A new trend in research in multiplicative ideal theory

Muhammad Zafrullah

Dedicated to the memory of above board Mathematics

Abstract. This is about a paper, "Unique factorization property of non-unique factorization domains, II", By G.W. Chang and A. Reinhart that appeared in [J. Pure Appl. Algebra 224 (12) (2020), 106430]. The topic was of interest to me in that I had started the study of non UFDs with the unique factorization property in my doctoral dissertation, in 1974. It appears the authors were after my work, without giving me any credit.

Some time ago I came across a paper by the title, "Unique factorization property of non-unique factorization domains, II", By G.W. Chang and A. Reinhart and it had appeared in [J. Pure Appl. Algebra 224 (12) (2020), 106430]. The topic was of interest to me in that I had started the study of non UFDs with the unique factorization property in my doctoral dissertation that I submitted to the University of London in 1974:

https://ethos.bl.uk/OrderDetails.do?uin=uk.bl.ethos.704293

Reading the paper, I got the distinct feeling, as I explain below, that in the next paper the authors would say something that would allow them to claim to be the ones who started the topic. So I wrote a response, included below, and sent it to the editor, Srikanth Iyengar, who had handled the above mentioned paper, by Chang and Reinhart. In his response to my submission, included below, he refused to accept that my comments had any value, for his intended audience. Now I ask, "Is redoing the work of a not so popular person without due credit, the real Modern day Mathematics?

It would be helpful here if the reader is familiar with the language of star operations used in [**15**] and description of it. While the relevant information is available below in Section 1, (the appendix), we repeat some of it here: Let D be an integral domain with quotient field K and let $F(D)$ be the set of nonzero fractional ideals of D. For $I \in F(D)$, the set $I^{-1} = \{x \in K | xI \subseteq D\}$ is again a fractional ideal and thus the relation v: $I \mapsto I_v$ is a function on $F(D)$. This function is called the v-operation on D. Similarly the relation t: $I \mapsto I_t = \cup\{F_v | \ 0 \neq F$ is a finitely generated subideal of $I\}$ is a function on $F(D)$ and is called the t-operation on D. These are examples of the so called star operations. The reader may consult

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 13A05, 13F15; Secondary 13G05.
Key words and phrases. Unique factorization, rigid, semirigid, GCD.
I thank my "friends" who taught me lessons my enemies couldn't.

Jesse Elliott's book [**16**], for these operations. A fractional ideal I is called a v-ideal (resp. a t-ideal) if $I_v = I$ (resp., $I_t = I$). The rather peculiar definition of the t-operation allows one to use Zorn's Lemma to prove that each integral domain that is not a field has at least one integral t-ideal maximal among integral t-ideals. This maximal t-ideal is prime and every proper, integral t-ideal is contained in at least one maximal t-ideal. A minimal prime of a t-ideal is a t-ideal and thus every height one prime is a t-ideal. The set of all maximal t-ideals of a domain D is denoted by $t\text{-}Max(D)$. It can be shown that $D = \cap_{M \in t\text{-}Max(D)} D_M$. Finally D is said to be of t-dimension one if each member of $t\text{-}Max(D)$ is of height one. A fractional ideal I in $F(D)$ is t-invertible if $(II^{-1})_t = D$. Also, given $I, J \in F(D)$ $(IJ)_t = (I_tJ)_t = (I_tJ_t)_t$ is called t-multiplication.

Briefly, here's what I took away from [**15**].

A nonzero non unit a of D is called a valuation element if there is a valuation ring V with $D \subseteq V \subseteq K$ such that $aV \cap D = aD$. Call D a valuation factorization domain(VFD) if each nonzero non unit of D can be written as a finite product of valuation elements. The authors of the paper [**15**] promise to study the ring-theoretic properties of VFDs.

Relevant parts of Proposition 1.1 of [**15**] say: "Let D be an integral domain, let D' be an overring of D and let $a, b \in D$ be such that $a \neq 0$ and $aD \cap D = aD$.

(1) If $bD' \cap D = bD$, then $abD \cap D = abD$. (2) If$b|_D a$, then $bD \cap D = bD$."

Next, relevant part of Corollary 1.2 of the same paper, [**15**], says: "Let D be an integral domain and let $a \in D$ be a valuation element. (2) Each two principal ideals of D that contain a are comparable."

Based on the above two results and some other results, the authors amass quite a few properties of VFDs, such as a VFD is integrally closed and that a VFD is a so called Schreier domain. Then they decide to look into VFDs with t-dimension one. It turns out that, according to Corollary 1.9, of their paper: Let D be an integral domain that is not a field. Then D is a VFD with $t\text{-}dim(D) = 1$ if and only if D is a weakly factorial GCD-domain.

Well, it so happens that Theorem 10 of [**3**] lists fourteen equivalent conditions to characterize the domains that they dismiss without adequate description, in an effort to hide the fact that there were once serious studies of "Unique factorization property of non-unique factorization domains", called GUFDs (generalized UFDs).

To make sure the readers know what I am talking about, I include below a copy of Theorem 10 of [**3**]. Readers may observe that condition (2) in the theorem below is exactly Corollary 1.9 of [**15**], only they have used a different reference in the proof, to serve their purposes.

THEOREM 1. *(Theorem 10 of* [**3**]*) For an integral domain D the following conditions are equivalent.*

(1) D is a GUFD.

(2) D is a weakly factorial GCD domain.

(3) D is a weakly factorial generalized Krull domain.

(4) D is a GCD domain and a generalized Krull domain.

(5) D is a generalized Krull domain with t-class group $Clt_t(D) = 0$.

(6) For each nonzero nonunit x of D, if P is a prime ideal minimal over (x), then D_p is a rank-one valuation domain and $(x)_P \cap D$ is principal.

(7) Every nonzero prime ideal contains a prime quantum.

(8) $D[X]$ is weakly factorial.

(9) $G(D)$ is lattice ordered and every convex, directed subgroup of $G(D)$ is a cardinal summand of $G(D)$.

(10) $G(D)$ is isomorphic to a direct sum $\oplus H_\lambda$ (with the product order) of subgroups H_λ of $(\mathbb{R},+)$.

(11) D is weakly factorial, and if p and q are primary elements belonging to the same prime, then $p|q$ or $q|p$.

(12) For every multiplicatively closed subset S of D, $D+XD_S[X]$ is a GCD domain.

(13) D is a semirigid GCD domain in which every rigid element satisfies Q_1.

(14) D is a GCD domain in which every nonzero nonunit is a finite product of rigid elements satisfying Q_1.

("GUFD" here refers to a, not necessarily atomic, domain each of whose nonzero nonunits is a finite product of prime power-like nonunit called "prime quanta" defined as follows. An element $q \in D\backslash\{0\}$ is called a prime quantum if the following hold.

Q_1. For every nonunit $r|q$ there exists a natural number n with $q|r^n$,

Q_2. For every natural number n, if $r,s|q^n$, then $r|s$ or $s|r$, and

Q_3. For every natural number n, each element t with $t|q^n$ has the property that if $t|ab$, then $t=t_1t_2$ where $t_1|a$ and $t_2|b$.

This is how a GUFD was defined in the first chapter of my doctoral thesis [**23**] where it was shown that in a GUFD a product of finitely many prime quanta could be uniquely expressed as a product of mutually coprime prime quanta and this is how it was defined and shown in [**3**]. Also $G(D)$ denotes the group of divisibility of D, while $Cl_t(D)$ denotes the quotient group $T(D)/P(D)$ where $T(D)$ is the group of t-invertible t-ideals under t-multiplication. Finally, $D+XD_S[X]=\{f \in D_S[X] | f(0) \in D\}$.)

Now imagine how it will feel if years of your hard work gets "adopted" by a couple of thugs with a flick of pen and with the aid of a bent referee and an uncaring (or possibly hostile) editor.

Then there's the "innocent" question (question 4.13) towards the end: Let D be a VFD. Is D a weakly Matlis GCD-domain?

The authors define a weakly Matlis domain as: (i) D is of finite t-character and (ii) D is independent, i.e., no two distinct maximal t-ideals of D contain a common nonzero prime ideal. (They don't mention that this concept was introduced in [**6**], perhaps to economize on citing my name.) Now as the GCD property is involved, a weakly Matlis GCD domain is just an independent GCD ring of Krull type. It was shown in Thorem 5 of Zafrullah [**24**] that a GCD domain each of whose nonzero non unit is expressible as a product of finitely many rigid elements was an independent ring of Krull type. But what is a rigid element? To see that, note that Part (2) of Corollary 1.2 can be translated into: "If a is a valuation element, then for all $x,y|a$ we have $x|y$ or $y|x$." Thus a valuation element is what was called a rigid element by P.M. Cohn in [**14**]. An element expressible as a product of finitely many rigid elements was termed as semirigid in my paper cited above.

Now let's go back to the original definition of a valuation element in the paper [**15**] and translate Proposition 1.1, taking D' to be a valuation domain. Then Part (1) of Proposition 1.1 says: The product of every pair of noncoprime valuation (i.e. rigid) elements is again a valuation element (i.e. a rigid element) and part (2) of Proposition 1.1 says that every non unit factor of a valuation element is a valuation element. Looking at it from this angle I wrote the response: "Comments on unique factorization in non-unique factorization domains" showing: Let D be an integral domain each of whose nonzero non-unit is semirigid. Then D is a semirigid GCD domain if and only if the product of every pair of non-v-coprime rigid elements of D is again a rigid element, [**29**]. I sent the response to S. Iyengar, the fellow who had handled [**15**]. This is what he told me about it:

Dear Professor Zafrullah,

This is about your submission “Comments on unique factorization in non-unique factorization domains”. I confess that I found it hard to discern what the main result of the paper is. The introduction and many parts of the paper come across as a commentary on the paper [14]. I do take your point that the authors of [14] missed key connections and earlier work on this topic. As you well know by now, the refereeing process is not infallible.

Nevertheless, I fear that the target audience of the JPAA (researchers in algebraic geometry, commutative algebra, algebraic topology, etc.) will find little to take away from the present work. For this reason, my opinion is that it does not meet the Aims and Scope of the JPAA. The paper would be a better fit in a journal focused on ring theory.

Respectfully,

Srikanth

Aims and Scope: The Journal of Pure and Applied Algebra
will concentrate on that part of algebra likely to be of general
mathematical interest: algebraic results with immediate applications,
and the development of algebraic theories of sufficiently general
relevance to allow for future applications.

Very respectful, very kind and very gentle, but totally missing the point. I had pointed out, in a round about way that the authors of [**15**] were trying to snatch my work, that originally appeared in my doctoral thesis. Of course, one of the immediate applications would be that folks would know that these two, the authors of [**15**] may not be trusted. Also, I have published in JPAA enough to know what its aims and scopes are. But I was not writing an ordinary paper, I was exposing a heist without indicating that the JPAA folks, especially the handling editor had been had by a couple of con-tricksters and the band of thugs behind them. In any case, that is all in the past. When I cooled down I rewrote [**29**] and submitted it to Journal of Algebra and Applications. Hopefully, this will appear as [**30**]. [https://doi.org/10.1142/S0219498822501614]. (A preprint of this paper is available at: https://lohar.com/researchpdf/semirigid%208%20web.pdf) In this paper, it was gently pointed out that the notions introduced as "new", in [**15**], had already been studied, in my thesis [**23**] and given in it ([**30**]) was a stronger, yet open, alternative to their ploy. Not so gently, I wrote https://lohar.com/mithelpdesk/hd2004.pdf exposing the culture of changing the terminology an recycling old results as new. Now it is up to the authors and their supporters to produce a single example of a VFD, that is not a Semirigid GCD domain, to refute the claim that this paper, [**15**], is an elaborate fraud.

Now what is the point of all this? I have written [**30**] and I have published https://lohar.com/mithelpdesk/hd2004.pdf what else do I want? I want to know the reasons and the folks behind this attempted heist, as these two, Chang and Reinhart do not seem capable of pulling off such a trick. Now one of the tricks some multiplicative ideal theorists use is teach their students to do purpose referencing. That is reference only friendly folks, even if you have to bend the truth. So I want journals to announce that in case of a priority dispute the name of the referee will be disclosed and I want JPAA, in particular to disclose the name of the referee and of course I want the JPAA Editorial board to indicate that the results included in [**15**] were an attempted redo, without due reference, of notions that had been studied in my thesis. Also, I want journals to allocate funds to making sure that all submitted papers are sent to at least two referees. My reason here is that usually those folks become editors who have convinced a select class of folks that they have excelled in their fields. Sadly excelling in some fields simply means being a good rote and regurgitating machine; it feels bad to be summarily executed by someone who does not quite know what is being said, just because yours is an unpopular name. Finally I want teachers and supervisors to tell their students that if you steal from someone and he becomes crazy, after years of similar abuse, like Muhammad Zafrullah, he/she will drag you and your teachers all over the globe. I wouldn't be writing this, if it weren't for these two.

This brings me to the teachers. Graz shot to fame in Multiplicative Ideal Theory when Franz Halter-Koch wrote "Ideal Systems. An Introduction to Ideal Theory", [**22**]. In this book he used monoids that looked just like the multiplicative monoiod of an integral domain and, with the help of already known techniques used for commutative monoids by authors like Gilmer [**19**] and the notions of ideal systems translated all that was available in Multiplicative Ideal Theory, including a lot of my work. Luckily Dan Anderson who was the (author designated) referee, listened to me and made Halter-Koch include clear references to where he got the ideas from. (While all this was happening, I was going through a difficult period of time: https://loharcom.wordpress.com/2020/09/21/my-vagabond-days-2/).

Since that book the Grazians have bought the right to translate into the language of monoids whatever they fancy in Multiplicative Ideal Theory. I have often seen papers by Grazians on class groups without any reference to the fact that it was a notion introduced for integral domains in [**11**], at my suggestion. (The Grazians have often tried to spread the misconception that studying cancellative monoids was Halter-Koch's idea though they forget that [**19**] had already introduced the v and t-ideals in monoids. Yet, after Dan and I published work on a slightly different kind of unique factorization (see e.g. [**7**] and [**28**]) where the elements do not have to be cancellative, they have started shifting positions. Now you would find statements like: Throughout, a monoid means a commutative unit-cancellative semigroup with identity element.

When your "research" is based on what goes on in other fields, confusion and incredulity is your lot. This to me explains Reinhart. Though the story does not end here. After writing [**22**] Halter-Koch started demanding that all papers in multiplicative ideal theory should reference [**22**]. I heard Scott Chapman bleat about it and decided to do something. As part of my response to Halter-Koch I wrote A question/Answer session on v-domains

(https://lohar.com/researchpdf/QA_session_on_v_domains.pdf)

which appeared as [**17**], later. On the monoid side I convinced Marco Fontana to join in writing [**18**], where it was established with simple examples that there are results in multiplicative ideal theory that cannot be proved using monoids alone. While it effectively put a stopper on Halter-Koch's demands, it angered a lot of "powerful" monoid theorists. I invite those folks to check if I care. (I dearly hope that this did not affect Marco much.)

Next let's look up Chang's end. While Dan Anderson has often helped me by agreeing to write papers with me, he has often helped his students with material that he's worked on with me or just letting them lift results from my pre-prints. I tolerated it as a kind of necessary evil. It is like this you see certain herons nest close to where the bald eagles nest. For while a bald eagle will occasionally make a meal of one of their chicks, other predators will not venture close to the heron population because of the bald eagle. This is how his student B.G. Kang made his big name as a researcher. But sadly he got the wrong idea that research meant only lifting some hapless fellows' work and writing papers so that Dan or David would get to referee it. Apparently, this is what he taught his students and Chang is one of them. Just to give you an idea of how Dan helped Kang at my expense, here is an example. Look up: https://lohar.com/mithelpdesk/hd2006.pdf

Because of Dan Anderson or possibly because the Japanese were cruel to South Koreans, generally Americans have a soft corner in their hearts for them, David Anderson likes to help Kang and his students and Chang is a close friend of David's. Recently David Anderson wrote a paper [**10**], referencing, as a source, one of my papers that was cut at the waist and did not have references, making a mockery of himself as a serious mathematician. I had to make a lot of noise to get the whole paper republished and only an ignoramus or an uncaring person would miss knowing that that paper was republished. Perhaps he wanted to indicate to his minions that he could get away with it, this time he did not, as I wrote: https://loharcom.wordpress.com/2022/03/13/truth-monster-strikes-again/

David now claims that the paper I was so mad at was written in 2003 and that tells you a lot about the standard of the material included in the Dan volume, at least as far as David is concerned. (He seems to overlook the fact that he includes a reference to a paper that appeared in 2006, meaning he did update where he thought update was necessary.) I won't dwell on it much and will close with the following. In an exchange with Chang I wrote to him: My offer stands: You publish a corrigendum to your paper, with Andreas, that addresses my complaints in hd2004.pdf , and in response, I would rewrite the script of hd2008.pdf differently. Now you can say whatever you like in your defense including, "By God we did not know anything", you can even pull pacifiers from your mouths to show to the readers that you really did not know anything about my work, except that you were free to make fun of it. But of course you would admit that what is your new idea of "UVFDs", or "weakly Matlis GCD domains" had appeared long ago in a paper of mine in Manuscripta Mathematica and what you call weakly factorial GCD domains were the "generalized UFDs" (or GUFDs) that were studied in the first Chapter of Zafrullah's doctoral thesis submitted to the University of London in 1974 and later included in a joint paper of Zafrullah with Dan and David Anderson. It won't be too hard to look up the references I have included them all in my complaint hd2004.pdf, as my helpdesk is a private instructive venture that I am forced to use as a means of registering my complaints as well. In response Chang felt "insulted". He also informed me that " Furthermore, for example, I have written several papers on weakly factorial domains (WFD), and as far as I know, the first paper on WFD is D.D. Anderson's paper with some guy in 1988 (which was published in JPAA), so I cited this paper whenever I wrote a paper on WFDs." But of course GUFDs were fifteen years before Dan Anderson's Weakly factorial domains and someone wanted my stuff to be "rediscovered so that Dan could claim priority.

Now I don't care about priority I want everyone involved in this heist to feel insulted. So, pacifiers everyone! Here's one pacifier each for the authors of [**15**], one pacifier for the referee who recommended for publication a paper on a theory that was not supported by a single example. And sadly, one for the handling editor who was warned but paid no attention because it was only "Muhammad Zafrullah" complaining.

Finally as a teacher I can't help but remark that these two (Chang and Reinhart) could have written an article saying that another way of studying Semirigid GCD domains of Zafrullah was via valuation elements. That way, they could have said a lot of things in that paper and that would all be above board and new. Of course, it's too late for that now as I have already written [**30**] showing that valuation elements are superfluous.

1. Appendix 1 (Copy of "Comments on unique factorization in non-unique factorization domains")

Abstract: Let D be an integral domain throughout. Call two elements $x, y \in D\backslash\{0\}$ v-coprime if $xD \cap yD = xyD$. Call a nonzero non unit r of an integral domain D rigid if for all $x, y|r$ we have $x|y$ or $y|x$. Also call D semirigid if every nonzero non unit of D is expressible as a finite product of rigid elements. We show that a semirigid domain D is a GCD domain if and only if D satisfies $*$: product of every pair of non-v-coprime rigid elements is again rigid. This research links the ancient notion of semirigid GCD domains of [Manuscripta Math. 17(1975), 55-66] with the recent work in [J. Pure Appl. Algebra 224 (12) (2020), 106430], in the context of "Unique factorization property of non-unique factorization domains."

Introduction:

Let D be an integral domain with quotient field K. Some recently introduced concepts may remind one of some old and some recent concepts. These are concepts such as a homogeneous element of Chang [**12**], one that belongs to a unique maximal t-ideal and a valuation element of Chang and Reinhart [**15**], i.e. an element a such that $aV \cap D = aD$ for some valuation ring V with $D \subseteq V \subseteq K$.

Chang [**12**] calls a domain a HoFD if every nonzero non unit of D is expressible as a product of mutually t-comaximal homogeneous elements and says HoFDs were first studied in [**5**], of course with different terminology. (A homogeneous element was "t-pure" and a HoFD was semi t-pure.) According to [**15**, Corollary 1.2] a valuation element a of a domain D has the property that for all $x, y|a$ we have $x|y$ or $y|x$. This makes a a rigid element of Cohn [**14**]. To be exact, let's call an element r of D rigid if r is a nonzero non-unit such that for all $x, y|r$ we have $x|y$ or $y|x$. Let's also call D semirigid (resp., semi homogeneous) if every nonzero non unit of D is expressible as a finite product of rigid (resp., homogeneous) elements of D. The trouble with the semirigid (resp., semi homogeneous) domains is that they are very general. For example every irreducible element, i.e., a nonzero non-unit a such that $a = \alpha\beta \Rightarrow \alpha$ is a unit or β is, is rigid. But the atomic domains, i.e., domains whose nonzero non-units are expressible as finite products of irreducible elements, often have little or no form of uniqueness of factorization [**2**]. For example, in $D = F[[X^2, X^3]]$, that is Noetherian and hence atomic, the elements X^2 and X^3 are irreducible, and $(X^2)^3 = (X^3)^2 = X^6$. That is X^6 has two distinct factorizations.

On the other hand, as we shall show, semi homogeneous domains are actually HoFDs and so do have a sort of uniqueness of factorization, but only just.

One way of getting such wayward concepts to deliver unique factorization of some sort is to bring in a somewhat stronger notion of coprimality and some conditions. Call two elements a, b v-coprime if $aD \cap bD = abD$. Obviously a, b are v-coprime if and only if $(a, b)^{-1} = D$, if and only, if $((a, b)^{-1})^{-1} = (a, b)_v = D$, where $A \mapsto A_v = (A^{-1})^{-1}$ is the usual star operation called the v-operation on $F(D)$, the set of nonzero factional ideals of D. The notion of v-coprimality has been discussed in detail in [**27**], where it is shown, in somewhat general terms, that if, for $a, b, c \in D\backslash\{0\}$, $(a, b)_v = D$ and $a|bc$, then $a|c$. It was also shown in [**27**] that for $r_1, ..., r_n, x \in D\backslash\{0\}$ $(r_1...r_n, x)_v = D$ if and only if $(r_i, x)_v = D$. Let's call two homogeneous (resp., rigid) elements a, b similar, denoted $a\tilde{\ }b$, if $(a, b)_v \neq D$. We plan to show that a semi homogeneous domain is a "HoFD" because the product of every pair of similar homogeneous elements of D is again a homogeneous element, of D, similar to them. We also show that a semirigid domain is a semirigid GCD domain if and only if the product of each pair of non-v-coprime rigid elements is rigid and give examples to show that the product of two non-v-coprime rigid elements may not be rigid. Incidentally semirigid GCD domains were first studied in [**24**] and are precisely the so called UVFDs of [**15**]. We shall also give examples to show that a homogeneous element may not be rigid and a rigid element may not be homogeneous.

It seems best to give the reader an idea of the v- and the t-operations and some related concepts that we shall have the occasion to use. For $I \in F(D)$, the set $I^{-1} = \{x \in K | xI \subseteq D\}$ is again a fractional ideal and thus the relation v: $I \mapsto I_v$ is a function on $F(D)$. This function is called the v-operation on D. Similarly the relation t: $I \mapsto I_t = \cup\{F_v | \ 0 \neq F$ is a finitely generated subideal of $I\}$ is a function on $F(D)$ and is called the t-operation on D. These are examples of the so called star operations. The reader may consult Jesse Elliott's book [**16**], for these operations. A fractional ideal I is called a v-ideal (resp. a t-ideal) if $I_v = I$ (resp., $I_t = I$).The rather peculiar definition of the t-operation allows one to use Zorn's Lemma to prove that each integral domain that is not a field has at least one integral t-ideal maximal among integral t-ideals. This maximal t-ideal is prime and every proper, integral t-ideal is contained in at least one maximal t-ideal. A minimal prime of a t-ideal is a t-ideal and thus every height one prime is a t-ideal. The set of all maximal t-ideals of a domain D is denoted by t-$Max(D)$. It can be shown that $D = \cap_{M \in t\text{-}Max(D)} D_M$. A fractional ideal I is said to be t-invertible if $(II^{-1})_t = D$. A domain in which every nonzero finitely generated ideal is t-invertible is called a Prufer v-multiplication domain (PVMD), a Prufer domain is a PVMD with every nonzero ideal a t-ideal. Griffin [**20**] showed that D is a PVMD if and only if D_M is a valuation domain for each maximal t-ideal M of D. Given any domain D the set t-$inv(D)$ of all t-invertible fractional t-ideals of D is a group under the t-operation $(I \times_t J = (IJ)_t$. The group t-$inv(D)$ has the group $P(D)$ of nonzero principal fractional ideals as its subgroup. The t-class group of D is the quotient group $Cl_t(D) = t\text{-}inv(D)/P(D)$. What makes this group interesting is that if D is a Krull domain $Cl_t(D)$ is the divisor class group and if D is a Prufer domain, $Cl_t(D)$ is the ideal class group. Of interest for this note is the fact that a PVMD D is a GCD domain if and only if $Cl_t(D)$ is trivial. This group was introduced in [**11**].

Next call an element $a \in D\backslash\{0\}$ primal if for all $b, c \in D\backslash\{0\}$ $a|bc$ implies that $a = rs$ where $r|b$ and $s|c$. A domain all of whose nonzero elements are primal is called a pre-Schreier domain and an integrally closed pre-Schreier domain was called a Schreier domain in [**13**]. Note that if D is pre-Schreier then $Cl_t(D)$ is trivial, [**11**]. Call a nonzero element p of D completely primal if every factor of p is again primal. A prime element is an example of a primal element. According to Cohn [**13**], if S is a set multiplicatively generated by completely primal elements of an integrally closed domain D such that D_S is a Schreier domain, then D is a Schreier domain. This Theorem is usually referred to as: Cohn's Nagata type Theorem for Schreier domains.

2. Results

Let's note that for a finitely generated nonzero ideal $I = (x_1, ..., x_n)$ we have $I_v = I_t$, so $x_1, ..., x_n$ being v-coprime (i.e., $(x_1, ..., x_n)_v = D$) is the same as $x_1, ..., x_n$ being t-comaximal (i.e., $(x_1, ..., x_n)_t = D$), which boils down to: $x_1, ..., x_n$ do not share any maximal t-ideal. We also note that a is a homogeneous element if aD is a t-homogeneous ideal in the sense of [**7**] and, sort of, following the convention of [**7**] we shall denote by $M(a)$ the maximal t-ideal containing the homogeneous element a. Indeed we have $M(a) = \{x \in D| \ (x, a)_v \neq D\}$ (cf. [**7**, (2) Proposition 1]).

Lemma 1. *Let a and b be two homogeneous elements of D then $(a, b)_v \neq D$ if and only if (a, b) is contained in the same maximal t-ideal if and only if ab is a homogeneous element.*

Proof. Let b be a homogeneous element belonging to the maximal t-ideal P. For any nonzero finitely generated ideal A, $(A, b)_v \neq D$ implies that that $A \subseteq P$. This is because $(A, b)_v \neq D$ implies (A, b) has to be contained in some maximal t-ideal and P is the only maximal t-ideal that contains b. So $A \subseteq P$. Now $(a, b)_v \neq D$ implies that a, b both belong to the same maximal t-ideal say P. Next note that $x \in M(a) \Leftrightarrow (x, a)_v \neq D$. So $x \in M(a)$ implies x belongs to P. Thus $M(a) = P$ and similarly $M(b) = P$ forcing $M(a) = M(b)$. Suppose ab belongs to a maximal t-ideal P. Then $a \in P$ or $b \in P$. If $a \in P$, then $M(a) = P$. But as $(b, a)_v \neq D$, $M(a) = M(b)$ whence ab is a homogeneous element, as $P(a) = P(b)$ is the only maximal t-ideal containing ab. Finally if ab is t-homogeneous then, by definition, $(a, b)_v \neq D$. □

Proposition 1. *An integral domain D is a HoFD if and only if D is a semi homogeneous domain.*

Proof. Suppose that D is a semi homogeneous domain. Lemma 1 shows that the product of every pair of similar homogeneous elements of D is homogeneous. Let $x = h_1 h_2 ... h_n$ where each of h_i is a homogeneous element. Now $M_1, ... M_r$ be the set of distinct maximal t-ideals containing h. Let $H_j = \Pi h$ where h ranges over $h_i \in M_j$. By Lemma 1, H_j are homogeneous and mutually t-comaximal. Thus we have $x = \Pi_{j=1}^{r} H_j$ where H_i are mutually v-coprime homogeneous. The converse is obvious. □

It was shown in [**24**] that if a nonzero non unit x in a GCD domain is expressible as a finite product of rigid elements then x is uniquely expressible as a product of finitely many mutually coprime rigid elements. Thus showing that in a semirigid GCD domain, every nonzero non unit x is expressible uniquely as a product of mutually coprime elements. So a valuation ring V of any rank is an example of a semirigid GCD domain and so is a polynomial ring over V. Griffin, in [**21**], called a domain D an Independent Ring of Krull type (IRKT) if D has a family of prime ideals $\{P_\alpha\}_{\alpha\in I}$ such that (a) D_{P_α} is a valuation domain for each $\alpha \in I$, (b) $D = \cap_{\alpha\in I} D_{P_\alpha}$ is locally finite and (c) No pair of distinct members of $\{P_\alpha\}_{\alpha\in I}$ contains a nonzero prime ideal. It was shown in Theorem 5 of [**24**] that a semirigid GCD domain is indeed an IRKT. Also, it was shown in Theorem B of [**25**] that a GCD IRKT is a semirigid GCD domain. Later, a domain satisfying only (b) and (c) above, requiring that P_α are maximal t-ideals, was called in [**9**] a weakly Matlis domain. An IRKT is a PVMD, [**21**]. Also, noting that a GCD domain is a PVMD which makes localization at each maximal t-ideal a valuation domain we have each of D_{P_α} a valuation domain, in the definition of a weakly Matlis domain and making it an IRKT. Finally, a GCD IRKT is a semirigid GCD domain, by Theorem B of [**25**].

LEMMA 2. *Let D be a semirigid domain with $*$: for every pair r, s of rigid elements $(r, s)_v \neq D \Leftrightarrow rs$ is rigid. Then the following hold. (1) Given that r, s are two similar rigid elements. Then r and s are comparable, i.e., $r|s$ or $s|r$, (2) If r is a rigid element and s, t are rigid elements, each similar to r, then s and t are similar, (3) A finite product of mutually similar rigid elements is rigid similar to each of the factors and (4) if a rigid element r divides a product $x = x_1x_2...x_n$ of mutually v-coprime rigid elements $x_1, ..., x_n$ then r divides exactly one of the x_i, in a semirigid domain with property $*$.*

PROOF. (1) Straightforward, as rs is rigid, (2) $r|s$ or $s|r$ and $r|t$ or $t|r$. Four cases arise (i) $r|s$ and $r|t \Rightarrow (s, t)_v \neq D$, (ii) $r|s$ and $t|r \Rightarrow t|s$ (iii) $s|r$ and $r|t \Rightarrow s|t$ (iv) $s|r$ and $t|r \Rightarrow s|t$ or $t|s$. In each case we have $s\tilde{\ }t$. (3) Suppose that D is semirigid with the given property $(*)$. Using induction, one can show that in a semirigid domain with $(*)$, a finite product of mutually similar rigid elements is rigid. This is how it can be accomplished. We know that the product of any two similar rigid elements is rigid. Assume that we have established that the product of any set of n of rigid elements, $r_1, r_2, ..., r_n$, similar to one of them and hence, by (2), similar to each other, is rigid. Let $\boldsymbol{r} = r_1r_2...r_n$ and let s be a rigid element similar to, one and hence, each of r_i and hence to $\mathbf{r}$. But then by $*$, $\mathbf{r}s$ is rigid. Finally for (4) note that $(r, x)_v = rD \neq D$, because $r|x$. So r cannot be v-coprime to each of x_i. Now, say, r is non-v-coprime to x_i, x_j for $i \neq j$. But then, by (2), $x_i\tilde{\ }x_j$ which is impossible because $(x_i, x_j)_v = D$. So r is non-v-coprime to exactly one of x_i, say x_k Now as D has the property $*$ and as r and x_k are rigid, one of them divides the other. But since $r|x$ already, we conclude that $r|x_k$. □

THEOREM 2. *Let D be a semirigid domain. Then every nonzero non unit of D is either rigid or can be written uniquely as a product of finitely many mutually v-coprime rigid elements if and only if $*$: for every pair r, s of rigid elements $(r, s)_v \neq D \Leftrightarrow rs$ is rigid holds.*

PROOF. Let $x = r_1r_2...r_n$ be a nonzero non unit of D. Pick r_1 and collect all the rigid factors, from r_i, $(i = 1, ..., n)$, that are similar to r_1. Next suppose that by a relabeling we can write $x = r_1r_2...r_{s_1}r_{s_1+1}...r_n$ where r_i $(i = 1, ..., s_1)$ are all the rigid factors of x that are similar to r_1. Set $\mathbf{r}_1 = r_1r_2...r_{s_1}$. Note that since, by the procedure, each of r_i $(i = 1, ..., s_1)$ is v-coprime to each of r_{i_1} $(i_1 = s_1+1, ..., n)$ we conclude that $\mathbf{r}_1$ is v-coprime to each of r_{i_1} $(i_1 = s_1+1, ..., n)$ and, of course, each of r_{i_1} $(i_1 = s_1 + 1, ..., n)$ v-coprime to $\mathbf{r}_1$. Now select all the rigid elements similar to r_{s_1+1} and suppose that by a relabeling we can write $r_{s_1+1}...r_n = r_{s_1+1}r_{s_1+2}...r_{s_2}...r_n$, where r_j $(j = s_1 + 1, ..., s_2)$ are similar to r_{s_1+1}. Set $\mathbf{r}_2 = r_{s_1+1}r_{s_1+2}...r_{s_2}$. By, Lemma 2, $\mathbf{r}_2$ is rigid. Since $r_{s_1+1}, r_{s_1+2}, ..., r_{s_2}$ are each v-coprime to $\mathbf{r}_1$, and so is their product, we conclude that $\mathbf{r}_1$ and $\mathbf{r}_2$ are v-coprime rigid elements. Thus $x = \mathbf{r}_1\mathbf{r}_2r_{s_2+1}...r_n$ and continuing this manner we can write $x = \mathbf{r}_1\mathbf{r}_2...\mathbf{r}_m$ where $\mathbf{r}_i$ are mutually v-coprime rigid elements.

Now let $x = \mathbf{r}_1\mathbf{r}_2...\mathbf{r}_m$ be a product of mutually v-coprime rigid elements in a domain D with property $*$. Also let $x = \mathbf{s}_1\mathbf{s}_2...\mathbf{s}_n$. We claim that each of the $\mathbf{r}_i$ is an associate of exactly one of the $\mathbf{s}_j$ and hence $m = n$. For this note that by (4) of Lemma 2, $\mathbf{r}_1|\mathbf{s}_1\mathbf{s}_2...\mathbf{s}_n$ implies that $\mathbf{r}_1$ divides exactly one one of the $\mathbf{s}_j$, say $\mathbf{s}_1$, by a relabeling. But then, considering $\mathbf{s}_1|\ \mathbf{r}_1\mathbf{r}_2...\mathbf{r}$ and noting that $\mathbf{s}_1\tilde{}\mathbf{r}_1$ we conclude that $\mathbf{s}_1|\mathbf{r}_1$. This leaves us with $\mathbf{r}_2...\mathbf{r}_m = \mathbf{s}_2...\mathbf{s}_n$. Now eliminating one by one, in this manner, and noting that $\mathbf{r}_i$, $\mathbf{s}_j$ are non units will take us to the conclusion, eventually.

Conversely let D be a semirigid domain in which every nonzero non unit is either a rigid element or is uniquely expressible as a finite product of mutually v-coprime rigid elements and consider $x = rs$ where r and s are any two similar rigid elements. If in each case rs is rigid, we are done. To ensure that there is no other possibility we proceed as follows. Because x is expressible as a product of finitely many mutually v-coprime rigid elements we can write $rs = r_1...r_n$. By (4) of Lemma 2, each of r, s divides exactly one of the r_i, so $n \leq 2$. So let $rs = r_1r_2$, where $r|r_1$ and $s|r_2$. Now this too is impossible because, by assumption, r and s are non-v-coprime while r_1 and r_2 are v-coprime and obviously a pair of v-coprime elements (such as r_1, r_2) cannot have factors like $r|\acute{r}_1$ and $s|r_2$ with $(r, s)_v \neq D$. (For this note that $r|\acute{r}_1$ and $s|r_2$ implies that $(\acute{r}_1, r_2) \subseteq (r, s)$ forces $D = (\acute{r}_1, r_2)_v \subseteq (r, s)_v \neq D$, which is a contradiction.) $\square$

Corollary 1. *A semirigid domain with property $*$ is a GCD domain.*

Proof. We shall show that $xD \cap yD$ is a principal ideal for each pair x, y of nonzero elements of D. Indeed if any of x, y is a unit then $(x, y)_v = D$ a principal ideal. But $(x, y)_v = D \Leftrightarrow xD \cap yD = xyD$. So let's assume that both x and y are non units. Next let, say, x be a rigid element and y a general element. Then $y = r_1...r_n$ where r_i are mutually v-coprime rigid elements. If x is v-coprime to each of r_i then $(x, y)_v = D$, and so $xD \cap yD$ is principal. If on the other hand $(x, y)_v \neq D$, then x is non-v-coprime to exactly one of r_i. (For otherwise, x non-v-coprime to r_i, r_j for $i \neq j$ would imply, by Lemma 2, that $r_i\tilde{}r_j$ which is impossible because r_i and r_j are v-coprime.) Suppose that, by a relabeling x is non-v-coprime to r_1. Then $x|r_1$ or $r_1|x$. This gives $xD \cap yD = (xD \cap r_1D) \cap r_2D \cap ... \cap r_nD = r_1D \cap r_2D \cap ... \cap r_nD$ in case $x|r_1$, giving us $xD \cap yD = yD$. If on the other hand $r_1|x$, $(xD \cap r_1D) = xD$ and x is v-coprime to each of $r_2, ..., r_n$. Thus giving $xD \cap yD = xD \cap r_2D \cap ... \cap r_nD = xr_2....r_nD$, a principal ideal.

This leaves the case when $x = a_1...a_rb_1...b_s$ and $y = c_1c_2...c_td_1...d_u$ are non units, each a product of mutually v-coprime rigid elements. (Note that $a_1, ..., a_r, b_1, ..., b_s$ are mutually v-coprime in case of x and $c_1, c_2, ...c_t, d_1, ..., d_s$ are mutually v-coprime in case of y.) We can write $x = ab$ where $a = a_1...a_r$ is the product of rigid elements a_i that are v-coprime to each of the, mutually v-coprime, rigid factors of y and

$b = b_1...b_s$ is the product of those rigid factors b_j each of which is non-v-coprime to y. Obviously a and b are v-coprime. Similarly we have $y = cd$ where $c = c_1c_2...c_t$ is the product of all those rigid elements that are v-coprime to every rigid factor of x while $d = d_1...d_u$ is the product of those rigid elements that are non-v-coprime to x. Obviously $u = s$ and each of d_i is similar to exactly one of b_i, say b_j. Here too c and d are v-coprime. Here, by a relabeling, we can assume that $b_i\tilde{\ }d_i$ for $i = 1, ..., s$.

Now consider $xD \cap yD = abD \cap cdD = aD \cap bD \cap dD \cap cD$ (because $(a, b)_v = D = (c, d)_v$). Now as, by their descriptions, aD and cD are v-coprime to each other and to bD and dD, we have $xD \cap yD = acD \cap bD \cap dD$. Next $bD \cap dD = \cap_{i=1}^{i=s} b_iD \cap (\cap_{i=1}^{i=s} d_iD) = \cap_{i=1}^{i=s}(b_iD \cap d_iD)$. Since by assumption $b_i\tilde{\ }d_i$ for $i = 1, ..., s$ $b_i|d_i$ or $d_i|b_i$ and so $(b_iD \cap d_iD) = d_iD$ if $b_i|d_i$ and $(b_iD \cap d_iD) = b_iD$ if $d_i|b_i$. In short, in each case $(b_iD \cap d_iD)$ is a principal ideal. Since all of $b_1, ..., b_s$ (resp., all of $d_1, ..., d_s$) are mutually v-coprime, all of $(b_iD \cap d_iD)$ are mutually v-coprime. Consequently $bD \cap dD = \cap_{i=1}^{i=s}(b_iD \cap d_iD)$ is an intersection of mutually v-coprime principal ideals and hence is principal. Say $bD \cap dD = \cap_{i=1}^{i=s}(b_iD \cap d_iD) = hD$. Thus $xD \cap yD = acD \cap bD \cap dD = acD \cap hD$. But as ac is v-coprime to each of the mutually v-coprime rigid factors of h and hence to h we have $acD \cap hD$ principal. But then $xD \cap yD$ is principal. Thus, in all possible cases, we have established that in a semirigid domain D with property $*$, $xD \cap yD$ is principal for each pair x, y of nonzero elements of D. This establishes that D is a GCD domain. □

In Proposition 2.1 the authors of [**15**] show that a VFD is a Schreier domain.

Corollary 2. *For an integral domain D the following are equivalent.*

(1) D is a semirigid domain with property $*$,
(2) D is a semirigid GCD domain,
(3) D is a semi homogeneous GCD domain,
(4) D is a HoFD PVMD ,
(5) D is a weakly Matlis GCD domain,
(6) D is a GCD VFD.
(7) D is a UVFD,
(8) D is a VFD such that product of every pair of non-coprime valuation elements is again a valuation element.
(9) D is a pre-Schreier semirigid domain with property $*$.

Proof. (1) $\Rightarrow$ (2) follows from Corollary 1, (2) $\Rightarrow$ (3) let r be a rigid element of a GCD domain D and consider $P(r) = \{x \in D | (x, r)_v \neq D\}$. By [**24**, Lemma 1] $P(r)$ is a prime ideal. To see that $P(r)$ is a t-ideal note that because D is a GCD domain, $(x, r)_v \neq D \Leftrightarrow x = a\rho$ where ρ is a non unit factor of r. Thus $x_1, x_2, ..., x_n \in P(r) \Rightarrow (x_1, x_2, ..., x_n) \subseteq (\rho_1)$ where ρ_1 is a non unit factor of r. But then, $x_1, x_2, ..., x_n \in P(r) \Rightarrow (x_1, x_2, ..., x_n)_v \subseteq P(r)$. Thus $P(r)$ is a t-ideal. Finally, let M be a prime ideal properly containing $P(r)$ and let $y \in M\backslash P(r)$. By the definition of $P(r)$, $(y, r)_v = D$. But then $M_t = D$ and this shows that $P(r)$ is actually a maximal t-ideal. Finally, using the definition, it can be easily established that for any pair of rigid elements r, s of D, $P(r) = P(s)$ if and only if $r\tilde{\ }s$. Thus every rigid element in a GCD domain D, belongs to a unique maximal t-ideal and hence is a homogeneous element. Consequently a semirigid GCD domain is a semi homogeneous GCD domain. For (3) $\Rightarrow$ (4) we proceed as follows. Note that a semi homogeneous domain is a HoFD, by Proposition 1 and, it is well known that, a GCD domain is a PVMD. Next (4) $\Rightarrow$ (5), since a HoFD D is a weakly Matlis domain with $Cl_t(D) = 0$ [**12**, Theorem 2.2] and since a PVMD D with $Cl_t(D) = 0$ is a GCD domain [**11**, Proposition 2], we conclude that a PVMD HoFD is a weakly Matlis GCD domain. Now for (5) $\Rightarrow$ (6), note that Corollary 4.5 of [**15**] says that a UVFD is a weakly Matlis GCD domain and as a UVFD is a VFD, in particular, we have the conclusion. Next, (6) $\Rightarrow$ (7) follows because, according to Theorem 4.2 of [**15**], a PVMD VFD is a UVFD and so a GCD VFD is a UVFD. For (7) $\Rightarrow$ (8), let D be a UVFD then D is a VFD. Take two non-coprime valuation elements u, v and using the fact that uv is an element of a UVFD write $uv = a_1a_2...a_n$ where a_i are mutually incomparable and hence mutually coprime. Now $u|a_1a_2...a_n$ implies that $u = u_1u_2...u_n$ where $u_i|a_i$, because a VFD is Schreier [**15**], see also Cohn [**13**]. We claim that exactly one of the u_i is non unit. For if say u_1 and u_2 are non units then being factors of coprime elements u_1 and u_2 are incomparable and this contradicts the fact that u is a valuation element (cf. [**15**, (2) of Corollary 1.2]). So u divides exactly one of the a_i. Similarly v divides exactly one of the a_i. Next u and v cannot divide two distinct a_i for that would make u, v coprime, which they are not. Now suppose that $u|a_1$. Then $v = (a_1/u)a_2...a_n$ and v cannot divide any of $a_2, ..., a_n$ as that would make v coprime with u. So, v must divide (a_1/u). But then $1 = (a_1/uv)a_2...a_n$, forcing $uv = a_1$ and forcing the conclusion that in the VFD D the product of any pair of non coprime valuation elements is again a valuation element. For (8) $\Rightarrow$ (9) note that as each valuation element is rigid, a VFD is semirigid. Since a VFD is Schreier we can say that D is a pre-Schreier semirigid domain. Also the product of two non coprime valuation elements being a valuation element translates to the product of two non-v-coprime rigid elements is rigid and that is the property $*$. Finally (9) $\Rightarrow$ (1) is direct. $\square$

While Corollary 2 establishes that the most ancient concept of semirigid GCD domains of [**24**] is precisely the most modern concept of UVFDs of [**15**], it raises the following question.

Question Must a Schreier semirigid domain be a semirigid GCD domain?

This question becomes interesting in view of the fact that the authors of [**15**] ask a similar question: is a VFD a semirigid GCD domain? (Actually they ask: Is a VFD a weakly Matlis GCD domain?) The other point of interest is that, according to [**13**] an atomic Schreier domain is a UFD. In fact, once we recall necessary terminology, we have the following more general result.

Proposition 2. *(cf.,* [**8**]*, Proposition 3.2]). In an integral domain with PSP property, every atom is a prime. Consequently an atomic domain with PSP property is a UFD.*

Here a polynomial $f(X) = \sum_{i=0}^{i=n} a_iX^i$ is primitive if the coefficients a_i of f have no non unit common factor and f is super primitive if the coefficients $a_0, ..., a_n$ are v-coprime. Also a domain D has the PSP property if every primitive polynomial is super primitive. Now as was indicated in [**8**] a domain with PSP property is much more general than a pre-Schreier domain. Lest hopes run too high, we hasten to offer the following example of a semirigid Schreier domain in which the product of two rigid elements is not rigid.

Example 1. *Let $\mathbb{Z}$ denote the ring of integers, let $\mathbb{Q}$ be the ring of rational numbers and let X, Y be two indeterminates over $\mathbb{Q}$. Construct the two dimensional regular local ring $R = \mathbb{Q}[[X, Y]]$ and for p a prime element set $D =$*

$\mathbb{Z}_{(p)} + (X,Y)\mathbb{Q}[[X,Y]]$. *This ring D is a semirigid Schreier domain with two rigid elements X, Y such that $(X,Y)_v \neq D$, yet XY is not rigid.*

Illustration: Indeed D is a quasi local ring with maximal ideal principal and of course X and Y are divisible by every power of p. That D is integrally closed follows from the fact that $D \subseteq \mathbb{Q}[[X,Y]]$ which is integrally closed, that $\mathbb{Z}_{(p)}$ is integrally closed and that X and Y are divisible by powers of p. For D being Schreier let S be multiplicatively generated by p. Then S is generated by completely primal elements and D_S is a UFD. Hence D is Schreier, by Cohn's Nagata type Theorem. Now look at X. Every factor of X of the form p^r or X/p^s. So any pair of factors of X is one of the forms: $(p^r, p^s), (p^r, X/p^s), (X/p^r, X/p^s)$, $r, s \geq 0$, and in each case one divides the other. Same with Y. Now $(X,Y)_v \neq D$, because $p|X, Y$. So X and Y are non-v-coprime rigid elements of D. Yet XY cannot be because X does not divide Y. Finally, as $\mathbb{Q}[[X,Y]]$ is a UFD with each prime an element $f(X,Y)$ such that $f(0,0) = 0$ we conclude that for each prime f of $\mathbb{Q}[[X,Y]]$, f/p^r is rigid in $\mathbb{Z}_{(p)} + (X,Y)\mathbb{Q}[[X,Y]]$. But then a typical nonzero non unit element of $\mathbb{Z}_{(p)} + (X,Y)\mathbb{Q}[[X,Y]]$ is a finite product of rigid elements.

Remark 1. *The above example has often appeared, in various guises, in papers in which Dan Anderson and I have been coauthors, see e.g.* [**5**, page 344], [**9**]*, though the current application is different.*

It was shown in the proof of (2) $\Rightarrow$ (3) of Corollary 2 that a rigid element is a homogeneous element. However a rigid element may not generally be a homogeneous element. For an atom is rigid but, say, in a Krull domain with torsion divisor class group an atom can be in more than one height one prime ideals which can be shown to be maximal t-ideals. (For a concrete example $\mathbb{Z}[\sqrt{-5}]$ is a Dedekind domain in which 3 is well known to be an irreducible element, but $(3) = (3, 1-2\sqrt{-5})(3, 1+2\sqrt{-5})$ where $(3, 1-2\sqrt{-5}), ((3, 1+2\sqrt{-5})$ are height one prime ideals and hence maximal (t-) ideals of $\mathbb{Z}[\sqrt{-5}]$. (Recall here that a Dedekind domain is a Prufer domain and so every nonzero ideal of Dedekind domain is a t-ideal.)

Call an integral domain D a t-local domain if D is quasi local with maximal ideal M a t-ideal, then D is a HoFD in that every nonzero non unit of D is a homogeneous element and hence is uniquely expressible as a product of mutually t-comaximal elements. Now every one dimensional local ring being t-local is a HoFD, in view of this the following proposition provides a valuable contrast.

Proposition 3. *Let D be an integral domain with each nonzero non unit a rigid element. Then D is a valuation domain.*

Proof. Let x, y be two nonzero non units. Then xy being a nonzero non unit, and hence rigid, gives $x|y$ or $y|x$. Thus for every pair of elements we have one dividing the other. □

Finally it appears that, very few restrictions other than the property $*$ will make semirigid domains into GCD domains. For example a Krull domain is atomic, and hence a semirigid domain, but not all Krull domains are UFDs. So some products of rigid elements are not rigid. However the following simple statement holds.

Proposition 4. *An atomic domain D is a UFD if and only if for every pair of atoms a, b, $(a,b)_v \neq D$ implies that ab is rigid.*

Since the proof of the significant part is direct, we leave the proof to the reader.

Finally, note that if h is a homogeneous element of an integral domain, then every non unit factor t of h is in $M(h)$ the unique maximal t-ideal containing h. Thus for every pair of non unit factors u, v of a homogeneous element h we have $(h, q)_v \neq D$. This leads to the question: Call a nonzero non unit q of an integral domain D a pre-homogeneous element if for every pair r, s of non unit factors of q we have $(r, s)_v \neq D$. Must a pre-homogeneous element be homogeneous?

Generally the answer is no, as every rigid element is pre-homogeneous and a rigid element may not be homogeneous. For example, as we have already mentioned, an atom is rigid and an atom may belong to more than one maximal t-ideals. However in some integral domains a pre-homogeneous element may well be homogeneous.

Proposition 5. *In a domain D with PSP property, every pre-homogeneous element is homogeneous.*

Proof. Let q be a pre-homogeneous element of the PSP domain D. Suppose that q is not homogeneous. Then there are at least two maximal t-ideals M_1, M_2 containing q. Let $m_1 \in M_1 \backslash M_2$ and $m_2 \in M_2 \backslash M$. Then $(m_1, M_2)_t = D$ and $(m_2, M_1)_t = D$. We can write $(m_1, M_2)_t = (m_1, F_2)_t$ where $F_2 \subseteq M_2$ and similarly $(m_2, M_1)_t = (m_2, F_1)_t$ where F_1 is a finitely generated ideal contained in M_1. Set $G = (q, F_1, F_2, m_1, m_2)$. Now $(q, F_1, m_1) \subseteq M_1$, so $(q, F_1, m_1)_v \neq D$. Since D is a PSP domain, $(q, F_1, m_1)_v \neq D$ means that there is a non unit r such that $(q, F_1, m_1) \subseteq rD$. Similarly we can find a nonzero non unit s in D such that $(q, F_2, m_2) \subseteq sD$, because $(q, F_2, m_2) \subseteq M_2$. Thus $(q, F_1, F_2, m_1, m_2) \subseteq (r, s)$. Yet, $(q, F_1, F_2, m_1, m_2)_t = D$. Whence $(r, s)_t = D$ a contradiction to the assumption that q is sub-homogeneous. Since this contradiction arises from the assumption that q is contained in more than one maximal t-ideals the conclusion follows. □

Corollary 3. *A PSP domain whose nonzero non units are expressible as finite products of pre-homogeneous elements is a HoFD.*

Now as we have seen, a rigid element is pre-homogeneous. we have the following result.

Corollary 4. *A semirigid pre-Schreier domain is a HOFD and consequently a VFD is a HoFD.*

The proof depends upon the fact that a pre-Schreier domain is PSP, as we have already seen. Moreover in, a PSP domain and hence, in a pre-Schreier domain a rigid element is homogeneous. Now use Proposition 1. It would be quite instructive to compare Corollary 4 with Proposition 3.1 of [**15**]. Now Could this author be wrong? What I have to call pre-homogeneous was once called homogeneous and according to Theorem 2.3 of [**5**], a completely primal (pre-) homogeneous element is t-pure (modern day homogeneous).

3. Discussion

Finally, let me note that, in the good old days, Dan Anderson wrote a nice chapter [**1**], highlighting some of my work, solo or joint with him, on unique factorization in domains which may not pass as UFDs. In this paper he also mentions generalized UFDs (GUFDs) and mentions [**3**] as its source. Actually, the theory of GUFDs was included in the first chapter of my doctoral dissertation. Briefly a GUFD is a semirigid domain where the rigid elements, called prime quanta, have all the properties of prime powers. (A rigid element q is a prime quantum if q is completely primal such that every power of q is rigid and for each non unit factor h of q we have $q|h^n$ for some n.) I showed a GUFD to be a GCD domain that was also a generalized Krull domain (GKD) that is a domain D such that (a) D is a locally finite intersection of localizations at all height one primes of D and (b) D_P is a valuation domain for each height one prime of D. It so transpired that later, in [**4**], domains with just the (a) part were studied as weakly Krull domains. And as noted on page 350 of [**5**], just above Corollary 3.8, a weakly Krull domain that is a GCD domain is a GUFD. A copy of my thesis is available here [**23**]. With some effort my thesis can be downloaded from here: https://ethos.bl.uk/OrderDetails.do?uin=uk.bl.ethos.704293

One of the reasons for bringing up my thesis and Dan's paper [**1**] is the sight of, "It is easy to see that if D is not a field, then D is a weakly factorial GCD-domain if and only if D is a weakly Matlis GCD-domain with t-dim$(D) = 1$." in [**15**]. Why "weakly factorial GCD-domain" and not a GUFD? Next why "weakly Matlis GCD-domain" and not a GCD IRKT or not a semirigid GCD domain? By Theorem 3.8 of [**1**] they are the same things! Next, why so much emphasis on weakly factorial domains? They only deal with a special case? Finally, I am grateful for the authors mentioning my paper [**26**], but why add "pre-Schreier domains have some "nice" properties"? (Without qualifying the quotes on "nice"!) Were they trying to poke fun? (Was the referee sleeping? Or is the referee part of the problem?)

Aside from gripes, I mentioned my thesis because, in the definition of a prime quantum there is a novel trick that makes sure that the product of two rigid elements is rigid, esuring the GCD property. But of course that would only get you GUFDs.

References

[1] D.D. Anderson, Non-atomic unique factorization in integral domains, in Properties of Commutative Rings and Modules (ed. S. Chapman) SRC Press Boca Raton, (2005), 1-21.

[2] D.D. Anderson, D.F. Anderson, M. Zafrullah, Factorization in integral domains, J. Pure Appl. Algebra 69, 1–19 (1990).

[3] D.D. Anderson, D.F. Anderson and M. Zafrullah, On generalized unique factorization, Bollettino U. M. I. (7) 9-A (1995), 401-413.

[4] D.D. Anderson, J. Mott and M. Zafrullah, Finite character representations for integral domains, Boll. Un. Mat. Ital. 6 (1992), 613 630.

[5] D. D. Anderson, J. L. Mott and M. Zafrullah, Unique factorization in non-atomic integral domains, Boll. Unione Mat. Ital. Ser. 8 2-B (1999) 341–352.

[6] D.D. Anderson and M. Zafrullah, Independent locally-finite intersections of localizations, Houston J. Math. 25 (1999), 433-452.

[7] D.D. Anderson and M. Zafrullah, On [redacted]-Semi-homogeneous Integral Domains. In: Badawi A., Coykendall J. (eds) Advances in Commutative Algebra. Trends in Mathematics. Birkhäuser, Singapore, (2019).

[8] D.D. Anderson, M. Zafrullah, The Schreier property and Gauss' lemma, Boll. UMI 10 (2007) 43–62.

[9] D. D. Anderson and M. Zafrullah, Splitting sets and weakly Matlis domains, in: Commutative Algebra and its Applications, eds. M. Fontana et al. (Walter de Gruyter, New York, 2009), pp. 1–8.

[10] David Anderson, Some Remarks on the D+M Construction. In: Badawi A., Coykendall J. (eds) Rings, Monoids and Module Theory. AUS-ICMS2020. Springer Proceedings in Mathematics & Statistics, vol 382. Springer, Singapore.

[11] A. Bouvier, Le groupe des classes d'un anneau integre, 107'eme Congres des Soci'et'es Savantes, Brest fasc. IV (1982), pp. 85–92.

[12] G.W. Chang, Unique factorization property of non-unique factorization domains, J. Algebra Appl. (2020).
[13] P.M. Cohn, Bézout rings and their subrings, Proc. Camb. Philos. Soc. 64 (1968) 251–264.
[14] P.M. Cohn, Unique factorization domains, Amer. Math. Monthly, 80 (1)(1973) 1-18.
[15] G.W. Chang and Andreas Reinhart, Unique factorization property of non-unique factorization domains ii, J. Pure Appl. Algebra 224 (12) (2020), 106430.
[16] J. Elliott, Rings, modules and closure operations, Springer Monographs in Mathematics. Springer, Cham, 2019.
[17] M. Fontana and M. Zafrullah, On v-domains: a survey. In: Fontana, M., Kabbaj, S., Olberding, B., Swanson, I. (eds.) Commutative Algebra: Noetherian and Non-Noetherian Perspectives, pp. 145–180. Springer, New York (2011)
[18] M. Fontana and M. Zafrullah, Studying monoids is not enough to study multiplicative properties of rings: an elementary approach, Arabian Journal of Mathematics 4(1) (2014):29-34.
[19] R. Gilmer: Commutative Semigroup Rings, The University of Chicago Press, 1984.
[20] M. Griffin, Some results on v-multiplication rings, Canad. J. Math.19(1967) 710-722.
[21] M. Griffin, Rings of Krull type. J. Reine Angew. Math. 229, 1–27 (1968).
[22] Halter-Koch, F.: Ideal Systems. An Introduction to Ideal Theory. Marcel Dekker, New York (1998).
[23] M. Zafrullah, https://lohar.com/researchpdf/Zafrullah_Dissertation.pdf
[24] M. Zafrullah, Semirigid GCD domains, Manuscripta Math. 17(1975), 55-66.
[25] M. Zafrullah, Rigid elements in GCD domains" J. Natur. Sci. and Math. **17** (1977), 7–14.
[26] M. Zafrullah, On a property of pre-Schreier domains, Comm. Algebra 15 (1987) 1895–1920.
[27] M. Zafrullah, What v-coprimality can do for you, in: J.W. Brewer, et al. (Eds.), Multiplicative Ideal Theory in Commutative Algebra, Springer, 2006, pp. 387–404.
[28] M. Zafrullah, Riesz and pre-Riesz monoids, Algebra Univers. 83, 9 (2022), https://doi.org/10.1007/s00012-021-00765-y
[29] M. Zafrullah, Comments on unique factorization in non-unique factorization domains, https://lohar.com/researchpdf/semirigid%202.pdf
[30] M. Zafrullah, Semirigid GCD domains, II, https://doi.org/10.1142/S0219498822501614

Department of Mathematics, Idaho State University, Pocatello, 83209 ID
E-mail address: `mzafrullah@usa.net`