

**Problem 1.** Let  $(R, \mathfrak{m})$  be a homomorphic image of a Noetherian Cohen-Macaulay local ring  $(S, \mathfrak{n})$ . Assume that  $R$  is equidimensional with  $\dim(R) = d$ . For any system of parameters  $x_1, \dots, x_d$  of  $R$ , show that  $((x_1, \dots, x_i)_R^* :_R x_{i+1}) = (x_1, \dots, x_i)_R^*$  for every  $i < d$ . (The case  $i = 0$  may be interpreted as  $(0^* :_R x_1) = 0^*$ , the proof of which should be well incorporated into the general case.)

*Proof.* Say  $R = S/Q$  with  $\text{height}(Q) = h$ . As shown in class, there exist  $\underline{y} = y_1, \dots, y_d \in S$ ,  $\underline{z} = z_1, \dots, z_h \in Q$ , and  $c \in S$  such that (a) the images of  $y_i$  are  $x_i$  for  $i = 1, \dots, d$ ; (b)  $y_1, \dots, y_d, z_1, \dots, z_h$  form part of a system of parameters of  $S$ ; (c) the image of  $c$  is  $\bar{c} \in R^\circ$ ; and (d) there exists  $q_0 \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $cQ^{[q_0]} \subseteq (\underline{z})S$ .

For any  $i < d$  and any  $x \in ((x_1, \dots, x_i)_R^* :_R x_{i+1})$ , we have  $xx_{i+1} \in (x_1, \dots, x_i)_R^*$ , meaning that there exists  $\bar{b} \in R^\circ$  and  $q_1$  such that  $\bar{b}(xx_{i+1})^q \in (x_1, \dots, x_i)^{[q]}$  for all  $q \geq q_1$ . Say  $y, b \in S$  maps to  $x, \bar{b} \in R$  respectively. Then  $b(yy_{i+1})^q \in (y_1, \dots, y_i)^{[q]} + Q$  for all  $q \geq q_1$ . Thus  $b^{q_0}(yy_{i+1})^{q_0 q} \in (y_1, \dots, y_i)^{[q_0 q]} + Q^{[q_0]}$  for all  $q \geq q_1$ . Hence  $cb^{q_0}y^{q_0 q}y_{i+1}^{q_0 q} \in (y_1, \dots, y_i)^{[q_0 q]} + (\underline{z})$ , which implies  $cb^{q_0}y^{q_0 q} \in (y_1, \dots, y_i)^{[q_0 q]} + (\underline{z})$  for all  $q \geq q_1$  (as  $S$  is Cohen-Macaulay). Applying the homomorphism  $S \rightarrow R$ , we get  $\bar{c}\bar{b}^{q_0}x^{q_0 q} \in (x_1, \dots, x_i)^{[q_0 q]}$  for all  $q \geq q_1$ . In other words, we have  $\bar{c}\bar{b}^{q_0}x^q \in (x_1, \dots, x_i)^{[q]}$  for all  $q \geq q_0 q_1$ . As  $\bar{c}\bar{b}^{q_0} \in R^\circ$ , we conclude that  $x \in (x_1, \dots, x_i)_R^*$ . Hence  $((x_1, \dots, x_i)_R^* :_R x_{i+1}) \subseteq (x_1, \dots, x_i)_R^*$ . Consequently,  $((x_1, \dots, x_i)_R^* :_R x_{i+1}) = (x_1, \dots, x_i)_R^*$  as the other containment,  $((x_1, \dots, x_i)_R^* :_R x_{i+1}) \supseteq (x_1, \dots, x_i)_R^*$ , is obvious.  $\square$

**Problem 2.** Let  $R \subseteq S$  be an extension of Noetherian domains of prime characteristic  $p$  such that  $R$  is complete local and  $S$  is weakly  $F$ -regular. Moreover, assume that  $(IS) \cap R = I$  for all ideals  $I$  of  $R$  (e.g.  $R$  is a direct summand of  $S$  as  $R$ -modules). Show  $R$  is Cohen-Macaulay.

*Proof.* Choose a system of parameters  $x_1, \dots, x_d$  of  $R$  (with  $d = \dim(R)$ ). Observe that  $R$  has ‘colon-capture’ property:  $((x_1, \dots, x_i) :_R x_{i+1}) \subseteq (x_1, \dots, x_i)_R^*$  for every  $i < d$ . Hence it suffices to show that  $(x_1, \dots, x_i)_R^* = (x_1, \dots, x_i)R$  for every  $i < d$ . We are actually to prove  $I^* = I$  for every ideal  $I$  of  $R$ . Indeed, since  $R^\circ \subseteq S^\circ$  and  $S$  is weakly  $F$ -regular, we have  $I_R^* S \subseteq (IS)_S^* = IS$  and therefore  $I_R^* = (I_R^* S) \cap R = (IS) \cap R = I$  for every ideal  $I$  of  $R$ .  $\square$

**Problem 3.** Let  $R \subseteq S$  be any integral extension of commutative rings of prime characteristic  $p$  in which  $R$  is Noetherian.

- (1) Assume that  $S$  is module-finite over  $R$ . Then  $(IS)_S^* \cap R \subseteq I_R^*$  for any ideal  $I$  of  $R$ .
- (2) Show that  $(IS) \cap R \subseteq I_R^*$  for any ideal  $I$  of  $R$ .

*Proof.* Say  $\min(R) = \{P_1, \dots, P_r\}$ . By lying over, there exists  $Q_i \in \text{Spec}(S)$  such that  $Q_i \cap R = P_i$  for every  $1 \leq i \leq r$ . By incomparability, each  $Q_i$  is a minimal prime of  $S$ . For every  $1 \leq i \leq r$ , there is an induced embedding  $R/P_i \rightarrow S/Q_i$ . For this reason, we simply treat  $R_i := R/P_i$  as a subring of  $S_i := S/Q_i$  for every  $1 \leq i \leq r$ . Remember that we have proved the claims of this problem in case of extensions of domains.

(1). For any  $x \in (IS)^* \cap R$ , we have  $x + Q_i \in (IS_i)_{S_i}^*$  over  $S_i$ , which implies  $x + P_i \in (IS_i)_{S_i}^* \cap R_i = (IR_i)_{R_i}^*$  over  $R_i$  for every  $1 \leq i \leq r$ . This shall force  $x \in I_R^*$  over  $R$ .

(2). For any  $x \in (IS) \cap R$ , we can write  $x = x_1 s_1 + \dots + x_n s_n$  for some  $x_i \in I$ ,  $s_i \in S$ . Then we may apply part (1) to  $R \subseteq R[s_1, \dots, s_n]$  and conclude  $x \in I_R^*$ . Alternatively, we observe that  $x \in (IS) \cap R$  implies that  $x + Q_i \in IS_i$ , which implies  $x + P_i \in (IS_i) \cap R_i \subseteq (IR_i)_{R_i}^*$  over  $R_i$  for every  $1 \leq i \leq r$ . This shall force  $x \in I_R^*$  over  $R$ .  $\square$

**Problem 4.** Let  $R$  be a Noetherian ring of prime characteristic  $p$  and  $N \subsetneq M$  be finitely generated  $R$ -modules. Let  $\Lambda = \{L \mid N \subseteq L \subseteq M \text{ and } \sqrt{\text{Ann}_R(M/L)} \text{ is a maximal ideal}\}$ .

- (1) Show that  $N = \bigcap_{L \in \Lambda} L$ . (This claim does not depend on characteristic  $p$ .)
- (2) Suppose that  $J^* = J$  for all ideals  $J$  of  $R$  such that  $\sqrt{J}$  are maximal ideals. Show that  $R$  is weakly  $F$ -regular, i.e. every ideal is tightly closed.

- (3) Show that  $R$  is weakly  $F$ -regular if and only if  $R_{\mathfrak{m}}$  is weakly  $F$ -regular for all maximal ideals  $\mathfrak{m}$  of  $R$ .

*Proof.* (1). We assume  $N = 0$  without loss of generality. For any  $0 \neq x \in M$ , choose a maximal ideal  $\mathfrak{m}$  of  $R$  such that  $(0 :_R x) \subseteq \mathfrak{m}$ . Then  $x/1$  is nonzero in  $M_{\mathfrak{m}}$ . But we have  $\bigcap_{n>0} \mathfrak{m}^n M_{\mathfrak{m}} = 0$ , which implies that  $x/1 \notin \mathfrak{m}^n M_{\mathfrak{m}}$  and, hence,  $x \notin \mathfrak{m}^n M$  for some  $0 < n \in \mathbb{N}$ . Let  $L = \mathfrak{m}^n M$  and, clearly,  $\sqrt{\text{Ann}_R(M/L)} = \mathfrak{m}$ . (The argument actually implies that  $N = \bigcap_{\mathfrak{m}} \bigcap_{n \in \mathbb{N}} (N + \mathfrak{m}^n M)$ , in which  $\mathfrak{m}$  runs through all maximal ideals of  $R$ .)

(2). For any ideal  $I$  of  $R$ , we have  $I = \bigcap_{J \in \Lambda} J$  with  $\Lambda = \{J \mid I \subseteq J \text{ and } \sqrt{J} \text{ is maximal}\}$  by part (1). Therefore  $I^* \subseteq \bigcap_{J \in \Lambda} J^* = \bigcap_{J \in \Lambda} J = I$ . So  $I^* = I$  for every ideal  $I$  of  $R$ .

(3). If  $R$  is weakly  $F$ -regular, then  $I^* = I$  for all ideals  $I$  of  $R$ . In particular,  $J^* = J$  for all ideals  $J$  primary to any given maximal ideal  $\mathfrak{m}$ . For any  $\mathfrak{m}R_{\mathfrak{m}}$ -primary ideal  $H$  of  $R_{\mathfrak{m}}$ ,  $H = JR_{\mathfrak{m}}$  for some  $\mathfrak{m}$ -primary ideal  $J$  of  $R$ . Therefore  $H_{R_{\mathfrak{m}}}^* = J_{R_{\mathfrak{m}}}^* R_{\mathfrak{m}} = JR_{\mathfrak{m}} = H$ , implying  $R_{\mathfrak{m}}$  is weakly  $F$ -regular by part (2). Conversely, suppose  $R_{\mathfrak{m}}$  is weakly  $F$ -regular for all maximal ideals  $\mathfrak{m}$  of  $R$ . For any ideal  $J$  that is primary to a maximal ideal, say  $\mathfrak{m}$ , we have  $J_{R_{\mathfrak{m}}}^* R_{\mathfrak{m}} = (JR_{\mathfrak{m}})_{R_{\mathfrak{m}}}^* = JR_{\mathfrak{m}}$ . This implies that  $J_{R_{\mathfrak{m}}}^* = J$ . Hence  $R$  is weakly  $F$ -regular by part (2).  $\square$

**Problem 5.** Let  $R$  be a commutative ring (not necessarily Noetherian or with characteristic  $p$ ). Given an ideal  $I \subseteq R$  and  $x \in R$ , prove that  $x$  is in the integral closure of  $I$  if and only if  $x + P$  is in the integral closure of  $(I + P)/P \subseteq R/P$  for all  $P$  in  $\text{min}(R)$ , the set of minimal primes of  $R$ .

*Proof.* Let  $W = \{x^n + a_1 x^{n-1} + \cdots + a_{n-1} x + a_n \mid n \in \mathbb{Z}, a_i \in I^i\}$ . Then we see that  $W$  is a multiplicatively closed subset of  $R$ .

Suppose that  $x$  is not in the integral closure of  $I$  on the contrary. Then  $0 \notin W$ , meaning  $W^{-1}R$  is not a zero ring and hence  $\text{Spec}(W^{-1}R) \neq \emptyset$ . Then, by Zorn lemma, there is a minimal prime ideal  $Q$  of  $W^{-1}R$ , in which  $Q$  has to be of the form  $W^{-1}P$  for some  $P \in \text{min}(R)$ . Clearly  $P \cap W = \emptyset$ . But this contradicts to the assumption that  $x + P$  is in the integral closure of  $(I + P)/P \subseteq R/P$ .  $\square$

**Problem 6.** Let  $R$  be a Noetherian ring of prime characteristic  $p$  and  $N \subseteq M$   $R$ -modules such that  $(N_P)_{M_P}^* = (N_M^*)_P$  for every  $P \in \text{Ass}(M/N_M^*)$ . Show that  $(W^{-1}N)_{W^{-1}M}^* = W^{-1}(N_M^*)$  for any multiplicatively closed set  $W \subset R$ .

*Proof.* Let  $W$  be any multiplicatively closed subset of  $R$ . Since  $W^{-1}(N_M^*) \subseteq (W^{-1}N)_{W^{-1}M}^*$  and, hence,  $(W^{-1}(N_M^*))_{W^{-1}M}^* = (W^{-1}N)_{W^{-1}M}^*$ , we may mod out  $N_M^*$ . In other words, we may assume  $N = 0 = 0_M^*$  without loss of generality. Now we need to show that  $0 = 0_{W^{-1}M}^*$ .

Say  $\text{Ass}_R(M) = \{P_1, \dots, P_t\}$  and  $\text{Ass}_{W^{-1}R}(W^{-1}M) = \{W^{-1}P_1, \dots, W^{-1}P_s\}$  for some  $s \leq t$ . Clearly, we have  $\text{Ass}_{W^{-1}R}(0_{W^{-1}M}^*) \subseteq \text{Ass}_{W^{-1}R}(W^{-1}M)$ .

Suppose, on the contrary, that  $0 \not\subseteq 0_{W^{-1}M}^*$ . Then  $\text{Ass}_{W^{-1}R}(0_{W^{-1}M}^*) \neq \emptyset$ . Say  $\text{Ass}_{W^{-1}R}(0_{W^{-1}M}^*) = \{W^{-1}P_1, \dots, W^{-1}P_r\}$  for some  $1 \leq r \leq s$ . Let  $P = P_1$ . Then  $M_P$  can be viewed as a further localization of  $W^{-1}M$  at  $W^{-1}P$ . Thus we have  $(0_{W^{-1}M}^*)_{W^{-1}P} \subseteq 0_{M_P}^*$ .

By our choice,  $W^{-1}P \in \text{Ass}_{W^{-1}R}(0_{W^{-1}M}^*)$ , which implies that  $0 \neq (0_{W^{-1}M}^*)_{W^{-1}P} \subseteq 0_{M_P}^*$ . On the other hand, the assumption, together with the fact that  $P \in \text{Ass}_R(M)$  (which is  $\text{Ass}_R(M/N_M^*)$  since we are assuming  $N_M^* = 0$ ), forces  $0_{M_P}^* = 0$ . We have reached a contradiction.  $\square$