

# MATH 7752 Homework 2

James Harbour

February 3, 2022

## Problem 1

Let  $D$  be a division ring (not necessarily commutative) and  $M$  be a  $D$ -module.

(a) Let  $X$  be a generating set of  $M$  and  $Y$  a  $D$ -linearly independent subset of  $X$ . Prove that  $M$  has a  $D$ -basis  $B$  with  $Y \subseteq B \subseteq X$ .

*Proof.* Consider the poset  $\mathcal{S} = \{B \subseteq M : Y \subseteq B \subseteq X \text{ and } B \text{ is } D\text{-linearly independent}\}$  ordered by inclusion. Since  $Y$  is a  $D$ -linearly independent subset of  $X$ , we have that  $Y \in \mathcal{S}$  so  $\mathcal{S} \neq \emptyset$ .

Suppose that  $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathcal{S}$  is any linearly ordered chain in  $\mathcal{S}$ . Let  $B = \bigcup \mathcal{C}$ . Then  $Y \subseteq B \subseteq X$ . Suppose that  $d_i \in D$  and  $b_i \in B$  such that  $\sum_{i=1}^n d_i \cdot b_i = 0$ . Then for each  $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ , there exists a  $B_i \in \mathcal{C}$  such that  $b_i \in B_i$ . As  $\mathcal{C}$  is a chain, there is some  $l \in \{1, \dots, n\}$  such that  $B_i \subseteq B_l$  for all  $1 \leq i \leq n$ . It follows that  $b_i \in B_l$  for all  $1 \leq i \leq n$ , whence  $B_l$  being  $D$ -linearly independent implies that  $d_i = 0$  for all  $i$ . Thus  $B$  is  $D$ -linearly independent, so  $B \in \mathcal{S}$ .

Now by Zorn's lemma, there exists a maximal element  $B \in \mathcal{S}$  of  $\mathcal{S}$ . We claim that  $B$  is in fact a  $D$ -basis for  $M$ . It suffices to show that  $B$  is a generating set for  $M$ . Let  $N = \text{span}_D(B)$ . Suppose, for the sake of contradiction, that  $N \neq M$ . As  $B \subseteq X$  and  $X$  is a generating set for  $M$ , it follows that there exists an  $x \in X \setminus \text{span}_D(B)$ . Suppose  $r, r_1, \dots, r_n \in R$  are such that

$$0 = rx + r_1 b_1 + \dots + r_n b_n.$$

If  $r \neq 0$ , then

$$x = (-r^{-1}r_1) \cdot b_1 + \dots + (-r^{-1}r_n) \cdot b_n,$$

which would imply that  $x \in \text{span}_D(B)$ , contradicting the choice of  $x$ . Hence  $r = 0$ , so  $B$  being  $D$ -linearly independent implies that  $r_i = 0$  for all  $i$ . Thus  $B \cup \{x\}$  is  $D$ -linearly independent, contradicting the maximality of  $B$ .  $\square$

(b) Conclude that every non zero  $D$ -module  $M$  has a  $D$ -basis.

*Proof.* Since  $M \neq 0$ , there exists an  $y \in M \setminus \{0\}$ . It follows that the singleton  $\{y\}$  is a  $D$ -linearly independent subset of  $M$ . On the other hand,  $M = 1 \cdot M$ , so the set  $M$  is a generating set of  $M$ . Applying part (a) to  $X = M$  and  $Y = \{y\}$ , it follows that  $M$  has a  $D$ -basis.  $\square$

## Problem 2

Let  $R$  be a commutative domain. Let  $I$  be a non-principal ideal of  $R$ . Show that when  $I$  is considered as an  $R$ -module (by left multiplication), then  $I$  is indecomposable but not cyclic.

*Proof.* Since  $I$  is non-principal, by definition  $I$  is not cyclic as an  $R$ -module. Suppose, for the sake of contradiction, that  $I = P \oplus Q$  for some nonzero proper  $R$ -submodules  $P, Q$  of  $I$ . Take  $p \in P \setminus \{0\}$  and  $q \in Q \setminus \{0\}$ . Then  $p \cdot q - q \cdot p = pq - qp = 0 \implies p \cdot q = q \cdot p$ . As  $R$  is a domain  $pq = qp \neq 0$ , whence  $pq = qp \in P \cap Q$  contradicts that the sum  $P \oplus Q$  is direct.  $\square$

## Problem 3

Let  $R$  be a commutative ring. An  $R$ -module  $M$  is called *torsion* if for any  $m \in M$  there exists some nonzero  $r \in R$  such that  $rm = 0$ . An  $R$ -module  $N$  is called *divisible* if for any nonzero  $r \in R$  it holds that  $rN = N$ .

(a) Suppose  $M$  is a torsion  $R$ -module and  $N$  is a divisible  $R$ -module. Prove that  $M \otimes_R N = \{0\}$ .

*Proof.* Let  $m \in M$  and  $n \in N$ . Since  $M$  is torsion, there exists a nonzero  $r \in R$  such that  $rm = 0$ . Now, by divisibility of  $N$ , there exists an  $n' \in N$  such that  $rn' = n$ . Hence

$$m \otimes n = m \otimes rn' = rm \otimes n' = 0 \otimes n' = 0.$$

Thus every simple tensor in  $M \otimes_R N$  is 0, whence  $M \otimes_R N = 0$ .  $\square$

(b) Consider the  $\mathbb{Z}$ -module  $M = \mathbb{Q}/\mathbb{Z}$ . Prove that  $M \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} M = \{0\}$

*Proof.* We show that  $M$  is both torsion and divisible. Note that for any  $\frac{p}{q} + \mathbb{Z} \in \mathbb{Q}/\mathbb{Z}$ ,  $q \neq 0$  and  $q \cdot (\frac{p}{q} + \mathbb{Z}) = q \cdot \frac{p}{q} + \mathbb{Z} = p + \mathbb{Z} = \mathbb{Z}$ , so  $\mathbb{Q}/\mathbb{Z}$  is torsion.

On the other hand, suppose  $n \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{0\}$ . For  $\frac{p}{q} + \mathbb{Z} \in \mathbb{Q}/\mathbb{Z}$ , observe that

$$n \cdot \left( \frac{p}{q} + \mathbb{Z} \right) = \frac{np}{q} + \mathbb{Z} = \frac{p}{q} + \mathbb{Z}$$

so  $\mathbb{Q}/\mathbb{Z}$  is divisible. Appealing to part(a), it follows that  $M \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} M = 0$ .  $\square$

## Problem 4

Let  $R$  be a PID and  $A$  be an  $R$ -module. Let  $K$  be the field of fractions of  $R$ , and consider the  $K$ -module  $B = K \otimes_R A$ . Prove that every  $z \in B$  is a simple tensor.

*Proof.* Let  $z \in B$ . Then there exists  $\frac{x_1}{s_1}, \dots, \frac{x_n}{s_n} \in K$ ,  $a_1, \dots, a_n \in A$  and  $c_1, \dots, c_n \in R$  such that

$$z = \sum_{i=1}^n c_i \cdot \left( \frac{x_i}{s_i} \otimes a_i \right) = \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{c_i x_i}{s_i} \otimes a_i = \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{c_i x_i \prod_{j \neq i} s_j}{s_1 \cdots s_n} \otimes a_i.$$

Since  $R$  is a PID, there exists an  $s \in R$  such that  $(s) = \langle c_i x_i \prod_{j \neq i} s_j : 1 \leq i \leq n \rangle$ . Then for each  $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ , there is an  $r_i \in R$  such that  $c_i x_i \prod_{j \neq i} s_j = r_i s$ . Hence,

$$z = \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{c_i x_i \prod_{j \neq i} s_j}{s_1 \cdots s_n} \otimes a_i = \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{r_i s}{s_1 \cdots s_n} \otimes a_i = \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{s}{s_1 \cdots s_n} \otimes r_i a_i = \frac{s}{s_1 \cdots s_n} \otimes \left( \sum_{i=1}^n r_i a_i \right)$$

is a simple tensor.  $\square$

## Problem 5

Let  $R$  be a commutative ring and  $M$  an  $R$ -module.

(a): Let  $I$  be an ideal of  $R$ . Prove an isomorphism

$$R/I \otimes M \simeq M/IM.$$

*Proof.* On one hand, consider the map  $\tilde{\Psi} : M \rightarrow R/I \otimes_R M$  given by  $\tilde{\Psi}(m) := (1 + I) \otimes m$  for  $m \in M$ . This map is clearly an  $R$ -module homomorphism by the second and third defining relations the tensor product. For  $i \in I$  and  $m \in M$ ,  $\tilde{\Psi}(im) = (1 + I) \otimes im = i \cdot (1 + I) \otimes m = 0$ , so the generators of  $IM$  lie in  $\ker(\tilde{\Psi})$  whence  $IM \subseteq \ker(\tilde{\Psi})$ . Hence,  $\tilde{\Psi}$  descends to an  $R$ -module homomorphism  $\Psi : M/IM \rightarrow R/I \otimes_R M$  such that  $\Psi(m + IM) = \tilde{\Psi}(m)$ . Observe that, for  $r \in R$  and  $m \in M$ ,  $\Psi(rm + IM) = (1 + I) \otimes r \cdot m = (r + I) \otimes m$ , so  $\Psi(M/IM)$  contains all simple tensors, whence by linearity  $\Psi$  is surjective.

On the hand, consider the map  $\tilde{\Phi} : R/I \times M \rightarrow M/IM$  given by  $\tilde{\Phi}(r + I, m) = rm + IM$ . To see that this is well-defined, if  $r + I = r' + I \in R/I$ , then  $r - r' \in I$  whence  $(r - r') \cdot m + IM = IM$ . Suppose now that  $m, n \in M$ ,  $r + I, s + I \in R/I$ , and  $x \in R$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\Phi}((r + I) + (s + I), m) &= \tilde{\Phi}((r + s) + I, m) = (r + s) \cdot m + IM \\ &= (r \cdot m + IM) + (s \cdot m + IM) = \tilde{\Phi}(r + I, m) + \tilde{\Phi}(s + I, m) \\ \tilde{\Phi}(r + I, m + n) &= r \cdot (m + n) + IM = r \cdot m + r \cdot n + IM = (r \cdot m + IM) + (r \cdot n + IM) \\ &= \tilde{\Phi}(r + I, m) + \tilde{\Phi}(r + I, n) \\ \tilde{\Phi}(x \cdot (r + I), m) &= \tilde{\Phi}(xr + I, m) = (xr) \cdot m + IM = x \cdot (r \cdot m + IM) = x \cdot \tilde{\Phi}(r + I, m) \\ \tilde{\Phi}(r + I, x \cdot m) &= r \cdot (x \cdot m) + IM = x \cdot (r \cdot m + IM) = x \cdot \tilde{\Phi}(r + I, m), \end{aligned}$$

so  $\tilde{\Phi}$  is an  $R$ -bilinear map. By the universal property of tensor products, there exists a unique  $R$ -module homomorphism  $\Phi : R/I \otimes M \rightarrow M/IM$  such that  $\Phi((r + I) \otimes m) = \tilde{\Phi}(r + I, m)$  for all  $r \in R$  and  $m \in M$ .

Now we show that  $\Phi$  and  $\Psi$  are mutual inverses. On one hand, for  $m + IM \in M/IM$ ,

$$\Phi(\Psi(m + IM)) = \Phi((1 + I) \otimes m) = 1 \cdot m + IM = m + IM,$$

so  $\Phi \circ \Psi = id_{M/IM}$ . For the other direction, it suffices by linearity to prove that  $\Psi \circ \Phi$  is the identity on just the simple tensors. For  $(r + I) \otimes m \in R/I \otimes M$ ,

$$\Psi(\Phi((r + I) \otimes m)) = \Psi(rm + IM) = (1 + I) \otimes rm = (r + I) \otimes m$$

so  $\Psi \circ \Phi$  is the identity on simple tensors, whence  $\Psi \circ \Phi = id_{R/I \otimes M}$ . □

(b): Suppose that  $M$  is a finitely generated free  $R$ -module. Show that the *rank* of  $M$  is well-defined, i.e. any two  $R$ -bases of  $M$  have the same number of elements.

*Proof.* Let  $\mathfrak{m} \subseteq R$  be a maximal ideal of  $R$ . Let  $k = R/\mathfrak{m}$  be the corresponding residue field. Suppose that  $n, l \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $R^l \cong M \cong R^n$ . Then,

$$k^l \cong (R/\mathfrak{m} \otimes R)^l \cong R/\mathfrak{m} \otimes R^l \cong R/\mathfrak{m} \otimes R^n \cong (R/\mathfrak{m} \otimes R)^n \cong k^n$$

as  $R$ -modules. Let  $\varphi : k^l \rightarrow k^n$  be the composition of the above  $R$ -module isomorphisms. Note that  $\mathfrak{m} \subseteq \text{Ann}_R(k^l), \text{Ann}_R(k^n)$ , so the  $k$ -module structures on  $k^l, k^n$  given by  $(r + \mathfrak{m}) \cdot a := r \cdot a$  and  $(r + \mathfrak{m}) \cdot b$  for  $a \in k^l$  and  $b \in k^n$  are well-defined. Moreover, for  $r \in R$  and  $a \in k^l$ ,

$$\varphi((r + \mathfrak{m}) \cdot a) = \varphi(r \cdot a) = r \cdot \varphi(a) = (r + \mathfrak{m}) \cdot \varphi(a),$$

so  $\varphi$  is also a  $k$ -module isomorphism. As  $k^l$  and  $k^n$  are isomorphic  $k$ -vector spaces, it follows that  $l = n$ .  $\square$

## Problem 6

Let  $R \subseteq S$  be an inclusion of commutative rings. Consider the polynomial rings  $R[x]$  and  $S[x]$ . Prove that there is an isomorphism of  $S$ -modules,

$$S \otimes_R R[x] \rightarrow S[x].$$

*Proof.* On one hand, there is an obvious map  $\Psi : S[x] \rightarrow S \otimes_R R[x]$  defined by

$$\Psi \left( \sum_{k=0}^n s_k x^k \right) := \sum_{k=0}^n s_k \otimes x^k.$$

Then, for monomials  $s_k x^k, t_k x^k \in S[x]$  and  $s \in S$ ,

$$\Psi(s \cdot (s_k x^k) + t_k x^k) = \Psi((ss_k + t_k)x^k) = (ss_k + t_k) \otimes x^k = s \cdot (s_k \otimes x^k) + t_k \otimes x^k = s \cdot \Psi(s_k x^k) + \Psi(t_k x^k),$$

whence via extending linearly and applying this relation, it follows that  $\Psi$  is an  $S$ -module homomorphism.

On the other hand, consider the map  $\tilde{\Phi} : S \times R[x] \rightarrow S[x]$  given by  $(s, f(x)) \mapsto sf(x)$ . This map is clearly  $R$ -bilinear as it is a multiplication map, so there exists a unique  $R$ -module homomorphism  $\Phi : S \otimes R[x] \rightarrow S[x]$  such  $\Phi(s \otimes f(x)) = \tilde{\Phi}(s, f(x)) = sf(x)$ . Moreover, we will show that this map is in fact an  $S$ -module homomorphism. It suffices to show this relation on simple tensors, whence linearity would imply that it holds on all of  $S \otimes_R R[x]$  considered as an  $S$ -module. Let  $s, s' \in S$  and  $f(x) \in R[x]$ . Then,

$$\Phi(s \cdot (s' \otimes f(x))) = \Phi((ss') \otimes f(x)) = ss'f(x) = s \cdot \Phi(s' \otimes f(x)).$$

Now we show that the  $S$ -module homomorphisms  $\Psi$  and  $\Phi$  are mutual inverses. On one hand, suppose that  $f(x) = \sum_{k=0}^n s_k x^k \in S[x]$ . Then

$$\Phi(\Psi(f(x))) = \Phi \left( \sum_{k=0}^n s_k \otimes x^k \right) = \sum_{k=0}^n \Phi(s_k \otimes x^k) = \sum_{k=0}^n s_k x^k = f(x),$$

so  $\Phi \circ \Psi = id_{S[x]}$ . On the other hand, it suffices to show that  $\Psi \circ \Phi$  agrees with the identity on simple tensors, whence by linearity it would agree with the identity on all of  $S \otimes_R R[x]$ . Suppose  $f(x) = \sum_{k=0}^n r_k x^k \in R[x]$  and  $s \in S$ . Then,

$$\Psi(\Phi(s \otimes f(x))) = \Psi(sf(x)) = \sum_{k=0}^n \Psi(sr_k x^k) = \sum_{k=0}^n (sr_k) \otimes x^k = \sum_{k=0}^n s \otimes r_k x^k = s \otimes \sum_{k=0}^n r_k x^k = s \otimes f(x),$$

so  $\Psi \circ \Phi = id_{S \otimes R[x]}$ .  $\square$

## Problem 7

Let  $R$  be a commutative ring and  $I_1, \dots, I_k$  be a finite collection of ideals of  $R$ . Let  $M$  be an  $R$ -module.

(a) Prove that the map  $f : M \rightarrow \frac{M}{I_1 M} \times \cdots \times \frac{M}{I_k M}$  defined by

$$m \mapsto (m + I_1 M, \dots, m + I_k M)$$

is an  $R$ -module homomorphism with kernel  $I_1 M \cap \cdots \cap I_k M$ .

*Proof.* Let  $m, n \in M$  and  $r \in R$ . Then

$$f(r \cdot m + n) = (r \cdot m + n + I_1 M, \dots, r \cdot m + n + I_k M) = r \cdot (m + I_1 M, \dots, m + I_k M) + (n + I_1 M, \dots, n + I_k M) = r \cdot f(m) + f(n)$$

so  $f$  is an  $R$ -module homomorphism. It is clear that  $I_1 M \cap \cdots \cap I_k M \subseteq \ker(f)$ , so it remains to show the reverse inclusion. Suppose that  $m \in \ker(f)$ . Then  $(I_1 M, \dots, I_k M) = f(m) = (m + I_1 M, \dots, m + I_k M)$ , whence  $m \in I_j M$  for  $1 \leq j \leq k$ , so  $m \in I_1 M \cap \cdots \cap I_k M$ .  $\square$

(b) Assume in addition that the ideals  $I_1, \dots, I_k$  are pairwise comaximal. Show that there is an isomorphism of  $R$ -modules,

$$\frac{M}{(I_1 \cdots I_k)M} \cong \frac{M}{I_1 M} \times \cdots \times \frac{M}{I_k M}.$$

*Proof.* We proceed by induction on the integer  $k \geq 2$ . Suppose first that  $k = 2$ . Then by comaximality, there exists an  $r \in I_1$  and  $s \in I_2$  such that  $r + s = 1$ . Then  $1 - s = r \in I_1$ , so for  $m \in M$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} f(rm) &= (rm + I_1 M, rm + I_2 M) = (I_1 M, (1 - s) \cdot m + I_2 M) = (I_1 M, m + I_2 M) \\ f(sm) &= (sm + I_1 M, sm + I_2 M) = ((1 - r) \cdot m + I_1 M, I_2 M) = (m + I_1 M, I_2 M). \end{aligned}$$

Hence, for a fixed  $(m + I_1 M, n + I_2 M) \in M/I_1 M \times M/I_2 M$ ,

$$f(rn + sm) = f(rn) + f(sm) = (m + I_1 M, n + I_2 M),$$

so  $f$  is surjective. Now we show that  $I_1 \cap I_2 = I_1 I_2$ . The reverse inclusion is true *a priori*, regardless of comaximality of the ideals. For the forward inclusion, suppose that  $x \in I_1 \cap I_2$ . Then  $x = x(r + s) = xr + xs \in I_1 I_2$ . Hence  $\ker(f) = I_1 I_2$  by part (a), so the claim follows via the first isomorphism theorem.

Now fix  $k > 2$  suppose that the claim holds for all integers less than  $k$ . Consider the ideals  $I = I_1$  and  $J = I_2 \cdots I_k$ . We claim that these ideals are comaximal. For  $j \in \{2, \dots, k\}$ , choose  $r_j \in I$  and  $s_j \in I_j$  such that  $r_j + s_j = 1$ . Then, every term in the expansion of the product  $1 = (x_2 + y_2) \cdots (x_k + y_k)$  is in  $I$  except for the term  $y_2 \cdots y_k \in J$ , so  $1 \in I + J$  i.e.  $I, J$  are comaximal. By the induction hypothesis,

$$\frac{M}{(I_1 \cdots I_k)M} = \frac{M}{(IJ)M} \cong \frac{M}{I_1 M} \times \frac{M}{(I_2 \cdots I_k)M} \cong \frac{M}{I_1 M} \times \cdots \times \frac{M}{I_k M}.$$

$\square$