

Homework 3

Due Thursday night, October 12 (technically 5am Oct. 13)

Given R -module homomorphisms $A \xrightarrow{\alpha} B$ and $B \xrightarrow{\beta} C$ with $\beta \circ \alpha = 0$, we say they form a *short exact sequence*, and write $0 \rightarrow A \xrightarrow{\alpha} B \xrightarrow{\beta} C \rightarrow 0$, if

- (i) $\alpha: A \rightarrow B$ is injective;
- (ii) $\beta: B \rightarrow C$ is surjective; and
- (iii) $\text{im}(\alpha) = \ker(\beta)$.

(The content is essentially the same as saying that $C \cong B/A$, except that it allows us the freedom to consider e.g. that A might not actually be a *subset* of B .) We might sometimes leave the labels α and β off, if we don't need names for the maps at the moment, but these maps are still an essential part of the SES.

Question 1. Consider a short exact sequence $0 \rightarrow A \xrightarrow{\alpha} B \xrightarrow{\beta} C \rightarrow 0$. Prove that the following are equivalent.

- (A) There exists a homomorphism $\sigma: C \rightarrow B$ such that $\beta \circ \sigma = \text{id}_C$.
- (B) There exists a homomorphism $\tau: B \rightarrow A$ such that $\tau \circ \alpha = \text{id}_A$.
- (C) There exists an isomorphism $\varphi: B \rightarrow A \oplus C$ under which α corresponds to the inclusion $A \hookrightarrow A \oplus C$ and β corresponds to the projection $A \oplus C \twoheadrightarrow C$.

When these equivalent conditions hold, we say the short exact sequence $0 \rightarrow A \xrightarrow{\alpha} B \xrightarrow{\beta} C \rightarrow 0$ *splits*. We can also equivalently say “ $\beta: B \rightarrow C$ splits” (since by (i) this only depends on β) or “ $\alpha: A \rightarrow B$ splits” (by (ii)).

Question 2. Given an R -module, prove that the following are equivalent.

- (A) Every short exact sequence $0 \rightarrow A \rightarrow B \rightarrow M \rightarrow 0$ splits.
- (B) There exists some R -module N such that $M \oplus N$ is free.

When these equivalent conditions hold, we say that the R -module M is *projective*.

Given R -modules M and N , recall that $\text{Hom}_R(M, N)$ is an R -module where $(rf + g)(m) = r \cdot f(m) + g(m)$. We can leave off the subscript if the ring R is unambiguous from context.

Question 3*. (Make sure you understand this, but don't write it up.)

Consider a short exact sequence $0 \rightarrow A \xrightarrow{\alpha} B \xrightarrow{\beta} C \rightarrow 0$.

- (a) Prove for any X that $\text{Hom}(C, X)$ can be identified with

$$\{f \in \text{Hom}(B, X) \mid f \circ \alpha = 0\} = \ker \text{Hom}(B, X) \xrightarrow{-\circ\alpha} \text{Hom}(A, X).$$

- (b) Prove for any Y that $\text{Hom}(Y, A)$ can be identified with

$$\{f \in \text{Hom}(Y, B) \mid \beta \circ f = 0\} = \ker \text{Hom}(Y, B) \xrightarrow{\beta \circ -} \text{Hom}(Y, C).$$

Question 4*. (NO LONGER ASSIGNED)

Let R be a commutative ring, and let M be a finitely generated R -module.

Prove that if $\alpha: M \rightarrow M$ is surjective, then it is an isomorphism.

(Note the following useful consequence: any n elements that generate R^n are actually a basis of R^n .)

To the equivalent definitions (A) \iff (B) \iff (C) of finite generation on HW1, we could add the following equivalent condition (you don't need to prove this).

An R -module M is finitely generated if and only if:

- (D) There exists a short exact sequence $0 \rightarrow A \rightarrow F \rightarrow M \rightarrow 0$ where F is a finitely generated free module.

Question 5. Let M be a finitely generated R -module. Prove that the following are equivalent.

- (A) There exists a short exact sequence $0 \rightarrow A \rightarrow F \rightarrow M \rightarrow 0$ where F is a finitely generated free module and A is finitely generated.
- (B) For *every* short exact sequence $0 \rightarrow Q \rightarrow F \rightarrow M \rightarrow 0$ where F is a finitely generated free module, Q is finitely generated.

When these equivalent conditions hold, we say that the R -module M is *finitely presented*.

Question 6*. (Make sure you understand this, but don't write it up.) Let R be a commutative ring, and $S \subset R$ a multiplicative set. Consider a short exact sequence $0 \rightarrow A \xrightarrow{\alpha} B \xrightarrow{\beta} C \rightarrow 0$. Applying the localization functor, we obtain maps $S^{-1}A \xrightarrow{S^{-1}\alpha} S^{-1}B$ and $S^{-1}B \xrightarrow{S^{-1}\beta} S^{-1}C$.

Prove that $0 \rightarrow S^{-1}A \xrightarrow{S^{-1}\alpha} S^{-1}B \xrightarrow{S^{-1}\beta} S^{-1}C \rightarrow 0$ is a short exact sequence.

(Hint: this is essentially equivalent to $\ker(S^{-1}f) = S^{-1}\ker(f)$ and $\text{im}(S^{-1}f) = S^{-1}\text{im}(f)$, which we saw in class. So just make sure you understand why it holds.)

(cont)

Let R be a commutative ring, and $S \subset R$ a multiplicative set. Given an R -linear map $f: M \rightarrow N$, in class we defined¹ the $R[\frac{1}{S}]$ -linear map $\frac{f}{S}: S^{-1}M \rightarrow S^{-1}N$ given by $\frac{f}{S}(\frac{m}{s}) = \frac{f(m)}{s}$.

A natural question is whether *every* $R[\frac{1}{S}]$ -linear map from $S^{-1}M$ to $S^{-1}N$ is of this form. Thinking a moment shows this can't quite be true: for example, the map $g: \mathbb{Z}[\frac{1}{2}] \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}[\frac{1}{2}]$ given by $g(x) = \frac{1}{2i0} \cdot x$ can't come from a map $\mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$.

So the real question is whether, for every $g: S^{-1}M \rightarrow S^{-1}N$, there exist $s \in S$ and $f: M \rightarrow N$ such that $s \cdot g = \frac{f}{S}$. In this question, you will show that this holds when M is finitely presented.

Question 7. If we set $L(f) = \frac{f}{S}$, this gives a set function

$$L: \text{Hom}_R(M, N) \rightarrow \text{Hom}_{R[\frac{1}{S}]}(S^{-1}M, S^{-1}N).$$

Observe that L is actually R -linear (you do not need to prove this).

Prove that if M is finitely presented, then L is the localization map of the R -module $\text{Hom}_R(M, N)$. More precisely, for any M the universal property gives a map

$$L': S^{-1}\text{Hom}_R(M, N) \rightarrow \text{Hom}_{R[\frac{1}{S}]}(S^{-1}M, S^{-1}N);$$

you must prove that if M is finitely presented, then L' is an isomorphism.

Question 8. Give a counterexample to Q7 when M is not finitely presented, by exhibiting some $g: S^{-1}M \rightarrow S^{-1}N$ for which there do not exist $s \in S$ and $f: M \rightarrow N$ such that $s \cdot g = \frac{f}{S}$. (Note: you don't have to take R to be some crazy ring for this.)

(cont)

¹in class I called this $S^{-1}f$ instead of $\frac{f}{S}$, but that will get too hard to write.

Question 9. Given elements r_1, \dots, r_k in a commutative ring R , prove the following are equivalent.

- (A) These elements generate the unit ideal: $(r_1, \dots, r_k) = R$;
in other words, there exist $a_1, \dots, a_k \in R$ such that $a_1 r_1 + \dots + a_k r_k = 1$.
- (B) An R -module M is 0 \iff the $R[\frac{1}{r_i}]$ -module $M[\frac{1}{r_i}]$ is 0 for all $i = 1, \dots, k$.

Question 10. Let R be a commutative ring, and let M be an R -module.

Prove that if M is **finitely presented**, the following are equivalent.

- (A) M is projective. (see Q2)
- (B) M is *locally free*, meaning there exist r_1, \dots, r_k in R with $(r_1, \dots, r_k) = R$ such that $M[\frac{1}{r_i}]$ is a free $R[\frac{1}{r_i}]$ -module for all $i = 1, \dots, n$.
- (C) M_P is a free R_P -module for all prime ideals P .
- (D) $M_{\mathfrak{m}}$ is a free $R_{\mathfrak{m}}$ -module for all maximal ideals \mathfrak{m} .

Question 11. (Hard) Extend the equivalence in Q10 to include the following equivalent condition (still under the assumption that M is finitely presented):

- (E) Every linear dependence in M is trivial, in the sense below.

A linear dependence in M is a list of module elements $m_1, \dots, m_n \in M$ and ring elements $r_1, \dots, r_n \in R$ such that $r_1 m_1 + \dots + r_n m_n = 0$ in M .

A *trivial* linear dependence is, colloquially, something like

$$\begin{aligned} & (10v_1 - 3v_2) \\ & + 2 \cdot (-3v_1 + v_2) \\ & + (-4v_1 + v_2) \\ & = (10 - 6 - 4)v_1 + (-3 + 2 + 1)v_2 \\ & = 0v_1 + 0v_2 = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Formally, a linear dependence is *trivial* if there exist module elements $v^1, \dots, v^k \in M$ and ring elements $a_i^j \in R$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} a_i^1 v^1 + a_i^2 v^2 + \dots + a_i^k v^k &= m_i && \text{for all } i \\ r_1 a_1^j + r_2 a_2^j + \dots + r_n a_n^j &= 0 && \text{for all } j \end{aligned}$$