

1. GRADED RINGS

Definition. Let G be an abelian group (written additively) and R a commutative ring. A G -**grading** for R is a family $\{R_g\}_{g \in G}$ of abelian groups of $(R, +)$ such that $R = \bigoplus_{g \in G} R_g$ (as abelian groups) and $R_g R_h \subseteq R_{g+h}$ for all $g, h \in G$. The elements of R_g are called the **homogeneous elements** of R of degree g . If $r \in R_g$, we write the **degree** of r as $\deg r = g$ or $|r| = g$.

Note. Any ring is a graded ring by letting $R_0 = R$ and $R_i = 0$ for all $i \neq 0$.

Examples.

(1) Let $R = S[x]$ and G be any abelian group. Set $|x| = g$ for some $g \in G$. For $h \in G$, we see $R_h = \bigoplus_{i=g+h} Sx^i$. Note that $S \subseteq R_0$.

- If $G = \mathbb{Z}$ and $|x| = 1$, then for $n \in \mathbb{Z}$, $R_n = \begin{cases} Sx^n & \text{if } n \geq 0, \\ 0 & \text{if } n < 0. \end{cases}$ This is an \mathbb{N} -grading.
- If $G = \mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z}$ and $|x| = \bar{1}$, then for $\bar{m} \in \mathbb{Z}_n$ with $0 \leq m \leq n-1$, we see $R_{\bar{m}} = \bigoplus_{i=\bar{m}} Sx^i = \bigoplus_{k=0}^{\infty} Sx^{m+kn}$. So $R_{\bar{0}} = \bigoplus_{k=0}^{\infty} Sx^{kn} = S[x^n] \subseteq R$.

(2) Let $R = S[x_1, \dots, x_d]$ and G be any abelian group. Set $|x_i| = g_i$. For $h \in G$, we have $R_h = \bigoplus_{\alpha_1 g_1 + \dots + \alpha_d g_d = h} Sx_1^{\alpha_1} \cdots x_d^{\alpha_d}$.

- If $R = S[x, y]$, $G = \mathbb{Z}$, and $|x| = |y| = 1$, then for $n \in \mathbb{Z}$, $R_n = \bigoplus_{i+j=n, i, j \geq 0} Sx^i y^j$.
- If $R = S[x, y]$, $G = \mathbb{Z}$, and $|x| = 2, |y| = 3$, then $R_m = \bigoplus_{2i+3j=m} Sx^i y^j$.
- If $R = S[x, y]$, $G = \mathbb{Z}$, and $|x| = 1, |y| = -1$, then $R_n = \bigoplus_{i-j=n} Sx^i y^j$. In particular, $R_0 = \bigoplus_{i \geq 0} Sx^i y^i = S[xy] \supsetneq S$.
- If $R = S[x, y]$, $G = \mathbb{Z} \oplus \mathbb{Z}$, and $|x| = (1, 0), |y| = (0, 1)$, then for $g = (m, n) \in G$, we see $R_g = Sx^m y^n$ (if $m, n \geq 0$).

Proposition 1.1. Let $R = \bigoplus_{g \in G} R_g$ be a graded ring by an abelian group G . Then R_0 is a ring with identity. In fact, $1_R \in R_0$ and each R_g is an R_0 -module.

Proof. We will prove $1_R \in R_0$. As $R = \bigoplus R_g$, we can write $1_R = e_{g_1} + \dots + e_{g_n}$ where $e_{g_i} \in R_{g_i} \setminus \{0\}$. Now, multiplying by e_{g_i} , we see $e_{g_i} = e_{g_i} e_{g_1} + \dots + e_{g_i} e_{g_n}$. By properties of the direct sum, we must have $e_{g_i} = e_{g_i} e_{g_j}$ for some j and $e_{g_i} e_{g_k} = 0$ for all other k . Note that $g_i + g_j = g_i$, that is, $g_j = 0$. WLOG, let $j = 1$. Thus, we have $1 = e_0 + e_{g_2} + \dots + e_{g_n}$. Notice that

$$1 = 1^2 = (e_0 + e_{g_2} + \dots + e_{g_n})^2 = \sum_{i,j} e_{g_i} e_{g_j} = e_0^2 = e_0 \in R_0. \quad \square$$

Lemma 1.2. Let M be an R_0 -submodule of R_i for some fixed i . Let RM be the ideal of R generated by M . Then $RM \cap R_i = M$.

Proof. It is clear that $M \subseteq RM \cap R_i$. So let $r \in RM \cap R_i$. Then $r = \sum_{j=1}^k f_j m_j$ where $f_j \in R, m_j \in M$. Write $f_j = \sum_{\ell \text{ finite}} f_{j,\ell}$ where $f_{j,\ell} \in R_\ell$. Then $R = \sum_{j,\ell} \underbrace{f_{j,\ell} m_j}_{\in R_{i+\ell}}$. As $r \in R_i$, we have $r = \sum_j f_{j,0} m_j \in R_0 M \subseteq M$. \square

Proposition 1.3. Let $R = \bigoplus_{g \in G} R_g$ and suppose R is Noetherian (resp. Artinian). Then each R_i is a Noetherian (resp. Artinian) R_0 -module. In particular, R_0 is a Noetherian (resp. Artinian) ring.

Proof. Let $M_0 \subseteq M_1 \subseteq \dots$ be an ascending chain of R_0 -modules in R_i . Then $RM_0 \subseteq RM_1 \subseteq \dots$ is an ascending chain of ideals in R . As R is Noetherian, there exists k such that $RM_{k+1} = RM_{k+2} = \dots$. Intersecting with R_i gives us $M_{k+1} = M_{k+2} = \dots$ by the Lemma. \square

Corollary 1.4. If R has finite length, R_i does for all i .

Proof. Recall that $\lambda(R) < \infty$ if and only if R is Noetherian and Artinian. \square

Corollary 1.5. *If $R = \bigoplus_{g \in G} R_g$ is Noetherian, then R_0 is Noetherian and each R_i is a finitely generated R_0 -module.*

By the Hilbert Basis Theorem, if R_0 is Noetherian and R is a finitely generated R_0 -algebra, then R is Noetherian.

Definition. *Let $R = \bigoplus_{g \in G} R_g$ and M an R -module. We say M is a **graded R -module** if there exists abelian subgroups M_g of M for all $g \in G$ such that $M = \bigoplus_{g \in G} M_g$ and $R_h M_g \subseteq M_{h+g}$ for all $g, h \in G$.*

Note. As $R_0 M_g \subseteq M_g$, we see each M_g is an R_0 -module. Also note that R is a graded R -module.

Example. If $\{M_i\}_{i \in I}$ is a family of graded R -modules, then $\bigoplus_{i \in I} M_i$ and $\prod_{i \in I} M_i$ are graded in the obvious way. Thus $R \oplus R$ is a graded R -module and R^n is a graded R -module.

Definition. *Let M be a G -graded R -module and $g \in G$. Define M **shifted by g** (or **twisted by g**) by $M(g) = M$ as R -modules, but for $h \in G$, $M(g)_h = M_{g+h}$. Then $M(g) = \bigoplus_{h \in G} M(g)_h$.*

Example. Let $R = K[x]$, $G = \mathbb{Z}$, and $|x| = 1$. Then $k[x] = k \oplus kx \oplus kx^2 \oplus \dots$ where $k[x]_0 = k$ but $k[x](2)_0 = kx^2$.

Proposition 1.6. *Let $R = \bigoplus_{g \in G} R_g$, $M = \bigoplus_{g \in G} M_g$. Let $N \subseteq M$ be an R -submodule. TFAE*

- (1) $N = \bigoplus_{g \in G} N_g$ where $N_g = N \cap M_g$.
- (2) Given $f \in M$, $f \in N$ if and only if each homogenous component of f is in N .
- (3) N has a homogenous generating set.

If (1) – (3) are satisfied, N is called a **graded submodule** or **homogeneous submodule** of M .

Proof. (1) \Rightarrow (2): Let $f \in M$. Write $f = f_{g_1} + \dots + f_{g_n}$, $f_{g_i} \in M_{g_i}$. If $f \in N$, then $f = \sum_{g \in G} f'_g$ where $f'_g \in N \cap M_g$. By uniqueness of the decomposition of f , $f'_g = f_g$ for all $g \in G$. Thus $f_g \in N$ for all $g \in G$. The other direction is clear.

(2) \Rightarrow (1): Similar.

(2) \Rightarrow (3): Let $S = \{f \in N | f \text{ is homogeneous}\}$. By (2), S generates N . [Note that when N is finitely generated, one can show there exists a finite homogeneous generating set].

(3) \Rightarrow (2): Let S be a homogeneous generating set for N . Let $f \in M$. The backward direction is clear. So suppose $f = \sum_{g \in G} f_g \in N$. Now, $f = \sum_{i=1}^n r_i s_i$ where $s_i \in S$ are homogeneous and $r_i \in R$. Let $|s_i| = g_i$ and $r_i = \sum_{g \in G} r_{i,g}$. So $f = \sum_{i,g} r_{i,g} s_i$. For $h \in G$, $f_h = \sum_i r_{i,h-g_i} s_i \in N$ as $s_i \in N$. □

Examples.

- (1) Let $R = k[x, y, z]$, $G = \mathbb{Z}$, and $|x| = |y| = |z| = 1$. Then $I_1 = (x^2 y z + z^4 - x^2 z^2, x y + y^2)$ is a homogeneous ideal (by (3) of the proposition). Also, $I_2 = (x^2 + y, y^2, x^2 + x^2 y)$ is homogeneous because $I_2 = (x^2, y)$. However, $I_3 = (x^2 + y)$ is not homogeneous as $y \notin I$ but y is a homogeneous component of $x^2 + y \in I_3$.
- (2) Let $R = k[x, y, z]$, $G = \mathbb{Z}^3$, and $|x| = (1, 0, 0)$, $|y| = (0, 1, 0)$, $|z| = (0, 0, 1)$. Note that I_1 is not homogeneous as it does not contain xy , a homogeneous component of $xy + y^2 \in I_1$. I_2 is again homogeneous, but I_3 is again not.

Remarks. Let R, M be graded.

- (1) Let $\{N_\lambda\}_{\lambda \in I}$ be a family of graded R -submodules of M . Then $\bigcap N_\lambda$ and $\sum N_\lambda$ are graded.
- (2) If I is a graded ideal and N a graded submodule, then IN is a graded submodule of N .

Proof. As I is a graded ideal, $I = (r_1, r_2, \dots)$ where the r_i are homogeneous. Similarly, as N is a graded submodule, it has a homogeneous generating set $S = \{f_i\}$. Then $\{r_i f_i\}$ is a homogeneous generating set for IN as for $rf \in IN$, we see $rf = (\sum_{i \in I} a_i r_i)(\sum_{j \in J} b_j f_j) = \sum_{i,j} a_i b_j r_i f_j$ (and similarly for $\sum s_i g_i \in IN$). Thus IN is graded. □

In particular, if I and J are homogeneous ideals, then $IJ, I \cap J, I + J$ are all homogeneous.

- (3) Let $N_1, N_2 \subseteq M$ be graded submodules. Then $(N_1 :_R N_2) = \{r \in R | rN_2 \subseteq N_1\}$ is a homogenous ideal of R .

Proof. Let $f \in (N_1 :_R N_2)$ and write $f = \sum_{g \in G} f_g$. Let T be a homogeneous generating set for N_2 . Note $f \in (N_1 :_R N_2)$ if and only if $ft \in N_1$ for all $t \in T$. Thus $(\sum f_g)t \in N_1$. But $(\sum f_g)t = \sum f_g t$ is a homogeneous decomposition of ft . As N_1 is homogeneous, $f_g t \in N_1$ for all $g \in G, t \in T$. Thus $f_g \in (N_1 :_R N_2)$ for all g . \square

Special Cases:

- If M is graded, then $\text{Ann}_R M = (0 :_R M)$ is a homogeneous ideal.
- If $x \in M$ is homogeneous, then $(0 :_R x) = (0 :_R Rx)$ is a homogeneous ideal.
- If I is a homogeneous ideal and x a homogeneous element, then $(I :_R x)$ is a homogeneous ideal.

- (4) If $N \subseteq M$ is a graded submodule and $I \subseteq R$ is homogeneous, then $(N :_M I) = \{m \in M | Im \subseteq N\}$ is a graded submodule of M .

Proof. Let $m \in (N :_M I)$. As M is graded, $m = \sum m_i$ where m_i are homogeneous. Let T be a homogeneous generating set for I . Then $tm \in N$ for all $t \in T$. Note $tm = \sum tm_i$ is a homogeneous decomposition of an element in N . Thus $tm_i \in N$ for all i as N is graded. Of course, this is true for all $t \in T$, which generates I . So $Im_i \subseteq N$, that is, $m_i \in (N :_M I)$ for all i . Thus $(N :_M I)$ is graded as it contains the homogeneous components of any element. \square

- (5) If $I \subseteq R$ is a homogeneous ideal, then R/I is a graded ring (as $(R/I)_g = \{r + I | r \in R_g\}$).

Definition. Let $R = \bigoplus_{g \in G} R_g$ be a graded ring. Let $S \subseteq R$ be a subring. Then S is a **graded subring** of R if $S = \bigoplus S_g$ where $S_g = S \cap R_g$.

Exercises.

- (1) Let $R = \bigoplus_{g \in G} R_g, S \subseteq R$ a subring. Let $S_0 = S \cap R_0$, a ring. Then S is a graded subring if and only if S is generated over S_0 by homogeneous elements of R . In particular, if f_1, \dots, f_n are homogeneous elements of R , then $R_0[f_1, \dots, f_n]$ is a graded subring of R .

Proof. For the forward direction, assume $S = \bigoplus_{g \in G} S_g$ where $S_g = S \cap R_g$. As $1_R \in S$ and $1_R \in R_0$, we know $1_R \in S_0$. Then it is clear to see $S = \sum_{s \in S_g, g \in G} S_0 s$. For the backward direction, let T be the generating set and set $S_g = \sum_{s \in T \cap R_g} S_0 s$. The clearly $S_g = S \cap R_g$ and $S = \bigoplus S_g$. \square

- (2) If $R = \bigoplus_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} R_i$ is a field, then $R_i = 0$ for all $i \neq 0$.

Proof. Consider the element $r_g + r_h \in R$ where $r_g \in R_g \setminus \{0\}$ and $r_h \in R_h$. Suppose $g < h$ and note $r_g + r_h \neq 0$. Then there exists $s \in R$ such that $s(r_g + r_h) = 1 \in R_0$. Write $s = s_1 + \dots + s_t$ where $s_i \in R_{m_i}$ and $m_1 < \dots < m_t$. Then, $1 = s_1 r_g + (\text{higher terms})$. Certainly $s_1 r_g \neq 0$ as $s_1, r_g \neq 0$. Thus $s_1 r_g = 1$. This says $s r_h = 0$, which implies $r_h = 0$. Thus every element of R is homogeneous. Furthermore, as $1 + r$ is a unit for all $r \in R \setminus \{-1\}$ and $1 \in R_0$, we must have $r \in R_0$ for all $r \in R$. \square

- (3) Suppose R is \mathbb{Z} -graded and I a homogeneous ideal. Then \sqrt{I} is homogeneous.

Proof. Let $r \in \sqrt{I}$ and write $r = \sum r_i$ where $r_i \in R_{m_i}$ and $m_1 < \dots < m_t$. Then $r^k \in I$ for some I . Of course, $r^k = r_1^k + (\text{higher terms})$ and as I is homogenous, we must have that the homogenous component $r_1^k \in I$. Thus $r_1 \in \sqrt{I}$, which implies $r - r_1 \in \sqrt{I}$. Now, induct on the number of homogeneous components to see that $r_i \in \sqrt{I}$ for all $1 \leq i \leq t$. Thus \sqrt{I} is homogeneous. \square

Note. In the above two exercises, we could have generalized \mathbb{Z} to the following:

Definition. A **totally ordered abelian group** $(G, +)$ is an abelian group with a partial order $<$ such that G is totally ordered with respect to $<$ and if $g_1 < g_2$ and $h \in G$, then $g_1 + h < g_2 + h$.

Example. Let $R = k[t]$, $G = \mathbb{Z}$, and $|t| = 1$. Then $S = k[t^2, t^3]$ is a graded subring of R .

Definition. Let R be a commutative ring and I an ideal of R . Consider $R[t]$, where t is a variable, as a graded ring over \mathbb{Z} with $|t| = 1$. Define $R[It] := R[\{it|i \in I\}] \subseteq R[t]$, a graded ring, to be the **Rees ring** of I .

If $I = (a_1, \dots, a_n)$, then $R[It] = R[a_1t, \dots, a_nt]$. Therefore, if R is Noetherian, $R[It]$ is a finitely generated algebra over a Noetherian ring and hence Noetherian. Often, the Rees ring is written without the t , that is, $\mathcal{R}(I) = R \oplus I \oplus I^2 \oplus \dots$, but we will write it with the t , in order to keep a better grasp on the grading.

Let M be an R -module. Consider the graded $R[t]$ -module $M[t] = \{m_0 + m_1t + \dots + m_kt^k | m_i \in M\} = M \oplus Mt \oplus Mt^2 \oplus \dots$. Note $M[t]$ is generated over $R[t]$ by M (degree 0). So, if M is finitely generated as an R -module, then $M[t]$ is finitely generated as an $R[t]$ -module. We define the **Rees module of I and M** to be $\mathcal{R}(I, M) = M[IMt] = M \oplus IMt \oplus I^2Mt^2 \oplus \dots = R[It]Mt^0 \subseteq M[t]$. This is a graded $R[It]$ -submodule of $M[t]$. Further, $M[IMt]$ is the $R[It]$ -submodule of $M[t]$ generated by M (degree 0). Again, if M is finitely generated over R , then $M[IMt]$ is a finitely generated $R[It]$ -module.

Remark. If R is Noetherian and M a finitely generated R -module, then $M[IMt]$ is a Noetherian (so finitely generated) $R[It]$ -module.

Theorem 1.7 (Artin-Rees Theorem). Let R be Noetherian, $I \subseteq R$ an ideal, M a finitely generated R -module and $N \subseteq M$ a submodule. Then there exists k such that for all $n \geq k$ we have $I^nM \cap N = I^{n-k}(I^kM \cap N)$.

Proof. Note that \supseteq is always true. So we need only to prove \subseteq . As $N[t] \subseteq M[t]$ is a graded $R[It]$ -module, we can consider $N[t] \cap M[IMt]$ to be a graded $R[It]$ -submodule of $M[IMt]$. Note

$$N[t] \cap M[IMt] = N \oplus (IM \cap N)t \oplus (I^2M \cap N)t^2 \oplus \dots \oplus (I^nM \cap N)t^n \oplus \dots$$

As R is Noetherian, so is $R[It]$ as a ring. Further, as $M[IMt]$ is a finitely generated $R[It]$ -module, $M[IMt]$ is a Noetherian $R[It]$ -module.. Hence $N[t] \cap M[IMt]$ is a finitely generated $R[It]$ -module, which implies it has a finite homogeneous generating set $\{x_1t^{m_1}, \dots, x_st^{m_s}\}$. Thus $x_i \in I^{m_i}M \cap N$. Let $k = \max\{m_1, \dots, m_s\}$, $n \geq k$ and $f \in I^nM \cap N$. Then $ft^n \in (N[t] \cap M[IMt])_n$, which implies $ft^n = \sum_{i=1}^s (r_it^{n-m_i})(x_it^{m_i}) = (\sum_1^s r_ix_i)t^n$, where $r_i \in I^{n-m_i}$. So $r_ix_i \in I^{n-m_i}(I^{m_i}M \cap N) \subseteq I^{n-m_i-1}(I^{m_i+1}M \cap N) \subseteq \dots \subseteq I^{n-k}(I^kM \cap N)$. Therefore, $f = \sum r_ix_i \in I^{n-k}(I^kM \cap N)$. \square

Note. The integer k above depends on I, M and N .

Theorem 1.8 (Krull's Intersection Theorem). Let R be Noetherian, I an ideal of R , and M a finitely generated R -module. Then there exists $s \in I$ such that $(1-s) \cap_{n=1}^{\infty} I^nM = 0$.

Proof. Let $N = \cap_{n=1}^{\infty} I^nM \subseteq M$. By the Artin-Rees Lemma, there exists k such that for all $n \geq k$, $I^nM \cap N \subseteq I^{n-k}N$. Let $n = k+1$. Then $N = I^{k+1}M \cap N \subseteq IN$. Note N is finitely generated and so by NAK, $I + \text{Ann}_R N = R$ (a 902 exercise). Thus $1 = s + t$ for $s \in I, t \in \text{Ann}_R N$. Then $t = 1 - s \in \text{Ann}_R N$. So $(1-s) \cap I^nM = 0$. \square

Special Cases.

- (1) If $I \subseteq J(R)$, then $\cap_1^{\infty} I^nM = 0$ (as if $s \in J(R)$, then $1-s$ is a unit).
- (2) If R is a domain and $I \neq R$, then $\cap_1^{\infty} I^n = 0$ (as $1-s \neq 0$, you can cancel).

Corollary 1.9. Let R be Noetherian, $I \subseteq J(R), N \subseteq M$ finitely generated. Then $\cap_{n=1}^{\infty} (N + I^nM) = N$.

Proof. Note that $I^n(M/N) = (N + I^nM)/N \subseteq M/N$, which is finitely generated. As $I \subseteq J(R)$, Krull's Intersection Theorem says $\cap_0^{\infty} I^n(M/N) = 0$. Thus $0 = \cap_0^{\infty} (N + I^nM)/N = (\cap_0^{\infty} (N + I^nM))/N$, and so $\cap_0^{\infty} (N + I^nM) = N$. \square

As $R[It] = R \oplus It \oplus I^2t^2 \oplus \dots$, we see $IR[It] = I \oplus I^2t \oplus I^3t^2 \oplus \dots$, a homogenous ideal. This yields the graded ring $R[It]/IR[It] = R/I \oplus (I/I^2)t \oplus (I^2/I^3)t^2 \oplus \dots$, the **associated graded ring** of I . We denote $R[It]/IR[It]$ by $gr_I(R)$ or $gr(I, R)$. As $R[It]$ is Noetherian, $gr_I(R)$ is Noetherian. Further, if $I = (a_1, \dots, a_n)$, then $gr_I(R) = R/I[\bar{a}_1t, \dots, \bar{a}_nt]$, where $\bar{a}_i \in I/I^2$. Suppose $\bar{x} \in I/I^2$ is a non-zero-divisor on $gr_I(R)$. Let $y \in I^n$ and $\bar{y} = y + I^{n+1} \in I^n/I^{n+1} = gr_I(R)_n$. Suppose $xy \in I^{n+2}$. Then $\bar{x} \cdot \bar{y} = \overline{xy} \in I^{n+1}/I^{n+2}$. Thus $\bar{x}\bar{y} = 0$ which implies $\bar{y} = 0$ as \bar{x} is a non-zero-divisor. Thus $y \in I^{n+1}$. This gives us $(I^{n+2} : x) \cap I^n = I^{n+1}$ for all n .

Exercise. Let (R, m) be local, $I \subseteq m$, and $x \in I$ a non-zero-divisor on R . Suppose $(I^n : x) \cap I^{n-2} = I^{n-1}$ for all $n \geq 2$. Prove $(I^n : x) = I^{n-1}$ for all $n \gg 0$.

Proof. Note that we can show inductively that $I^{m-1} = \cap_2^m (I^k : x)$. Of course, $(I^m : x) \subseteq (I^{m-1} : x) \subseteq \dots$. So $I^{m-1} = \cap_2^m (I^k : x) = (I^m : x)$. \square

Thus, in the situation above, if x is a non-zero-divisor, then $(I^n : x) = I^{n-1}$ for all n . Conversely, if $x \in I \setminus I^2$ and $(I^n : x) = I^{n-1}$ for all n , then $\bar{x} \in I/I^2$ is a non-zero-divisor on $gr_I(R)$. This gives us the following criteria:

Proposition 1.10. *Let $x \in I \setminus I^2$. Then $\bar{x} \in I/I^2$ is a non-zero-divisor on $gr_I(R)$ if and only if $(I^n : x) = I^{n-1}$ for all n .*

Exercise. Let (R, m) be local, $I \subseteq m$, $x \in I$ a non-zero-divisor on R . Then there exists k such that $(I^n : x) \subseteq I^{n-k}$ for all k .

Proof. First note that $x(I^n : x) = (x) \cap I^n$. By Artin-Rees (let $M = R, N = (x)$), we see $x(I^n : x) = (x) \cap I^n \subseteq I^{n-k}(x)$. Thus $x(I^n : x) \subseteq xI^{n-k}$. As x is a non-zero-divisor, we can cancel to get $(I^n : x) \subseteq I^{n-k}$. \square

Now, suppose we know $(I^{n+2} : x) \cap I^n = I^{n+1}$ for all $n \geq k$. Then, one can show inductively that $(I^{k+n} : x) \cap I^k = I^{k+n-1}$. Using the exercise, we get $(I^\ell : x) = I^{\ell-1}$ for all $\ell \gg 0$. This requirement says x is a **superficial element**.

With the above assumption, Krull's Intersection Theorem tells us $\cap I^{n-k} = 0$ and so $\cap (I^n : x) = 0$. If we choose $I = m$, then this exercise shows x a non-zero-divisor implies $\cap (m^n : x) = 0$. Of course, if x is a zero-divisor, then $\alpha x = 0$, which implies $\alpha \in \cap (m^n : x)$. So we now have a criteria for non-zero-divisors in a local ring, namely

$$x \text{ is a non-zero-divisor if and only if } \cap (m^n : x) = 0.$$

Exercise. If (R, m) is a local ring, then we can define $\rho(x, y) = \begin{cases} 2^{-n} & \text{if } x - y \in m^n \setminus m^{n+1} \\ 0 & \text{if } x = y \end{cases}$. This definition makes sense by Krull's Intersection Theorem. Prove that ρ is a metric.

Proof. Clearly ρ is symmetric and $\rho(x, y) = 0$ if and only if $x = y$. So we need only show the triangle inequality holds. If $x = z, z = y$, or $x = y$, we are done. So suppose $\rho(x, y) = 2^{-n_1}, \rho(x, z) = 2^{-n_2}$, and $\rho(y, z) = 2^{-n_3}$. WLOG, assume $n_2 \leq n_3$. Then $x - y = (x - z) + (z - y) \in m^{n_2}$, that is, $n_1 \geq n_2$. So $\rho(x, y) \leq 2^{-n_2} = \rho(x, z) \leq \rho(x, z) + \rho(z, y)$. \square

The resulting topology on R is called the m -adic topology. Let $\{x_n\}, \{y_n\}$ be Cauchy sequences in R . Define $\{x_n\} \sim \{y_n\}$ if and only if $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} x_n - y_n = 0$. Let \hat{R} denote the equivalence classes of Cauchy Sequences, that is, $\hat{R} = \{[\{x_n\}] \mid \{x_n\} \text{ is a Cauchy sequence}\}$. Define $+, \cdot$ on \hat{R} by $[\{x_n\}][\{y_n\}] = [\{x_n y_n\}]$ and $[\{x_n\}] + [\{y_n\}] = [\{x_n + y_n\}]$. These are well-defined

- Assume $[\{x_n\}] = [\{r_n\}]$ and $[\{y_n\}] = [\{s_n\}]$. Then, we wish to show $[\{x_n y_n\}] = [\{r_n s_n\}]$, that is $\lim x_n y_n - r_n s_n = 0$. So it suffices to show $\rho(x_n y_n - r_n s_n, 0)$ is arbitrarily small, that is, for all k there exists N such that $x_n y_n - r_n s_n \in m^k$ for all $n \geq N$. Let k be given. Then, there exists N_1 such that $x_n - r_n \in m^k$ for all $n \geq N_1$ and there exists N_2 such that $y_n - s_n \in m^k$ for all $n \geq N_2$. So, for all $n > \max\{N_1, N_2\}$ we have

$$x_n y_n - r_n s_n = x_n y_n - r_n y_n + r_n y_n - r_n s_n = \underbrace{(x_n - r_n)}_{\in m^k} y_n + r_n \underbrace{(y_n - s_n)}_{\in m^k} \in m^k.$$

Thus $\{\{x_n y_n\}\} = \{\{r_n s_n\}\}$.

- Assume $\{\{x_n\}\} = \{\{r_n\}\}$ and $\{\{y_n\}\} = \{\{s_n\}\}$ and define N_1, N_2 as above. We want to show $\{\{x_n + y_n\}\} = \{\{r_n + s_n\}\}$, that is, for all k there exists N such that $(x_n + y_n) - (r_n + s_n) \in m^k$. Of course, for all $n > \max\{N_1, N_2\}$, we see $(x_n + y_n) - (r_n + s_n) = (x_n - r_n) + (y_n - s_n) \in m^k$.

and they make \hat{R} into a commutative ring with identity (where $1 = \{\{1\}\}$). Note that there is a natural ring homomorphism $\phi : R \rightarrow \hat{R}$ defined by $r \mapsto \hat{r} = \{\{r, r, \dots\}\}$.

- ϕ is injective.

Proof. Suppose $\hat{r} = \hat{s}$. Then $\lim \hat{r} - \hat{s} = 0$, which implies $\rho(r - s, 0) \rightarrow 0$. Of course, $\rho(r - s, 0)$ is constant and so we must indeed have $\rho(r - s, 0) = 0$, that is, $r = s$. \square

Further, \hat{R} is faithfully flat as an R -module and is a Noetherian local ring with $\hat{m} = m\hat{R}$.

Definition. A ring R is complete if it is complete in the m -adic topology, that is, $\phi : R \hookrightarrow \hat{R}$ defined by $r \mapsto \hat{r}$ is an isomorphism.

In particular, the definition says $\hat{\hat{R}} \cong \hat{R}$.

Examples.

- (1) Any local ring R with $\dim R = 0$ is complete: Note $\sqrt{(0)} = m$ and so $m^n = 0$ for some n . Thus $\{x_n\}$ is a Cauchy sequence if and only if there exists k such that $x_n = x$ for all $n \geq k$. So $\{x_n\} \sim \{x\}$, the constant sequence. So $R \hookrightarrow \hat{R}$ is an isomorphism.
- (2) Let $R = k[x]_{(x)}$. Then $\{1, 1 + x, 1 + x + x^2, \dots\}$ is a Cauchy sequence. So $\hat{R} = k[[x]]$ [Recall $\sum r_i x^i$ is a unit if and only if r_0 is a unit. So \hat{R} is local with maximal ideal $m = (x)$ as the only non-units are those with zero constant term]. In general, for $R = k[x_1, \dots, x_n]_{(x_1, \dots, x_n)}$, we see $\hat{R} = k[[x_1, \dots, x_n]]$.

Theorem 1.11 (Cohen Structure Theorem). Let (R, m) be a complete local ring. Assume $R \supseteq$ a field. Then $R \cong k[[x_1, \dots, x_n]]/I$ for some field k .

Definition. Let M, N be graded R -modules where $R = \bigoplus_{g \in G} R_g$. An R -homomorphism $f : M \rightarrow N$ is called **graded** or **homogeneous** of degree $g \in G$ if $f(M_h) \subseteq N_{h+g}$ for all $h \in G$.

Exercise. If $f : M \rightarrow N$ is graded, then $\ker f$ is a graded submodule of M and $\operatorname{im} f$ is a graded submodule of N .

Proof. Let $m \in \ker f$. As $m \in M$ is graded, we know $m = \sum_{i=1}^t m_{g_i}$ where $m_{g_i} \in M_{g_i}$. Note that $0 = f(m) = f(\sum m_{g_i}) = \sum f(m_{g_i})$. Thus $\sum f(m_{g_i})$ is a decomposition of 0, which is homogenous. By the uniqueness of decompositions, we must have $f(m_{g_i}) = 0$, that is, $m_{g_i} \in \ker f$. Thus $m \in \ker f$ if and only if its homogenous components are, that is, $\ker f$ is graded.

Let $n \in \operatorname{im} f$. Say $n = \sum_{i=1}^t n_{g_i}$ where $n_{g_i} \in N_{g_i}$. As $n \in \operatorname{im} f$, there exists $m \in M$ such that $f(m) = n$. Say $m = \sum_{j=1}^t m_{h_j}$ where $m_{h_j} \in M_{h_j}$. Then, $n = f(\sum m_{h_j}) = \sum f(m_{h_j})$ is a decomposition. By uniqueness, we must have $s = t$ and (after reordering) $f(m_{h_i}) = n_{g_i}$ for all i . Thus $n_i \in \operatorname{im} f$ for all i , that is $\operatorname{im} f$ is graded. \square

Remarks.

- (1) Suppose $f : M \rightarrow N$ is graded of degree g . Define $f[-g] : M(-g) \rightarrow N$ by $m \mapsto f(m)$. So $f[-g](M(-g)_h) = f(M_{h-g}) \subseteq N_{h-g+g} = N_h$. Note $f[-g]$ is degree 0.
- (2) If $0 \rightarrow A \rightarrow B \rightarrow C \rightarrow 0$ is a short exact sequence of graded R -modules with degree 0 maps, then $0 \rightarrow A_g \rightarrow B_g \rightarrow C_g \rightarrow 0$ is a short exact sequence of R_0 -modules for all $g \in G$. In particular, if R_0 is a field, then we have infinitely many short exact sequences of vector spaces.
- (3) If $C : \dots C_i \xrightarrow{d_i} C_{i-1} \xrightarrow{d_{i-1}} C_{i-2} \rightarrow \dots$ is a complex of graded R -modules and degree 0 maps, then H_i are graded R -modules for all i by the exercise.

2. PRIMARY DECOMPOSITION

Definition. Let R be a commutative ring with identity and M a finitely generated R -module. An R -submodule $N \subseteq M$ is called **primary** if for all $f \in R$ the map $f_{M/N} : M/N \rightarrow M/N$ defined by $\overline{m} \mapsto \overline{fm}$ is either injective or nilpotent, that is, for all $f \in R, m \in M$, if $fm \in N$, then either $m \in N$ or $f \in \sqrt{\text{Ann}_R M/N}$.

Special Case. An ideal $I \subseteq R$ is primary if for all $a, b \in R$ if $ab \in I$ then $b \in I$ or $a \in \sqrt{\text{Ann}_R R/I} = \sqrt{I}$.

Remarks.

- (1) Prime ideals are primary.
- (2) If $N \subseteq M$ is primary, then $\sqrt{\text{Ann}_R M/N}$ is prime.

Proof. Suppose $ab \in \sqrt{\text{Ann}_R M/N}$, but $a \notin \sqrt{\text{Ann}_R M/N}$. Say $(ab)^\ell M \subseteq N$, that is, $a^\ell(b^\ell M) \subseteq N$. Then $a^\ell \notin \sqrt{\text{Ann}_R M/N}$ implies $b^\ell M \subseteq N$. Thus $b^\ell \in \sqrt{\text{Ann}_R M/N}$. \square

Definition. If $N \subseteq M$ is primary, we say N is p -**primary** in M if $p = \sqrt{\text{Ann}_R M/N}$.

Proposition 2.1. If $\sqrt{\text{Ann}_R M/N} = m$, where m is maximal, then N is primary in M .

Proof. Let $f \in R, u \in M$. Suppose $fu \in N$. Assume $f \notin \sqrt{\text{Ann}_R M/N} = m$. Then $m + (f) = R$, that is, $1 = rf + a$ for some $r \in R, a \in m$. Say $a^\ell M \subseteq N$. Then $1 = 1^\ell = (rf + a)^\ell = r^\ell f + a^\ell$ for $r^\ell \in R$. Then $u = r^\ell f u + a^\ell u \in N$. \square

Corollary 2.2. If $I \subseteq R$ and \sqrt{I} is maximal, then I is primary.

Example. Let $R = k[x, y], I = (x^2, y^3)$. Then $\sqrt{I} = (x, y)$ maximal implies I is primary.

Exercise. Find an example where \sqrt{I} is prime, but I is not primary.

Proof. Consider $R = k[x, y, z]/(xy - z^2)$, graded in the usual way. Let $p = (\overline{x}, \overline{z})$. We will show $\sqrt{p^2}$ is prime, but p^2 is not primary. First note that $\sqrt{p^2} = p$ (In general, $\sqrt{q^n} = q$ for a prime q as if $q' \supseteq q^n$, then $q' \supseteq q$. Thus $\sqrt{q^n} = \cap q' = q$). So $\sqrt{p^2}$ is prime. Now, p^2 is not primary as $\overline{xy} = \overline{z^2} \in p^2$, but $\overline{x} \notin p^2$ (as p^2 is generated by elements of degree 2 while \overline{x} has degree 1) and $\overline{y} \notin p$. \square

Example. Let $R = \mathbb{Z}_p[x]/(x^p - 1)$ for a prime p . Let R be \mathbb{Z}_p -graded with $\deg x = \overline{1}$. Then $\deg x^p = p \cdot \overline{1} = 0$. So $(x^p - 1)$ is homogenous. As $\text{char} R = p$, we see $(x^p - 1) = (x - 1)^p$. So $x - 1$ is nilpotent in R , but $1, x$ are not nilpotent. Hence $\sqrt{(0)}$ is not a homogenous ideal.

From now on, we will assume a graded ring will be graded by a totally ordered abelian group. Then, by the earlier exercise, I homogenous will imply \sqrt{I} is homogenous.

Proposition 2.3. Let R be graded, $N \subseteq M$ graded R -modules with M finitely generated. Then N is primary if and only if for all $f \in R$ homogeneous and $m \in M$ homogenous with $fm \in N$, then $f \in \sqrt{\text{Ann}_R M/N}$ or $m \in N$.

Proof. The forward direction is clear. For the backward direction, we will induct on the number of nonzero homogenous components of f . So first suppose f is homogenous and $m = \sum_{i=1}^t m_{g_i}$ where $g_1 < g_2 < \dots$ with $fm \in N$. If $m \in N$, done. Note also that if $m_{g_i} \in N$, then $f(m - m_{g_i}) \in N$. So, WLOG assume $m_{g_i} \notin N$ for all i . Now $\sum f m_{g_i} = fm \in N$, which implies $f m_{g_i} \in N$ for all g_i as N is graded. Thus $f \in \sqrt{\text{Ann}_R M/N}$ by assumption. Now assume $f = \sum_{j=1}^s f_{h_j}$, where $h_1 < h_2 < \dots$. Again suppose $m \notin N$ and thus $m_{g_i} \notin N$ for all i . So $\sum_{i,j} f_{h_j} m_{g_i} = fm \in N$ implies $f_{h_1} m_{g_1} \in N$, as it is a homogeneous component. Thus $f_{h_1} \in \sqrt{\text{Ann}_R M/N}$ by assumption. As $m \notin N$, we can find a smallest t such that $f_{h_1}^t m \in N$. Let $m' = f_{h_1}^{t-1} m \notin N$ and $f' = f - f_{h_1}$. Then $f' m' \in N$ and f' has one less homogenous component. By induction, $f' \in \sqrt{\text{Ann}_R M/N}$. Thus $f = f' + f_{h_1} \in \sqrt{\text{Ann}_R M/N}$. \square

Corollary 2.4. Let R be graded and p a homogenous ideal. Then p is prime if and only if for all $f, g \in R$ homogenous with $fg \in p$, we have $f \in p$ or $g \in p$.

Proof. Since \sqrt{p} is homogenous, the condition implies $p = \sqrt{p}$: take a homogeneous element f in \sqrt{p} and consider $f^t \in p$. Then either $f^{t-1} \in p$ or $f \in p$ and either way we see inductively that $f \in p$. This condition also gives that p is primary. Of course, we've shown that the radical of a primary ideal is prime. This $p = \sqrt{p}$ is prime. \square

Note. As a graded ring is a domain if and only if 0 is prime, the corollary shows a graded ring is a domain if and only if there are no homogenous zero-divisors.

Definition. Let $R = \oplus R_g$ and M a graded R -module. M is called ***Noetherian** if one of the equivalent conditions hold:

- (1) M satisfies ACC on graded submodules.
- (2) Every homogenous submodule of M is finitely generated.
- (3) Every nonzero set of graded submodules of M has a maximal element.

Similarly, one can define ***Artinian**.

Definition. A graded R -module M is called ***simple** if $M \neq 0$ and M has no nontrivial graded submodules.

Definition. Let $N \subseteq M$ be graded R -modules. N is ***primary** if for all $f \in R$ homogeneous, $f_{M/N}$ is either nilpotent or injective.

Note. If G is totally ordered, $N \subseteq M$, then *primary is equivalent to primary.

Definition. Let $N \subseteq M$ be graded R -modules. Say N is ***irreducible** if whenever $N = N_1 \cap N_2$ where N_1, N_2 are graded R -submodules of M , then $N = N_1$ or $N = N_2$.

Q: Is *irreducible equivalent to irreducible?

Proposition 2.5. Let $N \subseteq M$ be graded R -modules with M *Noetherian. Suppose N is *irreducible. Then N is *primary.

Proof. Let $f \in R$ homogeneous and suppose $f_{M/N}$ is not nilpotent. Then $f \in \sqrt{\text{Ann}_R M/N}$. We will show $(N :_M f) = N$, that is, $f_{M/N}$ is injective. Note that $(N :_M f)$ is homogeneous. Consider $(N :_M f) \subseteq (N :_M f^2) \subseteq \dots \subseteq (N :_M f^n) \subseteq \dots$, an ascending chain of graded submodules. As M is *Noetherian, we must have $(N :_M f^n) = (N :_M f^{n+1}) = \dots$. Let $g = f^n$. Note g is homogeneous, $g \notin \sqrt{\text{Ann}_R M/N}$, and $(N :_M g) = (N :_M g^2)$. If $(N :_M g) = N$, then $(N :_M f) = N$.

Claim. $N = (N :_M g) \cap (gM + N)$.

Proof. Note that \subseteq is clear. So let gm_n be a homogeneous element of $(N :_M g) \cap (gM + N)$, that is, m and n are homogeneous. Then $g^2m + gn \in N$, which implies $g^2m \in N$. As $(N :_M g) = (N :_M g^2)$, this says $gm \in N$. Thus $gm + n \in N$.

As N is *irreducible, either $N = (N :_M g)$ or $N = gM + N$. In the latter case, we have $gM \subseteq N$ which says $g \in \text{Ann}_R M/N$, a contradiction. Thus $N = (N :_M g)$. \square

Theorem 2.6. Let M be a *Noetherian graded R -module. Then every graded submodule of M is a finite intersection of *irreducible submodules and thus a finite intersection of *primary submodules.

Proof. Suppose not. Let $\Gamma = \{N \subseteq M \mid N \text{ is graded and not the intersection of *irreducibles}\} \neq \emptyset$. As M is *Noetherian, there exists $N \in \Gamma$ maximal. In particular, N is not *irreducible and so $N = N_1 \cap N_2$ where $N_1, N_2 \supsetneq N$ are graded. By maximality, we must have N_1 and N_2 are the intersections of finitely many *irreducibles and therefore N is, a contradiction. \square

Exercises.

- (1) Give an example of a *field (i.e., a graded ring in which every nonzero homogeneous element is a unit) which is not a field. [Thus *simple does not imply simple.]

Proof. Consider $R = \mathbb{Q}[x, \frac{1}{x}]$ where $\deg x = 1, \deg \frac{1}{x} = -1$. Then R is a $*$ field, but not a field as $1 + x$ is not a unit. \square

(2) Show that if a \mathbb{Z} -graded ring is $*$ Noetherian then it is Noetherian.

Proof. By the Hilbert Basis Theorem, it is enough to show R_0 is a Noetherian ring and R is a finitely generated R_0 -algebra.

Claim. R_i is a Noetherian R_0 -module for all i .

Proof. We will show R_i satisfies ACC on submodules. If $M_1 \subseteq M_2 \subseteq \dots$ is an ascending chain of R_0 -submodules of R_i , then $RM_1 \subseteq RM_2 \subseteq \dots$ is an ascending chain of homogeneous R -modules. Thus, there exists n such that $RM_n = RM_{n+1} = \dots$. We've shown $RM_n \cap R_i = M_n$ and thus $M_n = M_{n+1} = \dots$.

Thus, by the claim R_0 is Noetherian. Note that this also shows R_i is finitely generated as an R_0 -module for all i . To show R is a finitely generated R_0 -algebra, let $R_- = \bigoplus_{n < 0} R_n$ and $R_+ = \bigoplus_{n > 0} R_n$. Then R_-R is a homogenous ideal of R and thus finitely generated. Say $R_-R = (y_1, \dots, y_d)R$ where y_i are homogeneous. Let $-k = \min\{\deg y_1, \dots, \deg y_d\}$ and $N = R_{-k} \oplus R_{-k+1} \oplus \dots \oplus R_{-1}$. As each R_i is finitely generated, we see N is. Say $N = R_0x_1 + \dots + R_0x_t$ where x_i are homogenous.

Claim. $(x_1, \dots, x_t)R = R_-R$.

Proof. It is enough to show $(x_1, \dots, x_t) = (y_1, \dots, y_d)$. Of course, $y_i \in R_n$ for some $n \geq k$ and thus

$y_i \in N$. So $y_i = r_1x_1 + \dots + r_tx_t$. Similarly, $x_i \in N$ implies $x_i \in R_n$ for $n < 0$ and so $x_i \in I$.

We now claim $R_0[R_-] = R_0[x_1, \dots, x_t]$. Let $S = R_0[R_-]$ and $T = R_0[x_1, \dots, x_t]$. We'll show inductively that $S_{-n} = T_{-n}$ for all $n \geq 0$. Clearly, $S_0 = R_0 = T_0$. So suppose $n > 0$. Let $r \in S_n$. If $n \leq k$, then $r \in N = R_0x_1 + \dots + R_0x_t \subseteq T$. If $n > k$, then $r \in R_-R = (x_1, \dots, x_t)R$. So there exists homogenous elements $u_1, \dots, u_t \in R$ such that $r = \sum_1^t u_ix_i$. Note that $\deg u_i + \deg x_i = \deg r = -n$. Thus $0 > \deg u_i > -n$ for all i , which implies $u_i \in T$ by induction. Thus $r \in T$ and $S_n = T_n$. Thus $R_0[R_-] = R_0[x_1, \dots, x_t]$.

We will show R is finitely generated over S . Let $R_+R = (z_1, \dots, z_m)R$. As above, we can show $R = S[z_1, \dots, z_m]$ (as S is Noetherian by the Hilbert Basis Theorem). Now, R finitely generated over S and S finitely generated over R_0 implies R is in fact finitely generated over R_0 . \square

The above exercise can in fact be generalized to a ring graded by any finitely generated group. It is not true in general, however, as the following example shows:

Example. Let $R = k[x_1, x_2, \dots]$ where $G = \bigoplus_{i=1}^{\infty} \mathbb{Z}$ and $\deg x_i = (0, \dots, 0, 1, 0, \dots, 0)$ (where the 1 is in the i^{th} spot). Let S be the set of nonzero homogeneous elements. Then R_S is graded ($\deg \frac{r}{s} = \deg r - \deg s$). Further, R_S is a $*$ field (every homogeneous element is a unit), but not Noetherian.

Since most of the groups we will consider are finitely generated, we will from now on replace $*$ Noetherian with Noetherian.

Let R be a Noetherian graded ring, M a finitely generated R -module, $N \subseteq M$ graded. Then there exists a primary decomposition $N = Q_1 \cap \dots \cap Q_\ell$ where Q_i are graded primary submodules of M . If $\sqrt{\text{Ann}_R M/Q_i} = P_i$, a prime, then we say P_i is **associated** to Q_i and Q_i is **P_i -primary**.

Remark. If Q_1, Q_2 are (homogeneous) primary submodules of M with the same associated prime P , then $Q_1 \cap Q_2$ is a (homogenous) primary ideal with associated prime P .

Proof. It is an elementary exercise to show $\sqrt{\text{Ann}_R M/(Q_1 \cap Q_2)} = \sqrt{\text{Ann}_R M/Q_1 \cap \text{Ann}_R M/Q_2} = \sqrt{\text{Ann}_R M/Q_1} \cap \sqrt{\text{Ann}_R M/Q_2} = P \cap P = P$. Now suppose $f \in R$ homogeneous, $m \in M$ homogeneous, and $fm \in Q_1 \cap Q_2$. Suppose $f \notin \sqrt{\text{Ann}_R M/(Q_1 \cap Q_2)} = P$. Then $fm \in Q_i$ and $f \notin P$ implies $m \in Q_i$. Thus $m \in Q_1 \cap Q_2$. \square

Definition. Say $N = Q_1 \cap \dots \cap Q_\ell$ is an **irredundant primary decomposition (ipd)** for N if the following hold

- (1) It is a primary decomposition
- (2) $Q_i \not\supseteq Q_1 \cap \cdots \cap \hat{Q}_i \cap \cdots \cap Q_\ell$ (that is, the intersection without Q_i).
- (3) $\sqrt{\text{Ann } M/Q_i} \neq \sqrt{\text{Ann}_R M/Q_j}$ for all $i \neq j$.

By the previous theorem and the remark, M Noetherian implies every submodule $\neq M$ has an ipd.

Suppose $N \subseteq Q$ are graded submodules of M where Q is p -primary. Then Q/N is a p -primary submodule of M/N . Thus, if $N = Q_1 \cap \cdots \cap Q_\ell$ is an ipd, then $(\bar{0}) = Q_1/N \cap \cdots \cap Q_\ell/N$ is an ipd of $(\bar{0})$ in M/N . Thus, we often just consider ipd's of $(\bar{0})$ in various modules.

Example. Let $R = k[x, y]$, k a field. Then $(x^2, xy) = (x) \cap (x^2, y)$ (to prove this, give R the standard \mathbb{Z}_2 -grading where all the ideals are homogenous). Note (x) is prime and thus primary. Also $\sqrt{(x^2, y)} = (x, y)$, the maximal ideal. So (x^2, y) is primary. As the radicals are different, this forms an ipd. Notice, though, that $(x) \cap (x^2, xy, y^2)$ is also an ipd. Thus ipd's are not unique.

Remark. Suppose Q is a graded p -primary submodule of M . Then $\sqrt{(Q :_R f)} = \begin{cases} p & \text{if } f \notin Q \\ R & \text{if } f \in Q. \end{cases}$

Proof. If $f \in Q$, clear. So suppose $f \notin Q$. Let $r \in R$ be homogeneous such that $rf \in Q$. So $r \in \sqrt{\text{Ann}_R M/Q} = p$. If $r \in p$, then $r^n M \subseteq Q$ which implies $r^n f \in Q$, that is, $r \in \sqrt{(Q :_R f)}$. \square

Theorem 2.7 (First Uniqueness Theorem). Let R be a graded Noetherian ring, $N \subseteq M$ finitely generated R -modules, $N = Q_1 \cap \cdots \cap Q_\ell$ be a graded ipd. Let $P_i = \sqrt{\text{Ann}_R M/Q_i}$ for $i = 1, \dots, \ell$ and let $P \in \text{Spec}(R)$. Then $P = P_i$ for some i if and only if $P = (N :_R f)$ for some homogeneous $f \in M$. Thus $\{P_1, \dots, P_\ell\}$ depend only on N , not the ipd. This set of primes is denoted $\text{Ass}_R M/N$, the set of **associated primes of M/N** . Note these primes are all homogeneous and the number of primary components in an ipd is uniquely determined by N .

Proof. For the backward direction, suppose $P = (N :_R f)$ for some homogeneous $f \in M$. Then

$$P = (N :_R f) = (Q_1 \cap \cdots \cap Q_\ell :_R f) = \cap_1^\ell (Q_i :_R f).$$

This implies $P = (Q_i :_R f)$ (if $P = I \cap J$, then $P = I$ or $P = J$) and so $P = \sqrt{P} = \sqrt{(Q_i :_R f)} = P_i$ as $f \notin Q$ by the remark.

For the forward direction, choose f homogeneous such that $f \in Q_1 \cap \cdots \cap \hat{Q}_i \cap \cdots \cap Q_\ell \setminus Q_i$. Then $\sqrt{(Q_i :_R f)} = P_i$. Also, $(N :_R f) = \cap_1^\ell (Q_j :_R f) = (Q_i :_R f)$ by the remark as $f \in Q_j$ for all $j \neq i$. So $\sqrt{(N :_R f)} = P_i$. Consider the set $\Gamma = \{(N :_R yf) \mid y \in R \text{ homogeneous, } yf \notin N\}$. Choose $(N :_R yf)$ maximal in Γ .

Claim. $(N :_R yf) = P_i$.

Proof. Observe that $(N :_R f) \subseteq (N :_R yf)$ and $(N :_R yf) \subseteq P_i$ [We see $yf \in Q_j$ for all $j \neq i$ and $yf \notin Q_i$, else $yf \in N$. So suppose $r \in (N :_R yf)$ is homogeneous. Then $ryf \in N \subseteq Q_i$, which implies $r \in \sqrt{\text{Ann } M/Q_i} = P_i$.] So, we see

$$P_i = \sqrt{(N :_R f)} = \sqrt{(N :_R yf)} = \sqrt{P_i} = P_i,$$

that is, $\sqrt{(N :_R yf)} = P_i$. Notice that if $r \in \sqrt{(N :_R yf)}$ is homogeneous, then $r^n \in (N :_R yf)$.

If $ryf \in N$, then $r \in (N :_R yf)$ and if $ryf \notin N$, then $(N :_R yf) \subseteq (N :_R ryf)$ which implies $(N :_R yf) = (N :_R ryf)$ by maximality of y and thus $r^{n-1} \in (N :_R yf)$. Inductively, we see $r \in (N :_R yf)$. Thus $(N :_R yf) = \sqrt{(N :_R yf)} = P_i$. \square

Note. For a homogeneous $f \in M$, we have $(0 :_R f)$ is an associated prime of M if and only if $(0 :_R f)$ is prime.

Remarks. Let R be Noetherian, $N \subseteq M$ be finitely generated, and everything graded.

- (1) $M = N$ if and only if $\text{Ass}_R M/N = \emptyset$ and so $M = 0$ if and only $\text{Ass}_R M = \emptyset$.
- (2) Q is a primary submodule of M if and only if $|\text{Ass}_R M/Q| = 1$.

$$(3) \sqrt{\text{Ann}_R M} = \bigcap_{p \in \text{Ass}_R M} p.$$

Proof. Let $0 = Q_1 \cap \cdots \cap Q_\ell$ be an ipd. Then

$$\sqrt{\text{Ann}_R M} = \sqrt{\text{Ann}_R M / (Q_1 \cap \cdots \cap Q_\ell)} = \sqrt{\text{Ann} M / Q_1 \cap \cdots \cap \text{Ann} M / Q_\ell} = \bigcap_1^\ell \sqrt{\text{Ann} M / Q_i} = \bigcap P_i. \quad \square$$

$$(4) \text{ The set of zerodivisors of } M, Z_R(M) = \bigcup_{p \in \text{Ass}_R M} p.$$

Proof. To show \supseteq , let $x \in \bigcup_{p \in \text{Ass}_R M} p$. Then $x \in p$ for some associated prime, which says $x \in (0 :_R f)$ for some homogeneous element. Then $xf = 0$ implies $x \in Z_R(M)$. For \subseteq , note that $Z_R(M) = \bigcup_{x \in M \setminus \{0\}} (0 :_R x)$ and so

$$Z_R(M) = \sqrt{Z_R(M)} = \sqrt{\bigcup_{x \in M \setminus \{0\}} (0 :_R x)} = \bigcup \sqrt{(0 :_R x)}.$$

Now, for $x \in M$, we see $(0 :_R x) = ((Q_1 \cap \cdots \cap Q_\ell :_R x) = \bigcap_1^\ell (Q_i :_R x)$. By the earlier remark (before the first uniqueness thm), we see $\sqrt{(0 :_R x)} = \bigcup_1^\ell \sqrt{(Q_i :_R x)} = \bigcap_{x \notin Q_i} P_i \subseteq P_j$ for some j . Thus $Z_R(M) = \bigcup_{x \in M \setminus \{0\}} \sqrt{(0 :_R x)} \subseteq \bigcup_{p \in \text{Ass}_R M} p$. \square

Consequently, if $f \in Z_R(M)$, then all homogeneous components of f are in $Z_R(M)$ as each P is homogeneous. This also says that $(0 :_R x) \subseteq Z_R(M) = P_1 \cup \cdots \cup P_S$, which implies $(0 :_R x) \subset P$, for some associated prime. Thus, if $(0 :_R x)$ is not an associated prime, it is at least contained in one.

(5) $N = 0$ if and only if $N_p = 0$ for all $p \in \text{Ass}_R M$. In particular, if $I \subseteq R$, then $I = 0$ if and only if $I_p = 0$ for all $p \in \text{Ass}_R R$.

Proof. Suppose $N_p = 0$ for all associated primes and consider a homogeneous element $x \in N \setminus \{0\}$. Say $p \supseteq (0 :_R x)$ for $p \in \text{Ass}_R M$. Then $N_p = 0$ implies $\frac{x}{1} \equiv \frac{0}{1}$, that is, there exists $a \in R \setminus p$ such that $ax = 0$. This of course says $a \in p$, a contradiction. Thus $N = 0$. \square

(6) R is reduced if and only if R_p is a field for every $p \in \text{Ass}_R R$.

Proof. For the forward direction, let $p \in \text{Ass}_R R$. Then $p = (0 :_R f)$ for some homogeneous f . Note $f \notin (0 :_R f)$ as R is reduced. Let $\frac{a}{s} \in R_p$. If $a \in (0 :_R f)$, then $fa = 0$ implies $\frac{a}{s} \cong \frac{0}{1}$. Otherwise, $\frac{s}{a} \in R_p$, which implies every nonzero element is a unit.

For the backward direction, suppose $r^n = 0$ for some $r \neq 0$. Say $p \supseteq (0 :_R r)$ for some $p \in \text{Ass}_R R$. Consider R_p . If $\frac{r}{s} \cong \frac{0}{1}$, then there exists $t \in R \setminus p$ such that $tr = 0$, that is, $t \in p$, a contradiction. Otherwise $\frac{r}{s}$ is a unit, but also a nilpotent element, a contradiction. \square

Note that this can not be weakened to the set of minimal primes. For example, consider $R = k[x, y]/(x^2, xy)$, where the only minimal prime is (x) . Clearly, R is not reduced as $x^2 = 0$. However,

$$R_{(x)} = k[x, y]_{(x)} / (x^2, xy)_{(x)} \cong k[x, y]_{(x)} / (x)_{(x)} \cong (k[x, y]/(x))_{(x)} \cong k[y]_{(0)} = k(y),$$

a field. Recall for an R -module M , the set of **minimal primes** is

$$\text{Min}_R M = \{p \in \text{Spec } R \mid p \text{ is minimal over } \text{Ann}_R M\}.$$

(7) $\text{Min}_R M \subseteq \text{Ass}_R M$. Thus $\text{Min}_R M = \{p \in \text{Ass}_R M \mid p \text{ is minimal}\}$.

Proof. By Remark 3, we see $P \supseteq \sqrt{\text{Ann}_R M} = \bigcap_{Q \in \text{Ass}_R M} Q$. Thus $P \supseteq Q \supseteq \text{Ann}_R M$ for some Q and thus $P = Q$. \square

Hence, $\text{Min}_R M$ is a finite set and each minimal prime is homogeneous.

Combining the previous two remarks, we see that in a reduced ring R , the minimal primes are exactly the associated primes.

(8) $P \in \text{Ass}_R M$ if and only if there exists a degree 0 injective homomorphism $0 \rightarrow R/p(g) \rightarrow M$ for some $g \in G$.

Proof. If $p \in \text{Ass}_R M$, then $p = (0 :_R f)$ where f is homogeneous. Let $\deg f = g$. Define $\phi : R/p(-g) \rightarrow M$ by $\bar{r} \mapsto rf$. This is injective. Similarly, if $R/p(d) \rightarrow M$ is defined by $1 \mapsto f$, then $p = (0 :_R f)$. \square

- (9) Let $0 \rightarrow L \xrightarrow{\phi} M \xrightarrow{\psi} N$ be an exact sequence of degree 0 homomorphisms of finitely generated R -modules. Then $\text{Ass}_R L \subseteq \text{Ass}_R M \subseteq \text{Ass}_R L \cup \text{Ass}_R N$.

Proof. For the first containment, let $p \in \text{Ass}_R L$. Then $p = (0 :_R f)$ for some homogeneous $f \in L$. Note then that $p = (0 :_R \phi(f))$ as for $a \in p$, we have $af = 0$ which implies $0 = \phi(af) = a\phi(f)$ and for $a \in (0 :_R \phi(f))$, we have $0 = a\phi(f) = \phi(af)$ which implies $af = 0$ as ϕ is 1-1.

For the second containment, let $p \in \text{Ass}_R M$. By the above remark, we see $R/p(g) \cong M' \subseteq M$ for some submodule M' of M and $g \in G$. Note that for all $x \in M'$, we have $p = (0 :_R x)$.

Case 1: $M' \cap \phi(L) \neq (0)$. Say $x \in M' \cap \phi(L)$ with $x \neq 0$. Say $\phi(y) = x$ for $y \in L$. Then $p \subseteq (0 :_R y)$ as for $a \in p$ we have $0 = ax = a\phi(y) = \phi(ay)$ and thus $ay = 0$ as ϕ is injective. In fact $p = (0 :_R x)$ as for $a \in (0 :_R y)$ we have $ay = 0$ implies $0 = \phi(ay) = a\phi(y) = ax$. Thus $p \in \text{Ass}_R L$.

Case 2: $M' \cap \phi(L) = \emptyset$. Then $\psi|_{M'}$ is injective by exactness. So $R/p(g) \cong M' \cong \psi(M')$ and so $p \in \text{Ass}_R N$ by the above remark. \square

Proposition 2.8. *Let R be Noetherian, $M \neq 0$ finitely generated graded R -module. Then there exists a sequence of graded submodules of M $(0) = N_t \subsetneq N_{t-1} \subsetneq \cdots \subsetneq N_0 = M$ such that $N_i/N_{i+1} \cong (R/p_i)(g_i)$ for some homogeneous P_i for $i = 0, \dots, t-1$ and $g_i \in G$.*

Proof. Let $\Gamma = \{N \subseteq M \text{ graded} \mid N \text{ has such a filtration}\}$. As $M \neq 0$, there exists $p \in \text{Ass}_R M$ and thus an injection $\phi : R/p(f) \hookrightarrow M$. Let $N = \phi(R/p(g))$, a graded submodule of M , so that $N \cong R/p(g)$. Thus $N \in \Gamma$ and so $\Gamma \neq \emptyset$. Choose $N \in \Gamma$ maximal. Suppose $N \neq M$. Let $p \in \text{Ass}_R M/N$. So there exists an degree 0 injection $\phi : R/p(g) \hookrightarrow M/N$. Let $N' \subseteq M$ be graded with $N'/N = \phi(R/p(g))$. Then $N' \supseteq N$ has a filtration, a contradiction to maximality. Thus $N = M$. \square

Lemma 2.9 (Prime Avoidance Lemma). *Let I, P_1, \dots, P_k be ideals in a ring R . Suppose*

- (1) *At least $k-2$ of the P_i 's are prime*
- (2) *$I \not\subseteq P_i$ for $i = 1, \dots, k$.*

Then $I \not\subseteq \cup_{i=1}^k P_i$.

Application. Let R be Noetherian, I an ideal. Then I contains a non-zero-divisor if and only if $\text{Ann}_R I = 0$ if and only if $\text{Hom}_R(R/I, R) = 0$.

Proof. The second implication statement and the forward implication of the first are clear. So suppose $\text{Ann}_R I = (0)$, but I consists of zero-divisors. Then $I \subset \cup_{p \in \text{Ass}_R R} P$, which implies $I \subset P$ for some $p \in \text{Ass}_R R$. Say $p = (0 :_R x)$. Then $x \in \text{Ann}_R I$, a contradiction. \square

This sets up the homological aspect of depth.

Example. Let $R = k[x, y], I = (x, y), P_1 = (x), P_2 = (y)$. Clearly, $I \not\subseteq (x)$ and $I \not\subseteq (y)$. By the PAL, $I \not\subseteq (x) \cup (y)$. (for example, $x + y \in I \setminus ((x) \cup (y))$).

If $\deg x = \deg y = 1$, we have a homogeneous element in $I \setminus ((x) \cup (y))$. If $\deg x = (1, 0), \deg y = (0, 1)$, then $x + y$ is no homogeneous. In fact, there does not exist any homogeneous element in $I \setminus ((x) \cup (y))$.

Proof. Suppose there exists $f \in I$ homogeneous. Say $\deg f = (r, s)$. Then $f = cx^r y^s \in (x) \cup (y)$. So every homogeneous element of I is in $(x) \cup (y)$. \square

A similar proof shows no homogeneous elements exist in $I \setminus ((x) \cap (y))$ when $\deg x = 0, \deg y = 1$.

Thus (this version) of the Prime Avoidance Lemma can not be modified to a general graded ring so that we can find a homogeneous element in $I \setminus (\cup P_i)$. However, we can talk about a relaxed prime avoidance lemma in the graded case.

Exercise. Let R be local, Noetherian. Suppose I contains a non-zero-divisor. Prove I has a minimal generating set consisting of non-zero-divisors.

Proof. First, we show we can find a generating set consisting of non-zero-divisors. Recall, by NAK, $I = (x_1, \dots, x_n)$ if and only if $I/mI = (\overline{x_1}, \dots, \overline{x_n})$. So any $x \in I \setminus mI$ is part of a generating set of I . Now, as I contains a non-zero-divisor, $I \not\subseteq P = ZD(R)$ for $p \in \text{Ass } R$ and $I \not\subseteq mI$. Thus by PAL, there exists $x_1 \in I \setminus (mI \cup (\cup_{p \in \text{Ass } R} p))$. Then x_1 is a non-zero-divisor and part of a generating set for I . If $I = (x_1)$, done. Otherwise, suppose we have $\{x_1, \dots, x_{n-1}\}$. If $I = (x_1, \dots, x_{n-1})$, done. Otherwise, $I \not\subseteq (x_1, \dots, x_{n-1})$ which implies, by PAL, that there exists $x_n \in I \setminus ((x_1, \dots, x_{n-1}) \cup mI \cup (\cup_{p \in \text{Ass } R} p))$. If $I = (x_1, \dots, x_n)$, done. Otherwise, continue. By ACC, we must eventually stop. Say $I = (x_1, \dots, x_k)$ where x_i are non-zero-divisor. Then $\overline{I} = (\overline{x_1}, \dots, \overline{x_k})$. This is a generating set over a field and thus some subset must be a basis. Lift the subset back up to get a minimal generating set of non-zero-divisors for I . \square

Lemma 2.10 (Graded Version of the Prime Avoidance Lemma). Let R be a \mathbb{Z} -graded ring and I, P_1, \dots, P_l homogeneous ideals such that

- (1) P_i is prime for all i .
- (2) I is generated by elements in strictly positive degree
- (3) $I \not\subseteq P_i, i = 1, \dots, l$.

Then, there exists a homogeneous $f \in I \setminus \cup_1^l P_i$ with $\deg f > 0$.

Proof. Induct on l . If $l = 1$, clear. Assume true for $l - 1$ primes. By induction, we get homogeneous $f_i \in I \setminus (P_1 \cup \dots \cup \hat{P}_i \cup \dots \cup P_l)$ for $i = 1, \dots, l$ with $\deg f_i = m_i$. If $f_i \notin P_i$ for some i , done. So assume $f_i \in P_i$ for $i = 1, \dots, l$. Let $s = \prod m_i$ and so $\deg f_i^{s/m_i} = s$ for all i . Note $f_i^{s/m_i} \in I$ and $f_i^{s/m_i} \notin P_i$ as P_i is prime. By replacing f_i with f_i^{s/m_i} , we can assume f_i are homogeneous of the same degree. Consider $f = f_1^{k-1} + f_2 f_3 \dots f_l$, a homogeneous element in I . If $f \in P_1$, then $f_2 \dots f_l \in P_1$, which implies $f_j \in P_1$ for some $j > 1$, a contradiction to the definition of f_j . Similarly, if $f \in P_j$ for $j > 1$, then $f_1^{k-1} \in P_j$ and so $f_1 \in P_j$, a contradiction. Thus $f \in I \setminus \cup_1^l P_i$ is homogeneous. \square

Q: Can we extend this proof so that P_1, P_2 are not primes?

Example. Let $R = k[x, y]/(xy), (\overline{}) = (\overline{x}) \cap (\overline{y}), Z_R(R) = (\overline{x}) \cup (\overline{y})$. If R is graded in one of the standard ways, then R has non-zero-divisors, but no homogeneous ones.

Homogeneous Localization

Let R be a G -graded ring, S a mcs consisting of homogeneous elements. Then the localization R_S has a natural grading where, for $g \in G$,

$$(R_S)_g = \left\{ \frac{r}{s} \mid r, s \text{ are homogeneous, } \deg r - \deg s = g \right\}.$$

- Check that this is closed under addition, is an abelian group, every element can be written as a sum of $\frac{r}{s}$ (of course, $\frac{f}{s} = \frac{f_1}{s} + \dots + \frac{f_l}{s}$).

Then $R_S = \bigoplus_{g \in G} (R_S)_g$ is a G -graded ring. If M is a graded R -module, then $M_S = \bigoplus_{g \in G} (M_S)_g$ where $(M_S)_g = \{ \frac{m}{s} \mid m, s \text{ are homogeneous, } \deg m - \deg s = g \}$ is a graded R_S -module.

If $p \in \text{Spec } R$, let $(p) = \{s \in R \mid s \text{ is homogeneous, } s \notin P\}$. Then $R_{(p)}$ is the homogeneous localization of R at p .

Q: If p is homogeneous, is this *local?

Example. Let $R = k[t], \deg t = 1$. Let $S = \{t^n \mid n \geq 0\}$. Then R_S is a \mathbb{Z} -graded ring and $R_S \cong k[t, t^{-1}]$.

Exercise. Let R be graded, M a graded R -module, S a homogeneous mcs, and $Q \subseteq M$ p -primary and graded. Then

(1) $Q_S \subseteq M_S$ is p_S -primary if $S \cap p = \emptyset$.

Proof. Note that if $S \cap p = \emptyset$, then p_S is a prime in M_S . First, we show $p_S = \sqrt{\text{Ann } M_S/Q_S}$. Then, we show Q_S is in fact primary. Recall that localizing commutes with annihilators and radicals. Thus

$$p_S = \left(\sqrt{\text{Ann } M/Q} \right)_S = \sqrt{(\text{Ann } M/Q)_S} = \sqrt{\text{Ann}(M/Q)_S} = \sqrt{\text{Ann } M_S/Q_S}.$$

To show Q_S is primary, suppose $\frac{f}{s} \cdot \frac{m}{s'} \in Q_S$. If $\frac{f}{s} \in p_S$, done. Otherwise, there exists $s'' \in S$ such that $s''fm \in Q$. Now $s'' \in S$ and $p \cap S = \emptyset$ implies $s'' \notin p$. Thus $fm \in Q$. Of course, $\frac{f}{s} \notin p_S$ implies $f \notin p$. Thus $m \in Q$ and so $\frac{m}{s'} \in Q_S$. \square

(2) $Q_S = M_S$ if $S \cap p \neq \emptyset$.

Proof. If $S \cap p \neq \emptyset$, then $p_S = R_S$ which implies $R_S = \sqrt{\text{Ann } M_S/Q_S}$. Then $1 \in \text{Ann } M_S/Q_S$ which implies $Q_S = M_S$. \square

Lemma 2.11. With the same hypotheses as above, consider $\phi : M \rightarrow M_{(p)}$ defined by $m \mapsto \frac{m}{1}$. Then $\phi^{-1}(Q_{(p)}) = Q$.

Proof. \supseteq is clear. Let $q \in \phi^{-1}(Q_{(p)})$. Then $\frac{q}{1} = \frac{q'}{s}$, for $s \notin p$ homogeneous. So there exists $s' \in (p)$ such that $s'(sq - q') = 0$, i.e., $s'sq = s'q' \in Q$. Now $s's \notin P$ and so $q \in Q$ by definition of primary. \square

Exercise. Let R be graded, Noetherian, M a finitely generated R -module, and S a homogeneous mcs. Then $\text{Ass}_{R_S} M_S = \{p_S | p \in \text{Ass } M, p \cap S = \emptyset\}$.

Proof. To show \subseteq , let $0 = Q_1 \cap \dots \cap Q_t$ be an ipd. Then $0_S = (Q_1)_S \cap \dots \cap (Q_t)_S$ is a primary decomposition. If $S \cap p_i \neq \emptyset$, then $(Q_i)_S = M_S$ and so we can remove it from the intersection. This leaves us with (after indexing) $0_S = (Q_1)_S \cap \dots \cap (Q_n)_S$. To show this is irredundant, we need only show that we can not remove another one. We know there exists $x \in (Q_2 \cap \dots \cap Q_n) \setminus Q_1$. If it were the case that $x \in (Q_1)_S$, then there would exist $s \in S$ such that $xs \in Q_1$. Now Q_1 is primary and $s \notin P_1$ (since $P_1 \cap S = \emptyset$). Thus $x \in Q_1$, a contradiction. So we have an ipd for 0_S . \square

Theorem 2.12 (Second Uniqueness Theorem). Let R be graded, Noetherian, M finitely generated and graded, and $N \subsetneq M$ graded. Let $N = Q_1 \cap \dots \cap Q_t$ be an ipd, where Q_i are p_i -primary. Suppose $p_i \in \text{Min}_R M/N$ (that is, P_i is minimal in $\text{Ass}_R M/N$). Then $Q_i = N_{(p_i)} \cap M = \phi^{-1}(N_{(p_i)})$ where $\phi : M \rightarrow M_{(p_i)}$. In particular, the primary component of N corresponding to p_i is unique. Say Q_i is an **isolated primary component**.

Proof. Let $S = (p_i)$. Then $N_S = (Q_1 \cap \dots \cap Q_t)_S = (Q_1)_S \cap \dots \cap (Q_t)_S$. Suppose $j \neq i$. Then $P_j \not\subseteq P_i$ as P_i is minimal. So there exists a homogeneous element in $P_j \setminus P_i$, that is, $P_j \cap S \neq \emptyset$. Thus $N_S = (Q_i)_S$. Therefore, $Q_i \phi^{-1}((Q_i)_S) = \phi^{-1}(N_S)$. \square

This shows that if all the associated primes are minimal, then there is a unique ipd.

Exercise. Prove or Disprove. If Q is a uniquely determined primary component for $N \subseteq M$ (that is, Q is in every ipd for N), then Q is isolated.

2.1. Symbolic Powers. Let R be Noetherian, $p \in \text{Spec } R$. Note $\text{Min}_R R/p^n = \{p\}$ (as if $Q \supseteq p^n$ is prime, then $Q \supseteq p$). Thus the p -primary component of p^n is uniquely determined, denoted $p^{(n)}$. By the theorem, $p^{(n)} = \phi^{-1}(p^n R_p) = p^n R_p \cap R$. One easily sees the following:

- $p^{(n)} \supseteq p^{(n+1)} \supseteq \dots$
- $p^n \subseteq p^{(n)}$ with equality if and only if p^n is primary.
- $p^{(n)} p^{(m)} \subseteq p^{(n+m)}$.

This allows us to talk about the **Symbolic Rees Algebra** $S(p) = R \oplus pt \oplus p^{(2)}t^2 \oplus \dots$.

Let R be a regular local ring of dimension d , $p \in \text{Spec } R$ such that $\dim R/p = 1$ (that is, $\text{Spec } R/p = \{(\overline{0}), \overline{m}\}$).

Open Question. Does there exist $a_1, \dots, a_{d-1} \in p$ such that $p = \sqrt{(a_1, \dots, a_{d-1})}$, that is, is p a set theoretic complete intersection?

R. Cowsik showed in 1978 that, with the above hypotheses, this is true if $S(p) = R \oplus pt \oplus p^{(2)}t^2 \oplus \dots$ is Noetherian. Unfortunately, Paul Roberts gave an example in the 80s that showed the symbolic Rees algebra is not always Noetherian. Note however the being Noetherian implies there exists $k \geq 1$ such that $(p^{(k)})^n = p^{(kn)}$ for all $n \geq 1$.

Proposition 2.13. *Let $R = R_0 \oplus R_1 \oplus \dots$ be an \mathbb{N} -graded ring. Suppose R is Noetherian. Then there exists $k \geq 1$ such that $R_{kn} = (R_k)^n$ for all $n \geq 1$.*

Proof. Let $R_+ = R_1 \oplus R_2 \oplus \dots$, an ideal of R . Suppose R_+ is generated in degrees R_1, \dots, R_ℓ . So $(R_1 \oplus \dots \oplus R_\ell)R = R_+(*).$

Claim. For all $m \geq 1$, $R_m = \sum_{\substack{(j_1, \dots, j_\ell) \\ \sum i j_i = m}} R_1^{j_1} \cdots R_\ell^{j_\ell}.$

Proof. Note that $R_{\ell+1} = R_1 R_\ell + R_2 R_{\ell-1} + \dots + R_\ell R_1$ by $(*)$. Proceed by induction.

Claim. Let $k = \ell \cdot \ell!$. For all $m \geq k$, $R_m = R_{m-\ell!} R_{\ell!}.$

Proof. Note that \supseteq is true by the grading. So we only prove \subseteq . Now $R_m = \sum_{(j)} R_1^{j_1} \cdots R_\ell^{j_\ell}$. Let $(j_1, \dots, j_\ell) \in \mathbb{N}^\ell$ such that $\sum_1^k i j_i = m \geq k = \ell \cdot \ell!$. Then there exists $i \in \{1, \dots, \ell\}$ such that $i j_i \geq \ell!$ by the pigeonhole principle. Thus $j_i \geq \frac{\ell!}{i}$. So

$$R_1^{j_1} \cdots R_\ell^{j_\ell} = R_1^{j_1} \cdots R_{i-1}^{j_{i-1}} (R_i^{\ell!/i} \cdot R_i^{j_i - \ell!/i}) R_{i+1}^{j_{i+1}} \cdots R_\ell^{j_\ell} \subseteq R_{m-\ell!} R_{\ell!}.$$

To finish the proof, we will induct on n to show $R_{kn} = (R_k)^n$. If $n = 1$, clear. For $n > 1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} R_{kn} = R_{n \cdot \ell!} &= R_{(n\ell-1)\ell!} R_{\ell!} \\ &= R_{(n\ell-2)\ell!} R_{\ell!} \\ &\vdots \\ &= R_{(n\ell-\ell)\ell!} R_{\ell!} \\ &= R_{(n-1)k} R_k = (R_k)^{n-1} R_k = (R_k)^n. \end{aligned}$$

□

If $S(p)$ is Noetherian, then there exists k such that $p^{(kn)} = (p^{(k)})^n$ for all $n \geq 1$ (this is in fact an if and only if statement). Thus $\text{Ass}_R R/(p^{(k)})^n = \{p\}$. Let $I = p^{(k)}$. Choose $x \in m \setminus p$. Then $x \notin \cup_{\text{Ass}_R R/I^n} p$ which implies x is a non-zero-divisor on R/I^n for all $n \geq 1$. So $(I^n :_R x) = I^n$ for all $n \geq 1$.

Consider $gr_I(R) = R/I \oplus I/I^2 \oplus \dots$ and $\bar{x} \in R/I$. Then \bar{x} is a non-zero-divisor on $gr_I(R)$. (If not, then $\bar{x} \in Q \subseteq \text{Ass}_R gr_I(R)$. So $Q = (0 :_{gr_I(R)} \bar{t})$ for some homogeneous element t with $\bar{t} \in I^n/I^{n+1}$. then $\bar{x}\bar{t} = \bar{0}$ implies $xt \in I^{n+1}$ and so $t \in I^{n+1}$, a contradiction.) Hence \bar{x} is not in any minimal prime of $G = gr_I(R)$. So $\dim G/xG \leq \dim G - 1 = \dim R - 1$. From here, one could prove Cowsik's result.

Proposition 2.14. *Let R be a G -graded Noetherian ring, M a finitely generated graded R -module. Let $p \in \text{Ass}_{R_0} M_g$ for some $g \in G$. Then there exists $Q \in \text{Ass}_R M$ such that $Q \cap R_0 = p$. Consequently*

$$\bigcup_{g \in G} \text{Ass}_{R_0} M_g \subseteq \{Q \cap R_0 \mid Q \in \text{Ass}_R M\},$$

which is a finite set.

Proof. Let $S = R_0 \setminus p$, a multiplicatively closed set of homogeneous elements. Then $p_S \in \text{Ass}_{(R_0)_S}(M_g)_S$. If we show there exists $Q_S \in \text{Ass}_{R_S} M_S$ such that $Q_S \cap (R_0)_S = p_S$, we will be done as $Q_S \cap (R_0)_S = p_S$ if and only if $Q \cap R_0 = p$. Thus it suffices to prove in the case where (R_0, m) is local and $p = m$. Now $m \in \text{Ass}_{R_0} M_g$ implies m consists of zerodivisors on M_g and hence M . Thus $m \subset Q$ for some $Q \in \text{Ass}_R M$. So $m \subseteq Q \cap R_0$ which implies $m = Q \cap R_0$. \square

Theorem 2.15. *Let R be Noetherian, M a finitely generated R -module, I an ideal. Then $\cup_1^\infty \text{Ass}_R M/I^n M$ is a finite set.*

Proof. Let $G = \text{gr}_I(R)$ and $\tilde{M} = M/IM \oplus IM/I^2 M \oplus \dots$. Then \tilde{M} is a finitely generated graded G -module and G is Noetherian. By the proposition $\cup_0^\infty \text{Ass}_{R/I} I^n M/I^{n+1} M$ is finite. Note that if M is an R - and R/I -module, then $\text{Ass}_{R/I} M = \{p/I \mid p \in \text{Ass}_R M\}$.

Claim. $\cup \text{Ass}_R M/I^n M \subseteq \text{Ass}_{R/I} I^n M/I^{n+1} M = \cup_R I^n M/I^{n+1} M = A$.

Proof. We will induct on n to show $\cup \text{Ass}_R M/I^n M \subseteq A$. If $n = 1$, then $\text{Ass}_R M/IM = \text{Ass}_R I^0 M/IM \subseteq A$. For $n > 1$ we have

$$0 \rightarrow I^n M/I^{n+1} M \rightarrow M/I^{n+1} M \rightarrow M/I^n M \rightarrow 0.$$

So $\text{Ass}_R M/I^{n+1} M \subseteq \text{Ass}_R I^n M/I^{n+1} M \cup \text{Ass}_R M/I^n M \subseteq A$. \square

3. DIMENSION THEORY

Theorem 3.1 (Krull's Principal Ideal Theorem). *Let R be Noetherian, $p \in \text{Spec } R$. Suppose p is minimal over (x) for some $x \in R$. Then $\text{ht } p \leq 1$.*

Proof. Note that localizing at p does not change the height of p . So WLOG (R, m) is local with m minimal over x , that is, $m = \sqrt{(x)}$ (since m is the only prime containing (x)). Let $q \in \text{Spec } R$, $q \neq m$. We need to show $\text{ht } q = 0$. This would show $\text{ht } m \leq 1$.

Recall $q^{(n)} = \phi^{-1}(q^n R_q)$ where $\phi : R \rightarrow R_q$ is the canonical map. We have shown $q^{(n)}$ is the q -primary component of q^n . Note $q^{(n)} \supseteq q^{(n+1)} \supseteq \dots$. Note $x \notin q$ as m is the only prime over (x) . So consider the following chain of ideals in $R/(x)$:

$$\frac{(q, x)}{(x)} \supseteq \frac{(q^{(2)}, x)}{(x)} \supseteq \frac{(q^{(3)}, x)}{(x)} \supseteq \dots$$

As $R/(x)$ is Noetherian and $\dim R/(x) = 0$, we see $R/(x)$ is Artinian. So the chain stabilizes. Say $(q^{(n)}, x)/(x) = (q^{(n+1)}, x)/(x)$ for some n . Then $q^{(n)} \subseteq (q^{(n+1)}, x)$.

Claim. $q^{(n)} = xq^{(n)} + q^{(n+1)}$.

Proof. Note that \supseteq is clear. So let $a \in q^{(n)}$. Then $a = b + rx$ where $b \in q^{(n+1)}$ and $r \in R$. So

$$rx = a - b \in q^{(n)}. \text{ As } q^{(n)} \text{ is } q\text{-primary and } x \notin q, \text{ we have } r \in q^{(n)}.$$

Hence $q^{(n)} = q^{(n+1)} + mq^{(n)}$. By NAK, $q^{(n)} = q^{(n+1)}$. Note $q^{(n)} R_q = q^n R_q$ and $q^{(n+1)} R_q = q^{n+1} R_q$. Thus $q^n R_q = q^{n+1} R_q$ and again by NAK, $q^n R_q = 0$. So $\text{ht } q R_q = 0$ which implies $\text{ht } q = 0$. \square

If $p \in \text{Spec } R$ and $I \subset p$, then p/I is a prime in R/I . Is $q \subset p$ are primes, then $\text{ht}(p/q)$ is defined as the length of the longest chain of primes $q = q_0 \subsetneq q_1 \subsetneq \dots \subsetneq q_s = p$. Thus $\text{ht}(p/q) = 0$ if and only if $p = q$ and $\text{ht}(p/q) = 1$ if and only if there are no primes between p and q .

Corollary 3.2. *Let $q \subset p$ be primes in a Noetherian ring R . Suppose $\text{ht}(p/q) > 1$. Then there are infinitely many primes between p and q .*

Proof. By modding by q and localizing at p , it is enough to show in the case where (R, m) is a local domain, $q = 0$ and $p = m$. Then $\text{ht } m > 1$. So suppose there are only finitely many primes between m and 0. Then $m \not\subset p_i$ for all i

and so $m \not\subseteq p_1 \cup \dots \cup p_\ell$ by PAL. Let $x \in m \setminus (p_1 \cup \dots \cup p_\ell)$. Then m is minimal over (x) by $\text{ht}(m) > 1$, a contradiction to Krull's Principal Ideal Theorem. \square

Theorem 3.3 (Generalized Principal Ideal Theorem). *Let R be Noetherian, $p \in \text{Spec } R$. Suppose p is minimal over (a_1, \dots, a_ℓ) . Then $\text{ht } p \leq \ell$.*

Proof. By localizing at p we may assume (R, m) is local and m is minimal over (a_1, \dots, a_ℓ) . We want to show $\text{ht } m \leq \ell$. So suppose not. Then $\text{ht } m > \ell \geq 2$ (the $\ell = 1$ is true by the above). Let $m = p_0 \supsetneq p_1 \supsetneq \dots \supsetneq p_{\ell+1}$ be a chain of primes descending from m . Assume $\text{ht}(p_i/p_{i+1}) = 1$ for $i = 0, \dots, \ell$. We know $(a_1, \dots, a_\ell) \not\subseteq p_1$, so WLOG $a_1 \notin p_1$. As $\text{ht } m/p_1 = 1$ and $a \in m \setminus p_1$, we see $m = \sqrt{(p_1, a_1)}$. Then there exists t such that $a_i^t \in (p_1, a_1)$ for $i = 2, \dots, \ell$. Say $a_i^t = b_i + r_i a_1$ for $b_i \in p_1, r_i \in R$ and $i = 2, \dots, \ell$. Let $J = (b_2, \dots, b_\ell) \subset p_1$. Note $\text{ht } p_1 \geq \ell$ as $\text{ht } m > \ell$ and $\text{ht } m/p_1 = 1$. So p_1 is not minimal over J . Thus there exists $Q \in \text{Spec } R$ with $p_1 \subsetneq Q \subseteq J = (b_2, \dots, b_\ell)$. Note $a_i^t = b_i + r_i a_1 \in (J, a_1) \subseteq (Q, a_1)$. So $(a_1, \dots, a_\ell) \subseteq \sqrt{(Q, a_1)}$ which implies $m = \sqrt{(a_1, \dots, a_\ell)} = \sqrt{(Q, a_1)}$. Thus m is minimal over (Q, a_1) . In R/Q , we see $\overline{m} = m/Q$ is minimal over $(\overline{a_1})$. However $m/Q \supsetneq p_1/Q \supsetneq Q/Q$ implies $\text{ht}(\overline{m}) \geq 2$, a contradiction to Krull's principal ideal theorem. \square

This says every prime has finite height (as it is minimal over a generating set and has a finite generating set by Noetherianness).

Lemma 3.4. *Let R be a Noetherian ring, p a prime and $I \subseteq p$ an ideal. Then p is minimal over I if $p^n \subseteq I$ for some n . If (R, p) is local, then the converse is true.*

Proof. First suppose $p^n \subseteq I$ for some n . Note that $p^n \subseteq I$ are still proper ideals when we localize at p . So, WLOG let R be local and p maximal. Note that p/I is maximal in R/I and $p^n \subseteq I$. Thus $(p/I)^n = 0$, which implies R/I is Artinian (Prop 8.6 A&M) and thus has dimension 0. So p is the only prime containing I and is therefore minimal over I .

For the converse, if p is minimal over I , then R/I is Artinian (the only prime is p/I) and so $p^n \subseteq I$ as the nilradical is nilpotent in a Artinian Ring. \square

Lemma 3.5 ("Converse" to the Principal Ideal Theorem). *Let R be Noetherian, I an ideal of height n . Then there exists $x_1, \dots, x_n \in I$ such that $\text{ht}(x_1, \dots, x_i) = i$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$.*

Proof. If $\text{ht}(I) = 0$, let $x \in I$. Then $\text{ht}(x) = 0$. So suppose $\text{ht}(I) > 0$ and induct on $i \leq n$. Say we have found $x_1, \dots, x_{i-1} \in I$ with $\text{ht}(x_1, \dots, x_{i-1}) = i - 1$. Note that $I \not\subseteq (x_1, \dots, x_{i-1})$ as otherwise $\text{ht}(I) = i - 1$. Let P_1, \dots, P_m be the height $i - 1$ primes over (x_1, \dots, x_{i-1}) . Then again we see $I \not\subseteq P_i$ for all i as otherwise $\text{ht}(I) = i - 1$. By prime avoidance, there exists $x_i \in I \setminus (\cup_{i=1}^m P_i)$. Thus $\text{ht}(x_1, \dots, x_i) \geq i$. By the Principal Ideal Theorem, $\text{ht}(x_1, \dots, x_i) \leq i$ and so $\text{ht}(x_1, \dots, x_i) = i$. \square

Exercises.

- (1) If R is Noetherian, then $\dim R[x] = \dim R + 1$.

Proof. Let $Q \subset R[x]$ be a maximal ideal and $P = Q \cap R$. Then P is prime in R . Say $\text{ht}(P) = n$. We want to show $\text{ht}(Q) = n + 1$. Then, as we can choose Q lying over P with $\text{ht } P = \dim A$, we will be done. Let $S = R \setminus P$. Then $\text{ht}(P_S) = \text{ht}(P)$ and $\text{ht}(Q_S) = \text{ht}(Q)$ by our choice of S . So we may assume R is local with maximal ideal P .

Consider $PR[x]$. By the converse to the principal ideal theorem, there exists $a_1, \dots, a_n \in R$ such that P is minimal over $I = (a_1, \dots, a_n)$. By the lemma, there exists $P^n \subset I$ for some n . Then $(PR[x])^n \subseteq IR[x]$, and so $PR[x]$ is minimal over $IR[x]$.

Now consider Q and mod out by $PR[x]$. Then R/P is a field and thus $R[x]/PR[x] = (R/P)[x]$ is a PID. So $\overline{Q} = (\overline{f})$ for some $f \in R[x]$.

Let $Q' \subset Q$ be a minimal prime over $(I, f)R[x]$. Then $PR[x] \subseteq Q'$ as $(PR[x])^n \subseteq IR[x] \subseteq Q'$, a prime. But now $\overline{Q'}$ contains $((I, f) + p)R[x] = \overline{(f)}$. Thus $Q' = Q$ and Q is minimal over an ideal generated by $n + 1$ elements. This implies $\text{ht}(Q) \leq n + 1$ by the Principal Ideal Theorem. So $\dim R[x] \leq \dim R + 1$.

For the other inequality, let m be maximal with $\text{ht } m = \dim R$. Then $\text{ht } mR[x] = \dim R$ as the chain of primes $m = p_0 \supsetneq p_1 \supsetneq \cdots \supsetneq p_m = 0$ yields the chain $mR[x] = p_0R[x] \supsetneq p_1R[x] \supsetneq \cdots \supsetneq p_mR[x] = 0$. Let Q be maximal with $Q \supset mR[x]$. If $Q \cap R \neq m$, then $1 \in Q \cap R$ and so $1 \in Q$. Thus $Q \cap R = m$. Further, Q/m is maximal in $(R/m)[x]$ and so $Q \supsetneq mR[x]$. So $\text{ht } Q = \dim R + 1$ and thus $\dim R[x] = \dim R + 1$. \square

(2) Let $R = k[x_1, \dots, x_n]$, k a field. Prove $\text{ht } m = n$ for all maximal ideals m .

Proof. By the above, $\dim R = n$. So $\text{ht } m \leq n$ for all maximal ideals m . If $k = \bar{k}$ the Nullstellensatz says every maximal ideal has the form $(x_1 - a_1, \dots, x_n - a_n)$. Clearly, this has height n . If $k \neq \bar{k}$, then we refer to the following:

Strong Nullstellensatz: *If A/k is an extension of fields and A is finitely generated over k as an algebra, then A/k is algebraic.*

Let $m \subseteq k[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ be maximal. Then R/m is a field containing k , say $R/m = k[\overline{x_1}, \dots, \overline{x_n}]$. By the Strong Nullstellensatz, $(R/m)/k$ is algebraic. So for each i there exists $f_i(t) \in k[t]$ such that $\overline{f_i(x_i)} = \overline{0}$, that is, $f_i(x_i) \in m$.

We will induct on n . If $n = 1$, we are in a PID and it is clear. If $n > 1$ consider the algebraic extension of fields

$$\begin{array}{c} k[x_1, \dots, x_n]/m \\ | \\ k[x_1, \dots, x_{n-1}]/m \cap k[x_1, \dots, x_{n-1}] \\ | \\ k \end{array}$$

The middle ring is stuck between two fields and so must itself be a field. So $m \cap k[x_1, \dots, x_{n-1}] =: \mathfrak{n}$ is maximal in $k[x_1, \dots, x_{n-1}]$. By induction, \mathfrak{n} is generated by $n - 1$ elements and has height $n - 1$. Consider \overline{m} , maximal in $k[x_1, \dots, x_n]/\mathfrak{n}k[x_1, \dots, x_n] = (k[x_1, \dots, x_{n-1}]/\mathfrak{n})[x_n]$, a PID as $k[x_1, \dots, x_{n-1}]/\mathfrak{n}$ is a field. So $\overline{m} = \overline{(f(x_n))}$ which implies $m = (\mathfrak{n}, f(x_n))$. So m is generated by n elements and has height n as $\mathfrak{n}k[x_1, \dots, x_n] \subsetneq m$. \square

Example. Let $R = \mathbb{Z}_{(2)}$, a local ring of dimension 1. Then $\dim R[x] = 2$. Let $p = (2x - 1)$. Then p is a maximal ideal of height 1.

Let (R, m) be local with $\dim R = d = \text{ht } m$. By Prime Avoidance and the converse of the Principal Ideal Theorem, there exists $x_1, \dots, x_d \in m$ such that $m = \sqrt{(x_1, \dots, x_d)}$. Note that there does not exist $y_1, \dots, y_t \in m$ with $t < d$ such that $m = \sqrt{(y_1, \dots, y_t)}$ by the generalized Principal Ideal Theorem. A sequence $x_1, \dots, x_d \in m$ such that $m = \sqrt{(x_1, \dots, x_d)}$ is called a **system of parameters** for R . In fact, we can define the dimension of R by a system of parameters:

$$\dim R = \inf\{t \geq 0 \mid \text{there exists } x_1, \dots, x_t \in m \text{ such that } m = \sqrt{(x_1, \dots, x_t)}\}.$$

Definition. *If (R, m) is local, the **embedding dimension** of R , denoted $\text{edim } R$, is the least number of generators for m , that is,*

$$\text{edim } R = \dim_{R/m} m/m^2 = \mu_R(m).$$

(Recall by NAK $\mu_R(M) = \dim_{R/m} M/mM$.)

By the Principal Ideal Theorem $\dim R \leq \text{edim } R$. We say R is a **regular local ring** if $\text{edim } R = \dim R$, that is, m is generated by a system of parameters.

Exercises.

- (1) Let (R, m) be a local ring of dimension d and I an ideal. Show $\sqrt{I} = \sqrt{(x_1, \dots, x_d)}$ for some $x_1, \dots, x_d \in I$.

Proof. We first prove the following claim.

Claim. For all $i = 1, \dots, d$ there exists $x_1, \dots, x_i \in I$ such that for all $p \in \text{Spec } R$ with $\text{ht } p \leq i - 1$ we have $p \supseteq I$ if and only if $p \supseteq (x_1, \dots, x_i)$.

Proof. Let $i = 1$. If I is contained in every minimal prime of R , then choose any $x_1 \in I$. Otherwise, let p_1, \dots, p_s be the minimal primes of R not containing I . By prime avoidance, there exists $x_1 \in I \setminus \cup p_i$. So for all minimal primes we see $p \supseteq I$ if and only if $p \supseteq (x_1)$.

Now assume $i > 1$ and proceed by induction. If I is contained in every height $i - 1$ prime containing (x_1, \dots, x_{i-1}) , choose any $x_i \in I$. Otherwise, let q_1, \dots, q_t be the height $i - 1$ primes over (x_1, \dots, x_{i-1}) not containing I . (Note that the q_i are minimal primes as otherwise we would have $q_i \supseteq p \supseteq (x_1, \dots, x_{i-1})$ and $\text{ht } p \leq i - 2$, which implies $q_i \supseteq p \supseteq I$. As there are finitely many minimal primes over an ideal, there are finitely many q_i). By prime avoidance, there exists $x_i \in I \setminus \cup_{j=1}^t q_j$. Then for all height $\leq i - 1$ primes p we are done by induction and for all height $i - 1$ primes p with $p \supseteq (x_1, \dots, x_i)$, we see $x_i \in p$ and $p \supseteq (x_1, \dots, x_{i-1})$ says $p \neq q_j$ for any j , that is, $p \supseteq I$.

This shows that for all $p \in \text{Spec } R$ with $\text{ht } p \leq d - 1$ that $p \supseteq I$ if and only if $p \supseteq (x_1, \dots, x_d)$. Certainly this statement also holds for m , the only prime of height d . Thus we have

$$\sqrt{I} = \bigcap_{p \supseteq I} p = \bigcap_{p \supseteq (x_1, \dots, x_d)} p = \sqrt{(x_1, \dots, x_d)}. \quad \square$$

- (2) Find a Noetherian ring R with a non-unit $x \in R$ such that $\dim R/(x) \leq \dim R - 2$.

Proof. Consider the ring $R = \mathbb{Z}_{(2)}[x]$. We know $\mathbb{Z}_{(2)}$ has dimension 1 and thus $\dim R = 2$. Recall $(2x - 1)$ is maximal and thus $\dim R/(2x - 1) = 0$ as it is a field. □

- (3) Let (R, m) be local, $x_1, \dots, x_k \in m$. Then $\dim R/(x_1, \dots, x_k) \geq \dim R - k$ with equality if (x_1, \dots, x_k) is a regular sequence.

Proof. As $\dim R = \text{ht } m$, it is enough to show $\text{ht } \bar{m} \geq \text{ht } m - k$. Say $\text{ht } \bar{m} = d$. By the converse of the principal ideal theorem, there exists $a_1, \dots, a_d \in \bar{m}$ such that \bar{m} is minimal over (a_1, \dots, a_d) . Then m is minimal over $(x_1, \dots, x_k, a_1, \dots, a_d)$ which implies $\text{ht } m \leq k + d = k + \text{ht } \bar{m}$ by the principal ideal theorem. Thus $\text{ht } \bar{m} \geq \text{ht } m - k$.

Now suppose (x_1, \dots, x_k) is a regular sequence. By induction, it is enough to show $\dim R/x \leq \dim R - 1$ for a non-zerodivisor x . Recall that if x is a non-zerodivisor, then $x \notin \cup_{p \in \text{Ass } R} p$ and so, in particular, $x \notin p$ for any minimal primes p of R . So $\text{ht}(x) \geq 1$ which implies $\text{ht } m/(x) \leq \text{ht } m - 1$. □

Recall that $\dim M = \dim R/\text{Ann } M$ for an R -module M .

Corollary 3.6. *Let (R, m) be local, M a finitely generated R -module, and $x_1, \dots, x_k \in m$. Then $\dim M/(x_1, \dots, x_k)M \geq \dim M - k$ with equality if x_1, \dots, x_k is an M -sequence.*

Proof. Let $d = \dim M$ and $\bar{R} = R/\text{Ann } M$. Then $\dim M/(x_1, \dots, x_k)M = \dim R/\text{Ann}_R(M \otimes R/(x_1, \dots, x_k))$. Recall if M and N are finitely generated R -modules that $\sqrt{\text{Ann}_R M \otimes N} = \sqrt{\text{Ann}_R M + \text{Ann}_R N}$. So

$$\begin{aligned} \dim M/(x_1, \dots, x_k)M &= \dim R/\sqrt{\text{Ann}_R(M \otimes_R R/(x_1, \dots, x_k))} \\ &= \dim R/\sqrt{\text{Ann}_R M + \text{Ann}_R R/(x_1, \dots, x_k)} \\ &= \dim R/\text{Ann}_R M + \text{Ann}_R R/(x_1, \dots, x_k) \\ &= \dim \bar{R}/(\bar{x}_1, \dots, \bar{x}_k) \\ &\geq \dim \bar{R} - k = d - k. \end{aligned} \quad \square$$

Definition. A Noetherian commutative ring R is called **catenary** if for all $Q \supseteq P$ primes in R , every saturated chain of primes from P to Q has the same length ($= \text{ht}(Q/P)$).

We would like that $\text{ht}(Q/P) = \text{ht } Q - \text{ht } P$, but this is not true in general.

Example. Let $R = k[x, y, z]/(x) \cap (y, z)$. Then R is catenary by the exercise. However, if we take $Q = (x, y, z)$ and $P = (y, z)$ we see $\text{ht } Q = 2, \text{ht } P = 0$, yet $\text{ht } Q/P = 1$.

Remark. If R is a local catenary domain (or R is catenary and equidimensional, i.e., $\dim R/p = \dim R$ for all minimal primes p), then for all $p \in \text{Spec } R$, we have $\dim R/p + \text{ht } p = \dim R$.

Proof. If R is local then $\dim R/p = \text{ht } m/p$ and $\dim R = \text{ht } m$. □

This says that the ring R from the example is not equidimensional.

Remarks.

- (1) Quotients and localizations of catenary rings are catenary (as a result of the one-to-one correspondence between primes)
- (2) R catenary does not imply $R[x]$ is catenary.

Definition. Say R is **universally catenary (u.c.)** if every finitely generated R -algebra is catenary, that is, if $R[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ is catenary for all n where x_i are indeterminants.

Example. Fields, Cohen Macaulay rings, and completely local rings are u.c.

Notation. Let $p \in \text{Spec } R$. Let $k(p) := Q(R/p) = R_p/pR_p$.

Let S/R be ring extensions, $Q \in \text{Spec } S$ and $Q \cap R = p$. Then $R/p \hookrightarrow S/Q$ is an inclusion of domains. So $k(p) \hookrightarrow k(Q)$. If S is a finitely generated R -algebra, then $k(Q)$ is a finitely generated field extension of $k(p)$. If S is a finitely generated R -module, then $k(Q)$ is a finite dimensional $k(p)$ -vector space. If S is integral over R , then $k(Q)$ is algebraic over $k(p)$.

Theorem 3.7 (Dimension Theorem). Let $R \subseteq S$ be domains where S is a finitely generated R -algebra. Let $Q \in \text{Spec } S, p = Q \cap R$. Then

$$\text{ht } Q + \text{trdeg}_{k(p)} k(Q) \leq \text{ht } p + \text{trdeg}_{Q(R)} Q(S) (*)$$

with equality if R is u.c.

Proof. Say $S = R[u_1, \dots, u_n]$ and induct on n . Let $n = 1$ and for simplicity say $S = R[u]$.

Case 1. u is transcendental over $Q(R)$. Thus u is an indeterminant over R . Generalizing the proof that for a Noetherian ring $R, \dim R[x] = \dim R + 1$, we see that either $Q = pR[u]$ or $Q = (p, f(u))R[u]$ for some monic polynomial $f(u)$.

If $Q = pR[u]$, then $\text{ht } Q = \text{ht } p$. Note that $R[u]/Q = R/p[u]$ and so $k(Q) = k(p)(x)$. So $\text{trdeg}_{k(p)} k(Q) = 1$. As $S = R[u]$, we know $\text{trdeg}_{Q(R)} Q(S) = 1$, so equality holds in (*).

If $Q = (p, f(u))R[u]$, then $\text{ht } Q = \text{ht } p + 1$. Note that $R[u]/Q = (R/p[u])/(f(u))$ and so $k(Q) = k(p)(\bar{u})$ where $\bar{f}(\bar{u}) = 0$. As f is monic, this says \bar{u} is algebraic over $k(p)$. Thus $\text{trdeg}_{k(p)} k(Q) = 0$. Again, as $\text{trdeg}_{Q(R)} Q(S) = 1$, we see equality hold in (*).

Case 2. u is algebraic over $Q(R)$. Let x be an indeterminant over R . Map $\phi : R[x] \rightarrow R[u]$ by $f(x) \rightarrow f(u)$. As u is algebraic over $Q(R)$, we see $q = \ker \phi \neq 0$. Note q is prime as $R[x]/q \cong R[u]$ is a domain. Now $R \rightarrow R[x]/q$ defined by $r \mapsto r$ is injective and so $q \cap R = 0$. Note $\text{ht } q = \text{ht } q_W$ where $W = R \setminus \{0\}$. Of course q_W is a nonzero prime in $R_W[x] = Q(R)[x]$. As $Q(R)[x]$ is a PID, we see $q = \text{ht } q_W = \text{ht } q$.

Let $Q' \in \text{Spec } R[x]$ where $Q'/q = Q \in \text{Spec } R[x]/q = S$. By case 1,

$$\text{ht } Q' + \text{trdeg}_{k(p)} k(Q') = \text{ht } p + \underbrace{\text{trdeg}_{Q(R)} Q(R)(x)}_{=1}.$$

Note that $R[x]/Q' = (R[x]/q)/(Q'/q) = S/Q$. Thus $k(Q') = k(Q)$. So we have

$$\text{ht } Q' + \text{trdeg}_{k(p)} k(Q) = \text{ht } p + 1.$$

Now $\underbrace{\text{ht } q}_{=1} + \underbrace{\text{ht } Q'/q}_{\text{ht } Q} \leq \text{ht } Q'$ with equality if R is catenary. So $\text{ht } Q + 1 \leq \text{ht } Q'$ with equality if R is catenary. Thus

$$\text{ht } Q + \text{trdeg}_{k(p)} k(Q) \leq \text{ht } p$$

with equality if R is catenary. As u is algebraic over $Q(R)$, we see $\text{trdeg}_{Q(R)} Q(S) = 0$, thus $(*)$ holds.

Now suppose $A = R[x_1, \dots, x_{n-1}]$. Then $Q(R) \subseteq Q(A) \subseteq Q(S)$. So

$$\text{trdeg}_{Q(R)} Q(S) = \text{trdeg}_{Q(A)} Q(S) + \text{trdeg}_{Q(R)} Q(A).$$

Let $Q \in \text{Spec } R, Q' = Q \cap A, p = Q \cap R$. Then we have $R/p \hookrightarrow A/Q' \hookrightarrow S/Q$ and so $k(p) \subseteq k(Q') \subseteq k(Q)$. So again

$$\text{trdeg}_{k(p)} k(Q) = \text{trdeg}_{k(Q')} k(Q) + \text{trdeg}_{k(p)} k(Q').$$

Now

$$\begin{aligned} \text{ht } Q + \text{trdeg}_{k(p)} k(Q) &= \text{ht } Q + \text{trdeg}_{k(p)} k(Q') + \text{trdeg}_{k(Q')} k(Q) \\ &\leq \text{ht } Q' + \text{trdeg}_{Q(A)} Q(S) + \text{trdeg}_{k(p)} k(Q') \text{ by the } n = 1 \text{ step} \\ &\leq \text{ht } p + \text{trdeg}_{Q(R)} Q(A) + \text{trdeg}_{Q(A)} Q(S) \text{ by induction} \\ &= \text{ht } p + \text{trdeg}_{Q(R)} Q(S), \end{aligned}$$

with equality if R is u.c. □

Proposition 3.8 (Noether Normalization Lemma). *Suppose A is a domain which is a finitely generated k -algebra. Then there exists $u_1, \dots, u_n \in A$ algebraically independent over k such that A is integral over $k[u_1, \dots, u_n]$.*

This says $\dim A = \dim k[u_1, \dots, u_n] = n$. Then $\text{trdeg } Q(A) = n = \dim A$. For all $Q \in \text{Spec } A$, we see $Q \cap k = (0)$. So

$$\text{ht } Q + \text{trdeg}_k k(Q) = \underbrace{\text{ht } Q \cap k}_{=0} + \underbrace{\text{trdeg}_k Q(A)}_{=n}.$$

Thus $\text{ht } Q = \text{trdeg}_k Q(A) - \text{trdeg}_k k(Q)$. If Q is maximal in A , then A/Q is a finitely generated k -algebra. Since A/Q is a field, the Strong Nullstellensatz says A/Q is algebraic and so $\text{trdeg}_k k(Q) = 0$. So $\text{ht } Q = \text{trdeg}_k Q(A)$ for all maximal ideal Q of A .

3.1. Fields are Universally Catenary. In this section we wish to show fields are universally catenary. To do so, we must first build up a bit of machinery. The material in this section is taken from Kunz.

Lemma 3.9. *The set of all elements of K (the quotient field of R) which are integral over I , an ideal of R , is $\sqrt{I\bar{R}}$.*

Proof. Recall x is integral over I if there exists a monic polynomial $f(t) \in R[t]$ such that $f(x) = 0$ and $f(t) = t^n + a_1 t^{n-1} + \dots + a_n$ with $a_i \in I$.

If $x \in K$ is integral over I then there exists $f(t)$ as above. Then $x^n = -(a_1 x^{n-1} + \dots + a_n) \in IR[x] \subset I\bar{R}$. Thus $x \in \sqrt{I\bar{R}}$.

If $x \in \sqrt{I\bar{R}}$, then there exists m such that $x^m \in IR[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ for some $x_1, \dots, x_n \in \bar{R}$. Since $R[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ is a finitely generated R -module (as x_i are integral), we have x is integral over I (by the determinant trick). □

Lemma 3.10 (Krull). *Let I be an ideal of R , S a multiplicatively closed subset of R with $I \cap S = \emptyset$. Then the set M of all ideals J of R with $I \subseteq J$ and $J \cap S = \emptyset$ has a maximal element which is a prime ideal.*

Recall. R is normal if it is an integral domain which is integrally closed in its field of fractions.

Lemma 3.11. *Let R be a normal ring with field of fractions K , L/K a field extension and $I \subseteq R$ a prime ideal. If $x \in L$ is integral over I then the minimal polynomial $m(t)$ of x over K has the form $m(t) = t^n + a_1 t^{n-1} + \dots + a_n$ where $a_i \in I$.*

Proof. Let $\{x = x_1, \dots, x_n\}$ be the set of zeros of $m(t)$ in \overline{K} (the algebraic closure). Then $x \in L$ is integral over I implies there exists a monic polynomial $f(t)$ with coefficients in I such that $f(x) = 0$. For each $i = 1, \dots, n$ there exists an automorphism $\sigma_i \in \text{Aut}(\overline{K}/K)$ such that $\sigma_i(x) = x_i$. So $f(x_i) = f(\sigma_i(x)) = \sigma_i(f(x)) = 0$. So each x_i is a zero of $f(t)$ and hence is integral over I . The coefficients a_i of $m(t)$ are the elementary symmetric functions on the x_i 's and so are integral and therefore in \sqrt{IR} . But R normal implies $R = \overline{R}$ and I is prime. So $\sqrt{IR} = I$. Thus $a_i \in I$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$. □

Proposition 3.12 (The Going Down Theorem). *Let S/R be an integral ring extension where R and S are integral domains and R is normal. Let $p_0 \subset p_1$ be a prime ideal chain in $\text{Spec } R$ and Q_1 a prime ideal of S lying over p_1 . Then there exists $Q_0 \in \text{Spec } S$ with $Q_0 \subset Q_1$ and $Q_0 \cap R = p_0$.*

Proof. First note $N_0 = R \setminus p_1, N_1 = S \setminus Q_1$ and $N = N_0 N_1$ are multiplicatively closed subsets. We will show $p_0 S \cap N = \emptyset$. Then by Krull's Lemma, there exists $Q_0 \in \text{Spec } S$ with $p_0 S \subseteq Q_0$ and $Q_0 \cap N = \emptyset$, that is, $Q_0 \subseteq Q_1$ and $Q_0 \cap R = p_0$.

Now suppose for contradiction that $x \in p_0 S \cap N$. Say $x = \sum p_i s_i$. As S is integral over R , we see $(s_i)^n + r_1 (s_i)^{n-1} + \dots + r_n = 0$ for $r_i \in R$. Multiplying by p_i^n , we get $(p_i s_i)^n + r_1 p_i (p_i s_i)^{n-1} + \dots + r_n p_i^n = 0$, that is, $p_i s_i$ is integral over p_0 for all i and so x is integral over p_0 . By the previous lemma, the minimal polynomial over $m(t)$ for x over k has the form $m(t) = t^n + a_1 t^{n-1} + \dots + a_n$ for $a_i \in p_0$. Also $x \in N$ implies $x = rs$ for some $r \in N_0, s \in N_1$. The minimal polynomial for $s = \frac{x}{r}$ over k is $h(t) = t^n + \frac{a_1}{r} t^{n-1} + \dots + \frac{a_n}{r^n}$ (minimal as it is $\frac{f(rt)}{r^n}$). By the previous lemma, the coefficients of $h(t)$ lie in R since $s \in S$ is integral over R . The $p_i = \frac{a_i}{r^i} \in R$. Then $a_i = p_i r^i$ where $a_i \in p_0$ and $r^i \notin p_i$. As p_0 is prime, this says $p_i \in p_0$. Thus s is integral over p_0 which implies $s \in \sqrt{p_0 S} \subseteq Q_1$. This contradicts the fact that $s \in N_1 = S \setminus Q_1$. Therefore, $p_0 S \cap N = \emptyset$. □

Theorem 3.13 (Strong Version of Noether Normalization Theorem). *Let A be a finitely generated k -algebra for a field k and $I \subsetneq A$ an ideal. Then there exists $\delta, d \in \mathbb{N}$ with $\delta \leq d$ and $Y_1, \dots, Y_d \in A$ such that*

- (1) Y_1, \dots, Y_d are algebraically independent over k
- (2) A is finitely generated as a $k[Y_1, \dots, Y_d]$ -module
- (3) $I \cap k[Y_1, \dots, Y_d] = (Y_{\delta+1}, \dots, Y_d)$.

Proof. See Kunz, page 50. □

Proposition 3.14. *If $A \neq 0$ is a finitely generated k -algebra with Y_1, \dots, Y_d algebraically independent over k and A finitely generated as a $k[Y_1, \dots, Y_d]$ -module (that is, $k[Y_1, \dots, Y_d] \subset A$ is a **Noether Normalization**), then $\dim A = d$. Moreover, if A is an integral domain, then all maximal chains of primes have length d .*

Proof. Let $B = k[Y_1, \dots, Y_d]$. Now A a finitely generated k -algebra implies $A = k[x_1, \dots, x_n] = B[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ for some $x_1, \dots, x_n \in A$. As $A = B[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ is finitely generated as a B -module, A/B is integral. Thus $\dim A = \dim B = d$.

Let A be an integral domain and $Q_0 \subsetneq \dots \subsetneq Q_m$ a maximal chain of primes in A . Then $Q_0 = (0)$ and Q_m is maximal. Let $p_i = Q_i \cap B$. Then $(0) = p_0 \subsetneq \dots \subsetneq p_m$ is a prime ideal chain in B with p_m maximal. We want to show that this is also a maximal chain. So suppose we can insert another prime between p_i and p_{i+1} . Choose a Noether Normalization $k[T_1, \dots, T_d] \subset B$ (there are d elements as $\dim B = d$) such that $p_i \cap k[T_1, \dots, T_d] = (T_{\delta+1}, \dots, T_d)$ for

$\delta \leq d$. Then $k[T_1, \dots, T_\delta] = k[T_1, \dots, T_d]/p_i \subset B/p_i$ is also a Noether Normalization. Since we can insert a prime between (0) and p_{i+1}/p_i , we can between (0) and $p_{i+1}/p_i \cap k[T_1, \dots, T_\delta]$. Now $k[T_1, \dots, T_\delta] \subset A/Q_i$ is also a Noetherian Normalization. By the Going Down Theorem, there exists a prime between Q_{i+1}/Q_i and thus between Q_i and Q_{i+1} , a contradiction to maximality. Thus $p_0 \subset \dots \subset p_m$ is maximal.

Now, we show $m = d$ by induction. If $d = 0$, then $\dim A = 0$ and there is nothing to show. If $d > 0$ choose a Noether Normalization $k[T_1, \dots, T_d] \subset B$ with $p_1 \cap k[T_1, \dots, T_d] = (T_{\delta+1}, \dots, T_d)$. As $\text{ht } p_1 = 1$, we see $\text{ht}(T_{\delta+1}, \dots, T_d) = 1$ by the going down theorem. Thus $\delta = d - 1$. Now $K[T_1, \dots, T_\delta] \subset B/p_1$ is a Noetherian Normalization and so by induction $(0) = p_1/p_1 \subset p_2/p_1 \subset \dots \subset p_m/p_1$ has length $d - 1$. Thus $m = d$. \square

Corollary 3.15. *For a field k , k is universally catenary.*

Proof. Let A be a finitely generated k -algebra, $p \subset q$ primes in A . We want to show any saturated chain of primes $p = p_0 \subset \dots \subset p_m = q$ has the same length. Mod out by p to get an integral domain $A' = A/p$ and a chain $(0) = \bar{p}_0 \subset \dots \subset \bar{p}_m = \bar{q}$. By the proposition, the chain can be extended to a maximal chain of length $\dim A/p$. Then the part of the chain starting at \bar{q} will correspond to a maximal prime ideal chain in $A'/\bar{q} = A/q$, which by the proposition has length $\dim A/q$. Thus $m = \dim A/p - \dim A/q$, that is, the length of the chain does not depend on the intermediate primes we choose. \square

3.2. Dimension of the Associated Graded Ring. Let R be a commutative ring, I an ideal. Define $S = R[It, t^{-1}] := \dots \oplus Rt^{-2} \oplus Rt^{-1} \oplus R \oplus It \oplus I^2t^2 \oplus \dots$ to be the **extended Rees Algebra**.

Let $T = R[t, t^{-1}] \supset S \supset R$. Notice $T = S_{t^{-1}}$. Let $p \in \text{Spec } R$. Then $pT = \dots \oplus pt^{-2} \oplus pt^{-1} \oplus pt^0 \oplus pt \oplus pt^2 \in \text{Spec } T$ since $T/pT = T/p[t, t^{-1}]$. Thus $pT \cap S \in \text{Spec } S$. Also $pT \cap R = p$. Note also for $q \in \text{Spec } S, t^{-1} \notin q$ that $qT = (q)_{t^{-1}} \in \text{Spec } T$ and $qT \cap S = q$.

Claim. $\text{Min}_S S = \{pT \cap S \mid p \in \text{Min}_R R\}$.

Proof. Let $q \in \text{Spec } S$. Then $q \cap R \supseteq p$ for some $p \in \text{Min}_R R$. So $qT \supseteq pT$ and so $q = qT \cap S \supseteq pT \cap S$.

Thus the minimal primes of S are contained in $\{pT \cap S \mid p \in \text{Min}_R R\}$. For the other containment, let $p \in \text{Min}_R R$ and suppose $pT \cap S \supseteq q$ where $q \in \text{Spec } S$. Then $pT \supseteq qT$. Not $pT \in \text{Min}_T T$ (as if $pT \supseteq Q \in \text{Spec } T$, then $p = pT \cap R \supseteq Q \cap R$, that is, $p \subseteq Q$ and so $pT \subseteq Q$). So $pT = qT$ and thus $pT \cap S = qT \cap S = q$.

For $p \in \text{Spec } R$, let $\tilde{p} = pT \cap S \in \text{Spec } S$.

Claim. $S/\tilde{p} \cong R/p[(I + p/p)t, t^{-1}] =: \bar{R}[\bar{I}t, t^{-1}]$.

Proof. Notice $\tilde{p} = pT \cap S = \dots \oplus pt^{-1} \oplus p \oplus (p \cap I)t \oplus (p \cap I)^2t^2 \oplus \dots$. So map $S \xrightarrow{\phi} \bar{R}[\bar{I}t, t^{-1}] = \dots \oplus R/pt^{-1} \oplus R/p \oplus (I + p/p)t \oplus \dots$ by $a_n t^n \mapsto \bar{a}_n t^n$ for $a_n \in I_n$. Then ϕ is a surjective ring map with $\ker \phi = \tilde{p}$.

Remark. $\dim S = \max\{\dim S/\tilde{p} \mid \tilde{p} \in \text{Min}_S S\} = \max\{\dim R/p[(I + p/p)t, t^{-1}] \mid p \in \text{Min}_R S\}$.

Theorem 3.16. *Suppose R is Noetherian, I an ideal. Then $\dim S = \dim R + 1$. Further, if $\text{ht } m = \dim R$ for some maximal ideal $m \supseteq I$ of R , then $\text{ht}(m, It, t^{-1})S = \dim S$.*

Proof. By the remark, we may assume R is a domain. Notice

$$\dim S = \dim R[It, t^{-1}] \geq \dim R[It, t^{-1}]_{t^{-1}} = \dim T \geq_{(*)} \dim R + 1.$$

(*) If $(0) = p_0 \subsetneq \dots \subsetneq p_d = m$ is a chain of primes in R with $d = \dim R$, then $(0) = p_0T \subsetneq \dots \subsetneq p_dT = mT$ is a chain of primes in T . Note mT is not maximal as $T/mT = T/m[t, t^{-1}]$ is not a field. So $\dim T > \dim R + 1$.

Let M be a maximal ideal of S . We want to show $\text{ht } M \leq \dim R + 1$. Let $m = M \cap R \in \text{Spec } R$. By the dimension inequality

$$\text{ht } M + \text{trdeg}_{K(m)} K(M) \leq \text{ht } m + \text{trdeg}_{Q(R)} Q(S).$$

Of course $\text{trdeg}_{K(m)} K(M) = \text{trdeg}_{K(m)} S/M = 0$ as S/M is finitely generated over $K(m)$ and both are fields (Strong Nullstellensatz). Also $\text{trdeg}_{Q(R)} Q(S) = \text{trdeg}_{Q(R)} Q(R)(t) = 1$. Thus, the dimension inequality becomes $\text{ht } M \leq \text{ht } m + 1 \leq \dim R + 1$.

Now $(m, It, t^{-1})S = \dots \oplus Rt^{-1} \oplus Rt^{-1} \oplus m \oplus It \oplus I^2t^2 \oplus \dots$. So $S/(m, IT, t^{-1})S \cong R/m$, a field. Hence $M = (m, IT, t^{-1})S$ is a maximal ideal of S . Now $\text{ht } M \leq \dim S = \dim R + 1$. Also $\text{ht } m = \dim R = d$, so $p_0 \subsetneq p_1 \subsetneq \dots \subsetneq p_d = m$ in R . Thus $\tilde{p}_0 \subsetneq \tilde{p}_1 \subsetneq \dots \subsetneq \tilde{p}_d = \tilde{m}$ is a chain of primes in S where $\tilde{m} = mT \cap S = \dots \oplus mt^{-2} \oplus mt^{-1} \oplus m \oplus It \oplus I^2t^2 \oplus \dots$. Thus $S/\tilde{m} = R/m[t^{-1}]$ is not a field, making \tilde{m} not maximal. Thus $\text{ht } M = \dim R + 1$. \square

Lemma 3.17. *Let R be Noetherian, I an ideal of R and $\text{ht } m = \dim R$ for some maximal ideal $m \supseteq I$. Then $\dim S/t^{-1}S = \dim R$.*

Proof. We see t^{-1} is a non-zero-divisor on S and so $\dim S/t^{-1}S \leq \dim S - 1 = \dim R$. Let $M = (m, It, t^{-1})S$. By the proposition, $\text{ht } M = \dim S = \dim R + 1$. Then $\dim S_M = \dim R + 1$, but t^{-1} is a non-zero-divisor on S_M . So $\dim(S/t^{-1}S)_M = \dim S_M/t^{-1}S_M = \dim S_M - 1 = \dim R$. Thus $\dim S/t^{-1}S \geq \dim R$. \square

Theorem 3.18. *If $\dim R = \text{ht } m$ for some maximal ideal $m \supseteq I$, then $\dim gr_I(R) = \dim R$.*

Proof. Note that $t^{-1}S = \dots \oplus Rt^{-1} \oplus I \oplus I^2t \oplus I^3t^2 \oplus \dots$. Thus $S/t^{-1}S = R/I \oplus I/I^2 \oplus \dots = gr_I(R)$. By the previous lemma, done. \square

4. DEPTH

Definition. *Let R be a Noetherian ring, M a finitely generated R -module. An element $x \in R$ is called M -**regular** if $M \neq xM$ and x is a non-zero-divisor on M . A sequence $x_1, \dots, x_n \in R$ is an M -**sequence** if x_i is $M/(x_1, \dots, x_{i-1})M$ -regular for $i = 1, \dots, n$ (this forces $(x_1, \dots, x_i)M \neq M$). We say x_1, \dots, x_n is a **maximal M -sequence** if there does not exist $x_{n+1} \in R$ such that x_1, \dots, x_{n+1} is an M -sequence.*

Note. If x_1, \dots, x_n is an M -sequence then $x_1M \subsetneq (x_1, x_2)M \subsetneq \dots \subsetneq (x_1, \dots, x_n)M$.

Proof. Clearly containment is true. So suppose $(x_1, \dots, x_i)M = (x_1, \dots, x_{i+1})M$. Let $m \in M \setminus (x_1, \dots, x_i)M$. Then $x_{i+1}m \in (x_1, \dots, x_i)M$, that is, x_{i+1} is a zero-divisor on $M/(x_1, \dots, x_i)M$, a contradiction. \square

Hence all maximal M -sequences are finite by ACC.

Definition. *Let R be Noetherian, M a finitely generated R -module, I an ideal of R such that $IM \neq M$. The $\text{depth}_I M$ is defined to be*

$$\sup\{n \mid \text{there exists } x_1, \dots, x_n \in I \text{ which is an } M\text{-sequence}\}.$$

In the case $M = R$, $\text{depth}_I R$ is sometimes called the grade I . If (R, m) is local, write $\text{depth } M$ or $\text{depth}_R M$ for $\text{depth}_m M$.

We require $IM \neq M$ so that if $\text{depth}_I M = 0$ we can say I consists of zero-divisors of M . Otherwise $\text{depth}_I M = 0$ implies either $xM = M$ or x is a zero-divisor for each $x \in M$.

Theorem 4.1. *Let M be a finitely generated R -module, $I \subset R$ such that $IM \neq M$. Suppose $x_1, \dots, x_n \in I$ is a maximal M -sequence. Then $\text{Ext}_R^i(R/I, M) = 0$ for all $i < n$ and $\text{Ext}_R^n(R/I, M) \neq 0$. This implies every maximal M -sequence contained in I has length n . Hence $\text{depth}_I M < \infty$ and $\text{depth}_I M = \inf\{n \mid \text{Ext}_R^n(R/I, M) \neq 0\}$.*

Proof. Induct on n . If $n = 0$, then I consists of zero-divisors on M . Then $I \subset \cup_{p \in \text{Ass } M} p$. By prime avoidance, $I \subset p$ for some $p \in \text{Ass } M$. Say $p = (0 :_R x)$ for $x \in M \setminus \{0\}$. Thus $R/I \rightarrow R/p \hookrightarrow M$ defined by $\bar{1} \mapsto \bar{1} \mapsto x \neq 0$ is a nonzero homomorphism. Therefore $\text{Ext}_R^0(R/I, M) = \text{Hom}_R(R/I, M) \neq 0$. So suppose $n > 0$. Let $x_1, \dots, x_n \in I$ be a maximal M -sequence. Then x_1 is M -regular and x_2, \dots, x_n is a maximal M/x_1M -sequence. By induction

$\text{Ext}_R^i(R/I, M/x_1M) = 0$ for $i < n-1$ and $\text{Ext}_R^{n-1}(R/I, M/x_1M) \neq 0$. Consider the short exact sequence $0 \rightarrow M \xrightarrow{x_1} M \rightarrow M/x_1M \rightarrow 0$. Apply $\text{Hom}_R(R/I, -)$ to get a long exact sequence on Ext :

$$\cdots \rightarrow \text{Ext}_R^{i-1}(R/I, M/x_1M) \rightarrow \text{Ext}_R^i(R/I, M) \xrightarrow{x_1} \text{Ext}_R^i(R/I, M) \rightarrow \text{Ext}_R^i(R/I, M/x_1M) \rightarrow \text{Ext}_R^{i+1}(R/I, M) \xrightarrow{x_1} \cdots .$$

Notice that multiplication by x_1 in the above sequence is just the zero map as $x_1 \in I$. Thus, our long exact sequence becomes the following short exact sequence:

$$0 \rightarrow \text{Ext}_R^i(R/I, M) \rightarrow \text{Ext}_R^i(R/I, M/x_1M) \rightarrow \text{Ext}_R^{i+1}(R/I, M) \rightarrow 0$$

Now, the middle term is zero for all $i < n-1$ and so $\text{Ext}_R^1(R/I, M) = 0$ for all $i < n$. Similarly, if we consider the $i = n$ case, we see the left term is zero and the middle term is nonzero and so $\text{Ext}_R^{n+1}(R/I, M) \neq 0$. \square

Corollary 4.2. *If $x \in I$ is M -regular then $\text{depth}_I M/xM = \text{depth}_I M - 1$.*

Proof. If $\overline{x_2}, \dots, \overline{x_n}$ is an M/xM -sequence, then x, x_2, \dots, x_n is an M -sequence. \square

Corollary 4.3. *For all $p \in \text{Spec } R$ with $p \supseteq I$ we have $\text{depth}_{I_p} M_p \geq \text{depth}_I M$.*

Proof. Recall that $\text{Ext}_R^i(R/I, M)_p \cong \text{Ext}_{R_p}^i(R_p/I_p, M_p)$. So if $\text{depth}_I M = n$, then $\text{Ext}_R^i(R/I, M) = 0$ for all $i < n$ which implies $\text{Ext}_{R_p}^i(R_p/I_p, M_p) = 0$ for all $i < n$. So $\text{depth}_{I_p} M_p \geq n$. \square

Corollary 4.4. *There is a maximal ideal $m \supseteq I$ such that $\text{depth}_I M = \text{depth}_{I_m} M_m$.*

Proof. Let $n = \text{depth}_I M$. Then $\text{Ext}_R^n(R/I, M) \neq 0$. Recall $M = 0$ if and only if $M_m = 0$ for all maximal ideals m . Thus we must have $\text{Ext}_{R_m}^n(R_m/I_m, M_m) \neq 0$ for some m . Therefore, $\text{depth}_{I_m} M_m = n$. Note that $m \supseteq I$ as otherwise $R_m/I_m = 0$ which implies $\text{Ext}_{R_m}^n(R_m/I_m, M_m) = 0$. \square

Remark. x, y M -regular does not implies that y, x is M -regular.

- For example let k be a field and $R = k[x, y, z]/x(y-1)$. Then $z(y-1), y$ is not an R -sequence as $z(y-1)$ is a zero divisor. However, $y, z(y-1)$ is an R -sequence. As $(0) = x(y-1) = (x) \cap (y-1)$, we see the associated primes are $(x), (y-1)$ and certainly $y \notin (x) \cup (y-1)$. Also $z(y-1)$ is a non zerodivisor on $R/(y)$ as $R/(y) = k[x, y, z]/(x, y) = k[z]$ and $\overline{z(y-1)} = \overline{z}$.

However, if $x_1, \dots, x_n \in J(R)$ is an M -sequence, then any permutation of x_1, \dots, x_n is an M -sequence. Thus, in a local ring, regular sequences permute.

Proof. If x_1, \dots, x_n is an M -sequence, consider the homology on the Koszul Complex $H_i(x_1, \dots, x_n; M) = 0$ for all $i \geq 1$. If $x_1, \dots, x_n \in J(R)$ then $H_1(x_1, \dots, x_n; M) = 0$ and so x_1, \dots, x_n is an M -sequence. As permuting elements of the Koszul complex gives an isomorphic complex, the homology does not depend on the order. \square

Proposition 4.5. *Let (R, m) be local, $M \neq 0$ a finitely generated R -module. Then $\text{depth } M \leq \dim R/p$ for all $p \in \text{Ass}_R M$.*

Proof. Induct on $\text{depth } M$. If $\text{depth } M = 0$, done. So suppose $\text{depth } M > 0$. Let $x \in m$ be M -regular. So $\text{depth } M/xM = \text{depth } M - 1$ and by induction

$$\text{depth } M/xM \leq \text{depth } R/q \text{ for all } q \in \text{Ass}_R M/xM.$$

Let $p \in \text{Ass}_R M$. Then $p = (0 :_R z)$ for some $z \in M \setminus \{0\}$. Let $\Lambda = \{Ry | py = 0, y \in M \setminus \{0\}\}$. Certainly $\Lambda \neq \emptyset$ as it contains z . As M is Noetherian, there exists a maximal element $Ry \in \Lambda$.

Claim. $y \notin xM$.

Proof. Suppose $y = xu$ for some $u \in M$. Then $0 = py = pxu = x(pu)$. As x is a non-zerodivisor $pu = 0$. Then $Ru \in \Lambda$ and $Ry \subseteq Ru$. By maximality of Ry , $Ry = Ru$. So $u = ry$ for $r \in R$. Then $y = xry$ implies $(1 - xr)y = 0$. As $x \in m$, $1 - xr$ is a unit and so $y = 0$, contradiction.

Hence p consists of zerodivisors on M/xM and $p \subseteq q$ for some $q \in \text{Ass}_R M/xM$. Note $x \notin p$ as x is a non-zerodivisor. So $(M/xM)_p = 0$ but $(M/xM)_q \neq 0$ (as the associated primes are contained in the support of the module). Thus $p \subsetneq q$. Therefore

$$\dim R/p \geq \dim R/q + 1 \geq \text{depth } M/xM + 1 = \text{depth } M.$$

□

Exercise. In any Noetherian ring R , $\text{grade } I \leq \text{ht } I$ for all ideals I of R .

Proof. First assume $I = p$, a prime. Then

$$\text{grade } p = \text{depth}_p R \leq \text{depth}_{pR_p} R_p \leq \dim R_p/Q \leq \dim R_p = \text{ht } p$$

for all $Q \in \text{Ass}_{R_p} R_p$. For I an ideal, let $p \supseteq I$ for a prime p . Then $\text{grade } I = \text{depth}_I R \leq \text{depth}_p R \leq \text{ht } p$. Since true for all $p \supseteq I$ and $\text{ht } I = \inf\{\text{ht } p \mid p \supseteq I\}$, we see $\text{grade } I \leq \text{ht } I$. □

Definition. A local ring (R, m) is **Cohen-Macaulay (CM)** if $\text{depth } R = \dim R$. A Noetherian ring R is CM if R_m is CM for all maximal ideals m .

Proposition 4.6. Let (R, m) be a local CM ring. Then $\dim R/p = \dim R$ for all $p \in \text{Ass}_R R$.

Proof. We proved $\dim R = \text{depth } R \leq \dim R/p \leq \dim R$ for all $p \in \text{Ass } R$. □

Note that this says $\text{Min}_R R = \text{Ass}_R R$ for a CM local ring R .

Proposition 4.7. Let R be a Noetherian CM ring, $x \in R$ R -regular. Then R/xR is CM.

Proof. Let $m \supseteq (x)$ be a maximal ideal. Then x is R_m -regular and $\dim(R/xR)_m = \dim R_m - 1 = \text{depth } R_m - 1 = \text{depth}(R/xR)_m$. □

Proposition 4.8. Let R be CM, I an ideal. Then $\text{grade } I = \text{ht } I$.

Proof. By the above exercise, it is enough to show $\text{grade } I \geq \text{ht } I$. Let $m \supseteq I$ be a maximal ideal such that $\text{grade } I_m = \text{grade } I$. If we show $\text{grade } I_m \geq \text{ht } I_m \geq \text{ht } I$, we'll be done. So we may assume (R, m) is a CM local ring. Induct on $h = \text{ht } I$. If $h = 0$, done. So suppose $h > 0$. Then $I \not\subseteq p$ for all $p \in \text{Min}_R R = \text{Ass}_R R$. Hence I contains a non-zerodivisor x . Now $\text{grade } I/(x) = \text{grade } I - 1$ and $\text{ht } I/(x) = \text{ht } I - 1$ (as $\text{ht } p/(x) = \dim R_p/xR_p = \dim R_p - 1 = \text{ht } p - 1$). As $R/(x)$ is CM, induction implies $h - 1 \leq \text{grade } I/(x) - 1$. Thus $h \leq \text{grade } I$. □

Proposition 4.9. Let R be CM, $p \in \text{Spec } R$. Then R_p is CM.

Proof. $\text{depth } R_p = \text{grade}_{R_p} pR_p \geq \text{grade } p = \text{ht } p = \dim R_p$. □

Proposition 4.10. Let (R, m) be CM local. Then for any ideal I of R $\text{ht } I + \dim R/I = \dim R$.

Proof. Let $h = \text{ht } I = \text{grade } I$. Let x_1, \dots, x_n be an R -sequence. Let $\bar{R} = R/(x_1, \dots, x_n)$, a CM ring of dimension $\dim R - h$, and $\bar{I} = I/(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ so that $\text{ht } \bar{I} = \text{ht } I - h = 0$. Then $\bar{I} \subseteq \bar{p}$ where $\bar{p} \in \text{Min}_{\bar{R}} \bar{R}$. As \bar{R} is CM, $\dim \bar{R}/\bar{p} = \dim \bar{R}$. Now $\dim R/I = \dim \bar{R}/\bar{I} \geq \dim \bar{R}/\bar{p} = \dim \bar{R} \geq \dim R/I$. So $\dim R/I = \dim \bar{R} = \dim R - h = \dim R - \text{ht } I$. □

Theorem 4.11. Let R be CM. Then R is catenary.

Proof. Suppose not. Then there exist primes $P \subsetneq Q$ such that there are saturated chains of primes from P to Q of unequal length. Among all such $P \subsetneq Q$, choose a pair with smallest possible saturated chain. Let s be the length of the smallest saturated chain. Note $s > 1$ as otherwise $P \subsetneq Q$ is a saturated chain of primes and

thus there are no others. As we can localize at Q , we may assume (R, m) is a CM local ring and $Q = m$. Let $P = p_0 \subsetneq p_1 \subsetneq \cdots \subsetneq p_s = m$ and $P = q_0 \subsetneq \cdots \subsetneq q_t = m$ be saturated chains of primes with $s < t$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \text{ht } p + \dim R/p &= \dim R &= \text{ht } p_1 + \dim R/p_1 \\ &= \dim R_{p_1} + \dim R/p_1 \\ &= \text{ht}(PR_{p_1}) + \dim R_{p_1}/PR_{p_1} + \dim R/p_1 \\ &= \text{ht } P + 1 + \dim R/p_1 \text{ as } P \subsetneq p_1 \text{ is saturated} \end{aligned}$$

Thus $\dim R/P = \dim R/p_1 + 1$. Similarly, $\dim R/P = \dim R/q_1$. Thus $\dim R/p_1 = \dim R/q_1$. Now $p_1 \subseteq \cdots \subsetneq p_s = m$ is a saturated chain of primes in R of length $s - 1$. By choice of s , all saturated chains from p_1 have length $s - 1$. Thus $\dim R/p_1 = s - 1$. Hence $\dim R/q_1 = \dim R/p_1 = s - 1$. But this contradicts that there exists a saturated chain of length $t - 1 > s - 1$. \square

Exercises.

- (1) R CM implies $R[x]$ is CM.

Proof. Let $S = R[x]$. Let $n \subseteq S$ be a maximal ideal. Let $n \cap R = p$. Then $S_n = R_p[x]$. So we may assume R is local. Let $k = R/m$. Then $S/mS = k[x]$ is a PID., So n/mS is a principal ideal, say $(\phi(x))$ where $\phi(x)$ is a monic irreducible. Let $f(x) \in S$ be monic such that $\overline{f(x)} = \phi(x)$. So $n = (m, f(x))$. Let $(a_1, \dots, a_d) \in m$ be a maximal R -sequence. So $d = \dim R$.

Claim. (a_1, \dots, a_d, f) is an S -sequence.

Proof. As S is a flat R -module, $0 \rightarrow R \xrightarrow{a_1} R \rightarrow R/a_1 \rightarrow 0$ exact implies $0 \rightarrow S \rightarrow S \rightarrow S/a_1S \cong (R/a_1)[x] \rightarrow 0$ is exact. So (a_1, \dots, a_d) is an S -sequence. Note $\overline{f(x)}$ is monic in $R[x]/(a_1, \dots, a_d) \cong R/(a_1, \dots, a_d)[x]$ and so it is not a zerodivisor. Thus $\text{depth } S_n \geq d + 1 = \dim S \geq S_n$. \square

- (2) (Depth Lemma) Let R be Noetherian, I an ideal, $0 \rightarrow L \rightarrow M \rightarrow N \rightarrow 0$ a short exact sequence of finitely generated R -modules.

- (a) If $\text{depth}_I M > \text{depth}_I N$ then $\text{depth}_I L = \text{depth}_I N + 1$.

Proof. Recall $\text{depth}_I M = \inf\{n \mid \text{Ext}_R^n(R/I, M) \neq 0\}$. Say $n = \text{depth}_I N$. Then $\text{Ext}_R^n(R/I, N) \neq 0$, $\text{Ext}_R^k(R/I, N) = 0$ for all $k < n$, and since $\text{depth}_I M > n$, we have $\text{Ext}_R^k(R/I, M) = 0$ for all $k \leq n$. Consider the long exact sequence on $\text{Ext}_R(R/I, -)$:

$$\cdots \rightarrow \underbrace{\text{Ext}_R^{k-1}(R/I, N)}_{=0 \text{ for } k \leq n} \rightarrow \text{Ext}_R^k(R/I, L) \rightarrow \underbrace{\text{Ext}_R^k(R/I, M)}_{=0 \text{ for } k \leq n} \rightarrow \cdots$$

Thus $\text{Ext}_R^k(R/I, L) = 0$ for $k \leq n$. Of course, we also see

$$\cdots \rightarrow \underbrace{\text{Ext}_R^n(R/I, M)}_{=0} \rightarrow \underbrace{\text{Ext}_R^n(R/I, N)}_{\neq 0} \rightarrow \text{Ext}_R^{n+1}(R/I, L) \rightarrow \cdots$$

and so if the last term was zero, so would the middle term be. Thus $\text{Ext}_R^{n+1}(R/I, L) \neq 0$ which implies $\text{depth}_I L = n + 1 = \text{depth}_I N + 1$. \square

- (b) Given an example where $\text{depth}_I L > \text{depth}_I M$.

Proof. Let $R = (k[x, y]/(x^2, xy))_{\bar{x}, \bar{y}}$. Then $\text{depth } R = 0$ as \bar{x} kills the maximal ideal. Let $p = (x)R$. Then $p \in \text{Min}_R R \subseteq \text{Ass}_R R$. Consider R/p . We have proved $p \in \text{Ass } R$ implies $R/p \hookrightarrow R$. Thus we have an exact sequence $0 \rightarrow R/p \xrightarrow{\phi} R \rightarrow \text{coker } \phi \rightarrow 0$. Yet $\text{depth } R/p = 1$ as $R/p \cong k[y]_{(y)}$. [More to the point, y is a non-zerodivisor on R/p but not on R .] \square

Proposition 4.12. Let F be a minimal free resolution of M , $k = R/m$. Then $\text{rank } F_i = \dim_k \text{Tor}_i^R(k, M) =: \beta_i(M)$, the i^{th} Betti number.

Proof. Take $F \rightarrow M \rightarrow 0$ and apply $k \otimes_R -$. Then $\text{Tor}_i^R(k, M) = H_i(k \otimes_R F) = k^{n_i}$ if $\text{rank } F_i = n_i$ (all the maps become the 0 map when you tensor because all of the maps had entries in m). So $\dim \text{Tor}_i^R(k, M) = n_i$ if $F_i \cong R^{n_i}$. \square

Corollary 4.13. $\text{pd}_R M = \sup\{i \mid \text{Tor}_i^R(k, M) \neq 0\} =$ the length of any minimal free resolution of M .

Proposition 4.14. Let (R, m) be local, M finitely generated. Suppose $x \in m$ such that x is R -regular and M -regular. Let F be a minimal free resolution of M . Then $F \otimes R/(x)$ is a minimal free $R/(x)$ -resolution of M/xM . Hence $\text{pd}_R M = \text{pd}_{R/(x)} M/xM$.

Proof. We know it is minimal as the entries of $\bar{\phi}$ are still in m/xm and clearly the modules are still free. So we need only check $H_i(F \otimes R/(x))$ is 0 for $i > 0$ and M/xM for $i = 0$. Recall $H_i(F \otimes R/(x)) \cong \text{Tor}_i^R(M, R/(x))$. Note $(G.) 0 \rightarrow R \xrightarrow{x} R \rightarrow 0$ is a free resolution of $R/(x)$. Apply $- \otimes_k M$ to get $0 \rightarrow M \xrightarrow{x} M \rightarrow 0$. Thus $H_i(G \otimes_R M)$ is 0 for $i > 1$, is $(0 :_M x) = 0$ for $i = 1$ and $\text{coker } x = M/xM$ for $i = 0$. \square

Auslander-Buchsbaum Formula: Let (R, m) be a local ring and M a finitely generated R -module. If $\text{pd}_R M < \infty$ then $\text{pd}_R M + \text{depth } M = \text{depth } R$.

Proof. Induct on $\text{depth } R$. If $\text{depth } R = 0$, then $m \in \text{Ass}_R R$. Therefore $\text{Hom}_R(R/m, R) \neq 0$ and hence $\text{Hom}_R(R/m, F) \neq 0$ for any finitely generated nonzero free R -module. Let $0 \rightarrow F_n \rightarrow F_{n-1} \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow F_0 \rightarrow 0$ be a minimal free resolution of M . If $n > 0$, we have $0 \rightarrow F_n \xrightarrow{\phi} F_{n-1}$ where $\text{im } \phi \subseteq mF_{n-1}$. Apply $\text{Hom}_R(R/m, -)$ to get $0 \rightarrow \text{Hom}_R(R/m, F_n) \xrightarrow{0 \text{ map}} \text{Hom}_R(R/m, F_{n-1})$. As $\text{Hom}_R(R/m, -)$ is exact, this implies $\text{Hom}_R(R/m, F_n) = 0$, a contradiction. Thus $n = 0$ and M is projective. Of course, finitely generated projectives over a local ring are free. Thus M is free and by the ext characterization of depth, $\text{depth}_R M = \text{depth } R$. Now, assume $\text{depth } R > 0$ and proceed by induction.

Case 1. $\text{depth } M > 0$. Let $\text{Ass}_R R = \{Q_1, \dots, Q_\ell\}$ and $\text{Ass}_R M = \{P_1, \dots, P_k\}$. Now $m \notin \text{Ass}_R M$ or $\text{Ass}_R R$ (as otherwise the depth would be 0). So $m \not\subseteq Q_1 \cup \dots \cup Q_\ell \cup P_1 \cup \dots \cup P_k$ by prime avoidance. Let $x \in m \setminus (\cup Q_i \cup \cup P_j)$. Then x is a non-zerodivisor on M and R . By the proposition, $\text{pd}_{R/(x)} M/(x)M = \text{pd}_R M$, $\text{depth } R/(x) = \text{depth } R - 1$, and $\text{depth } M/(x)M = \text{depth } M - 1$. Done by induction.

Case 2. $\text{depth } M = 0$. Let $0 \rightarrow F_n \rightarrow \dots \xrightarrow{\phi_1} F_0 \rightarrow 0$ be a minimal free resolution of M . So $n = \text{pd}_R M$. Let $K = \text{im } \phi_1 = \ker(F_0 \rightarrow M)$. Then $0 \rightarrow F_n \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow F_1 \rightarrow 0$ is a minimal free resolution of K , making $\text{pd}_R K = n - 1$. Also $0 \rightarrow K \rightarrow F_0 \rightarrow M \rightarrow 0$ and since $\text{depth } F_0 = \text{depth } R > \text{depth } M = 0$, the Depth Lemma implies $\text{depth } K = \text{depth } M + 1 = 1$. By case 1, $\text{pd } K + \text{depth } K = \text{depth } R$. Of course $\text{depth } R = \text{pd } K + \text{depth } K = \text{pd } M + \text{depth } M$. \square

Exercise. (Stronger version of the Prime Avoidance Lemma) Let R be a commutative ring, I an ideal, $x \in R$. Suppose p_1, \dots, p_n are primes and $(x, I) \not\subseteq P_i$ for all i . Then there exists $x + y \notin p_i$ for all i .

Proof. Assume $p_k \not\subseteq p_j$ for any $k, j \leq n$ as otherwise, we can just throw the smaller one out. If $x \notin p_i$ for all i , take $y = 0$. Suppose $x \in p_1, \dots, p_r$ but $x \notin p_{r+1}, \dots, p_n$. Then $I \not\subseteq p_1, \dots, p_r$ and by the prime avoidance lemma, $I \not\subseteq p_1 \cup \dots \cup p_r$. Choose $i \in I \setminus (p_1 \cup \dots \cup p_r)$. If $r = n$, take $y = i$. So suppose $r < n$.

Claim. $P_{r+1} \cap \dots \cap P_n \not\subseteq P_1 \cup \dots \cup P_r$.

Proof. Suppose not. Then $P_{r+1} \cap \dots \cap P_n \subseteq P_j$ for some $j \leq r$. Then $p_k \subseteq p_j$ for some $k \geq r + 1$ as p_j is prime.

Choose $z \in p_{r+1} \cap \dots \cap p_n \setminus p_1 \cup \dots \cup p_r$. Let $y = iz$. Then $x + y \notin P_i$ for all i . \square

Exercise. Let R be a Noetherian local ring, $I = (x_1, \dots, x_n)$ an ideal of R such that $\text{grade } I = n$. Then x_1, \dots, x_n is a regular sequence.

Proof. For $n = 1$, we have $I = (x)$ and $\text{grade } I = 1$. So there exists $y \in I$ a non-zero-divisor. But $y = xz$ for some $z \in R$ and thus x is a non-zero-divisor. Therefore, x is R -regular. So suppose $n > 1$. Since $\text{grade } I > 0$, $I \not\subseteq p$ for any $p \in \text{Ass}_R R$. Let $J = (x_2, \dots, x_n)$. Then $(x_1, J) \not\subseteq p$ for all $p \in \text{Ass}_R R$. By the previous exercise, there exists $y \in J$ such that $x_1 + y \notin p$ for all $p \in \text{Ass}_R R$. Say $y = r_2x_2 + \dots + r_nx_n$ for $r_i \in R$. Let $x' = x_1 + y$. Then x' is a non-zero-divisor on R . Note $I = (x', x_2, \dots, x_n)$. So $\text{grade } I/(x') = n - 1$ and $I/(x') = (\overline{x_2}, \dots, \overline{x_n})$. By induction, $\overline{x_2}, \dots, \overline{x_n}$ is $R/(x')$ -regular. Thus x', x_2, \dots, x_n and therefore x_2, \dots, x_n, x' are R -regular as R is local. Thus $\overline{x'} = \overline{x_1}$ is a non-zero-divisor on $R/(x_2, \dots, x_n)$. So x_2, \dots, x_n, x_1 and therefore x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n are R -regular. \square

Thus in a Cohen-Macaulay local ring, if x_1, \dots, x_d is a system of parameters, then $\text{grade}(x_1, \dots, x_d) = \text{ht}(x_1, \dots, x_d) = d$ and so x_1, \dots, x_d is R -regular. So any system of parameters is an R -regular sequence.

Exercise. Given an example of an ideal $I = (x, y)$ such that $\text{grade } I = 1$ but x, y are zero-divisors on (R, m) .

Proof. Consider $R = (k[x, y]/(xy))_{(x, y)}$ and $I = (x, y)$. Then $x + y$ is a non-zero-divisor and so $\text{grade } I = 1$. \square

Definition. Let R be local, I an ideal. If $\text{grade } I = \mu_R(I)$, then I is a **complete intersection (c.i.)**.

By the exercise, a complete intersection ideal is just an ideal generated by a regular sequence.