

## Solutions for Oct 8, 2007 exercises

1. Let  $F : {}_R\mathbf{Mod} \rightarrow {}_T\mathbf{Mod}$  and  $G : {}_T\mathbf{Mod} \rightarrow {}_R\mathbf{Mod}$  be additive functors, such that  $F$  is left-adjoint to  $G$ . Prove that  $G$  is left-exact.

*Solution.* Let  $0 \rightarrow L \xrightarrow{f} M \xrightarrow{g} N$  be a left-exact sequence of  $T$ -modules. Let  $\varphi$  be the adjoint map. Since left-exactness is independent of isomorphism classes, we may assume that  $L \subseteq M$  and  $f$  is the inclusion map. Note that for any  $R$ -module  $A$  and  $T$ -module  $B$ ,  $\varphi_{A,B} : \text{Hom}_T(FA, B) \rightarrow \text{Hom}_R(A, GB)$  is not just a bijection, but a group isomorphism. Hence,  $\varphi(0) = 0$  and  $\varphi^{-1}(0) = 0$ . Also, on modules we have  $G(0) = 0$ , since  $H := \text{Hom}_R(G(0), G(0)) \cong \text{Hom}_T(FG(0), 0) = 0$ , but  $H$  must include both the zero map and the identity map, hence the identity map is zero.

So we want to show that the sequence

$$0 \rightarrow GL \xrightarrow{Gf} GM \xrightarrow{Gg} GN \quad (1)$$

is exact.

First, note that  $G(g) \circ G(f) = G(g \circ f) = G(0) = 0$  since  $G$  is an additive functor. Hence (1) is a complex.

To see that  $Gf$  is injective, let  $K = \text{Ker } Gf$ , so that  $0 \rightarrow K \xrightarrow{i} GL \xrightarrow{Gf} GM$  is exact. Then  $Gf \circ i = 0$ , so  $0 = \varphi^{-1}(Gf \circ i) = f \circ \varphi^{-1}(i)$ , but since  $f$  is injective it follows that  $\varphi^{-1}(i) = 0$ , so that  $i = \varphi(\varphi^{-1}(i)) = 0$ . Thus,  $K = 0$ .

Finally, we must show that  $\text{Ker } Gg \subseteq \text{Im } Gf$ . Let  $z \in \text{Ker } Gg$ ,  $J = Rz$ , and  $j : J \hookrightarrow GM$  the inclusion map. Then  $Gg \circ j = 0$ , so  $0 = \varphi^{-1}(Gg \circ j) = g \circ \varphi^{-1}(j)$ , so that  $\text{Im } \varphi^{-1}(j) \subseteq \text{Ker } g = \text{Im } f = L$ . That is, there is a map  $t : FJ \rightarrow L$  such that  $\varphi^{-1}(j) = f \circ t$ . Then  $j = \varphi(\varphi^{-1}(j)) = \varphi(f \circ t) = Gf \circ \varphi(t)$ , so  $z = j(z) = (Gf \circ \varphi(t))(z) \in \text{Im } Gf$ .<sup>1</sup>  $\square$

2. Let  $0 \rightarrow L \xrightarrow{f} M \xrightarrow{g} N \rightarrow 0$  be a sequence of  $R$ -modules; call it  $\mathcal{E}$ . Show that the following conditions are equivalent:

---

<sup>1</sup>An alternate way to do this problem is to show that  $\text{Hom}_T(FR, -)$  is left-exact, and then use the fact that this functor is essentially the same as  $\text{Hom}_R(R, G-)$ , which is isomorphic to the functor  $G$ . But I think this way ends up being harder to make precise.

- (a)  $\mathcal{E}$  is an exact complex, and there is an  $R$ -linear map  $p : M \rightarrow L$  such that  $p \circ f = 1_L$ .
- (b)  $\mathcal{E}$  is an exact complex, and there is an  $R$ -linear map  $j : N \rightarrow M$  such that  $g \circ j = 1_N$ .
- (c) There exist  $p : M \rightarrow L$  and  $j : N \rightarrow M$  such that  $p \circ f = 1_L$ ,  $g \circ j = 1_N$ , and  $(f \circ p) + (j \circ g) = 1_M$ .
- (d) There is an isomorphism  $\varphi : M \xrightarrow{\sim} L \oplus N$  in such a way that  $\varphi \circ f = i$  and  $\pi \circ \varphi = g$ , where  $i : L \rightarrow L \oplus N$  is the natural inclusion and  $\pi : L \oplus N \rightarrow N$  is the natural projection.

*Solution (partial).* (a)  $\implies$  (b): Define  $j : N \rightarrow M$  as follows: For  $n \in N$ , there is some  $m \in M$  with  $g(m) = n$ . Then let  $j(n) = m - f(p(m))$ . Then show that this definition is well-defined (independent of choice of  $m$ ), and then we have  $g(j(n)) = g(m - fp(m)) = g(m) - gfp(m) = g(m) - 0 = n$ .

(b)  $\implies$  (a): Define  $p : M \rightarrow L$  as follows. For  $m \in M$ , we have  $m - jg(m) \in \text{Ker } g = \text{Im } f$ , so there is a unique  $l \in L$  such that  $f(l) = m - jg(m)$ ; let  $p(m) :=$  this  $l$ . Then  $f(l) - jgf(l) = f(l)$ , so  $p(f(l)) = l$ .

(a)  $\implies$  (c): Let  $j$  be as in the proof of ((a)  $\implies$  (b)). Then for any  $m \in M$ , we have  $f(p(m)) + j(g(m)) = f(p(m)) + (m - f(p(m))) = m$ .

(c)  $\implies$  (d): First,  $gf = gfpf = g(1 - jg)f = gf - gjgf = gf - gf = 0$ . By symmetry we also have  $pj = 0$ .

Define  $\varphi : M \rightarrow L \oplus N$  by  $\varphi(m) := (p(m), g(m))$ . It is clear that  $\varphi$  is a homomorphism. Also,  $\varphi(f(l)) = (pf(l), gf(l)) = (l, 0) = i(l)$ , and  $\pi(\varphi(m)) = \pi(p(m), g(m)) = g(m)$ . So we need only show that  $\varphi$  is bijective.

If  $\varphi(m) = 0$ , then  $p(m) = g(m) = 0$ , so  $m = fp(m) + jg(m) = f(0) + j(0) = 0$ . Finally, given any  $(l, n) \in L \oplus N$ , we have  $\varphi(f(l) + j(n)) = (pf(l) + pj(n), gf(l) + gj(n)) = (l + 0, 0 + n) = (l, n)$ .

(d)  $\implies$  (a): Let  $q : L \oplus N \rightarrow L$  be the natural projection, and let  $p := q \circ \varphi$ . Then  $q \circ i = 1_L$ , so  $pf = q\varphi f = qi = 1_L$ . Thus also  $f$  is injective, and  $gf = \pi\varphi f = \pi i = 0$ . For  $z \in N$ , we have  $\varphi(y) = (0, z)$  for some  $y \in M$ , and then  $g(y) = \pi(\varphi(y)) = z$ , so  $g$  is surjective.

Finally, if  $y \in \text{Ker } g$ , then  $\pi(\varphi(y)) = 0$ , so  $\varphi(y) = i(x) = \varphi(f(x))$  for some  $x \in L$ , and then  $y = f(x) \in \text{Im } f$ . So the complex is exact.  $\square$

3. Use the previous problem to show that for any rings  $R$  and  $T$ , any additive functor  $F : {}_R\mathbf{Mod} \rightarrow {}_T\mathbf{Mod}$ , and any  $R$ -modules  $M$  and  $N$ , we have  $F(M \oplus N) \cong F(M) \oplus F(N)$ .

*Solution.* Let  $f : M \rightarrow M \oplus N$ ,  $j : N \rightarrow M \oplus N$  be the natural inclusions, and  $p : M \oplus N \rightarrow M$ ,  $g : M \oplus N \rightarrow N$  be the natural projections. Then  $f, g, p, j$  satisfy the properties of (c) above. Since  $F$  preserves composition, addition, and identity maps, it follows that  $F(f), F(g), F(p), F(j)$  satisfy the same properties. Hence since (c) implies (d), we have  $F(M \oplus N) \cong F(M) \oplus F(N)$ .  $\square$

4. Let  $R$  be a ring,  $W$  a multiplicative set, and  $C(W) := \{\mathfrak{p} \in \text{Spec } R \mid \mathfrak{p} \cap W = \emptyset\}$ . Show there is a bijection between  $\text{Spec } W^{-1}R$  and  $C(W)$ .

*Solution.* The bijection is given by extension and contraction via the localization map  $\ell_W : R \rightarrow W^{-1}R$ .

Take any  $\mathfrak{p} \in C(W)$ . Then  $\mathfrak{p} \cap W = \emptyset$ , so  $\mathfrak{p}^e = W^{-1}\mathfrak{p} \neq W^{-1}R$ , and in fact  $\mathfrak{p}^e \in \text{Spec } W^{-1}R$ , since  $W^{-1}R/W^{-1}\mathfrak{p} = \bar{W}^{-1}(R/\mathfrak{p})$ , which is a nonzero subring of the fraction field of  $R/\mathfrak{p}$ , hence an integral domain.

On the other hand, take any  $P \in \text{Spec } W^{-1}R$ . Then  $P^c$  is the image of  $P$  under the map of prime spectra associated to the localization map, so it must be prime.

Next, note that  $P = P^{ce}$ . By an earlier exercise, we need only show that  $P \subseteq P^{ce}$ . Let  $\frac{r}{w} \in P$ . Then  $\ell_W(r) = \frac{r}{1} = \frac{w}{1} \frac{r}{w} \in P$ , so  $r \in P^c$ , and hence  $\frac{r}{w} = \frac{1}{w} \ell_W(r) \in P^{ce}$ . Now, if  $P^c \cap W \neq \emptyset$ , then  $P = P^{ce} = W^{-1}R$ , which is impossible because  $P$  is prime. Hence,  $P^c \in C(W)$ .

Finally, for  $\mathfrak{p} \in C(W)$ , we have  $\mathfrak{p}^{ec} = \mathfrak{p}$ . By an earlier exercise we need only show that  $\mathfrak{p}^{ec} \subseteq \mathfrak{p}$ . So let  $x \in \mathfrak{p}^{ec}$ . Then  $\frac{x}{1} \in \mathfrak{p}^e$ , so that  $\frac{x}{1} = \frac{p}{w}$  for some  $p \in \mathfrak{p}$  and  $w \in W$ . Thus there is some  $w' \in W$  with  $w'wx = w'p \in \mathfrak{p}$ , but  $w'w \in W \subseteq R \setminus \mathfrak{p}$ , so  $x \in \mathfrak{p}$ .  $\square$

5. Say that a multiplicatively closed set  $W \subseteq R$  is *saturated* if  $x, y \in R$ ,  $xy \in W \Rightarrow x \in W$  and  $y \in W$ . For an arbitrary multiplicatively closed set  $W$ , define the *saturation*  $\widetilde{W}$  of  $W$  to be the set  $\widetilde{W} := \{v \in R \mid \exists x \in R : xv \in W\}$ . Show that
- (a)  $\widetilde{W}$  is a saturated multiplicative set that contains  $W$ .
  - (b) For any multiplicative set  $V$  such that  $W \subseteq V$ , we have  $\widetilde{W} \subseteq \widetilde{V}$ .
  - (c) If  $W$  is saturated then  $W = \widetilde{W}$ .
  - (d) If  $V \subseteq W$  are multiplicative sets, then the natural map  $\varphi : V^{-1}R \rightarrow W^{-1}R$  is an isomorphism if and only if  $W \subseteq \widetilde{V}$ .
  - (e)  $\widetilde{W} = R \setminus \bigcup C(W)$ .

*Solution.* (a)  $\widetilde{W}$  is a multiplicative set because if  $x, y \in \widetilde{W}$ , then there are  $r, s \in R$  with  $rx, sy \in W$ , so  $rsxy \in W$ , whence  $xy \in \widetilde{W}$ .  $\widetilde{W}$  contains  $W$  because for any  $w \in W$ , we have  $1w = w$ .  $\widetilde{W}$  is saturated because if  $xy \in \widetilde{W}$ , then  $rxxy = (rx)y = (ry)x \in W$  for some  $r \in R$ .

- (b) If  $x \in \widetilde{W}$  then  $rx \in W \subseteq V$ , so  $x \in \widetilde{V}$ .
- (c) If  $x \in \widetilde{W}$ , then  $rx \in W$ , so  $x \in W$ .
- (d) Suppose  $\varphi$  is an isomorphism, and let  $w \in W$ . Then since  $\varphi$  is surjective, for some  $\frac{r}{v} \in V^{-1}R$ , we have  $\varphi(r/v) = 1/w$ , which means that for some  $w' \in W$ , we have  $w'(rw - v) = 0$ . That is,  $\varphi(\frac{wr-v}{1}) = 0$ , so since  $\varphi$  is injective we have  $\frac{rw-v}{1} = 0$  in  $V^{-1}R$ . Thus there is some  $v' \in V$  with  $v'rw = v'v \in V$ , so that  $w \in \widetilde{V}$ . Conversely, suppose  $W \subseteq \widetilde{V}$ . If  $\varphi(\frac{r}{v}) = 0$ , then there is some  $w \in W$  with  $wr = 0$ , and some  $s \in R$  with  $sw \in V$ , so  $(sw)r = 0$  implies that  $\frac{r}{v} = 0$  in  $V^{-1}R$ . Thus  $\varphi$  is injective.<sup>2</sup> Let  $\frac{r}{w} \in W^{-1}R$ . There is some  $s \in R$  with  $sw \in V$ , and  $\varphi(\frac{sr}{sw}) = \frac{sr}{sw} = \frac{r}{w}$ , so  $\varphi$  is surjective.

---

<sup>2</sup>Several people got this problem wrong because they assumed that  $\varphi$  is injective by definition. This is not true. For instance, suppose  $V = \{1\}$  and  $W$  is some multiplicative set that contains both 1 and a zerodivisor  $x$ , so that there is some nonzero  $y \in R$  with  $xy = 0$ . Then  $\frac{y}{1} \neq 0$  in  $V^{-1}R \cong R$ , but  $\frac{y}{1} = 0$  in  $W^{-1}R$ . In this case  $\varphi$  can be surjective but not injective: Let  $R = \mathbb{Q}[x]/(x^2)$ ,  $V = \{1\}$ , and  $W = \{1, x\}$ . Then  $\varphi$  is the natural projection map  $R \rightarrow \mathbb{Q}$  which sends  $x$  to 0, and  $\widetilde{V} = \mathbb{Q} \not\subseteq W$ .

(e) Let  $x \in \widetilde{W}$ . For any  $\mathfrak{p} \in C(W)$ , if  $x \in \mathfrak{p}$ , then for some  $r \in R$ , we have  $rx \in W$  (by definition of  $\widetilde{W}$ ) and  $rx \in \mathfrak{p}$  (since  $\mathfrak{p}$  is an ideal), so  $rx \in \mathfrak{p} \cap W = \emptyset$ , a contradiction. Thus,  $\widetilde{W} \subseteq R \setminus \bigcup C(W)$ .

Conversely, suppose  $x \in R \setminus \bigcup C(W)$ . If  $\frac{x}{1}$  is contained in some maximal ideal  $M$  of  $W^{-1}R$ , then  $x \in M^c \in C(W)$  by problem 5, which contradicts our assumption on  $x$ . Hence  $\frac{x}{1}$  is a unit in  $W^{-1}R$ , which means that  $\frac{y}{w} \frac{x}{1} = \frac{1}{1}$  for some  $\frac{y}{w} \in W^{-1}R$ . So for some  $w' \in W$ , we have  $(w'y)x = w'w \in W$ , so that  $x \in \widetilde{W}$ . Thus,  $R \setminus \bigcup C(W) \subseteq \widetilde{W}$ .<sup>3</sup>

□

6. Let  $R$  be a ring,  $M$  a finitely presented  $R$ -module, and  $N$  any  $R$ -module. Prove that  $\text{Ass Hom}_R(M, N) = \text{Supp } M \cap \text{Ass } N$ .

*Solution.* Let  $\mathfrak{p} \in \text{Ass Hom}_R(M, N)$ . Say  $\mathfrak{p} = (0 : f)$  for some  $f : M \rightarrow N$ . For any  $a \in \text{Ann } M$  and any  $z \in M$ , we have  $af(z) = f(az) = f(0) = 0$ , so  $a \in (0 : f) = \mathfrak{p}$ . That is,  $\mathfrak{p} \in V(\text{Ann } M) = \text{Supp } M$  since  $M$  is finitely generated. Say  $M = \sum_{i=1}^n Rz_i$ . Suppose that for each  $i$ , there is some  $w_i \in (0 : f(z_i)) \setminus \mathfrak{p}$ . Letting  $w = \prod_i w_i \in R \setminus \mathfrak{p}$ , we have  $wf(z_i) = 0$  for all  $i$ , so  $wf(M) = 0$ , which means that  $w \in (0 : f) \in \mathfrak{p}$ , a contradiction. So for some  $i$ , we have  $\mathfrak{p} = (0 : f(z_i)) \in \text{Ass } N$ .

Conversely, suppose  $\mathfrak{p} \in \text{Supp } M \cap \text{Ass } N$ . Let  $f : M_{\mathfrak{p}} \rightarrow M_{\mathfrak{p}}/\mathfrak{p}M_{\mathfrak{p}}$  be the natural surjection. Since  $M_{\mathfrak{p}} \neq 0$ , Nakayama's lemma shows that  $M_{\mathfrak{p}}/\mathfrak{p}M_{\mathfrak{p}} \neq 0$ , and the latter is a finite-dimensional  $k$ -vector space, where  $k = R_{\mathfrak{p}}/\mathfrak{p}R_{\mathfrak{p}}$ . Hence, there is a  $k$ -linear (hence  $R_{\mathfrak{p}}$ -linear) surjection  $g : M_{\mathfrak{p}}/\mathfrak{p}M_{\mathfrak{p}} \rightarrow k$ . So we get a nonzero  $R_{\mathfrak{p}}$ -linear map  $g \circ f : M_{\mathfrak{p}} \rightarrow k = (R/\mathfrak{p})_{\mathfrak{p}}$ , and thus by localization of  $\text{Hom}$  there is a nonzero  $R$ -linear map  $v : M \rightarrow R/\mathfrak{p}$  such that  $g \circ f = v_{\mathfrak{p}}$ . Since  $\mathfrak{p} \in \text{Ass } N$ , there is an injection  $i : R/\mathfrak{p} \hookrightarrow N$ . Let  $u = i \circ v$ . Since  $u$  factors through  $R/\mathfrak{p}$  it is clear that  $\mathfrak{p}u = 0$ . On the other hand, suppose  $au = 0$ . Then  $i \circ (av) = 0$ , so  $i$  injective implies that  $av = 0$ . Since  $v$  is nonzero, there is some  $z \in M$  with  $v(z) \neq 0$ . Since  $av(z) = 0$ , it follows that  $\bar{a} = 0$  in the integral domain  $R/\mathfrak{p}$ , i.e.  $a \in \mathfrak{p}$ . Hence,  $(0 : u) = \mathfrak{p} \in \text{Ass Hom}_R(M, N)$ . □

---

<sup>3</sup>Thanks to William for this proof, which is simpler than the one I had in mind.