MATH 502 Notes

Jiantong Liu

November 9, 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

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 $n \geqslant N$, $M_n = M_{n+1}$.

(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 $x_2 \in N \backslash (x_1)$, 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 $N = (x_1, \ldots, x_n)$ 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. □

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 $n \geqslant N$, $M_n = M_{n+1}$.

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

Proof. Again, Zorn's lemma. □

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 $\pi : M \to M/N$ 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 Notherian (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 $n \geqslant m_0, n_0$, then $N \cap M_n = N \cap M_{n+1}$, hence $M_n = M_{n+1} = \cdots$ for such n. □

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

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

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 $\mathcal{J} \neq \varnothing$, 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 $J + Aa, J + Ab \notin J$, 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. ■

[1] The 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 $\pi : A \to A/J$, 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 $\ker(f) = 0$, $\mathrm{im}(g) = T$, and $\ker(g) = \mathrm{im}(f)$. 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 ⇒ projective ⇒ flat ⇒ torsion-free, and in the case of finitely-generated modules, torsion-free ⇒ 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

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

This homomorphism is injective if A is a domain.

Remark 0.27. Let I be an ideal of A.

- Consider the ring homomorphism $f : A \to S^{-1}A$ above, then
$$S^{-1}I = IS^{-1}A = f(I)S^{-1}A.$$
In particular, $f^{-1}(IS^{-1}A) \supseteq I$.
- If $I \cap S \neq \varnothing$, then $IS^{-1}A = S^{-1}A$.
- If P is a prime ideal of A such that $P \cap S = \varnothing$, 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 $0 \to N \xrightarrow{f} M$, 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

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

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 $A \to S^{-1}A$ 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 $S = A \backslash \mathfrak{p}$ 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 $\mathfrak{m}$, then there exists $t \in A \backslash \mathfrak{m}$ 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. □

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 $m_a : M \to M$ 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 $P = \{a \in A \mid a : M \to M \text{ is nilpotent}\}$, then P is a prime ideal of A.

Proof. For $a, b \notin P$, $a, b : M \to M$ are injective maps, so $ab : M \to M$ 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

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

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 $P = (a_1, \ldots, a_r)$, then $a_i^{t_i} \cdot x = 0$ for all i and some t_i's. Let $t = t_1 + \cdots + t_r$, 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 $y \in P^{j-1} \backslash I$, so $\bar{y} \neq 0$ in A/P, taking the injection into M, then $\operatorname{Ann}_A(\bar{y}) = P$. 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

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

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 $x = \operatorname{im}(X)$ and $z = \operatorname{im}(Z)$. 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., $\bigcap\limits_{j \neq i} N_j \nsubseteq N_i$.

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., $N = \bigcap\limits_{i=1}^{s} N'_i$ where N'_i's are P'_i-primary, then $r = s$ and $\{N_1, \ldots, N_r\} = \{N'_1, \ldots, N'_s\}$.

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 $T = T_1 \cap \cdots \cap T_l$ 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 $W_1 = T_1 \cap \cdots \cap T_r$ for irreducible T_i's, and $W_2 = T'_1 \cap \cdots \cap T'_s$ 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 $a : \bar{M} \to \bar{M}$ is either nilpotent or injective. Note that (0) in $\bar{M}$ is irreducible. To see this, we take the ascending chain

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

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

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

Subproof of Subclaim. Let $x \in \ker(g) \cap \operatorname{im}(g)$, 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 $N = N_1' \cap \cdots N_s'$ 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, $p \in \{P_1, \ldots, P_r\}$ if and only if there exists an injection $A/p \hookrightarrow M/N$.

Subproof. Let $p \in \{P_1, \ldots, P_r\}$, 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 $p \in \{P_1, \ldots, P_r\}$, it suffices to show $A/p \hookrightarrow M/N_i$ is injective for some $1 \leqslant i \leqslant r$. We have

$$\begin{tikzcd} A/p \arrow[r, hook, "\varphi"] \arrow[rr, bend left, "\varphi_i"] & M/N = \bar{M} \arrow[r, "\eta_i"] & \bar{M}/\bar{N}_i = M/N_i \end{tikzcd}$$

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

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

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

□

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 $\{P_1, \ldots, P_r\}$ 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 $\mathrm{Ass}_A(M) = \{P_1, \ldots, P_r\}$.

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

Proof. If $p \in \mathrm{Ass}_A(M)$, 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 $a : M/N_i \to M/N_i$ 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 $\mathrm{Ass}_A(M) = \{P_1, \ldots, P_r\}$, 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

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

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

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

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

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

Proof. Note that the essential prime ideals of I are just $\operatorname{Ass}_A(A/I)$, 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

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

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

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

□

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

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

Proof. Note that $P \in \operatorname{Ass}_A(M)$ 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 $\operatorname{Ass}_A(L) = \varnothing$.

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

$$\begin{tikzcd} & & & A/q \arrow[d, hook, "j"] & \\ 0 \arrow[r] & T \arrow[r] & M \arrow[r, "\eta"] & M/T \arrow[r] & 0 \end{tikzcd}$$

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 $A/I \to A/I$ 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 $S \cap P = \varnothing$, then $S^{-1}M$ is $S^{-1}P$-coprimary;
   - if $S \cap P \neq \varnothing$, then $S^{-1}M = 0$.

   Proof. Indeed, suppose $S \cap P \neq \varnothing$, let $a : M \to M$ 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 $\frac{a}{s} : S^{-1}M \to S^{-1}M$ 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 $s^n : M \to M$ is the zero map, therefore $s^n : S^{-1}M \to S^{-1}M$ 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 $S \cap P = \varnothing$, then $S^{-1}N$ is $S^{-1}P$-primary in $S^{-1}M$;
   - if $S \cap P \neq \varnothing$, 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 $P_{i_1}, \ldots, P_{i_r}$ are prime ideals for which $S \cap P_j = \varnothing$, where $P_j \in \{P_1, \ldots, P_t\}$.

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

- if $S \cap P = \varnothing$, then $i_M : M \to S^{-1}M$ and $i_N : N \to S^{-1}N$ gives $i_M^{-1}(S^{-1}N) = N$;
- if $S \cap P \neq \varnothing$, 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 $\{P_1, \ldots, P_t\}$, then $N_1 = N_1'$.

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

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

Lemma 1.33. Let $A \to B$ 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

$$\begin{tikzcd}
 & 0 \arrow[d] & 0 \arrow[d] & 0 \arrow[d] & \\
0 \arrow[r] & N_1 \cap N_2 \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & N_1 \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & N_1/(N_1 \cap N_2) \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & 0 \\
0 \arrow[r] & N_2 \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & M \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & M/N_2 \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & 0 \\
0 \arrow[r] & N_2/(N_1 \cap N_2) \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & M/N_1 \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & M/(N_1 + N_2) \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & 0 \\
 & 0 & 0 & 0 &
\end{tikzcd}$$

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

$$\begin{tikzcd}
 & 0 \arrow[d] & 0 \arrow[d] & 0 \arrow[d] & \\
0 \arrow[r] & (N_1 \cap N_2) \otimes_A B \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & N_1 \otimes_A B \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & (N/(N_1 \cap N_2)) \otimes_A B \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & 0 \\
0 \arrow[r] & N_2 \otimes_A B \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & M \otimes_A B \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & M/N_2 \otimes_A B \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & 0 \\
0 \arrow[r] & N_2/(N_1 \cap N_2) \otimes_A B \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & M/N_1 \otimes_A B \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & (M/(N_1 + N_2)) \otimes_A B \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & 0 \\
 & 0 & 0 & 0 &
\end{tikzcd}$$

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

Corollary 1.34. Suppose we have a primary decomposition $N = N_1 \cap \cdots \cap N_t$ in M, let $A \to A[x]$, 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 $M[x] = \sum_{i \geqslant 0} m_i x^i$ 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 $[f(x)]^p : M[x] \to M[x]$, 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 $m_0 + m_1 sx + \cdots$, 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 $i_P : R \to R_P$ 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 nth symbolic power of P, then $P^{(n)}$ is P-primary. (Indeed, we note that P is disjoint from $R \backslash P$, so given $M \to S^{-1}M$ 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 $\mathrm{Ass}_R(M)$ 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 $\mathrm{Ass}_A(M)$.

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

   (i) P is an essential prime ideal of some submodule N of M.

   (ii) $M_P \neq 0$.

[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) $P \supseteq \operatorname{Ann}_R(M)$.

(iv) P contains some $Q \in \operatorname{Ass}(M)$.

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

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

   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 $a : M \to M$ 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 $\operatorname{Ass}_R(M)$ 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 $P \in \operatorname{Ass}_R(M)$, there exists a P-primary submodule $N(P)$ of M such that $(0) = \bigcap_{P \in \operatorname{Ass}_R(M)} N(P)$, 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 $\varphi : B \to A$. 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 $\varphi : B \to A$ 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 $\operatorname{Ass}_A({}_{\varphi}M) = \varphi^{-1}(\operatorname{Ass}_A(M))$.

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

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

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 $d : X \times X \to \mathbb{R}^{\geqslant 0}$ such that

1. $d(x, y) + d(y, z) \geqslant d(x, z)$,
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 $\varphi : X \to \hat{X}$ such that

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

$$\begin{tikzcd} X \arrow[rr, "\varphi"] \arrow[dr, "\psi"'] & & \hat{X} \arrow[dl, "\theta"] \\ & Y & \end{tikzcd}$$

that is, given any complete metric space Y and a continuous map $\psi : X \to Y$, there exists a unique map $\theta : \hat{X} \to Y$ 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 $(I, \leqslant)$ 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 $\alpha \leqslant \gamma$ and $\beta \leqslant \gamma$.

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

$$\begin{tikzcd} X_\gamma \arrow[rr, "\varphi_{\alpha\gamma}"] \arrow[dr, "\varphi_{\beta\gamma}"'] & & X_\alpha \\ & X_\beta \arrow[ur, "\varphi_{\alpha\beta}"'] & \end{tikzcd}$$

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

$$\begin{tikzcd} X \arrow[rr, "\varphi_\alpha"] \arrow[dr, "\varphi_\beta"'] & & X_\alpha \\ & X_\beta \arrow[ur, "\varphi_{\alpha\beta}"'] & \end{tikzcd}$$

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

$$\begin{tikzcd} Y \arrow[rr, "\psi_\alpha"] \arrow[dr, "\psi_\beta"'] & & X_\alpha \\ & X_\beta \arrow[ur, "\varphi_{\alpha\beta}"'] & \end{tikzcd}$$

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

$$\begin{tikzcd} Y \arrow[rr, "f"] \arrow[dr, "\psi_\alpha"'] & & X \arrow[dl, "\varphi_\alpha"] \\ & X_\beta & \end{tikzcd}$$

commutes for all α.

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

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

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 $\varprojlim X_n = \bigcap\limits_{n\geqslant 0} X_n$.

Exercise 2.11. Let A be a commutative ring, and consider $A[x]$ or $A[x_1, \ldots, x_n]$. Let $I = (x)$, or respectively the maximal ideal $(x_1, \ldots, x_n)$. Then we have a map $\cdots \to A[x]/I^{n+1} \to A[x]/I^n \to A[x]/I^{n-1} \to \cdots \to A[x]/I$, 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 $\{A_n\}_{n\geqslant 1}$ of subgroups such that

- $A_i \cdot A_j \subseteq A_{i+j}$,
- $A = \bigoplus\limits_{i\geqslant 0} A_i$.

By definition, this implies A_0 is a subring of A, and $A_+ = \bigoplus\limits_{i\geqslant 1} A_i$ 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 $\{A_n\}_{n\geqslant 0}$ 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 $A \sim \{A_n\}_{n \geqslant 0}$, 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 $f : M \to T$ 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 $f : M \to N$ is called a filtered map if for all n, $f(M_n) \subseteq N_n$.

If $f : M \to N$ 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 $\bigcap\limits_{n \geqslant 0} N + M_n$.

Proof. Let $x \in \bar{N}$, then there exists n such that $(x + M_n) \cap N \neq \varnothing$. 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 $x \in \bigcap\limits_{n \geqslant 0} N + M_n$. 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 $(x + M_n) \cap N \neq \varnothing$. $\square$

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

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

Let $0 < c < 1$.

If we assume A (or M) is Hausdorff, i.e., $\bigcap\limits_{n \geqslant 0} A_n = 0$ ($\bigcap\limits_{n \geqslant 0} M_n = 0$). 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., $\bigcap\limits_{n \geqslant 0} A_n \neq 0$ ($\bigcap\limits_{n \geqslant 0} M_n \neq 0$). We can still define the notion of distance as above, but in addition we need: if $x - y \in \bigcap\limits_{n \geqslant 0} M_n$, 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 $n, m \geqslant N$. Therefore, given by M_n, there exists N such that for all $s, r \geqslant N$, 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 $\{x_n - x_{n-1}\} \to 0$ as $n \to \infty$.

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

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 $N = \bar{N} = \bigcap_{n \geqslant 0}(N + M_n)$. Consider $\eta : M \to \bar{M}$, 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 $n \geqslant N$, for some $i(n)$ corresponding to n. In particular, $i(n) \to \infty$ as $n \to \infty$. 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 $n \to \infty$, we have large enough $i(n) \gg 0$, therefore the sequence $\{y_n\}$ satisfies $y_n \in M_{i(n)}$, therefore $y_n \to 0$ for $n \to \infty$, thus the sequence $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} y_n$ converges. Hence, as $n \to \infty$, we have $\lim_{n\to\infty} \bar{x}_n = \bar{x}_1 + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \bar{y}_n + \tilde{z} = \bar{x}_1 + \bar{y}$. □

2.3 (I-adic) Completion

Definition 2.27 (Null Sequence, Completion)**.** A Cauchy sequence $\{x_n\}$ with $x_n \to 0$ 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 $d(x_n, y_n) \to 0$ as $n \to \infty$. 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

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

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 $\tilde{M}$ of M satisfies the following property: given any complete space T, there is $g : M \to T$ and $f : \hat{M} \to T$ such that $g = fi$ 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 $g(x_n) \to y$ 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 $\bar{i}_n : M/M_n \to \hat{M}/\hat{M}_n$. Now $\operatorname{im}(\bar{i}_n)$ is dense in $\hat{M}/\hat{M}_n$, then $\widehat{M/M_n} = \hat{M}/\hat{M}_n$. 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 $M \backslash M_n$ 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

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

and

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

We have $E_0(A) \cong E_0(\hat{A})$ and $E_0(M) \cong E_0(M)$ 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

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

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

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

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 $M \to M^*$ and mapping $f : M \to N$ for some complete Hausdorff space N, then there exists a unique $g : M^* \to N$ such that the diagram commutes.

$$\begin{tikzcd} M \arrow[rr] \arrow[dr, "f"'] & & M^* \arrow[dl, dashed, "\exists! g"] \\ & N & \end{tikzcd}$$

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 $\{x_n - x_n'\} \to 0$ for $n \to \infty$, hence $\varprojlim f(x_n) = \varprojlim f(x_n')$, so $M^* = \bar{M}$, $M_n^* = \hat{M}_n$ 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 $A[[x_1, \dots, x_n]]$.

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 $x \in A_n \backslash A_{n+1}$ and $y \in A_m \backslash A_{m+1}$ 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. □

Definition 2.43. Let A and M be filtered and Hausdorff, say $x \in M$ be such that $x \in M_n \backslash M_{n+1}$ 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 $f : M \to N$ be a filtered map. Suppose that M is complete, N is Hausdorff, and $E_0(f) : E_0(M) \to E_0(N)$ is onto, so we can write $E_0(M) = M/M_1 \oplus M_1/M_2 \oplus \cdots \oplus M_m/M_{m+1}$ and $E_0(N) = N/N_1 \oplus N_1/N_2 \oplus \cdots \oplus M_n/M_{n+1}$, then we have corresponding maps

$$\begin{aligned} E_0(f)_n : M_n/M_{n+1} &\to N_n/N_{n+1} \\ (\bar{x}) &\mapsto \overline{f(x)}, \end{aligned}$$

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 $x \in N_n \backslash N_{n+1}$ for some n. Therefore, the induced mapping $E_0(f)_n : M_n/M_{n+1} \to N_n/N_{n+1}$ 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 $y_{n+t} \to 0$ as $t \to \infty$, 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. □

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

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi : F &\to M \\ e_i &\mapsto x_i \end{aligned}$$

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:

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

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

$$\begin{tikzcd} E_0(F) \arrow[r, "E_0(\varphi)"] \arrow[d, equal] & E_0(M) \arrow[d, equal] \\ E_0(\bigoplus_{i=1}^{t} Ae_i) \arrow[r, "\varphi'"'] & E_0(M) \end{tikzcd}$$

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

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

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

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

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

then η is onto, hence $E_0(A)$ is Noetherian. If we write $M/\mathfrak{m}M = k\{\bar{\alpha}_1, \ldots, \bar{\alpha}_r\}$, then one can check that $E_0(M)$ is generated by $\bar{\alpha}_1, \ldots, \bar{\alpha}_r$ 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 $I = (x_1, \ldots, x_n)$, then using the same argument we have a ring homomorphism

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

which is also surjective. Since A/I is Noetherian, then $A/I[x_1, \ldots, x_n]$ 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 $B = A[[x_1, \ldots, x_n]]$ of $A[x_1, \ldots, x_n]$ with respect to the I-adic filtration where $I = (x_1, \ldots, x_n)$. Therefore, $A[[x_1, \ldots, x_n]] = \varprojlim A[x]/I^n$. Now B/IB is A-Noetherian, so by Corollary 2.49 we conclude that $A[[x_1, \ldots, x_n]]$ 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 $A[[x_1, \ldots, x_n]]$ is complete with respect to $(x_1, \ldots, x_n)$, then the completeness holds for any $I \subseteq (x_1, \ldots, x_n)$.

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 $M = \langle \alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_n \rangle$ and let I be such that $IM = M$, then

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

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

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

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

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

and this gives a matrix

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

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 $\det(C) \cdot \alpha_1 + 0 \cdot \alpha_2 + \cdots + 0 \cdot \alpha_n = 0$, 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] ☐

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 $M = 0$. ☐

Exercise 2.56. Let A be a commutative ring and M be a finitely-generated A-module. Suppose $f : M \to M$ 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 $N \cap I^{n+k}M = I^n(N \cap I^k M)$.

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

[3] The cleanest way to finish the proof would be to observe that $I \cdot \det(C) = (\mathrm{adj}(C))C$ and so $I \cdot \det(C)X = (\mathrm{adj}(C))CX = 0$. 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 $\mathrm{adj}(C)$.

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 $A \oplus It \oplus I^2t^2 \oplus \cdots \oplus I^nt^n \oplus \cdots \subseteq A[t]$.[4] This is a graded ring. Similarly, we write $\tilde{M} = M \oplus IM \oplus I^2M \oplus \cdots \oplus I^nM \oplus \cdots$.

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

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

$$\begin{aligned} \eta : A[x_1, \ldots, x_n] &\to \tilde{A} \\ x_i &\mapsto x_i, \end{aligned}$$

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

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

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

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 $\beta_1, \ldots, \beta_t$ where $\deg(\beta_i) = r_i$. Let $k = \max_{1 \leqslant i \leqslant t} r_i$, and we think of ways to obtain elements in $N \cap I^{n+k}M$. Considering the multiplicity of the degree, we know $I^{n+k-r_i}\beta_i \subseteq N \cap I^{n+k}$ for each $1 \leqslant i \leqslant t$. Therefore, we have

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

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

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 $\bigcap I^nM = (0)$.

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

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

$$\begin{aligned} M &\to \varprojlim M/I^nM \subseteq \prod M/M^nM \\ x &\mapsto (x, x, \ldots) \end{aligned}$$

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 $J = I^nJ$, then by Proposition 2.53 there exists $a \in I^n$ such that $(1-a)J = 0$, and since A is a domain, then $J = 0$. □

Remark 2.63. Corollary 2.62 implies that under I-adic topology, the map $A \to \hat{A}$ 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 $M_{n+h} = I^nM_h$.

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 $I^nM \subseteq M_h$ for some $h > 0$, so $M_{n+h} = I^nM_h \subseteq I^nM$. In this case, $\{I^nM\}$ and $\{M_n\}$ are cofinal with respect to each other and hence give the same topology on M. Moreover,

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

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

[4] For 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 $\operatorname{im}(\hat{f}) = \ker(\hat{f})$.

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 $\{y_i\}_{i \leqslant n}$ such that $\operatorname{im}(y_i) = z_i$ with system $y_n \to y_{n-1} \to \cdots \to y_1$, then there is a commutative diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd}
0 \arrow[r] & N/(N \cap I^{n+1} M) \arrow[r, "f_{n+1}"] \arrow[d] & M/I^{n+1} M \arrow[r, "g_{n+1}"] \arrow[d] & T/I^{n+1} T \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & 0 \\
0 \arrow[r] & N/(N \cap I^n M) \arrow[r] & M/I^n M \arrow[r] & T/I^n T \arrow[r] & 0
\end{tikzcd}$$

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 $\operatorname{im}(y_{n+1}) = z_{n+1}$, since $g_{n+1} : M/I^{n+1} M \to T/I^{n+1} M$ 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 $y_n \to z_n$ and $x_n \to z_n$, therefore $y_n - x_n \to 0$, 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

$$\begin{tikzcd}
x'_{n+1} + x_{n+1} \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & z_{n+1} \arrow[d] \\
y_n \arrow[r] & z_n
\end{tikzcd}$$

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 $m_1, \ldots, m_s$. 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 $A^r \to K$, 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

$$\begin{tikzcd}
\hat{A} \otimes A^r \arrow[r] \arrow[d, "\varphi_{A^r}"'] & \hat{A} \otimes A^s \arrow[r] \arrow[d, "\varphi_{A^s}"] & \hat{A} \otimes M \arrow[r] \arrow[d, "\varphi_M"] & 0 \\
\hat{A}^r \arrow[r] & \hat{A}^s \arrow[r] & \hat{M} \arrow[r] & 0
\end{tikzcd}$$

Now

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

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 $A^s = \bigoplus_s A \to \bigoplus_s \hat{A}$ has dense image, which implies φ_M is an isomorphism by diagram chasing. □

Theorem 2.72. Let A be Noetherian and I be an ideal, then $A \to \hat{A}$, 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

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

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).

$\square$

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 $\mathrm{Ann}_A(M) = \{a \in A \mid aM = 0\} = (0)$.

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

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

and therefore

$$\begin{tikzcd} 0 \arrow[r] & I \otimes_A M \arrow[r] \arrow[dr, "x\otimes m \mapsto xm"'] & A \otimes_A M \cong M \arrow[r] \arrow[d, "\cong"', "a\otimes m \mapsto am"] & A/I \otimes_A M \arrow[r] & 0 \\ & & M & & \end{tikzcd}$$

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 $f : A \to B$ 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, $M \to M \otimes_A B$ 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

$$\begin{tikzcd} 0 \arrow[r] & I \otimes_A B \arrow[r] \arrow[dr] & J \otimes_A B \arrow[r] \arrow[d, "j\otimes b \mapsto jb"] & J/I \otimes_A B \arrow[r] & 0 \\ & & B & & \end{tikzcd}$$

where $J \otimes_A B \cong B \cong A \otimes_A B$, and so $\operatorname{im}(J \otimes_A B) = JB$, and $\operatorname{im}(I \otimes_A B) = IB$, 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 $i_M : M \to M \otimes_A B$ 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

$$\begin{tikzcd} A/I \arrow[r, "\bar{f}"] \arrow[d, hook] & A/I \otimes_A B \arrow[d, hook] \\ M \arrow[r] & M \otimes_A B \end{tikzcd}$$

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

$$\begin{tikzcd} \bar{1} \arrow[r, "\bar{f}"] \arrow[d, hook] & \bar{1} \otimes 1 \arrow[d, hook] \\ x \arrow[r] & x \otimes 1 = 0 \end{tikzcd}$$

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 $M \to M \otimes_A B$ is an injection, then $A \to A \otimes_A R = R$ 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

$$\begin{tikzcd} & 0 \arrow[d] & 0 \arrow[d] & 0 \arrow[d] & \\ 0 \arrow[r] & N \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & T \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & M \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & 0 \\ 0 \arrow[r] & N \otimes_A B \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & T \otimes_A B \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & M \otimes_A B \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & 0 \\ & N \otimes_A B/A \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & T \otimes_A B/A \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & M \otimes_A B/A \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & 0 \\ & 0 & 0 & 0 & \end{tikzcd}$$

and it suffices to show exactness at $N \otimes_A B/A$. Let $x \in N \otimes B/A$ 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 $M \to M \otimes_A B$ 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 $N \otimes_A B \to T \otimes_A B$, 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.

[5] Instead 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

$$\begin{tikzcd}
 & 0 \arrow[d] & 0 \arrow[d] & & \\
0 \arrow[r] & V \otimes N \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & F \otimes N \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & L \otimes N \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & 0 \\
0 \arrow[r] & V \otimes M \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & F \otimes M \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & L \otimes M \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & 0 \\
0 \arrow[r] & V \otimes T \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & F \otimes T \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & L \otimes T \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & 0 \\
 & 0 & 0 & 0 &
\end{tikzcd}$$

We want to show $L \otimes N$ is exact in the column, i.e., $L \otimes N \to L \otimes M$ 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

$$\begin{tikzcd}
0 \arrow[r] & M \otimes_A A \arrow[r] \arrow[d, equal] & M \otimes_A B \arrow[r] & M \otimes_A B/A \arrow[r] & 0 \\
 & M \arrow[ur] & & &
\end{tikzcd}$$

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

$(iii), (iv) \Rightarrow (i)$: let B be A-flat and $M \to M \otimes_A B$ 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

$$\begin{tikzcd}
0 \arrow[r] & N \otimes_A A \arrow[r] \arrow[d, equal] & N \otimes_A B \arrow[r] & N \otimes_A B/A \arrow[r] & 0 \\
 & N \arrow[ur, hook] & & &
\end{tikzcd}$$

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 $A \to \hat{A}$ 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 $\bigcap_{n\geqslant 1} I^n M = (0)$. 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 $M \to M \otimes_A \hat{A}$ is an injection. Suppose $x \in M$ is mapped to 0, so let $N = Ax = A/J$ where $J = \mathrm{Ann}_A(x)$, then we have a diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd}
1 \in N \arrow[r, hook] \arrow[d] & y \in N \otimes_A \hat{A} \arrow[d, hook] \\
x \in M \arrow[r] & 0 \in M \otimes_A \hat{A}
\end{tikzcd}$$

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 $I \nsubseteq \mathfrak{m}$. 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 $k[x_1, \ldots, x_n] \to k[[x_1, \ldots, x_n]]$ is flat but not faithfully flat. Indeed, the ideal $(x_1, \ldots, x_n)$, the ideal is not contained in $(x_1 - a_1, \ldots, x_n - a_n)$ whenever a_i's are non-zero.

However, if we factor it via the localization

$$\begin{tikzcd}
k[x_1, \ldots, x_n] \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & k[[x_1, \ldots, x_n]] \\
k[x_1, \ldots, x_n]_{(x_1, \ldots, x_n)} \arrow[ur, hook]
\end{tikzcd}$$

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

Exercise 2.85. Let k be a field, fix n. Define $R_i = k[[X_1, \ldots, X_i]]$ for $i \leqslant n$. 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 $1, \bar{X}_n, \ldots, \bar{X}_n^{h-1}$, where $\bar{X}_n = \mathrm{im}(\bar{X}_n)$ in $R_n/(f)$. Also prove that $R_n/(f)$ is complete with respect to $(X_1, \ldots, X_{n-1})$-adic topology.

Remark 2.86. In $\mathbb{C}[[z]]$, f being regular of degree h implies $f(z) = a_h z^h + a_{h+1} z^{h+1} + \cdots$, so $\mathbb{C}[[z]]/(f(z)) = \mathbb{C}[[z]]/(z^h(a_h + a_{h+1}z + \cdots))$, where $a_h + a_{h+1}z + \cdots$ 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 $f : \mathbb{Z} \to \mathbb{Z}$, let $\mathcal{P}$ be the set of functions $f : \mathbb{Z} \to \mathbb{Z}$ 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 $n \geqslant i$, $f(n)$ 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 $\Delta f : \mathbb{Z} \to \mathbb{Z}$ 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 $\Delta^r : \mathbb{Z} \to \mathbb{Z}$ 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 $f : \mathbb{Z} \to \mathbb{Z}$, 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 $g(x) = r! a_0 \binom{x}{n+1}$ 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 $f \in \mathcal{P}$. □

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

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 $x = x_{i_1} + \cdots + x_{i_t}$, 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 $B = A[X_1, \ldots, X_n]$, 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., $B = A[x_1, \ldots, x_n]$ where each x_i has degree 1.

Theorem 3.14 (Hilbert-Serre)**.** Let A_0 be an Artinian ring and $A = A_0[x_1, \ldots, x_r]$ 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:

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

(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 $\Delta^{r-1}\chi(M,n)\leqslant\ell_{A_0}(M_0)$. Moreover, the equality holds if and only if

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

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 $x=\sum_{i,j} c_{i_1,\dots,i_r}x_1^{i_1}x_2i_2\cdots x_r^{i_r}m_j$ 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 $M=M_0\oplus M_1\oplus\cdots M_t\oplus 0\oplus 0\oplus\cdots$. 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 $\bar{M}=M/x_rM$, 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 $A_0[x_1,\dots,x_r]/x_rA_0[x_1,\dots,x_r]=A_0[\bar{x}_1,\dots,\bar{x}_{r-1}]$. For any n, we have

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

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

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

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, $\ell_{A_0}(M_n)\leqslant\ell_{A_0}(M_0[X_1,\dots,X_r])_n$. (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 nth 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, $\Delta^{r-1}\chi(M,n)\leqslant\ell_{A_0}(M_0)$.

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 $\chi(L_n)=\dim_k(L_n)\geqslant\dim_k(B_{n-d})=\binom{n-d+r-1}{r-1}$. This gives $\Delta^{r-1}\chi(L,n)\geqslant 1$, contradiction. Now suppose $\ell_{A_0}(M_0)>1$, then take a Jordan-Hölder series

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

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,

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

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

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

Hence, $\chi(L,n)=\sum\limits_i\chi(L^{(i)}/L^{(i+1)},n)$, therefore $\Delta^{r-1}\chi(L,n)=\sum\limits_i\Delta^{r-1}\chi(L^{(i)}/L^{(i+1)},n)$. 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.

□

Definition 3.15 (Hilbert Multiplicity)**.** Suppose $\deg(\chi(M,n))=d$, then $\chi(M,n)=a_0n^d+$ 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 $\operatorname{supp}(M)=V(M)$, 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 $P\supseteq\operatorname{Ann}_A(M)$.

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

2. Under the above assumption, $\operatorname{supp}(M\otimes_A N)=\operatorname{supp}(M)\cap\operatorname{supp}(N)$. 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 $P\in\operatorname{supp}(M)\cap\operatorname{supp}(N)$. Now suppose $P\in\operatorname{supp}(M)\cap\operatorname{supp}(N)$, 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 $N=0$. □

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

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 $\ell(M/q^nM)<\infty$ 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 $\ell(T/\mathfrak{q}T)<\infty$.

[7] Consider 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 $\operatorname{supp}(M/\mathfrak{q}M)$ consists of finitely many maximal ideals only, therefore $\operatorname{supp}(M/\mathfrak{q}M) = \operatorname{supp}(A/\mathfrak{q} \otimes_A M) = \operatorname{supp}(A/\mathfrak{q}) \cap \operatorname{supp}(M)$. Therefore,

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

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

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

□

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 $\mathfrak{q} = (x_1, \ldots, x_n)$, and so

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

is an onto map. Note that $A/\mathfrak{q}[x_1, \ldots, x_n]$ 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 $M/M_1, \ldots, M_h/M_{h+1}$, 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 $I = \operatorname{Ann}_A(M)$, then

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

If we denote $\bar{A} = A/I$, then $\bar{A}/\bar{\mathfrak{q}} = A/(q + I)$, 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, $(\mathfrak{q} + I)^n M_i = \mathfrak{q}^n M$. ■

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 $\bar{x}_1, \ldots, \bar{x}_r$, so $E_0(\bar{A}) = \bar{A}[\bar{x}_1, \ldots, \bar{x}_r]$, then $\Delta P_{\mathfrak{q}}(M,n)$ is of degree at most $r-1$, and $\Delta^{r-1}(\Delta P_q(M,n)) \leqslant \ell(M/\mathfrak{q}M)$, and note that the equality holds if and only if

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

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

Corollary 3.22. Under the same assumption, $\ell(M/\mathfrak{q}^nM) \geqslant \ell(M/M_n)$. 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 $\Delta^r(P_{\mathfrak{q}}(M,n)) = \Delta^r(P_q((M_n),n))$ 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 $\ell(M/\mathfrak{q}^nM) \geqslant \ell(M/M_n)$ for all n, then $d \geqslant d'$. Now $M_{n+h} = \mathfrak{q}^nM_h \subseteq \mathfrak{q}^nM$ since this is a good filtration, therefore $\ell(M/M_{n+h}) \geqslant \ell(M/\mathfrak{q}^nM)$, therefore $d' \geqslant d$, hence $d = d'$. Similarly, the argument above implies $a_0 \geqslant b_0$ and $b_0 \geqslant a_0$, 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
  $$0 \longrightarrow M_n/\mathfrak{q}^nM \longrightarrow M/\mathfrak{q}^nM \longrightarrow M/M_n \longrightarrow 0$$
  therefore $\ell(M/\mathfrak{q}^nM) = \ell(M/M_n) + \ell(M_n/\mathfrak{q}^nM)$. Let $R(n) = \ell(M_n/\mathfrak{q}^nM)$, 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.

□

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 $P_{\mathfrak{q}}(M,n) = a_0n^d + a_1n^{d-1} + \cdots$ 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 $\operatorname{supp}(M/\mathfrak{q}M) = \operatorname{supp}(M/\mathfrak{q}'M)$, then the degree of $P_{\mathfrak{q}}(M,n)$ equals to the degree of $P_{\mathfrak{q}'}(M,n)$.

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

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

then similarly $\operatorname{supp}(M/\mathfrak{q}'M) = \operatorname{supp}(A/(q'+I))$. Since $I = \operatorname{Ann}_A(M)$, then $IM = 0$, so we can assume M to be an A/I-module, that is, M is an A-module such that $\operatorname{Ann}_A(M) = 0$. In that case, then $\operatorname{supp}(M/\mathfrak{q}M) = \operatorname{supp}(A/\mathfrak{q})$ and $\operatorname{supp}(M/\mathfrak{q}'M) = \operatorname{supp}(A/\mathfrak{q}')$. Recall that $\ell(M/\mathfrak{q}M) < \infty$, so $\operatorname{supp}(A/\mathfrak{q})$ consists of maximal ideals only. (Since it is Artinian, there are finitely many of them.) Similarly, $\ell(M/\mathfrak{q}'M) < \infty$, so $\operatorname{supp}(A/\mathfrak{q}')$ consists of maximal ideals only as well. In particular, $\operatorname{supp}(A/\mathfrak{q})$ is the set of prime ideals containing $\mathfrak{q}$, and $\operatorname{supp}(A/\mathfrak{q}')$ 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 $P_{\mathfrak{q}}(M,n) = a_0 n^d + \cdots$, with lower degree terms, and $P_{\mathfrak{q}^r}(M,n) = \ell(M/\mathfrak{q}^{rn}M) = P_{\mathfrak{q}}(M,rn) = a_0(rn)^d + \cdots = a_0 r^d \cdot n^d + \cdots$, with lower degree terms. Therefore, the degree of $P_{\mathfrak{q}}(M,n)$ is the degree of $P_{\mathfrak{q}^r}(M,n)$, and the degree of $P_{\mathfrak{q}'}(M,n)$ is the degree of $P_{\mathfrak{q}'^{r'}}(M,n)$. ∎

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

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

If we write $\mathfrak{q} = I_1 \cap I_2 \cap \cdots \cap I_r$ where each I_i is $\mathfrak{m}_i$-primary for maximal ideal $\mathfrak{m}_i$. By the Chinese Remainder Theorem, we have $\mathfrak{q} = I_1 I_2 \cdots I_r$. Thus, $\mathfrak{q}6n = I_1^n I_2^n \cdots I_r^n$, and $A/\mathfrak{q} \cong A/I_1 \oplus \cdots\cdots \oplus A/I_r$, and so $A/\mathfrak{q}^n = A/I_1^n \oplus \cdots \oplus A/I_r^n$. Therefore, $I_i = \mathfrak{q}A_{\mathfrak{m}_i}$, and $M/\mathfrak{q}^n M \cong \bigoplus_i M/I_i^n M$ by tensoring M. Therefore, $P_{\mathfrak{q}}(M,n) = \sum_i P_{\mathfrak{q}A_{\mathfrak{m}_i}}(M_{\mathfrak{m}_i}, n)$. Therefore, it suffices to understand the Hilbert-Samuel polynomials in the local case (assuming $M/\mathfrak{q}M$ has finite length).

Proposition 3.27. Let A be Noetherian, $\mathfrak{q}$ be an ideal. Consider the short exact sequence

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

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

Proof. Consider

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

The corresponding filtrations $\{N_n = N \cap \mathfrak{q}^n M\}$ and $\{\mathfrak{q}^n N\}$ are $\mathfrak{q}$-good. By Corollary 3.22, $P_{\mathfrak{q}}(N,n) = P_{\mathfrak{q}}(N_n,n) + R(n)$. From the short exact sequence above, $P_{\mathfrak{q}}(M,n) = P_{\mathfrak{q}}(T,n) + P_{\mathfrak{q}}(N_n,n)$, thus $\ell(M/\mathfrak{q}^n M) = \ell(T/\mathfrak{q}^n T) + \ell(N/N_n)$, so one can write $P_{\mathfrak{q}}(M,n) = P_{\mathfrak{q}}(T,n) + P_{\mathfrak{q}}(N,n) - R(n)$ 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 $\mathrm{Spec}(A) = \{P \mid P \text{ is a prime ideal in } A\}$. This becomes a topological space $X = \mathrm{Spec}(A)$ with the following (Zariski) topology: we declare the closed sets of X to be $V(I) = \{P \in \mathrm{Spec}(A) \mid P \supseteq I\}$, 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 $V(I) = V(\sum_{i\in I} Af_i) = \bigcap_{i\in I} V(f_i)$, so $X \backslash V(I) = X \backslash \bigcap_{i\in I} V(f_i) = \bigcup_{i\in I}(X \backslash V(f_i)) = \bigcup_{i\in I} D(f_i)$, where we define $D(f_i) = X \backslash V(f_i) = \{p \in \mathrm{Spec}(A) \mid f_i \notin p\}$. Therefore, $\{D(f_i)\}$ forms a family of basic open subsets of X. Therefore, $D(f_i)$ corresponds to $\mathrm{Spec}(A_{f_i})$.

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 $X = \operatorname{Spec}(A)$ 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 $X = \operatorname{Spec}(A)$ if and only if $P_r \subsetneq P_{r-1} \subsetneq \cdots \subsetneq P_0$ for $V(P_i) = Y_i$ for all $0 \leqslant i \leqslant r$.

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 $Y = \bigcup_{i \geqslant 0} Y_i$ 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 $\operatorname{Spec}(A)$ 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 $\{P_1, \ldots, P_t\} = \min\{P_1, \ldots, P_r\}$ be the minimal primes, then $\operatorname{Spec}(A) = V(0) = V(\mathfrak{q}_1) \cup \cdots \cup V(\mathfrak{q}_r)$, but since $\mathfrak{q}_i$ is P_i-primary for all i, then $V(\mathfrak{q}_i) = V(P_i)$, so $P_i = \operatorname{Ass}(A/\mathfrak{q}_i) = V(P_1) \cup \cdots V(P_r)$. But if $P_i \subsetneq P_j$, then $V(P_j) \subsetneq V(P_i)$, so the union is just $V(P_1) \cup \cdots V(P_t)$, where each $V(P_i)$ is a component of $\operatorname{Spec}(A)$ for $1 \leqslant i \leqslant t$.

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, $X = \operatorname{Spec}(A)$. 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 $X = \operatorname{Spec}(A)$, 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 $\dim(\operatorname{Spec}(A))$.

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, $X = \operatorname{Spec}(A)$, 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 $I = \operatorname{Ann}_A(M)$.

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 $\operatorname{supp}(\mathfrak{q} + I) = \{\mathfrak{m}_1, \dots, \mathfrak{m}_n\}$ 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 $\dim(M) \leqslant d(M) \leqslant s(M) \leqslant \dim(M)$.

- To show $\dim(M) \leqslant d(M)$, 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 $\ell(M/\mathfrak{m}^n M) = \ell(M/\mathfrak{m}^{n+1}M) = \cdots$, 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 $\operatorname{supp}(M) = \{\mathfrak{m}\}$. 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 $P_0 \subsetneq P_1 \subsetneq \cdots \subsetneq P_n$ be a chain of prime ideals in $\operatorname{supp}(M)$ such that P_0 is a minimal prime ideal in $\operatorname{supp}(M)$. We need to show that $n \leqslant d(M)$. Denote $N = A/P_0$ and take $x \in P_1 \backslash P_0$, 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, $d(N/xN) \leqslant d(N) - 1$. By the inductive hypothesis, $\dim(N/xN) \leqslant d(N/xN) \leqslant d(N - 1)$, then note that $N/xN = A/(P_0 + x_1 A)$, so $P_0 + x_1 A \subseteq P_1 \subseteq P_2 \subseteq \cdots \subseteq P_n$, therefore $n - 1 \leqslant \dim(N/xN) \leqslant d(N/xN) \leqslant d(N) - 1$, therefore $n \leqslant d(N) \leqslant d(M)$.

- To show $d(M) \leqslant s(M)$, 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 $\deg(P_{(x_1, \dots, x_n)}(M, n)) \leqslant n$, but $V(M/(x_1, \dots, x_n)M) = V(M/\mathfrak{m}M)$, therefore we have $\operatorname{supp}(M/(x_1, \dots, x_n)M) = \{\mathfrak{m}\} = \operatorname{supp}(M/\mathfrak{m}M)$, thus by Proposition 3.24 we conclude $\deg(P_{\mathfrak{m}}(M, n)) = \deg(P_{(x_1, \dots, x_n)}(M, n))$, so $d(M) \leqslant s(M) = n$.

- To show $s(M) \leqslant \dim(M)$, we proceed by induction on $\dim(M)$. If $\dim(M) = 0$, then $\operatorname{supp}(M) = \{\mathfrak{m}\}$, so $\ell_A(M) < \infty$, therefore $s(M) = 0$. Let $\{P_1, \dots, P_r\}$ be the minimal primes of $\operatorname{supp}(M)$. Take $x \in \mathfrak{m} \backslash \bigcup_{i=1}^{r} P_i$, then $s(M) - 1 \leqslant s(M/xM) \leqslant \dim(M/xM) \leqslant \dim(M - 1)$[8], hence $s(M) \leqslant \dim(M)$.

[8]The 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 $A = k[x_1, \ldots, x_n]$, we have $(x_1, \ldots, x_n) \supseteq (x_1, \ldots, x_{n-1}) \supseteq \cdots \supseteq (x_1) \supseteq (0)$, so $\dim(A) \geqslant n$.

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

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 $x_1, \ldots, x_n \in \mathfrak{m}$ gives $\ell(A/(x_1, \ldots, x_n)) < \infty$. Since $s(A) = d$, then there exists $x_1, \ldots, x_d$ such that $\ell(A/(x_1, \ldots, x_d)) < \infty$, so $\{\mathfrak{m}\} = \operatorname{Ass}_A(A/(x_1, \ldots, x_d))$, i.e., $(x_1, \ldots, x_d)$ 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 $P = P_0 \supseteq P_1 \supseteq P_2 \supseteq \cdots$, then taking the localization at P, we have $PA_P \supseteq P_1 A_P \supseteq P_2 A_P \supseteq \cdots$ 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 $P_r A_P = P_{r+1} A_P = \cdots$. This implies $P_r = P_{r+1} = \cdots$, by pulling back via $i_P : A \to A_P$. (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 $\operatorname{ht}(P)$, is $\dim(A_P)$. Alternatively, it is $\sup\{r \mid \exists \text{ a chain of prime ideals } P_0 \subsetneq P_1 \subsetneq \cdots \subsetneq P_r \subsetneq P_r = P\}$.

Let I be an ideal of A, then $\operatorname{ht}(I) = \inf\limits_{P \supseteq I} \operatorname{ht}(P) = \inf\limits_{\text{minimal } P \supseteq I} \operatorname{ht}(P)$. By the primary decomposition, if we write down $I = \mathfrak{q}_1 \cap \cdots \cap \mathfrak{q}_r$ with minimal primes $P_1, \ldots, P_r$, then this is just $\inf\limits_{\text{minimal primes} P_i} \operatorname{ht}(P_i)$ 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 $\operatorname{ht}(P) \leqslant n$ if and only if there exists $a_1, \ldots, a_n \in P$ such that P contains $(a_1, \ldots, a_n)$ minimally.

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

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

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 $\dim(A) \geqslant 2$. 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 $x_1, \ldots, x_i \in \mathfrak{m}$ be non-zero, then show that $\dim(M/(x_1, \ldots, x_i)M) \geqslant \dim(M) - i$. In particular, show that the equality holds if and only if $x_1, \ldots, x_i$ 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 $\mathfrak{p} \supseteq \mathfrak{q}' \supseteq \mathfrak{q}$, 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 $\bar{A} := A/\mathfrak{q}_0 \to A/\mathfrak{q}_0[x] = A[x]/\mathfrak{q}_0[x] = \bar{A}[x]$. Now $\bar{A}[x]$ has a strict chain:

$$\bar{0} \subseteq \bar{\mathfrak{q}} \subseteq \bar{\mathfrak{q}}$$

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 $S = \bar{A} \backslash \{0\}$, then by tensoring with $\bar{A}$ on $k \to k[x]$ (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 $\dim(k[x]) \geqslant 2$, 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 $\operatorname{ht}(I) = \operatorname{ht}(I[x])$.

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

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

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 $\dim(A[x]) \geqslant \dim(A) + 1$. 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 $\dim(A[x]) \leqslant \dim(A) + 1$. 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 $\mathfrak{p}_r \supseteq \cdots \supseteq \mathfrak{p}_1 \supseteq \mathfrak{p}_0$, where $\mathfrak{p}_i = P_i \cap A$. We now want to show that $r \leqslant \dim(A) + 1$. We have two cases:

- suppose $\mathfrak{p}_r \neq \mathfrak{p}_{r-1}$, so $\operatorname{ht}(P_{r-1}) < \dim(A)$. By induction, $\dim(A_{\mathfrak{p}_{r-1}}[x]) = \dim(A_{\mathfrak{p}_{r-1}})+1$, so $\dim(A_{\mathfrak{p}_{r-1}}[x]) \leqslant \dim(A)$, and by localization we have a chain $A_{\mathfrak{p}_{r-1}}[x] \supseteq P_{r-1}A_{\mathfrak{p}_{r-1}}[x] \supsetneq \cdots \supsetneq P_0 A_{\mathfrak{p}_{r-1}}[x]$, therefore $r - 1 \leqslant \dim(A_{\mathfrak{p}_{r-1}}[x]) \leqslant \dim(A)$, so $r \leqslant \dim(A) + 1$.
- suppose $\mathfrak{p}_r = \mathfrak{p}_{r-1}$, so $P_{r-1} = \mathfrak{p}_{r-1}[x]$ by Lemma 3.65, with $\operatorname{ht}(P_{r-1}) = \operatorname{ht}(\mathfrak{p}_{r-1})$. Therefore, $r - 1 \leqslant \operatorname{ht}(P_{r-1}) = \operatorname{ht}(P_{r-1}) \leqslant \dim(A)$, so $r \leqslant \dim(A) + 1$.

□

Corollary 3.68.
- Let A be a Noetherian ring, then $\dim(A[x_1, \ldots, x_n]) = \dim(A) + n$.
- Let k be a field, then $\dim(k[x_1, \ldots, x_n]) = n$.
- $\dim(\mathbb{Z}[x_1, \ldots, x_n]) = n + 1$.

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

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

[9] Indeed, 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 $0 = I_1[x] \cap \cdots I_r[x]$, 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 $f : A \to B$ is a ring homomorphism, then

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

is a continuous map with respect to the Zariski topology.

Exercise 3.73. $\operatorname{im}(\operatorname{Spec}(f)(\operatorname{Spec}(B)))$ is dense in $\operatorname{Spec}(A)$ 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 $\{1, x, \ldots, x^{n-1}\}$ over A, hence $A[x]$ is a finitely-generated A-module with generators $1, x, \ldots, x^{n-1}$.

$(ii) \Rightarrow (iii)$: 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 $m_1, \ldots, m_n$ to be the generator of M. Since M is an $A[x]$-module, then we write

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

and we write

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

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. ∎

Corollary 4.3. Suppose $A \hookrightarrow B$. Suppose $B = A[x_1, \ldots, x_n]$, we view this as an algebra generated by n elements, i.e., as $A[X_1, \ldots, X_n]/I$ 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 $\operatorname{Frac}(A)$ is A itself, i.e., A is integrally closed in $\operatorname{Frac}(A)$.

Example 4.7. Let $A = k[x, y]/(y^2 = x^3)$ be a domain[10], then we know $\operatorname{Frac}(A) \ni \left(\frac{y}{x}\right)^2 = x \in A$, so $\frac{y}{x} \in \operatorname{Frac}(A)$. 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 $b(b^{n-1} + a_n b^{n-2} + \cdots + a_{n-1}) + a_n = 0$, so $b(b^{n-1} + a_n b^{n-2} + \cdots + a_{n-1}) = -a_n$, 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 $\mathfrak{q} = \mathfrak{p} \cap A$.

[10] To 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 $\mathfrak{p} \in \operatorname{Spec}(B)$ lies over $\mathfrak{q} \in \operatorname{Spec}(A)$, 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. □

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 $x^n + a_1 x^{n-1} + \cdots + a_n = 0$.

   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. ■

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

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

5. Suppose $P_1 \subsetneq P_2 \subsetneq \cdots \subsetneq P_n$ is a strict chain of prime ideals in B. Let $p_i = P_i \cap A$, then $p_1 \subsetneq p_2 \subsetneq \cdots \subsetneq p_n$ is a strict chain of prime ideals in A.

6. Using the notation above, $\dim(B) \leqslant \dim(A)$, $\operatorname{ht}(P_n) \leqslant \operatorname{ht}(p_n)$.

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 $S = A \backslash \mathfrak{q}$, then we have

$$\begin{tikzcd} B \arrow[r, "i_S"] & S^{-1}B \\ A \arrow[u, hook] \arrow[r] & S^{-1}A = A_{\mathfrak{q}} \arrow[u, hook] \end{tikzcd}$$

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 $\mathfrak{p} \cap A = \mathfrak{q}$.

$$\begin{tikzcd} \mathfrak{q} & \mathfrak{m} \arrow[l, "i_S^{-1}"'] \\ \mathfrak{q} \arrow[u, hook] \arrow[r] & \mathfrak{q}A_{\mathfrak{q}} \arrow[u, hook] \end{tikzcd}$$

□

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 $\operatorname{Spec}(B)$ 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 $\bar{\mathfrak{q}}_2 \subsetneq \bar{\mathfrak{q}}_3 \subsetneq \cdots \bar{\mathfrak{q}}_r$, 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 $\eta : B \to B/P_1$, 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, $\dim(B) = \dim(A)$. □

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

Remark 4.18.

1. Consider the usual AKLB setup, that is, let A be an integral domain, let $K = \operatorname{Frac}(A)$ 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

$$\begin{tikzcd} B \arrow[r, hook] & L \\ A \arrow[u, hook] \arrow[r, hook] & K \arrow[u, hook] \end{tikzcd}$$

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 $sx^n + a_1 x^{n-1} x + \cdots + a_n = 0$, 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 $S = A \backslash \{0\}$, we have $L = S^{-1}B$.

2. Let $\sigma \in \operatorname{Aut}(L/K)$, 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 $G = \operatorname{Aut}(L/K)$ 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 $G = \{\sigma_1, \ldots, \sigma_n\}$ where $\sigma_1 = \operatorname{id}$, and suppose for no σ_i we have $P \subseteq \sigma_i^{-1}(Q)$, then $P \nsubseteq \bigcup_{i=1}^{n} \sigma_i^{-1}(Q)$.

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

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

  - If $\operatorname{char}(K) = 0$, 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 $\operatorname{char}(K) = p > 0$, 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 $F \to G(L/F)$ 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 $(L_i,\sigma_i)\leqslant(L_j,\sigma_j)$ 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

$$\begin{tikzcd} B \arrow[r, dash] \arrow[d, dash] & L \arrow[d, dash] \\ B_0 \arrow[r, dash] \arrow[d, dash] & L_0 \arrow[d, dash] \\ A \arrow[r, dash] & K \end{tikzcd}$$

  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 $B'=B\cap L'$.

$$\begin{tikzcd} P,Q & B \arrow[r, dash] \arrow[d, dash] & L \arrow[d, dash] \\ P',Q' & B' \arrow[r, dash] \arrow[d, dash] & L' \arrow[d, dash] \\ P_0,Q_0 & B_0 \arrow[r, dash] \arrow[d, dash] & L_0 \arrow[d, dash] \\ P,Q & A \arrow[r, dash] & K \end{tikzcd}$$

  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 $\sigma''\in\operatorname{Aut}(L'/L_0)$, 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

$$\begin{tikzcd} B \arrow[r, dash] \arrow[d, dash] & L \arrow[d, dash] \\ A \arrow[r, dash] & K \end{tikzcd}$$

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

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

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

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

The stabilizer, also known as the isotopy 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

$$\begin{tikzcd}
P & B \arrow[r, dash] \arrow[d, dash] & L \arrow[d, dash] \\
\tilde{P} & C \arrow[r, dash] \arrow[d, dash] & F \arrow[d, dash] \\
p & A \arrow[r, dash] & K
\end{tikzcd}$$

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 $\mathrm{Spec}(A)$ with Zariski topology, then $\mathfrak{p} \in U$ for some open subset U, therefore $\mathfrak{p} \in \mathrm{Spec}(A_f)$, therefore looking at the mapping $A \to A_f$, 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 $K = \mathrm{Frac}(A)$, $L = \mathrm{Frac}(B)$. Let $\bar{L}$ be the normal closure of L and let $\bar{B}$ be the integral closure of A 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 $\bar{Q} \cap A = \mathfrak{q}$.

$$\begin{tikzcd}
\bar{P} & \bar{B} \arrow[r, dash] \arrow[d, dash] & \bar{L} \arrow[d, dash] \\
P & B \arrow[r, dash] \arrow[d, dash] & L \arrow[d, dash] \\
\mathfrak{q} \subseteq \mathfrak{p} & A \arrow[r, dash] & K
\end{tikzcd}$$

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 $\sigma \in \mathrm{Aut}(\bar{L}/K)$ such that $\sigma(\mathfrak{p}') = \bar{P}$. Therefore, $\sigma(\mathfrak{q}') \subseteq \sigma(\mathfrak{p}')$, and $\sigma(\mathfrak{q}') =: \bar{Q}$ lies over 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 $A \to B/\mathfrak{q}_0$ allows us to reduce it to the previous case. Let $S_1 = A\backslash\{0\}$ and $S_2 = B\backslash P$, take $S = S_1 S_2$, which is multiplicatively closed since B is torsion-free over A, then we have

$$\begin{tikzcd}
B \arrow[r, hook, "i_S"] & S^{-1}B \\
A \arrow[u, hook] \arrow[r, hook, "i"'] & K \arrow[u, hook]
\end{tikzcd}$$

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 $f : A \to B$ 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 $\mathfrak{q} \subseteq \mathfrak{p}$ in A such that $f^{-1}(Q) = \mathfrak{q}$.

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

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

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

Proof. Omitted. □

Corollary 4.30. Let $f : A \to B$ 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 $x \in \operatorname{Ass}(A/Ax)$;

(iv) $\mathfrak{m} \neq 0$ is principal.

Proof. $(i) \Rightarrow (ii)$: Since A is a local PID, then A is integrally closed, with $\operatorname{ht}(\mathfrak{m}) = 1$ since $\mathfrak{m} = (x)$, so $\dim(A) = 1$.
$(ii) \Rightarrow (iii)$: let $x \neq 0$, the prime ideals are (0) and $\mathfrak{m}$, so $\mathfrak{m} \in \operatorname{Ass}(A/Ax)$ where Ax is $\mathfrak{m}$-primary.
$(iii) \Rightarrow (iv)$: let $\mathfrak{m} \in \operatorname{Ass}(A/Ax)$, 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 $myx^{-1} = A$, then $\mathfrak{m} = Axy^{-1}$, i.e., $\mathfrak{m}$ is principal generated by xy^{-1};
- if $myx^{-1} \subseteq \mathfrak{m}$, then say $\mathfrak{m}$ is generated by $y_1, \dots, y_n$, then write $z = yx^{-1}$, so we have

$$\begin{cases} zy_1 &= a_{11}y_1 + \cdots + a_{1n}y_n \\ \vdots &= \vdots \\ zy_n &= a_{n1}y_1 + \cdots + a_{nn}y_n \end{cases}$$

  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 $myx^{-1} = A$ 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 $a_i \in (x^{t_i}) \backslash (x^{t_i+1})$, 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 $\operatorname{ht}(\mathfrak{p}) = 1$, $A_{\mathfrak{p}}$ is a DVR, and

(ii) for any $0 \neq x \in A$, $xA = \mathfrak{q}_1 \cap \cdots \cap \mathfrak{q}_n$ where $\mathfrak{q}_i$ is $\mathfrak{p}_i$-primary, where each prime $\mathfrak{p}_i$ has $\operatorname{ht}(\mathfrak{p}_i) = 1$, i.e., there is no embedded prime.

[11] In our case, we take the canonical discrete valuation, so we do not specify it.

Proof. Suppose A is normal, then $\mathrm{ht}(\mathfrak{p}) = 1$, 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 $\mathrm{ht}(\mathfrak{p}_1) > 1$, 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 $A = \bigcap_{\mathrm{ht}(\mathfrak{p})=1} A_\mathfrak{p} \hookrightarrow \mathrm{Frac}(A)$. Suppose $z \in \bigcap_{\mathrm{ht}(\mathfrak{p})=1} A_\mathfrak{p}$, 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 $\mathrm{ht}(\mathfrak{p}_i) = 1$. Therefore, we have $yA_{\mathfrak{p}_1} = \mathfrak{q}_1 A_{\mathfrak{p}_1}$, so $x \in yA_\mathfrak{p}$ for all height-1 prime $\mathfrak{p}$. This means $x \in yA_{\mathfrak{p}_i} = \mathfrak{q}_1 A_{\mathfrak{p}_i}$, so $x \in \mathfrak{q}_i$[12], then $x \in yA$. ☐

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, $K = \mathrm{Frac}(A)$, $[L : K] < \infty$, and B is the integral closure of A in L. Is B is 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 $\dim(A) \leqslant 1$, $K = \mathrm{Frac}(A)$, $[L : K] < \infty$, 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 $\dim(A) \geqslant 3$, Nagata showed that B may not be Noetherian.

Remark 4.39 (Hilbert's 14th Problem)**.** Let $K \subseteq k(x_1, \ldots, x_n)$ be a subfield, is $K \cap k[x_1, \ldots, x_n]$ 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, $K = \mathrm{Frac}(A)$, $[L : K] < \infty$, 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 $L = K\langle e_1, \ldots, e_n\rangle$ where $e_1, \ldots, e_n$ gives a basis. Now $x : L \to L$ is a K-linear map, so $xe_i = \sum a_{ij} e_j$, where we write $A = (a_{ij})$. Then $\mathrm{Tr}_{L/K}(x) = \mathrm{Tr}(A) = \sum a_{ii}$.

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 $f(X) = X^n + a_1 X^{n-1} \cdots + a_n$ for $a_i \in K$. Therefore, $K(x)$ is a k-vector space with basis $1, x, \ldots, x^{n-1}$. One can show that $\mathrm{Tr}_{K(x)/K}(x) = -a_1$, which is the sum of all the roots. Moreover, one can show that if x is not separable over K (so $\mathrm{char}(K) = p > 0$), then $\mathrm{Tr}_{K(x)/K}(x) = 0$.

3. Suppose $L/F/K$ is a field extension with $[L : K] < \infty$. Suppose $[L : F] = m$, and let $x \in F$, then $\mathrm{Tr}_{L/K}(x) = m \cdot \mathrm{Tr}_{F/K}(x)$.

4. Suppose $[L : K] < \infty$, then L/K is separable if and only if there exists $0 \neq x \in L$ such that $\mathrm{Tr}_{L/K}(x) \neq 0$.

[12] We can pullback $i_{\mathfrak{p}_i} : A \to A_{\mathfrak{p}_i}$ sending $\mathfrak{q}_i$ to $\mathfrak{q}_i A_{\mathfrak{p}_i}$, i.e., $i_{\mathfrak{p}_i}^{-1}(\mathfrak{q}_i A_{\mathfrak{p}_i}) = \mathfrak{q}$.

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 $S=A\backslash\{0\}$.) Note that this does not mean B is a free module. Consider

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{Tr}: L\times L&\to K\\ (x,y)&\mapsto \mathrm{Tr}_{L/K}(xy).\end{aligned}$$

as a non-degenerate bilinear form.

Claim 4.42. Given any $x\in L$, there exists $y\in L$ such that $\mathrm{Tr}(x,y)\neq 0$.

Subproof. Since L/K is separable, then there exists $0\neq\xi\in L$ such that $\mathrm{Tr}(\xi)\neq 0$ (by the fourth fact). Let $y=\frac{\xi}{x}$, then $\mathrm{Tr}(x,\frac{\xi}{x})=\mathrm{Tr}(\xi)\neq 0$. ■

Consider

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{\mathrm{Tr}}: L&\to L^*=\mathrm{Hom}_K(L,K)\\ x&\mapsto (y\mapsto \mathrm{Tr}(x,y)=\mathrm{Tr}(xy):=\mathrm{Tr}_{L/K}(xy))\end{aligned}$$

Thus, one can also write this as $\tilde{\mathrm{Tr}}(x)(y)=\mathrm{Tr}(x,y)=\mathrm{Tr}(xy)$. Now the assignment $x\mapsto\tilde{\mathrm{Tr}}(x)$ is a K-linear map which is injective, and since $[L:K]<\infty$, then $\tilde{\mathrm{Tr}}:L\to L^*$ 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 $\tilde{e}_i=\tilde{\mathrm{Tr}}^{-1}(e_i^*)$ be the pullback on L. One can show that

$$\mathrm{Tr}(\tilde{e}_ie_j)=\begin{cases}0, & i\neq j\\ 1, & i=j.\end{cases}$$

Therefore, $\{\tilde{e}_1,\dots,\tilde{e}_n\}$ forms a basis of L over K. Let $\tilde{B}=\{\lambda\in L\mid \mathrm{Tr}(\lambda B)\subseteq A\}$.

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 $f(x)=x^n+\lambda_1x^{n-1}+\dots+\lambda_n$ be the minimal polynomial of $b\in K[x]$, i.e., $\lambda_i\in K$ for $1\leqslant i\leqslant n$.

Claim 4.45. $\lambda_i\in A$ for all i.

Subproof of Claim 4.45. Note $b^n+\lambda_1b^{n-1}+b_0=0$, 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 $\sigma_i:L\to\bar{K}$ 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, $\mathrm{Tr}(b)=-\lambda_1\in A$, so $B\subseteq\tilde{B}$ by definition.

We will now show that $\tilde{B}\subseteq A\{\bar{e}_1,\dots,\bar{e}_n\}$. 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, $\tilde{b}e_i=\sum_j\mu_j\tilde{e}_je_i$ for $e_i\in B$, therefore

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{Tr}(\tilde{b}e_i)&=\sum_j\mu_j\,\mathrm{Tr}(\tilde{e}_je_i)\\ &=\mu_i.\end{aligned}$$

Since $\mathrm{Tr}(\tilde{b}e_i)\in A$, then $\mu_i\in A$ for all $1\leqslant i\leqslant n$, therefore $\tilde{B}\subseteq A\{\bar{e}_1,\dots,\bar{e}_n\}$. ■

□

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 $\mathfrak{a}_1 \subsetneq \mathfrak{a}_2 \subsetneq \cdots \subsetneq \mathfrak{a}_r$ 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 $h : \{1, \dots, r\} \to \{0, 1, \dots, n\}$ such that
- $h(i) \geqslant 0$ for all $i \in \{1, \dots, r\}$;
- $h(i) \leqslant h(j)$ 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 $\mathrm{ht}(\mathfrak{b}) = \mathrm{ht}(\mathfrak{a})$.

Proof. Step 1: Reduction to the case where A is a polynomial ring. Consider

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi : B = k[Y_1, \dots, Y_d] &\to A = k[y_1, \dots, y_d] \\ Y_i &\mapsto y_i \end{aligned}$$

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 $\varphi^{-1}(0) \subsetneq \varphi^{-1}(\mathfrak{a}_1) \subsetneq \cdots \subsetneq \varphi^{-1}(\mathfrak{a}_r)$ 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 $\mathfrak{a}_1 \subsetneq \mathfrak{a}_2 \subsetneq \cdots \subsetneq \mathfrak{a}_r$ 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

$$\begin{aligned} x_1 &= f(Y_1, \dots, Y_n) \\ &= \sum a_{i_1 \cdots i_n} Y_1^{i_1} \cdots Y_n^{i_n} \\ &= \sum a_{i_1 \cdots i_n} Y_1^{i_1} (x_2 + Y_1^{\alpha_2})^{i_2} \cdots (x_n + Y_1^{\alpha_n})^{i_n} \end{aligned}$$

where $a_{i_1 \cdots i_n} \in k$. This represents a polynomial equation in Y_1 and $k[x_1, \dots, x_n]$. For each term $a_{i_1 \cdots i_n} Y_1^{i_1} (x_2 + Y_1^{\alpha_2})^{i_2} \cdots (x_n + Y_1^{\alpha_n})^{i_n}$, the highest power of Y_1 is $i_1 + i_2\alpha_2 + \cdots + i_n\alpha_n$, given by the term $a_{i_1 \cdots i_n} Y_1^{i_1 + i_2\alpha_2 + \cdots + i_n\alpha_n}$. 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 $i_1 + i_2\alpha_2 + \cdots + i_n\alpha_n \neq j_1 + j_2\alpha_2 + \cdots + j_n\alpha_n$ 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, $i_1 + i_2\alpha_2 + \cdots + i_n\alpha_n \neq j_1 + j_2\alpha_2 + \cdots + j_n\alpha_n$ whenever $(i_1, \dots, i_n) \neq (j_1, \dots, j_n)$.

Subproof. Otherwise, we have $(i_1 - j_1) = -\alpha_2(i_2 - j_2) - \cdots - \alpha_n(i_n - j_n)$, but $i_1, j_1 < s$ and $\alpha_i > s^{i-1}$, so such an equation cannot hold.[15] ■

[13] Basically, because we have an extension $k[Z_1, \dots, Z_d] \hookrightarrow B$, then by modding out $\varphi^{-1}(0)$ we have $k[x_1, \dots, x_n] = k[Z_1, \dots, Z_d]/(\varphi^{-1}(0) \cap k[Z_1, \dots, Z_n])$ which has an integral extension into $A = B/\varphi^{-1}(0)$.

[14] Even 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.

[15] Basically, this is saying an integer has a unique s-adic expansion.

Therefore, Y_1 is integral in $k[x_1, \ldots, x_n]$, so by construction $Y_2, \ldots, Y_n$ are all integral over $k[x_1, \ldots, x_n]$. Hence, $A = k[Y_1, \ldots, Y_n]$ is integral over $k[x_1, \ldots, x_n]$. We know $A = k[Y_1, \ldots, Y_n]$ has dimension n, and that means $\dim(k[x_1, \ldots, x_n]) \geqslant n$ by the property of lying over, but having only n variables it has dimension at most n, so it has dimension exactly n, hence $k[x_1, \ldots, x_n]$ is a polynomial ring, i.e., $x_1, \ldots, x_n$ are algebraically independent over k.

Claim 5.5. $\mathfrak{a} \cap C = x_1 C$ for $C = k[x_1, \ldots, x_n]$.

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, $\operatorname{ht}(\mathfrak{a} \cap C) \geqslant 2$, but $\operatorname{ht}(\mathfrak{a}) = 1$, contradiction. ■

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 $x_1 = x, x_2, \ldots, x_n$ algebraically independent over k such that A is integral over $B = k[x_1, \ldots, x_n]$ and $xA \cap B = xB$. One can check that $\mathfrak{a} \cap B = xB + \mathfrak{a} \cap (x_2, \ldots, x_n)$. Due to Exercise 5.6, by induction on n, we can find $z_2, \ldots, z_n \in C = k[x_2, \ldots, x_n]$ such that C is integral over $D = k[z_2, \ldots, z_n]$, and $\mathfrak{a} \cap C \cap D = \mathfrak{a} \cap (x_2, \ldots, x_n) \cap D = (z_2, \ldots, z_h)$ for $h \leqslant n$ in D. Consider the extension

$$\begin{tikzcd}
A = k[y_1, \ldots, y_n] \arrow[d, dash] \\
B = k[x_1 = x, x_2, \ldots, x_n] \arrow[d, dash] \\
D[x_1] = k[x_1, z_2, \ldots, z_n]
\end{tikzcd}$$

such that A is integral over $D[x_1]$, and $\mathfrak{a} \cap D = (x_1, z_2, \ldots, z_h)$ in $D[x_1]$ for $h \leqslant n$.

Step 4: Suppose $A = k[y_1, \ldots, y_n]$ with strict chain $\mathfrak{a}_1 \subsetneq \mathfrak{a}_2 \subsetneq \cdots \subsetneq \mathfrak{a}_r$. We proceed by induction on r. If $r = 1$, this is just step 3. Suppose we know this holds for $\mathfrak{a}_1 \subsetneq \mathfrak{a}_2 \subsetneq \cdots \subsetneq \mathfrak{a}_{r-1}$, then there exists $x_1, \ldots, x_n$ algebraically independent over k such that A is integral over $B = k[x_1, \ldots, x_n]$ and $\mathfrak{a}_i \cap B = (x, \ldots, x_{h(i)})$ in B where $i \leqslant j$ implies $h(i) \leqslant h(j)$ for $1 \leqslant i, j \leqslant r - 1$. Note that $\mathfrak{a}_r \cap B = (x_1, \ldots, x_{h(r-1)}) + \mathfrak{a}_r \cap k[x_{h(r-1)+1}, \ldots, x_n]$. Let $C = k[x_{h(r-1)+1}, \ldots, x_n]$, and consider the ideal $\mathfrak{a}_r \cap C$. By step 3, there exists $z_{h(r-1)+1}, \ldots, z_n$ algebraically independent over k such that C is integral over $D = k[z_{h(r-1)+1}, \ldots, z_n]$, and note the ideal $(\mathfrak{a}_r \cap C) \cap D = \mathfrak{a}_r \cap D = (Z_{h(r-1)+1}, \ldots, z_{h(r)})$ for $h(r) \leqslant n$. Consider the extensions

$$\begin{tikzcd}
A = k[y_1, \ldots, y_n] \arrow[d, dash] \\
B = k[x_1, \ldots, x_n] \arrow[d, dash] \\
\tilde{D} = k[x_1, \ldots, x_{h(r-1)}, z_{h(r-1)+1}, \ldots, z_n]
\end{tikzcd}$$

which is a composition of integral extensions, hence integral. Note that $\mathfrak{a}_i \cap \tilde{D} = (x_1, \ldots, x_{h(i)}$ for $1 \leqslant i \leqslant r$ and $h(i) \leqslant h(j)$ for all $i \leqslant j$, therefore $\mathfrak{a}_r \cap \tilde{D} = (x_1, \ldots, x_{h(r-1)}, z_{h(r-1)+1}, \ldots, z_{h(r)})$ for $h(r) \leqslant n$. □

Corollary 5.7. Let A be an affine k-domain, i.e., an affine k-algebra that is also a domain, then $\dim(A) = \operatorname{trdeg}_k(\operatorname{Frac}(A))$.

Proof. Suppose A is a domain of dimension d, by Theorem 5.2, there exists $x_1, \ldots, x_d$ such that A is integral over $B = k[x_1, \ldots, x_d]$. One can check that $\operatorname{Frac}(A)$ is algebraic over $\operatorname{Frac}(B) = k(x_1, \ldots, x_d)$. Since $d = \dim(A)$, then $\operatorname{trdeg}_k(\operatorname{Frac}(A)) = \operatorname{trdeg}_k(k(x_1, \ldots, x_d)) = d$. □

Remark 5.8. Although $\dim(k[[x_1, \ldots, x_n]]) = n$ as well, we have $\operatorname{trdeg}_k(k((x_1, \ldots, x_n))) = \infty$ 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 $x_1, \ldots, x_n$ in A that are algebraically independent over k, such that $k[x_1, \ldots, x_n] \hookrightarrow A$ is an integral extension, and suppose $\mathfrak{m} \cap k[x_1, \ldots, x_n] = (x_1, \ldots, x_h)$. The claim is that $h = n$. To see this, consider the integral extension $k[x_1, \ldots, x_h]/(\mathfrak{m} \cap k[x_1, \ldots, x_n]) \hookrightarrow A/\mathfrak{m}$ which is a field, so this forces $k[x_1, \ldots, x_n]/(\mathfrak{m} \cap k[x_1, \ldots, x_n])$ to be a field as well. Therefore, $\mathfrak{m} \cap k[x_1, \ldots, x_n]$ has to be a maximal ideal, but that means $\mathfrak{m} = (x_1, \ldots, x_n)$ where $h = n$. In particular, this means we have an integral extension $k = k[x_1, \ldots, x_n]/(x_1, \ldots, x_h) \hookrightarrow A/\mathfrak{m}$, but that means $A/\mathfrak{m}$ is finitely-generated over k, that is, $\dim_k(A/\mathfrak{m}) < \infty$. □

Corollary 5.10 (Hilbert's Nullstellensatz)**.** Let $A = k[X_1, \ldots, X_n]$, then every maximal ideal $\mathfrak{m}$ of A is generated of the form

$$\mathfrak{m} = (f_1(X_1), f_2(X_1, X_2), \ldots, f_n(X_1, \ldots, X_n)).$$

Proof. By Corollary 5.9, $k \hookrightarrow A/\mathfrak{m}$ is a finite extension. Recall that if $x_1, \ldots, x_i$ are algebraic over k, then $k[x_1, \ldots, x_i] = k(x_1, \ldots, x_i)$. Let x_i be the image of X_i in $A/\mathfrak{m}$, then $A/\mathfrak{m} = k[x_1, \ldots, x_n] = k(x_1, \ldots, x_n)$. 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 $\sum\limits_i g_i(x_1)Z^i$ for $g_i(x_1) = \sum\limits_j a_j x_1^j \in k[x_1]$, where $a_j \in k$. From the integral extension, we define $f_2(X_1, X_2) = \sum\limits_i g_i(X_1)X_2^i$, then the evaluation at (x_1, x_2) is in $A/\mathfrak{m}$. Indeed, for $g_i(x_1) = \sum\limits_j a_j x^j$, we have $f_2(x_1, x_2) = \sum\limits_{i,j} a_j x_1^j x_2^i$ and $f_2(x_1, x_2) = 0$, hence $f_2(X_1, X_2) \in \mathfrak{m}$. We proceed inductively, and this gives $k[x_1, \ldots, x_{i-1}] \hookrightarrow k[x_1, \ldots, x_i]$ for any i, hence producing $f_i(X_1, \ldots, X_i) \in \mathfrak{m}$.

Claim 5.11. $\mathfrak{m} = (f_1(X_1), \ldots, f_n(X_1, \ldots, X_n))$.

Subproof. Note that

$$\begin{aligned} k[X_1, \ldots, X_n]/(f_1(X_1), \ldots, f_n(X_1, \ldots, X_n)) &\cong k[X_1]/(f_1(X_1)) \cdot k[X_2, \ldots, x_n]/(f_2(X_2), \ldots, f_n(X_2, \ldots, X_n)) \\ &\cong k[x_1] \cdot k[X_2, \ldots, X_n]/(f_2(X_2), \ldots, f_n(X_2, \ldots, X_n)) \\ &\cdots \\ &\cong k[x_1, \ldots, x_n] \\ &\cong A/\mathfrak{m}. \end{aligned}$$

■

□

Corollary 5.12. Let k be algebraically closed, i.e., $k = \bar{k}$, then every maximal ideal of $A = k[X_1, \ldots, X_n]$ is of the form $(X_1 - a_1, \ldots, X_n - a_n)$ 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 $x_1, \ldots, x_n$ to be images of $X_1, \ldots, X_n$ 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 $\mathfrak{m} = (X_1 - a_1, \ldots, X_n - a_n)$. □

Remark 5.13. There exists a one-to-one correspondence between tuples of k^n and the maximal ideals in $k[X_1, \ldots, X_n]$. In particular, there is an embedding of $k^n \hookrightarrow \operatorname{Spec}(k[x_1, \ldots, x_n])$, so the Zariski topology of k^n is induced by the Zariski topology on this spectrum.

Exercise 5.14. One can say that $\operatorname{Spec}(k[x_1, \ldots, x_n])$ is just k^n attached with all the irreducible closed subsets of k^n. In particular, show that k^n is dense in $\operatorname{Spec}(k[x_1, \ldots, x_n])$.

Remark 5.15. In particular, in the case $k = \mathbb{C}$, then $\mathbb{C}^n \hookrightarrow \operatorname{Spec}(\mathbb{C}[x_1, \ldots, x_n])$. 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 cohomolgoies, they converge.

Corollary 5.16. Let A be an affine k-domain, let $\mathfrak{p}$ be a prime ideal in A, then $\dim(A/\mathfrak{p}) + \operatorname{ht}(\mathfrak{p}) = \dim(A)$.

Proof. Suppose $\dim(A) = n$. Given $\mathfrak{p} \subseteq A$, there exists $x_1, \ldots, x_n \in A$ that are algebraically independent, gives an integral extension $k[x_1, \ldots, x_n] \hookrightarrow A$, and $\mathfrak{p} \cap k[x_1, \ldots, x_n] = (x_1, \ldots, x_{h(n)})$. By the going-down theorem (Theorem 4.25), since A is an affine domain, then $\operatorname{ht}(\mathfrak{p}) = h = \operatorname{ht}(x_1, \ldots, x_h)$. Now $k[x_1, \ldots, x_n]/(\mathfrak{p} \cap k[x_1, \ldots, x_h] \hookrightarrow A/\mathfrak{p}$ is integral, then

$$\dim(A/\mathfrak{p}) = \dim(k[x_1, \ldots, x_n]/(\mathfrak{p} \cap k[x_1, \ldots, x_n]) = \dim(k[x_1, \ldots, x_n]/(x_1, \ldots, x_h)) = n - h,$$

therefore $\dim(A/\mathfrak{p}) + \operatorname{ht}(\mathfrak{p}) = n - h + h = n = \dim(A)$. ☐

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

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{p} = \mathfrak{p}_0 \subsetneq \mathfrak{p}_1 \subsetneq \cdots \subsetneq \mathfrak{p}_r = \mathfrak{q} \\ \mathfrak{p} = \mathfrak{q}_0 \subsetneq \mathfrak{q}_1 \subsetneq \cdots \subsetneq \mathfrak{q}_s = \mathfrak{q} \end{aligned}$$

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 $\operatorname{ht}(\mathfrak{p}_{i+1}/\mathfrak{p}_i) = \operatorname{ht}(\mathfrak{q}_{j+1}/\mathfrak{q}_j) = 1$, by applying Corollary 5.16 to $A/\mathfrak{p}$, we have $\operatorname{ht}(\mathfrak{p}_1/\mathfrak{p}_0) + \dim(A/\mathfrak{p}_1) = \dim(A/\mathfrak{p}_0) = \dim(A/\mathfrak{p})$, 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, $r = s$. ☐

Remark 5.18. A ring A with this property, i.e., every saturated chain of ideals $\mathfrak{p} = \mathfrak{p}_0 \subsetneq \mathfrak{p}_1 \subsetneq \cdots \subsetneq \mathfrak{p}_r = \mathfrak{q}$ 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 $f : A \to B$ be an k-algebra homomorphism, i.e., a ring homomorphism with the property $f|_k = \mathrm{id}_k$. 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 $S = \{1, x, x^2, \ldots, x^n, \ldots\}$, 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

$$\begin{aligned} i_x : A &\to A_x \\ 1 &\mapsto \frac{a}{1} \end{aligned}$$

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. ☐

Corollary 5.22. Consider the following AKLB setup: let A be an affine k-domain, let $K = \operatorname{Frac}(A)$, $[L : K] < \infty$, and B is the integral closure of A in L:

$$\begin{tikzcd} B \arrow[r, dash] \arrow[d, dash] & L \arrow[d, dash] \\ A \arrow[r, dash] & K \end{tikzcd}$$

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

$$\begin{tikzcd} & \bar{L} \arrow[d, dash] \\ B \arrow[r, dash] \arrow[d, dash] & L \arrow[d, dash] \\ A \arrow[r, dash] \arrow[d, dash] & K \arrow[d, dash] \\ k[x_1,\dots,x_n] \arrow[r, dash] & k(x_1,\dots,x_n) \end{tikzcd}$$

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 $\mathrm{char}(k) = 0$, since every algebraic extension in characteristic 0 is separable. Therefore, we assume $\mathrm{char}(k) = p > 0$. Consider

$$\begin{tikzcd} B \arrow[r, dash] \arrow[d, dash] & L \arrow[d, dash] \\ k[x_1,\dots,x_n] \arrow[r, dash] & k(x_1,\dots,x_n) =: K \end{tikzcd}$$

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 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

$$\begin{tikzcd} B \arrow[r, dash] \arrow[d, dash] & L \arrow[d, dash] \\ k[x_1,\dots,x_n] \arrow[r, dash] & k(x_1,\dots,x_n) =: K \end{tikzcd}$$

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

$$\begin{tikzcd} B \arrow[r, dash] \arrow[d, dash] & L \arrow[d, dash] \\ C := B \cap F \arrow[r, dash] \arrow[d, dash] & F \arrow[d, dash] \\ k[x_1,\dots,x_n] \arrow[r, dash] & k(x_1,\dots,x_n) =: K \end{tikzcd}$$

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:

$$\begin{tikzcd} C \arrow[r, dash] \arrow[d, dash] & F \arrow[d, dash] \\ k[x_1,\dots,x_n] \arrow[r, dash] & k(x_1,\dots,x_n) =: K \end{tikzcd}$$

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 $\frac{f_i(x_1,\dots,x_n)}{g_i(x_1,\dots,x_n)} = \frac{\sum_i a^{(i)}_{j_1\cdots j_n} x_1^{j_1}\cdots x_n^{j_n}}{\sum_i b^{(i)}_{j_1\cdots j_n} x_1^{j_1}\cdots x_n^{j_n}}$ for $1 \leqslant i \leqslant d$. Consider the set of elements of the form

$$\left(\left(a^{(i)}_{j_1\cdots j_n}\right)^{\frac{1}{p^t}}, \left(b^{(i)}_{j_1\cdots j_n}\right)^{\frac{1}{p^t}}\right)$$

for all $j_1, \dots, j_n$'s appearing in the above extension with $1 \leqslant i \leqslant d$. Let k' be the extension of k by this set of elements, then this is a finite extension. Now consider

$$z_i = \frac{\sum_i a^{(i)}_{j_1\cdots j_n}(x_1^{\frac{1}{p^t}})^{j_1}\cdots(x_n^{\frac{1}{p^t}})^{j_n}}{\sum_i b^{(i)}_{j_1\cdots j_n}(x_1^{\frac{1}{p^t}})^{j_1}\cdots(x_n^{\frac{1}{p^t}})^{j_n}} \in k'(x_1^{\frac{1}{p^t}}, \dots, x_n^{\frac{1}{p^t}}).$$

We have

$$\begin{tikzcd}
k'[x_1^{\frac{1}{p^t}}, \dots, x_n^{\frac{1}{p^t}}] \arrow[r, dash] \arrow[d, dash] & k'(x_1^{\frac{1}{p^t}}, \dots, x_n^{\frac{1}{p^t}}) \arrow[d, dash] \\
C \arrow[r, dash] \arrow[d, dash] & F \arrow[d, dash] \\
k[x_1, \dots, x_n] \arrow[r, dash] & k(x_1, \dots, x_n) =: K
\end{tikzcd}$$

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 $(x_1^{\frac{1}{p^t}})^{i_1}\cdots(x_n^{\frac{1}{p^t}})^{i_n}$ for $1 \leqslant i_j < p^t$ where $1 \leqslant j \leqslant n$ as generator of k' over k. Therefore, C is a finitely-generated $k[x_1, \dots, x_n]$-module and we are done. □

Exercise 5.24. Let A be an integral domain and B be a finitely-generated A-algebra containing A as a subring, 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 $B\left[\frac{1}{a}\right]$ is integral over $B'\left[\frac{1}{a}\right]$.

Exercise 5.25. Let $A \hookrightarrow B$ be an (not necessarily integral) extension where B is a finitely-generated domain[16] over A, and suppose there exists a ring homomorphism $f : A \to L$ where L is algebraically closed, such that $f(a) \neq 0$ for any $a \in A$. Show that there exists a ring homomorphism $g : B \to L$ 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 $Z \to A$ 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 $\{f_i = 0\}_{1 \leqslant i \leqslant m}$ has a solution in $\mathbb{C}$ if and only if $\{f_i = 0\}_{1 \leqslant i \leqslant m}$ has a solution in a finite field extension of characteristic $p > 0$ for infinitely many primes $p > 0$.

[16] This assumption can be removed.

6 Homological Algebra

6.1 Complexes, Homotopy, Homology

Definition 6.1 (Chain Complex, Exact Sequence)**.** Consider a sequence $\{X_n, d_n : X_n \to X_{n-1}\}_{n\in\mathbb{Z}}$ of A-modules, we say it is a complex if we have a sequence

$$X_* : \qquad \cdots \longrightarrow X_{n+1} \xrightarrow{d_{n+1}} X_n \xrightarrow{d_n} X_{n-1} \longrightarrow \cdots$$

such that $d_n d_{n+1} = 0$ for all n. Therefore, $\operatorname{im}(d_{n+1}) \subseteq \ker(d_n)$.

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 $f_* : X_* \to Y_*$ is a morphism of chain complexes if $f_n : X_n \to Y_n$ is an A-module homomorphism, such that the diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd} X_n \arrow[r, "f_n"] \arrow[d, "d_n^X"'] & Y_n \arrow[d, "d_n^Y"] \\ X_{n-1} \arrow[r, "f_{n-1}"'] & Y_{n-1} \end{tikzcd}$$

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 $f_*, g_* : X_* \to Y_*$ be two morphisms, we say they are homotopic $f_* \sim g_*$ if there exists $h_* : X_* \to Y_{*+1}$ such that the following holds:

$$\begin{tikzcd} \cdots \arrow[r] & X_{n+1} \arrow[r, "d_{n+1}^X"] \arrow[d, shift right, "f_{n+1}"'] \arrow[d, shift left, "g_{n+1}"] & X_n \arrow[r, "d_n^X"] \arrow[d, shift right, "f_n"'] \arrow[d, shift left, "g_n"] \arrow[dl, "h_n"] & X_{n-1} \arrow[r] \arrow[d, shift right, "f_{n-1}"'] \arrow[d, shift left, "g_{n-1}"] \arrow[dl, "h_{n-1}"] & \cdots \\ \cdots \arrow[r] & Y_{n+1} \arrow[r, "d_{n+1}^Y"'] & X_n \arrow[r, "d_n^Y"'] & Y_{n-1} \arrow[r] & \cdots \end{tikzcd}$$

such that for all n, $h_n : X_n \to Y_{n+1}$ 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 $H_n(X_*) = \ker(d_n)/\operatorname{im}(d_{n+1})$ 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 $f_* : X_* \to Y_*$ there is the commutative diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd} \cdots \arrow[r] & X_{n+1} \arrow[r, "d_{n+1}^X"] \arrow[d, "f_{n+1}"'] & X_n \arrow[r, "d_n^X"] \arrow[d, "f_n"'] & X_{n-1} \arrow[r] \arrow[d, "f_{n-1}"'] & \cdots \\ \cdots \arrow[r] & Y_{n+1} \arrow[r, "d_{n+1}^Y"'] & X_n \arrow[r, "d_n^Y"'] & Y_{n-1} \arrow[r] & \cdots \end{tikzcd}$$

Homology is a functor, therefore $H_n(f_*) : H_n(X_*) \to H_n(Y_*)$ is a morphism as well, given by

$$\begin{aligned} H_n(f_*) : H_n(X_*) &\to H_n(Y_*) \\ \bar{x} &\mapsto \overline{f_n(x)} \end{aligned}$$

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:

$$\begin{array}{ccccccccc}
0 & \longrightarrow & X_{n+1} & \longrightarrow & Y_{n+1} & \longrightarrow & Z_{n+1} & \longrightarrow & 0 \\
 & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \\
0 & \longrightarrow & X_n & \longrightarrow & Y_n & \longrightarrow & Z_n & \longrightarrow & 0 \\
 & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \\
0 & \longrightarrow & X_{n-1} & \longrightarrow & Y_{n-1} & \longrightarrow & Z_{n-1} & \longrightarrow & 0
\end{array}$$

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 $\partial_n : H_n(Z_*) \to H_{n-1}(X_*)$ 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. □

Exercise 6.6. Given two exact sequence of chain complexes

$$\begin{array}{ccccccccc}
\cdots & \longrightarrow & X_* & \xrightarrow{f_*} & Y_* & \xrightarrow{g_*} & Z_* & \longrightarrow & \cdots \\
 & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle \alpha_*} & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle \beta_*} & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle \gamma_*} & & \\
\cdots & \longrightarrow & X'_* & \xrightarrow[h_*]{} & Y'_* & \xrightarrow[k_*]{} & Z'_* & \longrightarrow & \cdots
\end{array}$$

one can show the functoriality of connecting homomorphisms ∂_n's. We have a commutative diagram of long exact sequences

$$\begin{array}{ccccccccccccc}
\cdots & \longrightarrow & H_{n+1}(Z_*) & \xrightarrow{\partial_{n+1}} & H_n(X_*) & \xrightarrow{H_n(f_*)} & H_n(Y_*) & \xrightarrow{H_n(g_*)} & H_n(Z_*) & \xrightarrow{\partial_n} & H_{n-1}(X) & \longrightarrow & \cdots \\
 & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle H_{n+1}(\gamma_*)} & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle H_n(\alpha_*)} & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle H_n(\beta_*)} & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle H_n(\gamma_*)} & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle H_{n-1}(\alpha_*)} & & \\
\cdots & \longrightarrow & H_{n+1}(Z'_*) & \xrightarrow{\partial_{n+1}} & H_n(X'_*) & \xrightarrow{H_n(f_*)} & H_n(Y'_*) & \xrightarrow{H_n(g_*)} & H_n(Z'_*) & \xrightarrow{\partial_n} & H_{n-1}(X) & \longrightarrow & \cdots
\end{array}$$

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

$$0 \longrightarrow \mathrm{Hom}(P, M') \longrightarrow \mathrm{Hom}(P, M) \longrightarrow \mathrm{Hom}(P, M'') \longrightarrow 0$$

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 $\varphi : F \to P$. Therefore we have a diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd} & P \arrow[dl, dashed, "\alpha"'] \arrow[d, equal] & \\ F \arrow[r, "\varphi"'] & P \arrow[r] & 0 \end{tikzcd}$$

Since P is projective, then $\mathrm{Hom}(P, F) \to \mathrm{Hom}(P, P)$ is onto, therefore for the identity map in $\mathrm{Hom}(P, P)$, we lift to $\alpha \in \mathrm{Hom}(P, F)$. By definition, this means $\mathrm{id} = \varphi \circ \alpha$.

Exercise 6.11. Suppose

$$M \xrightarrow{f} N \xrightarrow{g} M$$

where $g \circ f$ is an isomorphism on M, then $N = \ker(g) \oplus \mathrm{im}(f)$.

Hence P is a direct summand of F. $\square$

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 $\varphi : R^3 \to R$ 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/Quillen–Suslin theorem)**.** Let k be a field, then any finitely-generated 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. This is currently known as Quillen–Suslin theorem.

Remark 6.15 (Bass-Quillen Conjecture)**.** Suppose A is a regular ring, and suppose P is a finitely-generated $A[t_1, \dots, t_n]$-module, then P is extended from A, that is, there exists isomorphism $P \cong P_0 \otimes_A A[t_1, \dots, t_n]$ where we have $P_0 \cong P/(t_1, \dots, t_n)P$.

Definition 6.16 (Projective Resolutions)**.** Let M be an A-module, consider $(P_*, d_*)_{n \geqslant 0}$ as a complex of projective modules with an augmentation map $\varepsilon : P_0 \to M$ 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 6.17. 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 $\eta_1 : F_1 \to S_1$, therefore by composition we have $d_1 : F_1 \to F_0$. Continue inductively, we have a projective resolution, and in fact this is a free resolution.

$$\begin{tikzcd} \cdots \arrow[r] & F_2 \arrow[r, "d_2"] \arrow[d, "\eta_2"'] & F_1 \arrow[r, "d_1"] \arrow[d, "\eta_1"'] & F_0 \arrow[r, "\varepsilon"] & M \arrow[r] & 0 \\ & S_2 = \ker(\eta_1) \arrow[ur] & S_1 = \ker(\varepsilon) \arrow[ur] & & & \end{tikzcd}$$

In particular, we say S_i is the ith syzygy of M.

Example 6.18. Let A be Noetherian and M be a finitely-generated A-module, then all F_i's in Remark 6.17 are finitely-generated free modules.

Lemma 6.19. 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 $f : M \to M'$, then there exists $f_* : P_* \to P'_*$ such that the diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd} P_* \arrow[r, "f_*"] \arrow[d] & P'_* \arrow[d] \\ M \arrow[r, "f"'] & M' \end{tikzcd}$$

commutes.

Proof. We want to build

$$\begin{tikzcd} \cdots \arrow[r] & P_2 \arrow[r, "d_2"] \arrow[d, dashed, "f_2"] & P_1 \arrow[r, "d_1"] \arrow[d, dashed, "f_1"] & P_0 \arrow[r, "\varepsilon"] \arrow[d, dashed, "f_0"] & M \arrow[r] \arrow[d, "f"] & 0 \\ \cdots \arrow[r] & P'_2 \arrow[r, "d'_2"'] & P'_1 \arrow[r, "d'_1"'] & P'_0 \arrow[r, "\varepsilon'"'] & M' \arrow[r] & 0 \end{tikzcd}$$

Consider

$$\begin{tikzcd} & P_0 \arrow[dl, dashed, "f_0"'] \arrow[d, "f \circ \varepsilon"] & \\ P_0 \arrow[r, "\varepsilon'"'] & M' \arrow[r] & 0 \end{tikzcd}$$

then since P_0 is projective and ε' is onto, then there exists $f_0 : P_0 \to P'_0$ such that the diagram commutes. Now by commutativity we have $\varepsilon'_0 f_0 \circ d_1 = f_0 \varepsilon d_1$, but $\varepsilon_0 d_1 = 0$, therefore $f_0 d_1 \in \ker(\varepsilon')$. But now we look at

$$\begin{tikzcd} & P_1 \arrow[dl, dashed, "f_1"'] \arrow[d, "f_0 \circ d_1"] & \\ P'_1 \arrow[r] & \ker(\varepsilon') \arrow[r] & 0 \end{tikzcd}$$

then since P_1 is projective, there exists $f_1 : P_1 \to P'_1$ such that $d'_1 \circ f_1 = f_0 \circ d_1$ as well. Similarly, we have $f_0 \circ d_1 \circ d_2 = d'_1 \circ f_1 \circ d_2$, but $d_1 \circ d_2 = 0$, therefore $d'_1 \circ f_1 \circ d_2 = 0$. Now $\mathrm{im}(f_1 \circ d_2) \subseteq \ker(d'_1)$, so we look at

$$\begin{tikzcd} & P_2 \arrow[dl, dashed, "f_2"'] \arrow[d, "f_1 \circ d_2"] & \\ P'_2 \arrow[r] & \ker(d'_1) \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & 0 \\ & \mathrm{im}(d'_2) & \end{tikzcd}$$

and again since P_2 is projective there exists f_2 such that $f_2 \circ d_2 = f_1 \circ d_2$. We can then proceed inductively. $\square$

Proposition 6.20. Any two lifts $f_*, g_* : P_* \to P'_*$ of $f :\to M'$ are homotopic, i.e., given

$$\begin{tikzcd} P_* \arrow[r] \arrow[d, shift right, "f_*"'] \arrow[d, shift left, "g_*"] & M \arrow[r] \arrow[d, "f"] & 0 \\ P'_* \arrow[r] & M' \arrow[r] & 0 \end{tikzcd}$$

then $f_* \sim g_*$.

Proof. We look at

$$\begin{tikzcd} \cdots \arrow[r] & P_2 \arrow[r, "d_2"] \arrow[d, dashed, shift right, "g_2"'] \arrow[d, shift left, "f_2"] & P_1 \arrow[r, "d_1"] \arrow[d, shift right, "g_1"'] \arrow[d, shift left, "f_1"] & P_0 \arrow[r, "\varepsilon"] \arrow[d, shift right, "g_0"'] \arrow[d, shift left, "f_0"] & M \arrow[r] \arrow[d, shift right, "g"'] \arrow[d, shift left, "f"] & 0 \\ \cdots \arrow[r] & P'_2 \arrow[r, "d'_2"'] & P'_1 \arrow[r, "d'_1"'] & P'_0 \arrow[r, "\varepsilon'"'] & M' \arrow[r] & 0 \end{tikzcd}$$

then for all n we have $d'_n \circ f_n = f_{n-1} \circ d_n$ and $d'_n \circ g_n = g_{n-1} \circ d_n$, and $f\varepsilon = \varepsilon' g_0 = \varepsilon' f_0$, therefore $\varepsilon' \circ (f_0 - g_0) = 0$, therefore $\operatorname{im}(f_0 - g_0) \in \ker(\varepsilon') = \operatorname{im}(d'_1)$. Now look at the diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd} & P_0 \arrow[dl, dashed, "h_0"'] \arrow[d, "f_0-g_0"] & \\ P'_1 \arrow[r] & \ker(\varepsilon') \arrow[r] & 0 \end{tikzcd}$$

then there exists $h_0 : P_0 \to P'_1$ such that $d'_1 \circ h_0 = f_0 - g_0$. We proceed inductively. Suppose we know how to lift the $(n-1)$th projective module, giving $h_{n-1} : P_{n-1} \to P'_n$, then we have $f_{n-1} - g_{n-1} = d'_n \circ h_{n-1} + h_{n-2} \circ d_{n-1}$, now

$$\begin{aligned} d'_n \circ (f_n - g_n - h_{n-1} - d_n) &= d'_n \circ (f_n - g_n) - d'_n \circ h_{n-1} \circ d_n \\ &= f_{n-1} \circ d_n - g_{n-1} \circ d_n - (f_n - g_{n-1} - h_{n-2} \circ d_{n-1}) \circ d_n \\ &= h_{n-2} \circ d_{n-1} \circ d_n \\ &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

This shows that $\operatorname{im}(f_n - g_n - h_{n-1} \circ d_n) \in \ker(d'_n) = \operatorname{im}(d'_{n-1})$, therefore

$$\begin{tikzcd} & P_n \arrow[dl, dashed, "h_n"'] \arrow[d, "f_n-g_n-h_{n-1}d_n"] & \\ P'_{n+1} \arrow[r] & \ker(d'_n) = \operatorname{im}(d'_{n+1}) \arrow[r] & 0 \end{tikzcd}$$

and since $P_{n+1} \to \ker(d'_n)$ is onto, then this lifts to $h_n : P_n \to P'_{n+1}$ such that $f_n - g_n = d'_{n+1} \circ h_n + h_{n-1} \circ d_n$. $\square$

Proposition 6.21. Suppose

$$0 \longrightarrow M' \xrightarrow{f} M \xrightarrow{g} M'' \longrightarrow 0$$

is exact, then given a projective resolution (P'_*, ε') of M' and (P''_*, ε'') of M'', therefore exists a projective resolution (P_*, ε) of M such that

$$0 \longrightarrow P'_* \longrightarrow P_* \longrightarrow P''_* \longrightarrow 0$$

is exact, and

$$\begin{tikzcd} 0 \arrow[r] & P'_* \arrow[r] \arrow[d, "\varepsilon'"'] & P_* \arrow[r] \arrow[d, "\varepsilon"] & P''_* \arrow[r] \arrow[d, "\varepsilon''"] & 0 \\ 0 \arrow[r] & M' \arrow[r] & M \arrow[r] & M'' \arrow[r] & 0 \end{tikzcd}$$

commutes.

Proof. Take $P_n = P'_n \oplus P''_n$ for all n, and we want to define $d_n : P_n \to P_{n-1}$. Note that the obvious direct sum does not make it a resolution. (This would only work if the exact sequence of modules is split.)

Remark 6.22. If we take a vector bundle E over X, then take the sections Γ of the form $X \to E$, then this gives a projective module over X, but does not give a splitting.

We start at the zeroth level. Consider

$$\begin{tikzcd} 0 \arrow[r] & P'_0 \arrow[r] \arrow[d, "\varepsilon'"'] & P_0 = P'_0 \oplus P''_0 \arrow[r] \arrow[d, dashed, "\varepsilon"] & P''_0 \arrow[r] \arrow[d, "\varepsilon''"] \arrow[dl, dashed, "k_0"] & 0 \\ 0 \arrow[r] & M' \arrow[r, "f"'] & M \arrow[r, "g"'] & M'' \arrow[r] & 0 \end{tikzcd}$$

Because g is onto, then there exists $k_0 : P_0'' \to M$ such that $g \circ k_0 = \varepsilon''$. We define $\varepsilon : P_0 \to M$ by $\varepsilon(x_0, x_0'') = f_0\varepsilon'(x_0') + k_0(x_0'')$. Now consider

$$\begin{tikzcd}
0 \arrow[r] & P_1' \arrow[r] \arrow[d, "d_1'"'] & P_1 = P_1' \oplus P_1'' \arrow[r] \arrow[d, dashed, "d_1"] & P_1'' \arrow[r] \arrow[d, "d_1''"] & 0 \\
0 \arrow[r] & P_0' \arrow[r] \arrow[d, "\varepsilon'"'] & P_0 = P_0' \oplus P_0'' \arrow[r] \arrow[d, "\varepsilon"] & P_0'' \arrow[r] \arrow[d, "\varepsilon''"] \arrow[dl, "k_0"] & 0 \\
0 \arrow[r] & M' \arrow[r, "f"'] & M \arrow[r, "g"'] & M'' \arrow[r] & 0
\end{tikzcd}$$

then $g \circ k_0 \circ d_1''\varepsilon'' \circ d_1'' = 0$, therefore $k \circ d_1'' \in \ker(g) = \operatorname{im}(f)$, now since $P_0 \to M$ is onto, and since P_1' is projective, so there exists a lift $k_1 : P_1' \to P_0'$.

$$\begin{tikzcd}
P_1' \arrow[d, dashed, "k_1"'] \arrow[dr, "k_0 \circ d_1''"] & & \\
P_0' \arrow[r] & M \arrow[r] & 0
\end{tikzcd}$$

We choose k_1 to be such that $k_0 \circ d_1'' + d_0' \circ k_1 = 0$. Now we define

$$\begin{aligned}
d_1 : P_1' \oplus P_1'' &\to P_0' \oplus P_0'' \\
(x_1', x_1'') &\mapsto (d_1'(x_1') + k_1(x_1''), d_1(x_1'')).
\end{aligned}$$

Proceeding inductively, we have $k_{n-1} : P_{n-1}'' \to P_{n-2}'$, so we define $d_{n-1} : P_{n-1} \to P_{n-2}$ such that $d_{n-2} \circ k_{n-1} + k_{n-2} \circ d_{n-1}'' = 0$. To construct d_n, we lift $k_n : P_n'' \to P_{n-1}'$ from $P_{n-1}' \to P_{n-2}' \to P_{n-3}'$: one can check that $d_{n-2}' \circ k_{n-1} \circ d_n'' = 0$, so $k_{n-1} \circ d_n'' \in \ker(d_{n-2}') = \operatorname{im}(d_{n-1}')$, so we have

$$\begin{tikzcd}
 & P_n'' \arrow[dl, dashed, "k_n"'] \arrow[d, "k_{n-1} \circ d_n''"] & \\
P_{n-1}' \arrow[r] & \operatorname{im}(P_{n-1}') \arrow[r] & 0
\end{tikzcd}$$

and by the usual argument we lift to $k_n : P_n'' \to P_{n-1}'$ such that $k_n \circ d_{n-1}' + k_{n-1} \circ d_n'' = 0$, now define

$$\begin{aligned}
d_n : P_n &\to P_{n-1} \\
(x_n', x_n'') &\mapsto (d_n(x_n') + k_n(x_n''), d_n''(x_n''))
\end{aligned}$$

One should check that (P_*, d_*) is exact via the construction above, i.e., $(P_*, \varepsilon) \to M$ is a projective resolution. ☐

Definition 6.23. Given exact sequences

$$0 \longrightarrow M' \longrightarrow M \longrightarrow M'' \longrightarrow 0$$

and suppose the projective resolution

$$0 \longrightarrow P_*' \longrightarrow P_* \longrightarrow P_*'' \longrightarrow 0$$

is constructed as in Proposition 6.21, we say this is a projected resolution of exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow M' \longrightarrow M \longrightarrow M'' \longrightarrow 0$$

Exercise 6.24. Suppose

$$\begin{tikzcd}
0 \arrow[r] & M' \arrow[r, "f"] \arrow[d, "\alpha"'] & M \arrow[r, "g"] \arrow[d, "\beta"] & M'' \arrow[r] \arrow[d, "\gamma"] & 0 \\
0 \arrow[r] & N' \arrow[r, "p"'] & N \arrow[r, "q"'] & N'' \arrow[r] & 0
\end{tikzcd}$$

and let

$$0 \longrightarrow P'_* \xrightarrow{f_*} P_* \xrightarrow{g_*} P''_* \longrightarrow 0$$

be a projective resolution of

$$0 \longrightarrow M' \longrightarrow M \longrightarrow M'' \longrightarrow 0$$

and let

$$0 \longrightarrow Q'_* \xrightarrow{p_*} Q_* \xrightarrow{g_*} Q''_* \longrightarrow 0$$

be a projective resolution of

$$0 \longrightarrow N' \longrightarrow N \longrightarrow N'' \longrightarrow 0$$

Suppose we have

$$\begin{tikzcd}
0 \arrow[r] & P'_* \arrow[r, "f_*"] \arrow[d, "\alpha_*"'] & P_* \arrow[r, "g_*"] \arrow[d, dashed, "\beta_*"] & P''_* \arrow[r] \arrow[d, "\gamma_*"] & 0 \\
0 \arrow[r] & Q'_* \arrow[r, "p_*"'] & Q_* \arrow[r, "g_*"'] & Q''_* \arrow[r] & 0
\end{tikzcd}$$

Show that there exists $\beta_* : P_* \to Q_*$ such that the diagram above commutes.
Hint: draw boxes one above another.

Dually, we can derive injective resolutions.

6.3 Tor and Ext Functors

Definition 6.25 (Tor Functor)**.** Let A be a commutative ring and M and N be two A-modules. Suppose (P_*, ε) is a projective resolution of M, then we have an exact sequence

$$\cdots \longrightarrow P_1 \longrightarrow P_0 \longrightarrow M \longrightarrow 0$$

Tensoring with N, we have

$$\cdots \longrightarrow P_1 \otimes N \longrightarrow P_0 \otimes N \longrightarrow M \otimes N \longrightarrow 0$$

Now consider the homology $H_n(P_* \otimes N) = \ker(d_n \otimes \mathbb{1}_N)/\operatorname{im}(d_{n+1} \otimes \mathbb{1}_N)$, this is called the nth Tor functor, denoted $\operatorname{Tor}_n^A(M, N)$.

Remark 6.26.

1. Suppose $f : M \to M'$ is a map, then this induces a map $\operatorname{Tor}_n^A(M, N) \to \operatorname{Tor}_n^A(M', N)$ for all n.
2. Suppose we have a diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd}
P_* \arrow[r, "\varepsilon"] \arrow[d, "f_*"'] & M \arrow[d, "f"] \\
P'_* \arrow[r, "\varepsilon'"'] & M
\end{tikzcd}$$

   then by tensoring $P_* \to P'_*$ by N, i.e., apply $f_* \otimes \mathrm{id}_N$, then we induce $\operatorname{Tor}_n^A(M, N) \to \operatorname{Tor}_n^A(M', N)$. Although the lift is not unique, but they are all homotopic, which means the induced map is unique.
3. Suppose $\alpha_* : P_* \to P'_*$ and $\beta_* : P'_* \to P_*$ lift identity id_{P_*},

$$\begin{tikzcd}
P_* \arrow[r] \arrow[d, "\alpha_*"'] & M \arrow[r] \arrow[d, equal] & 0 \\
Q_* \arrow[r] \arrow[d, "\beta_*"'] & M \arrow[d, equal] & \\
P_* \arrow[r] & M &
\end{tikzcd}$$

that is, $\beta_*\alpha_* \sim \mathrm{id}$ and $\alpha_*\beta_* \sim \mathrm{id}$, then this induces the compositions

$$H_n(P_* \otimes N) \longrightarrow H_n(Q_* \otimes N) \longrightarrow H_n(P_* \otimes N)$$

and

$$H_n(Q_* \otimes N) \longrightarrow H_n(P_* \otimes N) \longrightarrow H_n(Q_* \otimes N)$$

to be the identity map. Therefore, $H_n(P_* \otimes N) \cong H_*(Q_* \otimes N)$ for all n.

4. $\mathrm{Tor}_0^A(M, N) = (P_0 \otimes N)/\operatorname{im}(P_1 \otimes N) = M \otimes_A N$.
5. Suppose we have an exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow M' \longrightarrow M \longrightarrow M'' \longrightarrow 0$$

and a module N, then there exists a long exact sequence of Tor-modules, given by

$$\cdots \longrightarrow \mathrm{Tor}_{n+1}^A(M'', N) \xrightarrow{d_{n+1}} \mathrm{Tor}_n^A(M', N) \longrightarrow \mathrm{Tor}_n^A(M, N) \longrightarrow \mathrm{Tor}_n^A(M'', N) \xrightarrow{d_n} \cdots$$

$$\longrightarrow \mathrm{Tor}_1^A(M'', N) \longrightarrow M' \otimes N \longrightarrow M \otimes N \longrightarrow M'' \otimes N \longrightarrow 0$$

To see this,

$$0 \longrightarrow P'_* \longrightarrow P_* \longrightarrow P''_* \longrightarrow 0$$

is an exact sequence of

$$0 \longrightarrow M' \longrightarrow M \longrightarrow M'' \longrightarrow 0$$

then

$$0 \longrightarrow P'_* \otimes N \longrightarrow P_* \otimes N \longrightarrow P''_* \otimes N \longrightarrow 0$$

is exact as well. Taking the homology, we get the required long exact sequence.

6. Suppose we have a short exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow N' \longrightarrow N \longrightarrow N'' \longrightarrow 0$$

of A-modules, then we have a long exact sequence of Tor-modules, given by

$$\cdots \longrightarrow \mathrm{Tor}_{n+1}^A(M, N'') \longrightarrow \mathrm{Tor}_n^A(M, N') \longrightarrow \mathrm{Tor}_n^A(M, N) \longrightarrow \mathrm{Tor}_n^A(M, N\text{”}') \longrightarrow \cdots$$

To see this, consider a projective resolution

$$P_* \longrightarrow M \longrightarrow 0$$

of M, then

$$0 \longrightarrow P_* \otimes N' \longrightarrow P_* \otimes N \longrightarrow P_* \otimes N'' \longrightarrow 0$$

is exact, and similarly, take the homology and get the long exact sequence, as desired.

7. $\mathrm{Tor}_n^A(M, N) = 0$ for $n > 0$ if M or N is flat. To see this, take a projective resolution

$$P_* \longrightarrow M \longrightarrow 0$$

and suppose N is A-flat, then

$$P_* \otimes N \longrightarrow M \otimes N \longrightarrow 0$$

is also exact, therefore $\mathrm{Tor}_n^A(M,N)=0$ for all $n>0$. Suppose M is flat, then we consider

$$\begin{tikzcd}
\cdots \arrow[r] & P_2 \arrow[r, "d_2"] \arrow[d, "\eta_2"'] & P_1 \arrow[r, "d_1"] \arrow[d, "\eta_1"'] & P_0 \arrow[r, "\varepsilon"] & M \arrow[r] & 0 \\
& S_2=\ker(\eta_1) \arrow[ur] & S_1=\ker(\varepsilon) \arrow[ur] & & &
\end{tikzcd}$$

and since M is flat and P_0 is flat, then S_1 is flat, and tensoring N is flat for the short exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow S_1 \longrightarrow P_0 \longrightarrow M \longrightarrow 0$$

gives another short exact sequence, and similarly

$$0 \longrightarrow S_2 \longrightarrow P_1 \longrightarrow S_1 \longrightarrow 0$$

is a short exact sequence. Again, since S_1 is flat and P_1 is flat, then S_2 is flat, and tensoring with N is still exact on the short exact sequence above, therefore

$$P_1\otimes N \longrightarrow M\otimes N \longrightarrow 0$$

is exact as well, therefore $\mathrm{Tor}_n^A(M,N)=0$ for all n, proceeding by induction.

8. $\mathrm{Tor}_n^A(M,N)\cong\mathrm{Tor}_n^A(N,M)$ for all $n\geqslant 0$. Suppose $n=0$, then we have an obvious isomorphism

$$\begin{aligned} M\otimes_A N &\cong N\otimes_A M \\ x\otimes y &\mapsto y\otimes x \end{aligned}$$

We proceed by induction on n, and consider the short exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow T \longrightarrow F \xrightarrow{\eta} M \longrightarrow 0$$

where F is a free module, then η is a surjection, so $\mathrm{Tor}_i^A(F,N)=0=\mathrm{Tor}_i^A(N,F)$ for all $i>0$. By the long exact sequence of Tor, whenever $n>1$, we have $\mathrm{Tor}_n^A(M,N)\cong\mathrm{Tor}_{n-1}^A(T,N)$, and $\mathrm{Tor}_n^A(N,M)\cong\mathrm{Tor}_{n-1}^A(N,T)$, but by induction we know $\mathrm{Tor}_{n-1}^A(T,N)\cong\mathrm{Tor}_{n-1}^A(N,T)$, so this means $\mathrm{Tor}_n^A(M,N)\cong\mathrm{Tor}_n^A(N,M)$. For $n=1$, we have exact sequences

$$\begin{tikzcd}
0 \arrow[r] & \mathrm{Tor}_1^A(M,N) \arrow[r] \arrow[d, dashed] & T\otimes N \arrow[r] \arrow[d, "\cong"] & F\otimes N \arrow[r] \arrow[d, "\cong"] & M\otimes N \arrow[r] \arrow[d, "\cong"] & 0 \\
0 \arrow[r] & \mathrm{Tor}_1^A(N,M) \arrow[r] & N\otimes T \arrow[r] & N\otimes F \arrow[r] & N\otimes M \arrow[r] & 0
\end{tikzcd}$$

and this forces $\mathrm{Tor}_1^A(M,N)\cong\mathrm{Tor}_1^A(N,M)$.

Index

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.