

## Lecture 25: Primary Decomposition II R Commutative

- Recall .  $Q$  primary ideal if  $xy \in Q$  &  $y \notin Q \Rightarrow x^n \in Q$  for some  $n$
- $Q$  med ideal if  $Q = I \cap C$  with  $I, C$  ideals  $\Rightarrow Q = I$  or  $Q = C$ .

Lemma:  $Q$  primary  $\Rightarrow r(Q)$  prime

- Obs:
- ①  $Q$  primary  $\not\Rightarrow Q$  is a power of a prime
  - ②  $\mathcal{P}$  prime  $\not\Rightarrow \mathcal{P}^n$  is primary
  - ③  $r(Q)$  maximal  $\Rightarrow Q$  is primary

Prop: R Noetherian : (i) Every ideal is a finite intersection of med. ideals  
(ii)  $I$  med  $\Rightarrow$  Primary.

Consequence: "Primary Decomposition" for Noetherian rings.

$\mathcal{A} = Q_1 \cap \dots \cap Q_r$  &  $\mathcal{P}$  minimal among prime ideals containing  $\mathcal{A}$   
then  $\mathcal{P} = r(Q_i)$  for some  $i$

Consequence:  $\mathcal{A}$  has finitely many minimal associate primes.  
(=  $\text{Min}(\mathcal{A})$ )

### §1. Noetherian + $\text{sum } 0 \Rightarrow$ Artinian

Theorem 1: Let R be a commutative Noetherian ring R of  $\text{sum } 0$   
(that is, every prime ideal is maximal). Then, R is Artinian.

Proof: By the Corollary, R has finitely many minimal primes

By our  $\text{sum } 0$  assumption, these are maximal ideals.

Call them  $m_1, \dots, m_e$ .

• Any other maximal ideal  $M$  must contain a minimal prime, namely  $m_i$  itself. Indeed, if  $M$  is not minimal  $\exists \mathcal{P} \subsetneq M$  prime with  $\mathcal{P} \subseteq m_i$ . But  $\mathcal{P}$  &  $M$  are both  $\text{max}$  so  $\mathcal{P} = M$  ( $\Rightarrow \text{max}$ )

$\Rightarrow \{m_1, \dots, m_e\} = \text{Max Spec}(R)$  (set of  $\text{max}$  ideals of R)

• Claim 1:  $\mathcal{N} = \bigcap_{\mathcal{P} \text{ prime}} \mathcal{P} = \bigcap_{\mathcal{P} \text{ min prime}} \mathcal{P} = \mathfrak{m}_1 \cap \dots \cap \mathfrak{m}_\ell = \mathfrak{m}_1 \dots \mathfrak{m}_\ell$   
↓  
pairwise coprime

• Claim 2:  $\exists n$  st  $\mathcal{N}^n = (0)$

Pf/  $\mathcal{N}$  is fg, so  $\mathcal{N} = (x_1, \dots, x_s)$  &  $x_1^{m_1} = \dots = x_s^{m_s} = 0$   
 $m_1, \dots, m_s \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$

Pick  $k = \max \{m_1, \dots, m_s\}$  so  $x_i^k = 0 \ \forall i = 1, \dots, s$

Pick  $n > s(k-1)$

Write  $y_i = \sum_{j=1}^s a_j^{(i)} x_j \in \mathcal{N}$

$\Rightarrow y_1, \dots, y_n = (a_1^{(1)} x_1 + \dots + a_s^{(1)} x_s) \dots (a_1^{(n)} x_1 + \dots + a_s^{(n)} x_s)$

equals 0 since after distributing, each summand must contain some  $x_j$  raised to a power  $> k-1$  (ie  $\geq k$ ).  $\square$

• Using the claim & the proof of the Structure Theorem, we have  $\mathcal{R} \cong \mathcal{R}/\mathfrak{m}_1^n \times \dots \times \mathcal{R}/\mathfrak{m}_\ell^n$

Each  $\mathcal{R}/\mathfrak{m}_j^n$  is Noetherian, of dim 0 & local (with unique maximal ideal  $\bar{\mathfrak{m}}_j = \mathfrak{m}_j/\mathfrak{m}_j^n$ ).

The Noetherian condition says  $\bar{\mathfrak{m}}_j^i / \bar{\mathfrak{m}}_j^{i+1}$  is an  $\mathcal{R}/\mathfrak{m}_j$ -v.s of finite dimension (f.g as an  $\mathcal{R}$ -module).

The proof technique of (Artinian + local  $\Rightarrow$  Noetherian) works here as well. And shows  $\mathcal{R}/\mathfrak{m}_n$  is Artinian

If  $\exists$  strictly descending chain of ideals in  $R/\mathfrak{m}_j^n \Rightarrow \exists$  infinite list of  $\neq$  subspaces in  $\overline{\mathfrak{m}_j^i}/\mathfrak{m}_j^{i+1}$   $i=1, \dots, n$ . (contra!)

To finish, we need only show that finite product of Artinian rings is Artinian. (any ideal in  $R_1 \times \dots \times R_n$  has the form  $\mathfrak{a}_1 \times \dots \times \mathfrak{a}_n$  for  $\mathfrak{a}_i \subseteq R_i$  ideal)  $\square$

## §2 More on Primary Decomposition:

• Next we discuss uniqueness properties of this decomposition

**⚠** Decompositions are in general not unique, but certain features will be:

Ex:  $\mathfrak{a} = (x^2, xy) \subseteq R = K[x, y]$  ( $K = \text{any field}$ )

Let  $\mathfrak{p}_1 = (x)$ ,  $\mathfrak{p}_2 = (x, y)$  Both are prime ideals

$\mathfrak{a} = \mathfrak{p}_1 \cap \mathfrak{p}_2^2 = \mathfrak{p}_1 \cap (x^2, y)$  are 2 distinct primary dec of  $\mathfrak{a}$

•  $\mathfrak{p}_1$  primary  $fg \in (x)$  &  $x \nmid f \Rightarrow x \mid g$ .

•  $\mathfrak{p}_2^2$  " because  $r(\mathfrak{p}_2^2) = (x, y)$  is maxl.

•  $(x^2, y)$  " "  $r((x^2, y)) = (x, y)$  —

Both have  $\mathfrak{p}_2$  in common. This is no accident!

From now on, we write  $\mathfrak{a} = \mathfrak{q}_1 \cap \dots \cap \mathfrak{q}_l$  primary decm  $(*)$

$\mathfrak{p}_i = r(\mathfrak{q}_i)$  (prime) for all  $i=1, \dots, l$

STEP 1: Create a "reduced primary decomp" from  $(*)$

Def: The decomposition (\*) is reduced if the following 2 assumptions hold:

(1)  $\mathfrak{P}_1, \dots, \mathfrak{P}_\ell$  are all distinct.

(2)  $q_i \not\subseteq \bigcap_{\substack{1 \leq j \leq \ell \\ j \neq i}} q_j$  for all  $i = 1, \dots, \ell$ . (ie, no  $q_i$  is redundant)

Removing redundant  $q_i$ 's we can assume (2) holds.

Our next lemma says that (1) can always be achieved:

Lemma: If  $\tilde{q}_1, \dots, \tilde{q}_n$  are primary ideals with  $r(\tilde{q}_i) = \mathfrak{P}$   $\forall i = 1, \dots, n$ , then  $\tilde{q} = \bigcap_{i=1}^n \tilde{q}_i$  is also primary and  $r(\tilde{q}) = \mathfrak{P}$ .

Proof:  $r(\tilde{q}) = \bigcap_{i=1}^n r(\tilde{q}_i) = \bigcap_{i=1}^n \mathfrak{P} = \mathfrak{P}$

• Pick  $xy \in \tilde{q}$  with  $y \notin \tilde{q}$ . Then,  $y \notin \tilde{q}_j$  for some  $j$  &  $xy \in \tilde{q}_j \implies x^N \in \tilde{q}_j$ , (ie  $x \in r(\tilde{q}_j) = \mathfrak{P} = r(\tilde{q})$ ) so  $x^N \in \tilde{q}$  for some  $N > 0$ , as we wanted. So  $\tilde{q}$  is primary.  $\square$

STEP 2: Analyze uniqueness features of reduced prim decmp.

Theorem 2 The set of prime ideals  $\{\mathfrak{P}_1, \dots, \mathfrak{P}_\ell\}$  is uniquely determined by  $\mathfrak{A}$ . More precisely:

$$\{\mathfrak{P}_1, \dots, \mathfrak{P}_\ell\} = \{r((\mathfrak{A}:x)) : x \in R \text{ \& } r((\mathfrak{A}:x)) \text{ is prime}\}$$

this does NOT require a primary decmp.  
(so LHS) is indep of our choice of red. primary decmp)

To prove this statement, we need some technical lemmas:

Lemma: Let  $q \neq R$  be primary &  $\mathcal{P} := r(q)$ . Given  $x \in R$ , we have:

$$(1) \quad x \in q \Rightarrow (q:x) = R$$

$$(2) \quad x \notin q \Rightarrow (q:x) \text{ is primary \& } r(q:x) = \mathcal{P}.$$

$$(3) \quad x \notin \mathcal{P} \Rightarrow (q:x) = q.$$

Recall:  $(\mathcal{A}:b) = \{ r \in R : rb \subseteq \mathcal{A} \}$  for  $\mathcal{A}, b$  ideals.

Proof: (1) is clear, For (3): if  $y \in (q:x)$  &  $x \notin \mathcal{P}$ , then  $y \in q$  (otherwise,  $xy \in q$  &  $y \notin q \Rightarrow x \in r(q) = \mathcal{P}$ )  
So  $q \subseteq (q:x) \subseteq q$  gives  $(q:x) = q$ .  
Always

For (2): We begin by proving  $(q:x) \subset \mathcal{P}$ . Let  $y \in (q:x)$   
so  $xy \in q$ . Since  $x \notin q$ , then  $y^n \in q$  for some  $n > 0$ , i.e.,  $y \in \mathcal{P}$ .

So  $q \subseteq (q:x) \subset \mathcal{P}$ . Taking radicals gives

$$\mathcal{P} = r(q) \subseteq r((q:x)) \subseteq r(\mathcal{P}) = \mathcal{P} \Rightarrow r((q:x)) = \mathcal{P}.$$

• To finish, we show  $(q:x)$  is primary. Pick  $yz \in (q:x)$ , i.e.  $yzx \in q$ . We'll use the contrapositive in the definition of primary ideal. Assume  $y^n \notin (q:x) \forall n > 0$ . Then,  $y \notin \mathcal{P}$  & so  $y^n \notin q \forall n > 0$ .

Then,  $xz \in q$  so  $z \in (q:x)$ . □

