



Claim 1: In a PID, every nonzero prime ideal is maximal

proof: Suppose I is a nonzero prime ideal in a PID, R . (I is proper)

Suppose $I \subset J$

R is PID so $I = (a)$ and $J = (b)$ for $a, b \in R$

Then $I = (a) \subseteq (b) = J \Rightarrow a \in (b)$ so $a = rb$ for some $r \in R$

Then $rb = a \in I$ so by I being prime $\Rightarrow r \in I$ or $b \in I$.

Suppose $r \in I$. Then $r = ka$ for some $k \in R$

$a = rb = kab$ ($a \neq 0$) so cancel a

$1 = kb$ so $b \in (b) \subseteq J$ and $J = R$

Next suppose $b \in I$ then $b = ka$ for some $k \in R$

$a = rka$ $1 = rk$

Then $J = (b) \subseteq I \Rightarrow J = I$

Claim: Every PID is a UFD

proof (sketch): Suppose R is a PID

(Existence of factorization into irreducibles in R)

Suppose $r \in R$ is a nonzero, nonunit element

If r is irreducible in R , then done (factorization $r=r$)

If r is reducible in R $r = st$ for nonunits s, t .

If s_1, t_1 are irreducible, then you're done

Now suppose s_1 is reducible in R

$\hookrightarrow s_1 = s_2 t_2$ continue...

Q: Why must this process terminate

Elements: $r = s_1 t_1$ $s_1 = s_2 t_2$ $s_2 = s_3 t_3, \dots$

ideals: $(r) \subseteq (s_1) \subseteq (s_2) \subseteq (s_3) \subseteq \dots$

can this happen infinitely in a PID?

No, PID's are Noetherian

Claim 3: Every PID is Noetherian

proof: Suppose $I_1 \subseteq I_2 \subseteq I_3 \subseteq \dots$

is an ascending chain of ideals in a PID, R

Let $I = \bigcup_{k=1}^{\infty} I_k$

(Exercise: this is an ideal)

R is a PID $\Rightarrow I = (a)$ for some $a \in I$

Then $a \in \bigcup_{k=1}^{\infty} I_k$ so $a \in I_n$ for some $n \in \mathbb{N}$

$\Rightarrow a \in I_n$ for all $n \geq n$

but then $I = (a) \subseteq I_n \subseteq I$ so $I_n = I$ for all $n \geq n$

so it must stabilize

Aside: in a general ring R
a chain of ideals can
be 1) finite or infinite
ascending $I_1 \subseteq I_2 \subseteq \dots$
descending $\dots \subseteq I_1 \subseteq I_2 \subseteq I_3$

A ring is Noetherian if
there are no strictly ascending
infinite chains of ideals

A ring is Artinian if
there are no strictly descending
infinite chains

Ex: in \mathbb{Z} $(60) \subseteq (15) \subseteq (5) \subseteq (1) \subseteq \dots$