

## Lecture 26: Primary Decomposition (III)

Last time: a Primary Decomp  $\Rightarrow$  a Reduced One:  $\mathfrak{a} = \mathfrak{q}_1 \cap \dots \cap \mathfrak{q}_l$

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

(2)  $\mathfrak{q}_i \not\subseteq \bigcap_{\substack{1 \leq j \leq l \\ j \neq i}} \mathfrak{q}_j$  for all  $i = 1, \dots, l$ . (ie, no  $\mathfrak{q}_i$  is redundant)

Example  $\mathfrak{a} = (x^2, xy) = (x) \cap (x, y)^2 = (x) \cap (x, y)$  reduced, not unique!  
 $\mathfrak{P}_1 = (x), \mathfrak{P}_2 = (x, y)$

TODAY: ① Discussed uniqueness features of reduced primary decomp

② Special case:  $R$  is a PID

Theorem 1: The set of prime ideals  $\{\mathfrak{P}_1, \dots, \mathfrak{P}_l\}$  of a reduced primary decomposition of  $\mathfrak{a}$  is uniquely determined by  $\mathfrak{a}$ . More precisely:

$$\{\mathfrak{P}_1, \dots, \mathfrak{P}_l\} = \{ \cap((\mathfrak{a}:x)) : x \in R \text{ & } ((\mathfrak{a}:x)) \text{ is prime} \}$$

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

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

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

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

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

Recall:  $(\mathfrak{a}:f) = \{ r \in R : rf \subseteq \mathfrak{a} \}$  for  $\mathfrak{a}, f$  ideals.

Proof: (1) is clear.

For (3): if  $y \in (q:x)$  &  $x \notin \mathcal{P}$ , then  $y \in q$  (otherwise,

$$xy \in q \& y \notin q \Rightarrow x \in r(q) = \mathcal{P}$$

$$\text{So } q \stackrel{\text{Always}}{\subseteq} (q:x) \subseteq q \text{ gives } (q:x) = q.$$

For (z) : To show:  $x \notin q \Rightarrow (q:x)$  is primary &  $r(q:x) = \emptyset$

Theorem: The set of prime ideals  $\{\mathfrak{P}_1, \dots, \mathfrak{P}_e\}$  in a reduced decomp  
of  $\mathfrak{A}\mathcal{C}$  is  $\{\mathfrak{P}_1, \dots, \mathfrak{P}_e\} = \{r((\mathfrak{A}\mathcal{C}:x)) : x \in R \text{ & } r((\mathfrak{A}\mathcal{C}:x)) \text{ is prime}\}$

Notation  $\text{Assoc}(\alpha) = \{\mathfrak{P}_1, \dots, \mathfrak{P}_l\}$  is the set of primes associated to  $\alpha$  (it doesn't depend on a prim decmp, but solely on  $\alpha$ ).

Corollary: If  $\mathfrak{P} \subsetneq R$  prime ideal minimal among primes containing  $\alpha$ , then  $\mathfrak{P} \in \text{Assoc}(\alpha)$ . That is,  $\text{Min}(\alpha) \subseteq \text{Ass}(\alpha)$

- We relabel  $\text{Assoc}(\alpha)$  so that  $\text{Min}(\alpha) = \{\mathfrak{P}_1, \dots, \mathfrak{P}_k\}$  for some  $k \leq l$
- Assuming  $\alpha = q_1 \cap \dots \cap q_l$  is reduced primary decmp, where:

Theorem:  $\{q_1, \dots, q_k\}$  are uniquely determined by  $\alpha$ .

More explicitly,  $q_i = j_i^{-1}(j_i(\alpha) R_{P_i})$  for  $i=1 \dots k$ ,  
where  $j_i : R \rightarrow R_{P_i}$ .



## Primary decomposition for PIDs

Def : A commutative ring  $R$  is a principal ideal domain (PID) if it is a domain and every ideal of  $R$  can be generated by 1 element.

Observation : PID  $\Rightarrow$  Noetherian.

Ex : ①  $\mathbb{Z}$

②  $\mathbb{K}[x]$

Q: What do primary decompositions look like for PIDs?

Lemma: Fix  $R = \text{PID} \neq \emptyset \subseteq R$  nonzero prime ideal. Then,  $\mathfrak{P}$  is maximal

Corollary: (HW9) All nonzero primary ideals in PID have maximal radicals.

Theorem (Prim Decomp for PIDs)

Given  $\neq 0 \subset R$  ideal in a PID, there exist primary ideals  $q_1, \dots, q_\ell$  st

$$(1) \quad \alpha = q_1 \cap \dots \cap q_\ell$$

(2)  $\{r(q_i)\}_{1 \leq i \leq \ell}$  are distinct nonzero prime ideals.

$$(3) \quad q_i \not\supset \bigcap_{j \neq i} q_j$$

Furthermore  $\text{Im}(\alpha) = \text{Ass}(\alpha)$ , so we get uniqueness of all  $q_1, \dots, q_\ell$ .

Q: What more can we say about primary ideals?

Lemma: If  $R$  is a PID &  $0 \neq q$  is primary, then  $q = \mathfrak{m}^n$  for some  $n \geq 0$  where  $\mathfrak{m} = r(q)$  is a maximal ideal.

Corollary :  $\delta\alpha = \delta_1^{n_1} \cap \dots \cap \delta_\ell^{n_\ell} = \delta_1^{n_1} \cdot \dots \cdot \delta_\ell^{n_\ell}$ . (because  $\delta_i$  p.v.d)