

**QUESTION: (HD 1504)** Did anyone ever look at domains with the property that if the gcd exists for a given pair, then the LCM exists for that given pair or if the gcd exists for a given pair it is a linear combination? This question was proposed by Professor Daniel Anderson.

**ANSWER:** I'll take parts of the question one by one.

The domains in which the following holds: "if the gcd exists for a given pair, then the LCM exists for that given pair".

It is patent that if for  $a, b \in D \setminus \{0\}$   $LCM(a, b)$  exists then  $GCD(a, b)$  exists. Thus we are looking at domains  $D$  in which  $GCD(a, b) \Leftrightarrow LCM(a, b)$  exists.

It is easy to see that if  $GCD(a, b)$  and  $LCM(a, b)$  both exist then  $LCM(a, b)D = \frac{ab}{GCD(a, b)}D = (a) \cap (b)$

Next if  $GCD(a, b) = d$  then  $a = a_1d$  and  $b = b_1d$  where  $GCD(a_1, b_1) = 1$ . So, in these domains,  $GCD(a, b) = d \Leftrightarrow LCM(a, b) = a_1b_1d$ , where  $a_1, b_1$  are as described. Thus, in these domains,  $GCD(x, y) = 1 \Leftrightarrow LCM(x, y)D = xyD = (x) \cap (y) = xy(x, y)^{-1}$ . Or, in these domains,  $GCD(x, y) = 1 \Leftrightarrow xyD = xy(x, y)^{-1}$ . Cancelling  $xy$  we get  $GCD(x, y) = 1 \Leftrightarrow D = (x, y)^{-1}$  and as  $(x, y)^{-1} = D \Leftrightarrow ((x, y)^{-1})^{-1} = (x, y)_v = D$ . When  $(x, y)_v = D$  we say that  $x, y$  are  $v$ -coprime as we say that  $x, y$  are coprime when  $GCD(x, y) = 1$ . Thus in the domains in question any two coprime elements are  $v$ -coprime. Again if  $GCD(a, b) = d$  then  $a = a_1d$  and  $b = b_1d$  where  $GCD(a_1, b_1) = 1$  and so  $(a, b)_v = d(a_1, b_1)_v = dD = GCD(a, b)D$  and  $((a, b)_v)^{-1} = \frac{1}{ab}((a) \cap (b))$  and from  $(a, b)_v = dD$  we get  $((a, b)_v)^{-1} = (\frac{1}{d})$ . Comparing,  $\frac{1}{ab}((a) \cap (b)) = \frac{1}{d}D$  or  $((a) \cap (b)) = \frac{ab}{d}D$ . Thus a domain  $D$  in which  $GCD(a, b)$  exists implies  $LCM(a, b)$  exists is precisely the domain in which  $x, y$  coprime implies  $x, y$   $v$ -coprime.

Now these domains do have a name! In [MZ, On Prufer  $v$ -multiplication domains, Manuscripta Math. 35(1981), 1-26], on page 18, a domain  $D$  is said to satisfy Property  $\lambda$  if any two coprime elements of  $D$  are  $v$ -coprime. The property appears to be quite toothless. But works wonders in the following situations.

(1) When  $D$  is atomic, i.e. every nonzero non unit of  $D$  is expressible as a finite product of irreducible elements.

Proposition 6.4 of [MZ] says: An atomic integral domain  $D$  is a UFD if and only if  $D$  satisfies the property  $\lambda$ .

In more general situations Corollary 6.5 of [MZ] says: If an integral domain  $D$  satisfies property  $\lambda$  then every atom of  $D$  is a prime.

(2) Of course every GCD domain satisfies property  $\lambda$ . But the property  $\lambda$  can be seen in a generalization of GCD domains, the so called pre-Schreier domains of [Z, Comm. Algebra 15(9) (1987), 1895-1920]. Using the proof of Lemma 2.1 of [Z1, J. Pure Appl. Algebra 65(1990) 199-207] we can establish that every pair of coprime elements of a pre-Schreier domain is  $v$ -coprime.

(3) Another generalization of GCD domains, the so-called Prufer  $v$ -multiplication domain PVMD does not generally satisfy the  $\lambda$  property. In fact, even a Prufer domain, a specialization of PVMDs, does not satisfy the  $\lambda$  property. This can be seen by taking a non-PID Dedekind domain  $D$ . Because  $D$  is not a PID, by

Proposition 6.4 of [MZ]  $D$  does not satisfy  $\lambda$ .

(4) Cohn [C, Bezout rings and their subrings, Proc. Cambridge Philos. Soc. 64 (1968), 251-264] called a domain  $D$  a pre-Bezout ring if for every pair  $x, y \in D$ ,  $x, y$  coprime implies that  $x$  and  $y$  are comaximal. Now  $x, y$  being co-maximal means the GCD, 1, is a linear combination of  $x$  and  $y$ . And as  $d = GCD(a, b) = dGCD(a_1, b_1)$  where  $a_1, b_1$  are coprime, we conclude that pre-Bezout domains are precisely the domains in which the GCD of two elements  $a, b$  is a linear combination of  $a, b$ . (This much answers the part: if the gcd exists for a given pair it is a linear combination.) The pre-Bezout property was generalized to the GCD-Bezout property in [PT, Divisibility properties related to star operations on integral domains, Int. Electron. J. Algebra 12 (2012), 53-74] where Park and Tartarone study domains in which the GCD of a finite set of elements, if it exists, is a linear combination of those elements. Of interest to me is the fact that pre-Bezout and GCD-Bezout domains all satisfy the  $\lambda$  property.

That leaves: If LCM  $m$  of  $a, b$  exists when is  $m$  a linear combination of  $a, b$ ? The answer, with a tongue in the cheek, is yes! Always. As we can always have  $mD = a_1b_1d(1, x)$  for some  $x$  in  $D$ . But of course in the pre-Bezout domains case we can have  $mD = a_1b_1d(a_1, b_1)$ . In any case in the pre-Bezout domains this also is the case that if LCM of  $a, b$  exists, then GCD of  $a, b$  is a linear combination of  $a, b$ . Now note that, as we have already seen  $(a) \cap (b)$  is principal if and only if  $(a, b)_v$  is principal. Thus the domains in which LCM( $a, b$ ) exists implies GCD( $a, b$ ) is a linear combination of  $a, b$  are precisely the domains in which  $a, b$   $v$ -coprime implies  $a, b$  co-maximal. These domains were discussed in [HZ, J. Algebra 423 (1)(2015) 93-113].

Comment added on 2-9-2020. About that Park-Tartarone paper on GCD-Bezout domains [Int. Electron. J. Algebra 12 (2012), 53-74]. I had a brief look into it again and realized that a so-called GCD-Bezout domain is nothing but the Special pre-Bezout domains of [DZ, J. Pure Appl. Algebra, 214 (2010), 2087-2091]. Let me elaborate on it. Indeed  $D$  may be assumed to be different from its field of quotients. Now reading the comments between Corollaries 11 and 12 of the DZ paper one gathers that  $D$  is a Special pre-Bezout (spre-Bezout) domain if and only if for every finite set of elements  $x_1, \dots, x_n$  in  $D$  the ideal  $(x_1, \dots, x_n)$  being primitive implies that  $(x_1, \dots, x_n) = D$ . (Here  $(x_1, \dots, x_n)$  is primitive if  $(x_1, \dots, x_n) \subseteq xD$  implies that  $x$  is a unit.) On the other hand Park and Tartarone say that  $D$  is a GCD Bezout domain if whenever  $GCD(x_1, \dots, x_n) = d$  exists "we have a Bezout identity" which, in plain Math, means we have  $d = (x_1, \dots, x_n)$ .

Now let's start. Spre-Bezout implies GCD-Bezout. Let  $d$  be a GCD of  $(y_1, \dots, y_n)$  and write  $y_i = x_id$ . Then  $(y_1, \dots, y_n) = (x_1, \dots, x_n)d$ , where  $(x_1, \dots, x_n)$  is primitive because  $d$  is a GCD of the  $y_i$ . So, by the spre-Bezout property  $(x_1, \dots, x_n) = D$  forcing  $(y_1, \dots, y_n) = dD$  and this means that  $d$  is a linear combination of  $y_i$  or  $d$  satisfies the Bezout identity or whatever scholarly speak you want to speak. Conversely suppose that  $D$  is a GCD-Bezout domain and let  $(x_1, \dots, x_n)$  be a primitive ideal in  $D$ . Then 1 is a GCD of  $(x_1, \dots, x_n)$  and

so by the GCD-Bezout property 1 is a linear combination of  $x_1, \dots, x_n$ . That is  $(x_1, \dots, x_n) = D$ . Oddly, after Corollary 12, the authors of DZ talk about the PSP property and lo and behold PSP property has good coverage in that Park-Tartarone paper.