

ON RINGS OF FRACTIONS

BY
T. M. K. DAVISON⁽¹⁾

1. Introduction and summary. Let R be a commutative Noetherian ring with identity, and let M be a fixed ideal of R . Then, trivially, ring multiplication is continuous in the M -adic topology. Let S be a multiplicative system in R , and let $j = j_S: R \rightarrow S^{-1}R$, be the natural map. One can then ask whether (cf. Warner [3, p. 165]) $S^{-1}R$ is a topological ring in the $j(M)$ -adic topology. In Proposition 1, I prove this is the case if and only if $M \subset p(S)$, where

$$p(S) = \bigcap \{P \mid P \text{ prime ideal of } R \text{ such that } P \supset \ker j, P \cap S \neq \emptyset\}.$$

Hence $S^{-1}R$ is a topological ring for all S if and only if $M \subset p^*(R)$, where

$$p^*(R) = \bigcap \{p(S) \mid S \text{ a multiplicative system}\}.$$

The ideal $p(S)$ occurs in another context: in Proposition 2, I prove that $S^{-1}R$ is an R -algebra of finite type (that is a ring finite extension of R) if and only if $S \cap p(S) \neq \emptyset$. To globalize this result I prove in Theorem 1 that the all quotient rings of R are of finite type if and only if R is semilocal of dimension at most 1. (This generalizes an old result of Artin-Tate [1, Theorem 4].)

The remainder of the paper is taken up in evaluating $p^*(R)$, (in particular when R is a domain $p^*(R)$ is the pseudo-radical introduced by Gilmer [2]), and discussing the interrelationships with $\text{Rad}(R)$, the Jacobson radical of R , and $\text{rad}(R)$, the prime radical of R .

2. Notation and terminology. In general the notation and terminology is that of Zariski-Samuel [4]. T denotes the set of all nonzero divisors of R , a commutative Noetherian ring with identity. For a given multiplicative system we put

$$S^\perp = \{x \in R \mid \exists s \in S \text{ with } xs = 0\}.$$

Thus $S^\perp = \ker j_S$, as defined above. \mathcal{S} denotes the set of all multiplicative systems which do not contain 0, hence

$$\mathcal{S} = \{S \text{ mult. system} \mid S \cap S^\perp = \emptyset\}.$$

We say a prime ideal P of R is S -prime if and only if $P \supset S^\perp$ and $P \cap S \neq \emptyset$. Thus

$$p(S) = \bigcap \{P \mid P \text{ is an } S\text{-prime ideal}\}.$$

R is *not* considered to be a prime ideal.

Received by the editors, in revised form, December 5, 1969.

⁽¹⁾ The author wishes to acknowledge that the above paper was prepared while he was a National Research Council of Canada Postdoctorate Fellow.

3. Elementary results.

LEMMA 1. Let A_1, \dots, A_n be a set of pairwise incommensurable prime ideals in R . For each $i \in [1, n]$ there is an $x_i \in R$ such that $x_i \notin A_i$, but $x_i \in A_j$ all $j \neq i$.

Proof. Immediate.

LEMMA 2. Let R_1 be a commutative ring, and G a subgroup of R_1 satisfying $G \supset G^2 \supset G^3 \supset \dots$. Then the powers of G can be used for a base for a topology on R_1 which gives it the structure of a topological group.

Then R_1 is a topological ring if and only if given $x_1 \in R_1$ there is a $k \geq 1$ such that $x_1 G^k \subset G$.

Proof. Straightforward (or Bourbaki?).

Finally we have the following property of minimal prime ideals of R :

LEMMA 3. Let P be a minimal prime ideal of R (i.e. isolated prime ideal of (0)). For all $S \in \mathcal{S}$, P is not an S -prime ideal.

Proof. Let P_1, \dots, P_m be the associated prime ideals of (0) , and write $(0) = \bigcap Q_i$ in an obvious notation. Put $S_i = R \setminus P_i$.

Assume P is S -prime, then $P \supset S^\perp$. Hence [4, Vol. 1, Ch. IV, Theorem 18 (3)]

$$P \supset \bigcap \{Q_i \mid i \text{ such that } Q_i \cap S = \phi\}.$$

Thus $P \supset P_i$ for some i such that $P_i \cap S = \phi$. As P is minimal $P = P_i$, and so $P \cap S = \phi$; which contradicts our assumption that P is S -prime.

4. Local and global results for continuity of ring multiplication. Let R, M be as in §1.

LEMMA 4. Let $S \in \mathcal{S}$. Then $S^{-1}R$ is a topological ring in the $j_S(M)$ -adic topology if and only if given $s \in S$ there is a $k \geq 1$ such that

$$M^k \subset Ms + S^\perp.$$

Proof. Let $(x, s) \in S^{-1}R$ be given. By Lemma 2 we need only show there is a $k \geq 1$ such that $(x, s)j(M)^k \subset j(M)$. Since $(x, 1)j(M) \subset j(M)$ for all $x \in R$ it is necessary and sufficient to prove that given $s \in S$ there is a $k \geq 1$ such that $j(M)^k \subset j(M)(s, 1)$. The result now follows.

COROLLARY. $(S^{-1}R, j(M))$ is a topological ring if and only if $M \subset \bigcap_{s \in S} \sqrt{Rs + S^\perp}$.

Proof. If multiplication is continuous, then given $s, M \subset \sqrt{Ms + S^\perp} \subset \sqrt{Rs + S^\perp}$. But this is true for all s , whence the result.

Conversely assume the result. Let $s \in S$ be given, then $M \subset \sqrt{Rs + S^\perp}$. As R is Noetherian,

$$Rs + S^\perp \supset (\sqrt{Rs + S^\perp})^k \supset M^k \text{ for some } k \geq 1,$$

and so $Ms + S^\perp \supset M^{k+1}$.

We now prove the intersection of the above corollary is identical with $p(S)$.

LEMMA 5. $\bigcap_{s \in S} \sqrt{Rs + S^\perp} = p(S)$.

Proof. Assume x belongs to the left-hand side. Let P be an S -prime ideal, and choose $s \in P \cap S$. Then as $x \in \sqrt{Rs + S^\perp}$ there is a $k \geq 1$, $y \in R$, $z \in S^\perp$ such that $x^k = ys + z$. But this implies that $x \in P$ (as $s \in P$, and $z \in P$). Hence x belongs to the right-hand side.

Conversely assume $x \in p(S)$. Let $s \in S$ be given. Every prime ideal containing $\sqrt{Rs + S^\perp}$ is S -prime, and so $x \in \sqrt{Rs + S^\perp}$. Thus $x \in \bigcap_{s \in S} \sqrt{Rs + S^\perp}$.

We combine this result, with the preceding corollary to obtain:

PROPOSITION 1. *A necessary and sufficient condition that $(S^{-1}R, j(M))$ is a topological ring is*

$$M \subset p(S).$$

Hence we deduce.

COROLLARY. $(S^{-1}R, j_S(M))$ is a topological ring for all $S \in \mathcal{S}$ if and only if

$$M \subset p^*(R).$$

5. **Local results for ring-finiteness.** In the results that follow we will make use of the fact that the prime ideals of a Noetherian ring satisfy the d.c.c., and so, if there are S -prime ideals then there are minimal such.

PROPOSITION 2. (cf. [2, Lemma 3]). *Let $S \in \mathcal{S}$. The following conditions are equivalent*

- (i) $S^{-1}R$ is an R -algebra of finite type.
- (ii) $S \cap p(S) \neq \phi$.
- (iii) There are only finitely many minimal S -prime ideals.

Proof. (i) \Rightarrow (ii). Assume $\phi: R_1[x_1, \dots, x_n] \rightarrow S^{-1}R$, with $R_1 = R/A$ for some ideal A of R , is an isomorphism. Choose $(y_i, s_i) \in S^{-1}R$ such that $\phi(x_i) = (y_i, s_i)$. Put $s = s_1 \dots s_n$. Clearly $s \in S$. I claim $s \in p(S)$.

It is straightforward (but tedious) to prove using ϕ^{-1} that given $(y, t) \in S^{-1}R$ there is a $k \geq 0$, and $x \in R$ such that $(s^k y, t) \sim (x, 1)$ (in the case of domains this is trivial). Let P be an S -prime ideal, and choose $t \in P \cap S$. By the preceding remark we see that $s^m - xt \in S^\perp$ for some $m \geq 0$, $x \in R$. Thus $s^m \in xt + S^\perp \subset P + S^\perp \subset P$ and so $s \in P$. Whence $s \in p(S)$.

(ii) \Rightarrow (iii). Assume $s \in S \cap p(S)$, and put

$$\sqrt{Rs + S^\perp} = P^{(1)} \cap P^{(2)} \cap \dots \cap P^{(k)},$$

where all $P^{(j)}$ are prime, and in fact S -prime. Let P be an S -prime ideal. Clearly $P \supset Rs + S^\perp$, and so $P \supset P^{(j)}$ for some j . Hence the minimal S -prime ideals are among the $P^{(j)}$, for $j = 1, 2, \dots, k$.

(iii)⇒(i). If there are no S -prime ideals then in particular a maximal ideal is either disjoint from S or does not contain S^\perp . Thus the natural injection of R/S^\perp into $S^{-1}R$ is onto, and so an isomorphism.

Now assume $P^{(1)}, \dots, P^{(k)}, k \geq 1$, are the minimal S -prime ideals of R . Take $s_i \in P^{(i)} \cap S$, and put $t = \prod_{i=1}^k s_i$. In the ring $\bar{R} = R/S^\perp$ we denote images by \bar{r} , etc., so $\{1, \bar{t}, \bar{t}^2, \dots\}$ is a multiplicative system in \bar{R} . We denote the ring of fractions by $\bar{R}[1/\bar{t}]$. I claim $S^{-1}R \simeq \bar{R}[1/\bar{t}]$. The following three statements make this clear, using the universal property of $S^{-1}R$. Consider the natural map f obtained from composing $R \rightarrow \bar{R} \rightarrow \bar{R}[1/\bar{t}]$ namely $r \mapsto \bar{r}/1$:

(a) $s \in S \Rightarrow f(s)$ is a unit in $\bar{R}[1/\bar{t}]$. For since $\sqrt{Rs + S^\perp}$ is an intersection of S -prime ideals it must contain t , which is in each S -prime ideal. Thus $\exists x \in R, m \geq 0$ such that $xs - t^m \in S^\perp$; and so $\bar{x}\bar{s} = \bar{t}^m$, whence the result, as \bar{t} is a unit.

(b) $x \in R, f(x) = 0 \Rightarrow x \in S^\perp$. This is clear as

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\bar{x}}{1} = \frac{\bar{0}}{1} &\Leftrightarrow \exists m \geq 0 && \bar{t}^m \bar{x} = \bar{0} \\ &\Leftrightarrow \exists m \geq 0 && xt^m \in S^\perp \\ &\Leftrightarrow x \in S^\perp, && \text{as } t^m \in S. \end{aligned}$$

(c) Each element of $\bar{R}[1/\bar{t}]$ is of the form $f(x)f(s)^{-1}$ for some $x \in R, s \in S$. This is clear also, as in fact each element of $\bar{R}[1/\bar{t}]$ is of the form $f(x)f(t^m)^{-1}$ for some $x \in R, m \geq 0$; and $t^m \in S$.

6. Global results for ring-finiteness. The result of this section (Theorem 1) is a generalization of a theorem of Artin–Tate [1, Theorem 4], and also contains part of Gilmer’s theorem 1 (see [2]).

THEOREM 1. *Let R be a commutative Noetherian ring. Then the following statements are equivalent.*

- (a) R is semilocal, and $\dim R \leq 1$.
- (b) R has only finitely many prime ideals.
- (c) $S^{-1}R/R$ is finite for all $S \in \mathcal{S}$.

Proof. (a)⇒(b) is trivial.

(b)⇒(c) is true by §5, Proposition 2(iii).

(c)⇒(a). Let $\{P_1, \dots, P_n\}$ be all the prime ideals of R of height 0; since R is Noetherian these are finite in number. Put $T = R \setminus \bigcap_{i=1}^n P_i$. Clearly $T^\perp \subset \sqrt{(0)} = \bigcap_{i=1}^n P_i$, so $P \supset T^\perp$ for all prime ideals P . Furthermore $P \cap T = \phi$ if and only if $P = P_j$ for some $j \in [1, n]$. Hence, by Lemma 3, P is T -prime if and only if $\text{ht}(P) \geq 1$. Let P'_1, \dots, P'_k be the minimal T -prime ideals (these are finite in number since $T^{-1}R$ is an R -algebra of finite type). Let P'_{k+1}, \dots, P'_m denote the prime ideals of height 0 which are not contained in any P'_j , for $j \leq k$.

I claim P'_1, \dots, P'_m are maximal ideals. Let $\{a_1, \dots, a_m\}$ be chosen (by Lemma 1)

so that $a_i \notin P'_i, a_i \in \bigcap_{j \neq i} P'_j$. Assume $a \notin P'_j$. Consider $b = a + \sum' a_q$, where Σ' denotes the sum over all indices q such that $a \in P'_q$. Clearly $b \notin \bigcup_{i=1}^m P'_i$. If b is not a unit, let P' be an isolated prime ideal of Rb . By the principal ideal theorem [4, Vol. 1, p. 238], $\text{ht } P' \leq 1$. If $\text{ht } P' = 1$ then P' is a T -prime ideal, and so $P' \supset P'_q$ for some $q \leq k$. If $P' > P'_q$ then $\text{ht}(P'_q) = 0$, and so P'_q is not T -prime, which is absurd. Thus $P' = P'_q$, and so $b \in P'_q$ which is contrary to the construction of b . So we must have $\text{ht } P' = 0$. But then $P' \subset \bigcup_{q=1}^m P'_q$, by our choice of the set of ideals $\{P'_1, \dots, P'_m\}$ which implies $b \in \bigcup_{q=1}^m P'_q$; which is also absurd. Thus b is a unit, and so P'_j is maximal.

There are no more maximal ideals, for if M is maximal either it is T -prime, and so belongs to $\{P'_1, \dots, P'_k\}$ or it is not T -prime and so belongs to $\{P_1, \dots, P_n\}$.

Finally each prime ideal has height ≤ 1 . For if P is a prime ideal with $\text{ht } P \geq 2$ then P is T -prime, and so $P \supset P'_j$ for some $j \leq k$. Since P'_j is maximal $P = P'_j$. Let $P > P' > P''$ with P', P'' prime. Then P' is a T -prime ideal, and $P'_j > P'$ contradicts the fact that P'_j is a minimal T -prime ideal.

Compare the proof of (c) \Rightarrow (b) with Theorem 8 in [3].

7. Properties of $p^*(R)$. Let P_1, \dots, P_n be the isolated prime ideals of (0). We find a more convenient description of $p^*(R)$ in the next result.

PROPOSITION 3. $p^*(R) = \bigcap_{i=1}^n p(S_i)$.

Proof. It is clear that $p^*(R) \subset \bigcap_{i=1}^n p(S_i)$ directly from the definition. If $x \notin p^*(R)$ there is a prime P , and an $S \in \mathcal{S}$ such that P is S -prime and $x \notin P$. Now $P \supset P_i$ for some $i \leq n$. If $P > P_i$ then P is S_i -prime, and so $x \notin p(S_i)$. Hence $x \notin \bigcap_{i=1}^n p(S_i)$. If $P = P_i$ we contradict Lemma 3. Hence $x \notin p^*(R) \Rightarrow x \notin \bigcap_{i=1}^n p(S_i)$.

COROLLARY. For any pair of rings R', R'' we have

$$p^*(R' \times R'') \simeq p^*(R') \times p^*(R'').$$

Proof. The minimal prime ideals of $R' \times R''$ are easy to describe, given the minimal primes of R' and R'' . Now apply the proposition.

The next result in conjunction with the one following shows that p^* has the effect of indicating dimension.

PROPOSITION 4. $p^*(R) = R$ if and only if $\dim R = (0)$. That is if and only if R is Artinian.

Proof. If $p^*(R) = R$ then $p(S_i) = R$, each i , and so there are no prime ideals properly containing P_i , for any i . Hence each P_i is maximal and so the result follows. Conversely if R is Artinian then R is a finite product of primary rings. Now if R' is primary $p^*(R') = R$, and so the result follows by applying the Corollary to Proposition 3.

As $p(S_i) \supset P_i$ for each i it is clear that $p^*(R) > \text{rad}(R)$. With respect to $\text{Rad}(R)$ the situation is a little more complex. First we need the following result.

2—C.M.B.

LEMMA 7. Let R' be an arbitrary ring. There exist rings R'' and R''' such that (i) the minimal prime ideals of R'' have depth ≥ 1 (equivalently the maximal prime ideals have height ≥ 1). (ii) R'' is Artinian, with the property that $R' \simeq R'' \times R'''$.

Note if R' has property (i) or (ii) itself this representation is trivial, i.e. $R' \simeq R''$ or $R' \simeq R'''$.

Proof. Let P'_1, \dots, P'_n be the minimal prime ideals of (0) in R' . Assume $P'_k, P'_{k+1}, \dots, P'_n$ are maximal ideals, and put $B = \bigcap_{j=k}^n Q'_j$ where $(0) = \bigcap_{i=1}^m Q'_i$ in an obvious notation. Then there is A such that $A \cap B = (0)$, $A + B = R$, namely $\bigcap_{i=1}^{k-1} Q'_i \cap \bigcap_{i=n+1}^m Q'_i$. It is now standard [4, Vol. 1, Theorem 32, p. 178] that $R' \simeq R'/A \times R'/B$. Take $R'' = R'/A$, $R''' = R'/B$. These rings clearly have the desired property.

PROPOSITION 5. $p^*(R) \subset \text{Rad}(R)$ if and only if there is no minimal prime ideal of R which is also maximal.

Proof. Assume no minimal prime ideal of R is maximal. Let M be a maximal prime, then there is a minimal prime P_i properly contained in M , so $p(S_i) \subset M$. Thus $p^*(R) \subset \bigcap M = \text{rad}(R)$.

Assume conversely that $p^*(R) \subset \text{Rad}(R)$. Write $R = R' \times R''$ using Lemma 7, with R'' Artinian. Then $p^*(R) = p^*(R') \times p^*(R'')$, whereas $\text{Rad}(R) = \text{Rad}(R') \times \text{Rad}(R'')$ and so $p^*(R'') \subset \text{Rad}(R'')$ —but this is absurd (apply Proposition 4), and so we must have $R'' = (0)$. Thus R has no Artinian part, which implies that no minimal prime of R is maximal.

COROLLARY. $(R, p^*(R))$ is a Zariski ring if and only if there is no minimal prime ideal of R which is also maximal.

In fact it is clear that more than Proposition 5 is true: $p^*(R) \subset \bigcap \{P \mid P \text{ prime of height } \geq 1\}$. One more result of the type is worth stating.

PROPOSITION 6. $p^*(R) = \text{rad}(R)$ if and only if $S_i^{-1}R$ is not ring-finite for any i .

COROLLARY. If R is semiprimary then $p^*(R) > \text{rad}(R)$.

REFERENCES

1. E. Artin and J. Tate, *A note on finite ring extensions*, J. Math. Soc. Japan **3** (1951), 74–77.
2. D. Gilmer, *The pseudo-radical of a commutative ring*, Pacific J. Math. **19** (1966), 275–284.
3. S. Warner, *Compact noetherian rings*, Math. Ann. **141** (1960), 161–170.
4. O. Zariski and P. Samuel, *Commutative algebra I, II*, Van Nostrand, Princeton, N.J., 1958.

MCMASTER UNIVERSITY,
HAMILTON, ONTARIO