow P_2 \xrightarrow{d_2} P_1 \xrightarrow{d_1} P_0 \xrightarrow{\varepsilon} M \longrightarrow 0$$

is an exact sequence. If this is the case, we say (P_*, d_*, ε) is a projective resolution of M over A .

Remark 6.16. We can always get a projective resolution through the following. Let F_0 be a free module over M , then this extends to an exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow S_1 \longrightarrow F_0 \xrightarrow{\varepsilon} M \longrightarrow 0$$

then let F_1 be the free module generated by the generators of S_1 , then this gives a surjection $\eta_1 : F_1 \rightarrow S_1$, therefore by composition we have $d_1 : F_1 \rightarrow F_0$. Continue inductively, we have a projective resolution, and in fact this is a free resolution.

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} \cdots & \longrightarrow & F_2 & \xrightarrow{d_2} & F_1 & \xrightarrow{d_1} & F_0 \xrightarrow{\varepsilon} M \longrightarrow 0 \\ & & \eta_2 \downarrow & \nearrow & \eta_1 \downarrow & \nearrow & \\ & & S_2 = \ker(\eta_1) & & S_1 = \ker(\varepsilon) & & \end{array}$$

In particular, we say S_i is the i th syzygy of M .

Example 6.17. Let A be Noetherian and M be a finitely-generated A -module, then all F_i 's in [Remark 6.16](#) are finitely-generated free modules.

Lemma 6.18. Let (P_*, ε) be a projective resolution of M , and (P'_*, ε') be a projective resolution of M' , and suppose we have an A -linear map $f : M \rightarrow M'$, then there exists $f_* : P_* \rightarrow P'_*$ such that the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} P_* & \xrightarrow{f_*} & P'_* \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ M & \xrightarrow{f} & M' \end{array}$$

INDEX

- E_0 of a graded ring/module, 19
- affine algebra, 52
- Artin-Rees lemma, 23
- Artinian module, 2
- associated prime ideal, 10, 15
- catenary ring, 55
- chain complex, 58
 - exact sequence of, 58
 - morphism of, 58
- completion
 - of a module, 19
 - of a space, 16
- component, 38
- connecting homomorphism, 59
- coprimary module, 8, 15
- Dedekind domain, 50
- dimension of a spectrum, 38
- dimension of a topological space, 38
- dimension theorem, 39
- directed set, 16
- discrete valuation ring (DVR), 49
- essential prime ideal, 10
- essentially polynomial, 32
 - $\Delta(f)$ of, 32
 - degree of, 32
 - multiplicity of, 32
- faithful module, 28
- faithfully flat module, 28
- filtered degree, 21
- filtered map, 18
- filtered module, 18
- filtered ring, 17
- flat module, 4
- fundamental system, 18
- generalized Krull's principal ideal theorem, 40
- going-down property, 48
- going-down theorem, 48
- going-up property, 48
- going-up theorem, 45
- good filtration, 24
- graded ring, 17
- graded submodule, 32
- hausdorffication, 19
- height of a prime ideal, 40
- Hilbert multiplicity, 34
- Hilbert's 14th problem, 50
- Hilbert-Samuel multiplicity, 36
- Hilbert-Samuel polynomial, 36
- Hilbert-Serre theorem, 32
- homology, 58
- homotopy, 58
- image filtration, 18
- induced filtration, 18
- integral closure, 44
- integral element, 43
- integral extension, 43
- integrally closed, 44
- inverse limit, 16, 20
- irreducible module, 9
- irreducible subset of a space, 37
- Jordan-Hölder chain, 3
- Krull dimension, 38, 39
- length of a local ring, 39
- local ring, 7
- localization
 - away from prime ideals, 7
 - of module, 5
- metric space, 16
- multiplicatively closed subset, 5
- Nakayama lemma, 23
- Noether's normalization lemma, 52
- Noetherian module, 2
- Noetherian topological space, 38
- normal domain, 49
- null sequence, 19
- primary decomposition theorem, 9
- primary module, 8
- prime filtration theorem, 11
- projective module, 59
- projective resolution, 60
- quasi-local ring, 7
- regular power series, 31
- Serre theorem, 49
- short exact sequence, 4
- simple module, 3
- strict morphism, 18
- support, 11
- system of parameters, 39
- syzygy, 60

topological ring, 16

universally catenary, 55

Zariski topology, 37

zero-divisor, 10

REFERENCES

- [Ati18] Michael Atiyah. *Introduction to commutative algebra*. CRC Press, 2018.
- [Bou98] Nicolas Bourbaki. *Commutative algebra: chapters 1-7*, volume 1. Springer Science & Business Media, 1998.
- [Mat70] Hideyuki Matsumura. *Commutative algebra*, volume 120. WA Benjamin New York, 1970.
- [Ser12] Jean-Pierre Serre. *Local algebra*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2012.
- [ZS13] Oscar Zariski and Pierre Samuel. *Commutative algebra: Volume II*, volume 29. Springer Science & Business Media, 2013.
- [ZSC59] Oscar Zariski, Pierre Samuel, and Irvin Sol Cohen. *Commutative algebra*, volume 1. Springer, 1959.