date: monday, march 18, 2024

Principal Ideal Domains Recall: An integral domain is a principal ideal domain (PID) if every ideal in the domain is principal.

Goal: To show all PIDs are UFDs

 $I_{N} = I_{N+1} = I_{N+2} = \cdot$

Lemma: Let D be a PID. Let $I_1, I_2, I_3, ...$ be a collection of ideals

such that $I \subseteq I \subseteq I_s \subseteq \cdots$. Then there exists an N such that

· Let a,beI. So we have aeI, and beI, for some i,j. If i=j, aeI, \subseteq I, So a,beI, Thus, a-beI, \subseteq I (similar argument if j<i). Let aeI. So aeI, For any reD, raeI, \subseteq I. Since D is a PID, there exists deD such that $I = \langle d \rangle$. Since

Proof

Let $I = \bigcup_{i=1}^{n} I_i$. We claim that I is an ideal. · I≠Ø since O∈I.⊆I.

eq. \mathbb{Z} , F[x]

deI=UI, there exists a N such that deIn. So

 $\langle d \rangle \subseteq I_N \subseteq I_{N+1} \subseteq \cdots \subseteq I = \langle d \rangle$ $S_0 \langle d \rangle = I_N = I_{N+1} = \cdots$

Def": A ring R is a Noetherian ring if it has the ascending chain condition, ie. for any chain of ideals $I_1\subseteq I_2\subseteq\cdots$, there exists N such that

 $I_{N} = I_{N+1} = \cdots$

Corollary: Any PID is Noetherian.

Lemma: Let 3 be a nonempty set of ideals in a PID. Then 3

has a maximal element, ie. a J⊆S such that for all I∈S

with J⊆I, J=I. Proof Suppose 5 did not have a maximal element. Let I, &S. Since I, is 'not maximal, there exists Ize8 such that Again, Iz is not maximal, so exists $I_3 \in S$ such that $I_1 \subsetneq I_2 \subsetneq I_3$. We can continue this process forever to get $I_1 \subsetneq I_2 \subsetneq I_3 \subsetneq \dots$ But this contradicts the fact that a PID is Noetherian. Lemma: Let R be a PID. If a is not a unit, then a can be written as a product of irreducibles. Let S={<a>|a cannot be written as a product of irreducibles} (a is not a unit). Goal is to show $S=\emptyset$. Suppose $S \neq \emptyset$. Then by previous theorem, there exists $(a) \in S$ such that (a) is maximal in S. But we also know a = bc with anot reducible, so b and c not units. But then, $\langle a \rangle \subset \langle b \rangle$ and $\langle a \rangle \subset \langle c \rangle$ So , <c> \&S. So b=p...pr and c=q...qs can be factored into irreducibles. But then $a=bc=p_1\cdots p_rq_1\cdots q_s$ is a product of irreducibles. So $\langle a\rangle \notin S$, a contradiction. So $S=\emptyset$. Theorem: Every PID is also a UFD. Proof Given an aeD that is not a unit, we saw a can be written as a product of irreducibles, $0 = p_1 \cdots p_r$ Suppose $a=p, \dots p_r$ and $a=q, \dots q_s$ are two ways to write a as a product of irreducibles. Assume res. 80 p. ...pr = q. ...q., Since D is a PID, p. is also prime. Since pilqings, we have pilqi for some i Relabel so

p.1q., ie. q.=u.p. Since q. is irreducible, u. is a unit. Thus, If r<s, would end with $p_1p_2 \cdots p_r = u_1p_1q_2 \cdots q_3$. $1 = U_1 \cdots U_r Q_{r+1} \cdots Q_s$ But this can't happen since q_i 's are not units. So r=s and $p_i=u_iq_i$ for all i. Corollary: If F is a field, F[x] is an UFD. eq. Z is an UFD Note: Converse is false, there are UFDs that are not PIDs. eq. $F[x_1,...,x_n]$ is a UFD but not a PID. domains -UFDs fields Euclidean. **PIDs** domains Deft Let D be an integral domain. Suppose that there is a function v: D/203-> IN that satisfies: ① If a,b \in D, then $v(a) \leq v(ab)$. ② Let a,b∈D with b≠0, then there exists q,r∈D such that $\alpha = bq + r$ with r = 0 or v(r) < v(b). Then D is called an Euclidean domain and v is a Euclidean valuation. v puts a "size" on elements of D. eg. For $D=\mathbb{Z}$, we use $v:\mathbb{Z}\setminus\{0\}\to \mathbb{N}$

