

## Some Properties on Noetherian Rings

By JONG-YOULL PARK,

### § 1. Introduction

Recently, the theory of Commutative rings is blindingly developed together with algebraic geometry ([1], [8], [10], [12], [14]).

In particular, the concepts of height, dimension and depth have been studied deeply ([2], [3], [4], [9], [13], [15]). The purpose of this paper is to prove some properties on noetherian rings. (Proposition 2.9, Proposition 3.1, and Proposition 3.4) and to prove our main theorems (Theorem 5.1 and Theorem 5.2) which say that for a noetherian local ring  $(A, \mathfrak{m})$ , a finite  $A$ -module  $M$  we have

$$\text{Proj. dim}(M) + \text{depth}(M) = \text{depth}(A)$$

and for a Cohen-Macaulay  $A$ -module  $M$  and a element  $p \in \text{Ass}(M)$  we have

$$\text{Proj. dim}(M) = \text{ht}(p).$$

In details, we shall describe definitions of concepts which are used throughout this paper in section § 2, and also prove Proposition 2.9 with respect to minimal homomorphisms. In section § 3, we shall prove two propositions with respect to depths and dimensions (Proposition 3.1 and Proposition 3.4). In section § 4, we shall define Cohen-Macaulay module and show that some properties on the dimension and depths.

Finally, in section § 5, main theorems of this paper (Theorem 5.1, Theorem 5.2) will be proved.

### § 2. Preliminaries

Throughout this paper, all rings are commutative ring with identity. Let  $A$  be a ring. By a finite  $A$ -module  $B$  we mean that  $B$  is a finitely generated  $A$ -module.

**Definition 2.1** Let  $\varphi: A \rightarrow B$  be a ring homomorphism. If  $B$  is flat as an  $A$ -module

then  $\varphi$  is called a flat homomorphism.

For a ring homomorphism  $\varphi: A \rightarrow B$ , there is the natural map  $\varphi^*: \text{Spec}(B) \rightarrow \text{Spec}(A)$ , where for each element  $p \in \text{Spec}(B)$ ,

$$\varphi^*(p) = \varphi^{-1}(p) = p \cap A.$$

**Lemma 2.2** Let  $\varphi: A \rightarrow B$  be a ring homomorphism. Then the following are equivalent.

- (i)  $\varphi$  is a flat homomorphism.
- (ii) For each  $p \in \text{Spec}(B)$ ,  $B_p$  is flat over  $A_p$ , where  $p = p \cap A$ .

**Proof.** Let us note the following facts.

- (a) For a ring homomorphism  $\varphi: A \rightarrow B$  and a flat  $A$ -module  $M$ ,  $M_{(B)} = M \otimes_A B$  is flat over  $B$ .
  - (b) If  $S$  is a multiplicative subset of  $A$ , then  $S^{-1}A$  is a flat  $A$ -module.
  - (c) For a flat ring homomorphism  $\varphi: A \rightarrow B$ , a flat  $B$ -module is flat over  $A$ .
- (i)  $\Rightarrow$  (ii)

Consider the canonical ring homomorphism  $A \rightarrow A_p$ . Since  $A$  is a flat  $A$ -module, by (a)  $B \otimes_A A_p = B_p$  is flat over  $A_p$ . Therefore, the canonical homomorphism  $A_p \rightarrow B_p$  is a flat homomorphism. Since  $p$  is a prime ideal of  $B$ , it is also a prime ideal of  $B_p$ , by (b)  $(B_p)_p = B_p$  is a flat  $B_p$ -module. Since  $A_p \rightarrow B_p$  is flat, it follows from (c) that  $B_p$  is a flat  $A_p$ -module.

(ii)  $\Rightarrow$  (i)

In general, for a ring homomorphism  $A \rightarrow B$ , which  $p$  is an ideal of  $B$ ,  $p = p \cap A$  and an  $A$ -module  $N$  we have

$$(Tor_i^A(B, N))_p = Tor_i^{A_p}(B_p, N_p) \quad (i=1, 2, \dots) \quad ([10]).$$

By our assumption,

$$Tor_i^{A_p}(B_p, N_p) = 0$$

So that  $B_p$  is a flat  $A_p$ -module. Therefore, for all maximal ideals  $p$  of  $B$  and for all  $A$ -module  $N$ ,

$$Tor_i^A(B, N)_p = (Tor_i^A(B, N))_p = 0$$

This implies that

$$Tor_i^A(B, N) = 0$$

for all  $A$ -module  $N$  ([1]). And thus  $B$  is flat over  $A$ .

**Lemma 2.3** If  $\varphi : A \rightarrow B$  is a flat homomorphism, then the going-down theorem holds for  $\varphi$ .

**Proof.** Suppose  $p'$  and  $p$  are prime ideals of  $A$  with  $p' \subset p$ .

Assume that  $p$  is a prime ideal of  $B$  lying over  $p$ . By Lemma 2.2,  $B_p$  is flat over  $A_p$ . Moreover  $pB_p$  contains the image of  $pA_p$  under the canonical ring homomorphism  $A_p \rightarrow B_p$ , where  $A_p$  and  $B_p$  are local rings.  $B_p$  is a faithfully flat  $A_p$ -module. Hence  $\text{Spec}(B_p) \rightarrow \text{Spec}(A_p)$  is surjective. Since  $p'A_p$  is a prime ideal of  $A_p$ , there is a prime ideal  $p'^*$  of  $B_p$  which is lying over  $p'A_p$ . If we put  $p' = p'^* \cap B$ , then  $p'$  is a prime ideal of  $B$  lying over  $p'$  which is contained in  $p$ .

**Definition 2.4** Let  $A$  be a noetherian ring and  $M$  an  $A$ -module.

A prime ideal  $p$  of  $A$  is called by an *associated prime* of  $M$  if there is a submodule of  $M$  which is isomorphic to  $A/p$  as  $A$ -modules.

The set of all associated primes of  $M$  is denoted by  $\text{Ass}_A(M)$  (or by  $\text{Ass}(M)$ ).

**Definition 2.5** For a ring  $A (\neq 0)$ , a finite sequence of  $n+1$  prime ideals  $p_0 \supset p_1 \supset \dots \supset p_n$  is said to be a *prime chain of length  $n$* .

For each prime ideal  $p$ , the height  $ht(p)$  of  $p$  is defined by

$$ht(p) = \max_n \{n \mid p = p_0 \supset p_1 \supset \dots \supset p_n \text{ is a prime chain}\}$$

Therefore,  $ht(p) = 0$  iff  $p$  is a minimal prime ideal of  $A$ .

For each proper ideal  $I$  of  $A$ , we define  $ht(I)$

$$ht(I) = \inf_{I \subset p \in \text{Spec}(A)} \{ht(p)\}$$

The dimension of  $A$  (or *Krull dimension* of  $A$ ) is defined by

$$\dim(A) = \sup_{p \in \text{Spec}(A)} \{ht(p)\}$$

Therefore, the dimension of every principal ideal domain always zero or one.

Let  $M$  be an  $A$ -module. The dimension of  $M$  is defined by

$$\dim(M) = \dim(A/\text{Ann}(M)),$$

where  $\text{Ann}(M) = \{a \in A \mid aM = 0\}$ .

**Lemma 2.6** Let  $A (\neq 0)$  be a ring. Then the following hold.

(i) For each  $p \in \text{Spec}(A)$ ,  $ht(p) = \dim(A_p)$ .

(ii) For an ideal  $I$  of  $A$

$$\dim(A/I) + ht(I) \leq \dim(A).$$

**Definition 2.7** Let  $A$  be a ring and let  $M$  be an  $A$ -module. An element  $a \in A$  is said to be  $M$ -regular if

$$a: M \longrightarrow M \quad (m \longmapsto am)$$

is injective.

A sequence  $\{a_1, a_2, \dots, a_r\}$  of elements of  $A$  is called an  $M$ -regular sequence if for each  $i$  ( $1 \leq i \leq r$ ),  $a_i$  is  $M/(a_1M + \dots + a_{i-1}M)$ -regular. Let  $\{a_1, a_2, \dots, a_r\}$  be an  $M$ -regular sequence and let  $I$  be an ideal of  $A$ . If each  $a_i$  ( $1 \leq i \leq r$ ) is in  $I$ , then  $\{a_1, a_2, \dots, a_r\}$  is called an  $M$ -regular sequence in  $I$ . Furthermore, if there is no element  $b \in I$  such that  $\{a_1, a_2, \dots, a_r, b\}$  is an  $M$ -regular sequence in  $I$ , then  $\{a_1, a_2, \dots, a_r\}$  is called a maximal  $M$ -regular sequence in  $I$ .

When  $A$  is noetherian, for an ideal  $I$  of  $A$  and a finite  $A$ -module  $M$ ,  $depth_I(M)$  is defined by the length of a maximal  $M$ -regular sequence in  $I$ .

Let  $(A, \mathfrak{m})$  be a noetherian local ring with its maximal ideal  $\mathfrak{m}$ .

Then we write  $depth(M)$  or  $depth_{\mathfrak{m}}(M)$  for  $depth_{\mathfrak{m}}(M)$ .

The following are clear:

If  $A$  is noetherian and  $M$  is a finite  $A$ -module, then

(i) If  $a \in I$  is an  $M$ -regular element, then

$$depth_I(M/aM) = depth_I(M) - 1$$

(ii) If  $(A, \mathfrak{m})$  is a local ring,  $depth_{\mathfrak{m}}(M) = 0$  iff  $\mathfrak{m} \in \text{Ass}(M)$ .

(iii) For each  $p \in \text{Spec}(A)$ ,

$$depth(M_p) = 0 \text{ as } A_p\text{-module iff } pA_p \in \text{Ass}_{A_p}(M_p) \text{ iff } p \in \text{Ass}(M).$$

(iv) For each  $p \in \text{Spec}(A)$ ,

$$depth(M_p) \text{ as } A_p\text{-module} \geq depth_p(M).$$

**Definition 2.8** Let  $(A, \mathfrak{m}, k)$  be a local ring, where  $k = A/\mathfrak{m}$ . Let  $M$  and  $N$  be finite  $A$ -modules.

A homomorphism  $u: M \rightarrow N$  is said to be *minimal* if  $u \otimes 1_k: M \otimes_A k \rightarrow N \otimes_A k$  is an isomorphism.

**Proposition 2.9** Let  $(A, \mathfrak{m}, k)$  be a noetherian local ring. Then the following hold.

(i) The following statements (a) and (b) are equivalent:

(a)  $M$  is free.

(b)  $\text{Tor}_1^A(k, M) = 0$ .

(ii) Let  $M$  and  $N$  be finite  $A$ -modules. Then a homomorphism  $u: M \rightarrow N$  is minimal iff  $u$  is surjective and  $\ker(u) \subset \mathfrak{m}M$ .

(iii) For each finite  $A$ -module  $M$ , there exists a minimal homomorphism  $u: M \rightarrow F$ , where  $F$  is Free.

(iv) Let  $0 \rightarrow K \xrightarrow{v} F \xrightarrow{u} M \rightarrow 0$  be an exact sequence of  $A$  modules. If  $M$  is a finite  $A$ -module,  $u$  is a minimal homomorphism and  $F$  and  $K$  are free  $A$ -modules, then the homomorphism

$$v^*: \text{Ext}_A^i(k, M) \rightarrow \text{Ext}_A^i(k, F) \quad (i=0, 1, \dots)$$

induced by  $v$  is zero.

**Proof.** (i) (a)  $\Rightarrow$  (b): Since any free  $A$ -module is flat over  $A$ , we have  $\text{Tor}_1^A(k, M) = 0$ .

(b)  $\Rightarrow$  (a): Since  $M/\mathfrak{m}M = M \otimes_A k$  is a vector space over  $k$ , there is a base  $\{\bar{x}_1, \dots, \bar{x}_n\}$  of  $M/\mathfrak{m}M$ . Let  $\eta: M \rightarrow M/\mathfrak{m}M$  be the canonical projection, and let  $x_i'$  be an element of  $M$  such that

$$\eta(x_i') = \bar{x}_i \text{ for } i=1, 2, \dots, n.$$

Then  $x_i' = x_i + \alpha_i m_i$  ( $i=1, 2, \dots, n$ )

where  $\alpha_i \in \mathfrak{m}$  and  $m_i \in M$ . And  $\{x_1', \dots, x_n'\}$  generates  $M$ . We define a free  $A$ -module  $F$  which is generated by  $\{e_1, \dots, e_n\}$ , and an  $A$ -homomorphism  $f: F \rightarrow M$  by  $f(e_i) = x_i'$ . Put

$$K = \ker f$$

Then we have an exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow K \rightarrow F \rightarrow M \rightarrow 0$$

of  $A$ -modules. Therefore, we have the following long exact sequence

$$\dots \rightarrow \text{Tor}_1^A(k, M) \rightarrow K \otimes_A k \rightarrow F \otimes_A k \rightarrow M \otimes_A k \rightarrow 0$$

By our assumption  $\text{Tor}_1^A(k, M) = 0$ , and we have the following exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow K \otimes_A k \rightarrow F \otimes_A k \rightarrow M \otimes_A k \rightarrow 0$$

By our definition of  $F$  and  $f$ ,

$$f \otimes I_k: F \otimes_A k \rightarrow M \otimes_A k$$

is an isomorphism. Since

$$\dim_k(F \otimes_A k) = \dim_k(M \otimes_A k) = n$$

Thus,  $K \otimes_A k = 0$ , that is,  $K \otimes_A k = K/\mathfrak{m}K = 0$ . Since this implies that  $K = \mathfrak{m}K$ , by the Nakayama's Lemma we have  $K = 0$ . Therefore  $F \cong M$  and thus  $M$  is a free  $A$ -module.

(ii) Suppose that  $u$  is a minimal homomorphism. Then we have  $u \otimes I_k: M/\mathfrak{m}M \rightarrow N/\mathfrak{m}N$  is an isomorphism and the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} M & \xrightarrow{u} & N \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ M/\mathfrak{m}M & \xrightarrow{u \otimes I_k} & N/\mathfrak{m}N \end{array}$$

is commutative.

As in the proof of (i),  $u \otimes I_k(x + \mathfrak{m}M) = u(x) + \mathfrak{m}N$  for all  $x \in M$ ,  $u$  is clearly surjective. Since  $\ker(u \otimes I_k) = \{x + \mathfrak{m}M \mid u(x) + \mathfrak{m}N = 0\} = 0$ , it is clear that  $\ker(u) \subset \mathfrak{m}M$ .

Conversely, assume that  $u$  is surjective and  $\ker(u) \subset \mathfrak{m}M$ . Then  $u \otimes I_k$  is surjective. We shall claim that  $\ker(u \otimes I_k) = 0$ . Suppose  $\ker(u \otimes I_k) \neq 0$ .

Then  $x + \mathfrak{m}M \neq 0$  such that  $x + \mathfrak{m}M \in \ker(u \otimes I_k)$ .

Since  $\ker(u) \subset \mathfrak{m}M$ ,  $x \notin \ker(u)$ .

Thus  $u(x) \neq 0$ . And  $u(x) + \mathfrak{m}N = 0$ ,  $u(x) \in \mathfrak{m}N$ .

This is a contradiction.

(iii) Since  $M$  is a finite  $A$ -module, there is a minimal set  $\{x_1, \dots, x_n\}$  which generates  $M$ . Let  $F$  be a free  $A$ -module with a free basis  $\{e_1, \dots, e_n\}$ . Then the homomorphism

$$\varphi: F \rightarrow M \quad (\varphi(e_i) = x_i)$$

induces an isomorphism

$$F/\mathfrak{m}F \cong M/\mathfrak{m}M$$

Since  $\dim_k(F/\mathfrak{m}F) = \dim_k(M/\mathfrak{m}M) = n$ .

Therefore  $\varphi$  is a minimal homomorphism.

(iv) Since  $u$  is a minimal homomorphism,  $\ker(u) \subset \mathfrak{m}F$  by (ii).

The exact sequence implies that  $K \cong \ker(u)$  and so  $K \subset \mathfrak{m}F$ . For any  $f \in \text{Hom}_A(k, \mathfrak{m}F)$ , and for any  $a + \mathfrak{m} \in k$  we have

$$f(\bar{a}) = f(a + \mathfrak{m}) = f(a(1 + \mathfrak{m})) = af(1 + \mathfrak{m}) \in \mathfrak{m}F.$$

So  $a \in \mathfrak{m}$ ,  $f(a + \mathfrak{m}) = f(0) = 0$ .

Therefore  $\text{Hom}_A(k, K) = 0$ .

We can take injective resolutions of  $K, F$  and  $M$  respectively as the below diagrams:

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
 & & 0 & & 0 & & 0 \\
 & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\
 0 & \longrightarrow & K & \xrightarrow{v} & F & \xrightarrow{u} & M \longrightarrow 0 \\
 & & \downarrow d_0 & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\
 0 & \longrightarrow & J_0 & \xrightarrow{v_0} & J_0' & \xrightarrow{u_0} & J_0'' \longrightarrow 0 \\
 & & \downarrow d_1 & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\
 0 & \longrightarrow & J_1 & \xrightarrow{v_1} & J_1' & \xrightarrow{u_1} & J_1'' \longrightarrow 0 \\
 & & \downarrow d_2 & & & & \\
 & & J_2 & & & & 
 \end{array}$$

where the vertical sequence are injective resolutions.

Applying the covariant functor  $\text{Hom}_A(k, -)$  above diagram, we can obtain the induced homomorphism as below:

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
 0 & \longrightarrow & \text{Hom}_A(k, K) & \xrightarrow{d_0^*} & \text{Hom}_A(k, J_0) & \xrightarrow{d_1^*} & \text{Hom}_A(k, J_1) \xrightarrow{d_2^*} \text{Hom}_A(k, J_2) \\
 & & \downarrow v^* & & \downarrow v_0^* & & \downarrow v_1^* \\
 0 & \longrightarrow & \text{Hom}_A(k, F) & \xrightarrow{d_0'^*} & \text{Hom}_A(k, J_0') & \xrightarrow{d_1'^*} & \text{Hom}_A(k, J_0'')
 \end{array}$$

In case of  $n=1$ , we have  $\text{Ext}_A^1(k, K) = \ker d_1^*/\text{im } d_0^*$ .

We claim that  $\ker d_1^* \subset \text{im } d_0^*$ . For any  $f \in \text{Hom}_A(k, J_0)$  such that  $d_1^*(f) = 0$ ,  $\text{im}(f) \subset \ker(d_1) = \text{im } d_0$ .

We can fixed a element  $x \in K$  such that  $f(1+u) = d_0(x)$ .

Now we can define a homomorphism  $f': k \rightarrow K$  by  $f'(1+u) = x$ .

Therefore,  $f = d_0 \circ f' = d_0^*(f') \in \text{im } d_0^*$ . So,  $\text{Ext}_A^1(k, K) = 0$ .

Similar arguments yields that  $\text{Ext}_A^n(k, K) = 0$  for all  $n \geq 2$ .

### § 3. Some Properties of Depths and Dimensions

**Proposition 3.1** Let  $A$  and  $B$  be noetherian rings. If  $\varphi: A \rightarrow B$  is a flat homomorphism, then for each ideal  $I$  of  $A$  and a finite  $A$ -module  $M$

$$\text{depth}_I(M) = \text{depth}_{I_{(B)}} M_{(B)},$$

where  $I_{(B)} = I \otimes_A B$  and  $M_{(B)} = M \otimes_A B$ .

In particular, if  $\varphi: \text{Spec}(B) \rightarrow \text{Spec}(A)$  is surjective then  $\text{ht}(I) = \text{ht}(I_B)$ .

**Proof.** Since  $B$  is a flat  $A$ -module, we have  $I \otimes_A B \cong IB$  which is an ideal of  $B$ . Furthermore, we have

$$A_{(B)}/I_{(B)} \cong A/I \otimes_A B \cong B/I_{(B)} \cong B/IB.$$

The first part of our assertion is ascribe to the following two lemmas.

**Lemma 3.2** Let  $\varphi: A \rightarrow B$  be a flat homomorphism with  $A$  noetherian. For each finite  $A$ -module  $M$  the following holds.

$$\text{Ext}_A^i(M, N) \otimes_{AB} = \text{Ext}_B^i(M_{(B)}, N_{(B)}) \quad (i=0, 1, 2, \dots)$$

where  $N$  is an  $A$ -module.

**Proof.** Since  $M$  is an finite  $A$ -module, there is a projective resolution

$$X_*: \dots \rightarrow X_n \xrightarrow{d_n} X_{n-1} \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow X_1 \xrightarrow{d_1} X_0 \rightarrow M \rightarrow 0$$

of the  $A$ -module  $M$ , where each  $X_i (i=0, 1, \dots)$  is finite free  $A$ -module.

Let  $X_i = A \oplus \dots \oplus A$  ( $r$ -times). Then, the following holds ([7]).

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Hom}_B(X_i \otimes_{AB}, N \otimes_{AB}) &\cong \text{Hom}_B(B, N \otimes_{AB}) + \dots + \text{Hom}_B(B, N \otimes_{AB}) \\ &\cong N \otimes_{AB} \oplus \dots \oplus N \otimes_{AB} \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Hom}_A(X_i, N) \otimes_{AB} &\cong (\text{Hom}_A(A, N) \oplus \dots \oplus \text{Hom}_A(A, N)) \otimes_{AB} \\ &\cong (N \oplus \dots \oplus N) \otimes_{AB} \\ &\cong N \otimes_{AB} \oplus \dots \oplus N \otimes_{AB} \end{aligned}$$

In consequence,

$$f_i: \text{Hom}_B(X_i \otimes_{AB}, N \otimes_{AB}) \rightarrow \text{Hom}_A(X_i, N) \otimes_{AB}$$

is an isomorphism and the following diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} 0 \longrightarrow \text{Hom}_B(X_0 \otimes_{AB}, N \otimes_{AB}) & \xrightarrow{\text{Hom}(d_1 \otimes I_B, I_N \otimes I_B)} & \text{Hom}_B(X_1 \otimes_{AB}, N \otimes_{AB}) \longrightarrow \\ 0 \longrightarrow \text{Hom}_A(X_0, N) \otimes_{AB} & \xrightarrow{\text{Hom}(d_1, I_N) \otimes I_B} & \text{Hom}_A(X_1, N) \otimes_{AB} \longrightarrow \end{array}$$

is commutative.

Since each  $X_i \otimes_{AB}$  is isomorphic to a direct sum of  $r$  copies of  $B$ , clearly  $X_i \otimes_{AB}$  is a projective  $B$ -module.

Furthermore, since  $B$  is a flat  $A$ -module, the sequence

$$X_* \otimes_{AB}: \dots \rightarrow X_n \otimes_{AB} \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow X_0 \otimes_{AB} \rightarrow M \otimes_{AB} \rightarrow 0$$

is exact. That is,  $X_* \otimes_{AB}$  is a projective resolution of the  $B$ -module  $M \otimes_{AB}$ . In consequence, we have

$$\text{Ext}_A^i(M_{(B)}, N_{(B)}) = \text{Ext}_A^i(M, N) \otimes_{AB}$$

for  $i=0, 1, 2, \dots$



**Lemma 3.3** Let  $A$  be a noetherian ring. For a finite  $A$ -module  $M$ , an ideal  $I$  of  $A$  and an integer  $n > 0$ , the following are equivalent

- (i)  $\text{Ext}_A^i(A/I, M) = 0$  for any  $i < n$ .
- (ii) There exists an  $M$ -regular sequence  $\{a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n\}$  of length  $n$  in  $I$ .

**Proof.** (i)  $\Rightarrow$  (ii) Since  $\text{Ext}_A^0(A/I, M) = 0$ , we have

$$\text{Hom}_A(A/I, M) = 0.$$

Assume that every element of  $I$  is not an  $M$ -regular element.

Then  $I \subset \bigcup_{p \in \text{Ass}(M)} p$ , and thus there exists an element  $p \in \text{Ass}(M)$  such that  $I \subset p$ . By Definition 2.4  $A/p$  is isomorphic to a submodule of  $M$ , that is, there is a monomorphism  $A/p \rightarrow M$ . Since  $I \subset p$ , there exists the canonical projection  $A/I \rightarrow A/p$ . Therefore, the composition

$$A/I \rightarrow A/p \rightarrow M$$

is not a zero homomorphism. This implies that  $\text{Hom}_A(A/I, M) \neq 0$  and thus we get a contradiction. Hence, there is a  $M$ -regular element  $a_1$  in  $I$ .

We put  $M_1 = M/a_1M$ , then

$$0 \rightarrow M \xrightarrow{a_1} M \rightarrow M_1 \rightarrow 0$$

is a short exact sequence of  $A$ -modules.

Since  $\text{Ext}_A^i(A/I, M) = 0$  ( $0 \leq i < n$ ), from the long cohomology exact sequence

$$\dots \rightarrow \text{Ext}_A^{i-1}(A/I, M) \rightarrow \text{Ext}_A^i(A/I, M) \rightarrow \text{Ext}_A^i(A/I, M_1) \rightarrow \text{Ext}_A^{i+1}(A/I, M) \rightarrow \dots$$

we get  $\text{Ext}_A^i(A/I, M_1) = 0$  for  $i < n-1$ . By repeating the above argument we get an  $M_1$ -regular element  $a_2$  in  $I$ . Therefore,  $\{a_1, a_2\}$  is an  $M$ -regular sequence, and  $\text{Ext}_A^i(A/I, M_2) = 0$  for  $i < n-2$ , where

$$M_2 = M/a_1M + a_2M.$$

By using this method continuously, we see that there exists an  $M$ -regular sequence  $\{a_1, a_2, \dots, a_{n-1}\}$ , and  $\text{Ext}_A^0(A/I, M_{n-1}) = 0$ , where

$$M_{n-1} = M/a_1M + \dots + a_{n-1}M.$$

Therefore, by the same reason as above, there exists an  $M_{n-1}$ -regular element  $a_n$  in  $I$  and thus  $\{a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n\}$  is an  $M$ -regular sequence in  $I$ .

(ii)  $\Rightarrow$  (i) we shall put

$$M_i = M/a_1M + \dots + a_{i-1}M$$

Then, from the short exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow M_{n-1} \xrightarrow{a_n} M_{n-1} \longrightarrow M_n \longrightarrow 0$$

we get the injection

$$0 \longrightarrow \text{Hom}_A(A/I, M_{n-1}) \xrightarrow{a_n^*} \text{Hom}_A(A/I, M_{n-1}),$$

where  $a_n^*$  is induced by  $a_n$ . That is, for each  $f \in \text{Hom}_A(A/I, M_{n-1})$  and  $[a] \in A/I$ ,  $a_n^*(f([a])) = f([a_n a])$ . Since  $a_n a \in I$ , we have  $[a_n a] = 0$  in  $A/I$  and thus  $a_n^*$  is a zero homomorphism.

It follows that  $\text{Hom}_A(A/I, M_{n-1}) = \text{Ext}_A^0(A/I, M_{n-1}) = 0$

From the short exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow M_{n-2} \xrightarrow{a_{n-1}} M_{n-2} \longrightarrow M_{n-1} \longrightarrow 0$$

we get the long exact sequence

$$\begin{aligned} 0 \longrightarrow \text{Hom}_A(A/I, M_{n-2}) \xrightarrow{a_{n-1}^*} \text{Hom}_A(A/I, M_{n-2}) \longrightarrow \text{Hom}_A(A/I, M_{n-1}) \longrightarrow \\ \longrightarrow \text{Ext}_A^1(A/I, M_{n-2}) \xrightarrow{a_{n-1}^*} \text{Ext}_A^1(A/I, M_{n-2}) \end{aligned}$$

By the same reason as above we obtain

$$\text{Hom}_A(A/I, M_{n-2}) \cong \text{Ext}_A^0(A/I, M_{n-2}) = 0.$$

Since,

$$\text{Hom}_A(A/I, M_{n-1}) \cong \text{Ext}_A^0(A/I, M_{n-1}) = 0$$

we have the exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow \text{Ext}_A^1(A/I, M_{n-2}) \xrightarrow{a_{n-1}^*} \text{Ext}_A^1(A/I, M_{n-2})$$

Now we take an injective resolution

$$0 \longrightarrow M_{n-2} \longrightarrow I_0 \xrightarrow{\delta_0} I_1 \xrightarrow{\delta_1} I_2 \longrightarrow \dots$$

of  $M_{n-2}$ . Then

$$\text{Ext}_A^1(A/I, M_{n-2}) = \ker(\text{Hom}(I_{A/I}, \delta_1)) / \text{Im}(\text{Hom}(I_{A/I}, \delta_0)),$$

where

$$\text{Hom}_A(I_{A/I}, \delta_1): \text{Hom}_A(A/I, I_1) \rightarrow \text{Hom}_A(A/I, I_2)$$

and

$$\text{Hom}_A(I_{A/I}, \delta_0): \text{Hom}_A(A/I, I_0) \rightarrow \text{Hom}_A(A/I, I_1).$$

Therefore, for each element  $[f] \in \text{Ext}_A^1(A/I, M_{n-2})$ , we see that  $f \in \text{Hom}_A(A/I, I_1)$ . For each  $[a] \in A/I$ , Since  $a_{n-1}(f(a)) = f(a_{n-1}a) = f(0)$ ,  $a_{n-1}a \in I$ , and thus  $\text{Ext}_A^1(A/I, M_{n-2}) = 0$ .

We assume that

$$\text{Ext}_A^0(A/I, M_{n-1}) = \dots = \text{Ext}_A^{i-1}(A/I, M_{n-1}) = 0$$

for  $i$  ( $2 < i < n-1$ ).

Then the short exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow M_{n-i-1} \xrightarrow{a_{n-i}} M_{n-i-1} \longrightarrow M_{n-i} \longrightarrow 0$$

implies that

$$0 \longrightarrow \text{Ext}_A^i(A/I, M_{n-i-1}) \xrightarrow{a_{n-i}^*} \text{Ext}_A^i(A/I, M_{n-i-1}) \longrightarrow \dots$$

is exact. Therefore, we get  $\text{Ext}_A^i(A/I, M_{n-i-1}) = 0$  by the above argument. Consequently, we have

$$\text{Ext}_A^i(A/I, M) = 0$$

for  $i=0, 1, \dots, n-1$ .

**Proof of the Proposition 3.1 (continued):**

Since  $A/I$  is a finite  $A$ -module, by Lemma 3.2 we have

$$\text{Ext}_A^i(A/I, M) \otimes_A B \cong \text{Ext}_B^i(B/I_{(B)}, M_{(B)}).$$

Thus, if we can prove that

$$(*) \text{ depth}_i(M) = n \Leftrightarrow \text{Ext}_A^i(A/I, M) = 0 \text{ for } i=0, 1, \dots, n-1, \\ \text{and } \text{Ext}_A^n(A/I, M) \neq 0,$$

then our first assertion

$$\text{depth}_i(M) = \text{depth}_{i(B)}(M_{(B)})$$

holds because of that

$$\text{Ext}_A^i(A/I, M) \otimes_A B = 0 \Leftrightarrow \text{Ext}_A^i(A/I, M) = 0 \text{ by } 1 \in B.$$

In order to prove (\*) we shall use mathematical induction on  $i$ . If there is no  $M$ -regular element in  $I$ , then

$$\text{Hom}_A(A/I, M) \cong \text{Ext}_A^0(A/I, M) \neq 0$$

as in the proof of (i)  $\Rightarrow$  (ii) in Lemma 3.3.

Assume that (\*) always holds for all  $r < n$ . Let  $[a_1, a_2, \dots, a_r]$  be a maximal  $M$ -regular sequence in  $I$ . Then  $[a_2, \dots, a_r]$  is a maximal  $M_1$ -regular sequence in  $I$ , where  $M_1 = M/a_1M$ .

By our induction assumption,

$$\text{Ext}_A^{r-1}(A/I, M_1) \neq 0.$$

From the following short exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow M \xrightarrow{a_1} M \longrightarrow M_1 \longrightarrow 0,$$

we get the long exact sequence for  $Ext$

$$0 \rightarrow Ext_A^{s-1}(A/I, M_1) \rightarrow Ext_A^s(A/I, M) \rightarrow Ext_A^s(A/I, M) \rightarrow \dots$$

because of that  $Ext_A^{s-1}(A/I, M) = 0$ , by Lemma 3.3.

Since  $Ext_A^{s-1}(A/I, M_1) \neq 0$ , we have

$$Ext_A^s(A/I, M) \neq 0.$$

Hence (\*) holds.

We shall prove the second part of our proposition.

By Lemma 2.3, the going-down theorem holds for the flat homomorphism  $\varphi: A \rightarrow B$ . Therefore, for a  $p \in \text{Spec}(B)$  and  $\mathfrak{p} = p \cap A$  we have the following holds ([6], [10])

$$(**) \quad ht(\mathfrak{p}) = ht(p) + ht(\mathfrak{p}/pB).$$

We take a minimal prime over-ideal  $p$  of  $IB$  such that  $ht(p) = ht(IB)$ , and put  $\mathfrak{p} = p \cap A$ . Then  $ht(\mathfrak{p}/pB) = 0$ . By (\*\*) we get  $ht(\mathfrak{p}) = ht(p)$ . Since  $I \subset p$ , we have  $ht(\mathfrak{p}) \geq ht(I)$  and so  $ht(IB) \geq ht(I)$ .

Conversely, let  $\mathfrak{p}$  be a minimal prime over-ideal of  $I$  such that  $ht(\mathfrak{p}) = ht(I)$ . We take a prime  $p$  of  $B$  lying over  $\mathfrak{p}$  ( $\varphi: \text{Spec}(B) \rightarrow \text{Spec}(A)$  is surjective and the going-down theorem holds for  $\varphi$ ).

If necessary, replacing  $p$  we may assume that  $p$  is a minimal prime over-ideal of  $pB$ , that is,  $ht(p) = ht(pB)$ . Then, again by (\*\*),  $ht(\mathfrak{p}) = ht(p)$ , and thus

$$ht(I) = ht(\mathfrak{p}) = ht(p) \geq ht(IB)$$

Consequently,  $ht(I) = ht(IB)$ .

**Proposition 3.4** Let  $A = K[X_1, \dots, X_n]$  be a polynomial ring over a field  $K$ .

Then there exists a subring  $B = K[Y_1, \dots, Y_n]$ ,  $Y_i \in K[X_1, \dots, X_n]$ ,  $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$  which satisfies the following conditions:

- (i)  $A$  is integral over  $B$ .
- (ii) There is no inclusion relation between prime ideals of  $A$  lying over a fixed prime ideal of  $B$ .

$$(iii) \quad \dim(A) = \dim(B).$$

**Proof.** We put  $Y_1 = f(X) = \sum_{i=1}^n a_i M_i(X) \neq 0$  in  $K[X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n]$ , where  $0 \neq a_i \in K$  and the  $M_i(X)$  are distinct monomials in  $X_1, \dots, X_n$  such that  $M_i(X) \neq b_i X_1$  for any  $b_i \in K$ .

For  $n$  positive integers  $d_1 = 1, d_2, \dots, d_n$  and a monomial  $M(X) = \prod X_i^{d_i}$ , the positive integer  $\sum a_i d_i$  is called the weight of  $M(X)$ . By a suitable choice of  $d_2, \dots, d_n$ , we can make that

no two of the monomials  $M_1, \dots, M_r$  in  $f(X)$  have the same weight ([12]). If we put

$$Y_i = X_i - X_i^{d_i}, \quad (i=2, 3, \dots, n)$$

then  $X_i = Y_i + X_i^{d_i}$ , and thus

$$\begin{aligned} Y_1 &= f(X) = f(X_1, Y_2 + X_2^{d_2}, \dots, Y_n + X_n^{d_n}) \\ &= a_r X_1^{d_r} + g(X_1, Y_2, \dots, Y_n), \end{aligned}$$

where  $g$  is a polynomial over  $K$  whose degree in  $X_1$  is less than  $d_r$  and  $a_r$  is the coefficient of the term which has the highest weight in  $f(X)$ . Then we have

$$X_1^{d_r} + 1/a_r \{g(X_1, Y_2, \dots, Y_n) - Y_1\} = 0$$

This implies that  $X_1$  is integral over  $K[Y_1, \dots, Y_n]$ . Since

$$X_i = Y_i + X_i^{d_i} \quad (i=2, 3, \dots, n)$$

we see that  $X_2, \dots, X_n$  are integral over  $K[Y_1, \dots, Y_n]$ . Consequently,  $A = K[X_1, \dots, X_n]$  is integral over  $K[Y_1, \dots, Y_n]$ . Moreover, since  $X_1 \notin K[Y_1, \dots, Y_n]$  it follows that  $K[Y_1, \dots, Y_n]$  is a proper subring of  $A$ . If we put  $B = K[Y_1, \dots, Y_n]$  then (i) holds for  $A$  and  $B$ .

We shall prove that  $A$  and  $B$  satisfy our condition (ii). In order to do this we need the following ([1], [8], [10] and [12]).

(\*\*\*) Let  $B$  be a subring of a ring  $A$  such that

$A$  is integral over  $B$ . If  $B$  is a local ring and  $\mathfrak{p}$  is the maximal ideal of  $B$ , then the prime ideals of  $A$  lying over  $\mathfrak{p}$  are precisely the maximal ideals of  $A$ .

Since  $A$  is integral over  $B$ , for each  $\mathfrak{p} \in \text{Spec}(B)$   $A_{\mathfrak{p}} = A \otimes_B B_{\mathfrak{p}} = (B - \mathfrak{p})^{-1}A$  is integral over  $B_{\mathfrak{p}}$  and  $B_{\mathfrak{p}}$  is contained as a subring. Moreover the prime ideals of  $A$  lying over  $\mathfrak{p}$  correspond to the prime ideals of  $A_{\mathfrak{p}}$  lying over  $\mathfrak{p}B_{\mathfrak{p}}$  which are the maximal ideals of  $A_{\mathfrak{p}}$  by(\*\*\*) .

Since  $B_{\mathfrak{p}} \neq 0$ ,  $A_{\mathfrak{p}}$  is not zero and it has maximal ideals. For two maximal ideals  $\mathfrak{m}_1$  and  $\mathfrak{m}_2$  of  $A_{\mathfrak{p}}$  there is no inclusion relation between  $\mathfrak{m}_1 \cap A$  and  $\mathfrak{m}_2 \cap A$ , which are prime ideals of  $A$  lying over  $\mathfrak{p}$ . Hence condition (ii) is true for  $A$  and  $B$ . Note that  $\text{Spec}(A) \rightarrow \text{Spec}(B)$  is surjective.

Let us prove that  $\dim(A) = \dim(B)$ . At first, we shall prove that the going-up theorem holds for  $B \subset A$ . We take  $\mathfrak{p} \subset \mathfrak{p}'$  in  $\text{Spec}(B)$  and  $\mathfrak{p}$  in  $\text{Spec}(A)$  such that  $\mathfrak{p} \cap B = \mathfrak{p}$ . Then  $A/\mathfrak{p}$  is integral over  $B/\mathfrak{p}$  and it contains  $B/\mathfrak{p}$  as a subring.

Since  $\text{Spec}(A) \rightarrow \text{Spec}(B)$  is surjective it also follows that  $\text{Spec}(A/\mathfrak{p}) \rightarrow \text{Spec}(B/\mathfrak{p})$  is surjective.

Therefore there exists a prime  $p'/p$  lying over  $p'/p$ . Then  $p'$  is a prime ideal of  $A$  lying over  $p$  and thus the going-up theorem holds for  $B \subset A$ .

Next, we have to note that  $B = K[Y_1, Y_2, \dots, Y_n]$  is a noetherian subring of  $A = K[X_1, \dots, X_n]$  which is also a noetherian ring. We shall take  $p_1 \subset p_2$  in  $\text{Spec}(A)$ . Then by (ii) there is no inclusion relation between  $p_1 \cap B$  and  $p_2 \cap B$  in  $\text{Spec}(B)$ . This implies that  $\dim(A) \leq \dim(B)$ . By the going-up theorem, for  $p \subset p'$  in  $\text{Spec}(B)$  there exist  $p$  and  $p'$  in  $\text{Spec}(A)$  such that  $p \subset p'$ . This implies that  $\dim(B) \leq \dim(A)$ . In consequence, we have  $\dim(A) = \dim(B)$ .

#### § 4. Some Properties of Cohen-Macaulay modules

**Definition 4.1** Let  $(A, \mathfrak{m})$  be a noetherian local ring. If  $\text{depth}(A) = \dim(A)$  or  $A = 0$ , then  $A$  is called a *Cohen-Macaulay ring*. A finite  $A$ -module  $M$  is called a *Cohen-Macaulay  $A$ -module* if  $\text{depth}(M) = \dim(M)$  or  $M = 0$ . Note that for a non zero finite  $A$ -module  $M$   $\text{depth}(M) \leq \dim(M)$  in general.

**Lemma 4.2** Let  $(A, \mathfrak{m})$  be a noetherian local ring. For a Cohen-Macaulay  $A$ -module  $M$  the following hold.

- (i) For each  $p \in \text{Ass}(M)$ ,  $\dim(A/p) = \text{depth}(M)$ .
- (ii) For each  $p \in \text{Spec}(A)$ , the  $A_p$ -module  $M_p$  is a Cohen-Macaulay  $A_p$ -module.

**Proof.** (i) It is well known that

$$(a) \text{depth}(M) \leq \dim(A/p) \text{ for all } p \in \text{Ass}(M)$$

$$(b) \text{Ann}(M) = \bigcap_{p \in \text{Ass}(M)} p$$

Therefore we have

$$\text{depth}(M) = \dim(M) = \dim(A/\text{Ann}(M)) \geq \dim(A/p) \geq \text{depth}(M), \text{ and thus } \text{depth}(M) = \dim(A/p).$$

- (ii) We want to prove that  $\dim(M_p) = \text{depth}(M_p)$ . As well-known the following holds:

$$(\text{****}) \dim M_p = \text{ht}(p/\text{Ann}(M)) \geq \text{depth } M_p \geq \text{depth}_p M.$$

Step 1. We assume that  $\text{Ann}(M) \subset p$ . Then  $(A-p) \cap \text{Ann}(M) \neq 0$  and thus  $M_p = 0$ . Therefore, by Definition 4.1,  $M_p$  is a Cohen-Macaulay  $A_p$ -module.

Step 2. We assume that  $\text{Ann}(M) \subset p$ , we shall prove our assertion by mathematical

induction on  $\text{depth}_p M$ .

(a)  $\text{depth}_p(M) = 0$ . This case implies that there exists an element  $q \in \text{Ass}(M)$  such that  $p \subset q$ . By (i) every element of  $\text{Ass}(M)$  is a minimal prime over-ideal of  $\text{Ann}(M)$ . (See  $\dim(A/\text{Ass}(M)) = \dim(A/p)$  as in the proof (i)) It follows that  $p = q$ , and thus  $\dim M_p = \text{ht}(p/\text{Ann}(M)) = 0$ . By (\*\*\*) we have  $\dim M_p = \text{depth}(M_p) = 0$ .

(b)  $\text{depth}_p(M) > 0$  ( $M \neq 0$ ); we shall at first prove that under our assertion if  $a \in A$  is a  $M$ -regular element in  $\mathfrak{m}$  then  $\dim(M/aM) = \dim(M) - 1$  and  $M/aM$  is a Cohen-Macaulay  $A$ -module. Since  $a$  is an  $M$ -regular element  $\text{Ann}(M/aM) \subsetneq \text{Ann}(M)$  and thus  $\dim(M/aM) < \dim(M)$ .

On the other hand,

$$\text{Supp}(M/aM) = \text{Supp}(M) \cap V(a) = V(\text{Ann}(M) + aA)$$

where  $\text{Supp}(M) = \{p \in \text{Spec}(A) \mid M_p \neq 0\}$  and

$$V(a) = \{p \in \text{Spec}(A) \mid a \in p\}$$

It follows that  $\dim(M/aM) = \dim(\text{Ann}(M) + aA) \geq \dim(A/\text{Ann}(M)) - 1 = \dim(M) - 1$ . Hence  $\dim(M/aM) = \dim(M) - 1$ . Let

$$M_1 = M/aM.$$

Then  $\dim(M_1) = \dim(M) - 1$ . On the other hand by Lemma 3.3, We have  $\text{depth}(M_1) = \text{depth}(M) - 1$ . Since  $M$  is a Cohen-Macaulay  $A$ -module  $\text{depth}(M) = \dim(M)$  and thus  $\text{depth}(M_1) = \dim(M_1) = \dim(M) - 1$ . That is,  $M_1$  is a Cohen-Macaulay  $A$ -module.

In general, for a  $M$ -regular sequence  $\{a_1, \dots, a_n\}$  in  $p$ . We can prove that  $M/a_1M + \dots + a_nM$  is also a Cohen-Macaulay  $A$ -module.

We assume that our assertion holds for  $\text{depth}_p(M) < n$  and we shall prove our assertion when  $n = \text{depth}_p(M)$ . If  $\text{depth}_p(M) = n \neq 0$  then there exist an  $M$ -regular element  $a_1$  in  $p$ . Let us put  $M_1 = M/a_1M$  For  $S = A - p$ , Since

$$0 \rightarrow M \xrightarrow{a_1} M(\text{exact}) \Rightarrow 0 \rightarrow S^{-1}M \xrightarrow{a_1} S^{-1}M(\text{exact})$$

the element  $a_1$  is an  $M_p$ -regular element in  $pA_p$ . Therefore by the preceding statements and Lemma 3.3 we have

$$\dim(M_1)_p = \dim(M_p/a_1M_p) = \dim(M_p) - 1,$$

$$\text{depth}(M_1)_p = \text{depth}(M_p) - 1$$

and that  $M_1$  is a Cohen-Macaulay  $A$ -module.

Since  $\text{depth}_p M_1 = \text{depth}_p M - 1 < n$  and  $M_1$  is a Cohen-Macaulay  $A_p$ -module. by our inductive hypothesis  $(M_1)_p$  is a Cohen-Macaulay  $A_p$ -module. Therefore we have

i. e  $\dim(M_p) = \text{depth}(M_p)$ .

$M_p$  is a Cohen-Macaulay  $A_p$ -module.

**Lemma 4.3** Let  $(A, \mathfrak{m})$  be a Cohen-Macaulay ring. Then for every proper ideal  $I$ ,  $ht(I) + \dim(A/I) = \dim(A)$ .

**Proof.** Since for a minimal prime  $p$  over-ideal of  $I$

$$ht(I) = ht(p), \quad \dim(A/I) = \dim(A/p)$$

If our formula holds for every prime ideal then our Lemma is proved completely. Let  $p$  be a prime ideal, and  $\dim(A) = \text{depth}(A) = n$ . By Lemma 4.2,  $A_p$  is a Cohen-Macaulay ring, and by (i) of Lemma 2.6, we have

$$\text{depth}(A_p) = \dim(A_p) = ht(p)$$

Let us put  $ht(p) = r$ . Hence, we can find an  $A$ -regular sequence  $\{a_1, \dots, a_r\}$  in  $p$  by Lemma 3.3.

As in the proof of Lemma 4.2,  $A/(a_1, \dots, a_r)$  is a Cohen-Macaulay ring with dimension  $n-r$  ( $\dim(A/a_1A) = n-1$ ,  $\dim(A_1/a_2A) = \dim A_1 - 1 = \dim A - 2$ , where  $A_1 = A/a_1A$ ). By repeating  $\dim(A/a_1A + \dots + a_rA) = n-r$ .

Since  $p$  is a minimal prime over ideal of  $(a_1, \dots, a_r)$  we have  $ht(p) = ht((a_1, \dots, a_r))$ .

Therefore, by (i) of Lemma 4.2, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \dim(A/p) &= \text{depth}(A/(a_1, \dots, a_r)) = \dim(A/(a_1, \dots, a_r)) = n-r \\ &\quad (\text{note that } p \in \text{Ass}(A/(a_1, \dots, a_r))) \end{aligned}$$

## § 5. Main Theorems

Let  $M$  be a finite  $A$ -module. We define that the projective dimension ( $\text{Proj. dim}(M)$ ) of  $M$  is the length of shortest projective resolution of  $M$ .

### Theorem 5.1

Let  $(A, \mathfrak{m})$  be a noetherian local ring and let  $M(\neq 0)$  be a finite  $A$ -module, then

$$\text{Proj. dim}(M) + \text{depth}(M) = \text{depth}(A).$$

**Proof.** If  $A$  is a noetherian local ring, we know that

$$M \text{ is free} \Leftrightarrow M \text{ is projective} \Leftrightarrow M \text{ is flat. ([8], [14])}$$

If  $M$  is free then  $\text{depth}(M) = \text{depth}(A)$ , and  $\text{Proj. dim}(M) = 0$ . Hence our formula is clear.



We will prove our Proposition by mathematical induction on  $\text{Proj. dim}(M)$ .

Case 1.  $\text{Proj. dim}(M)=1$ . In this case there exists a projective resolution:

$$0 \rightarrow K \xrightarrow{\nu} F \xrightarrow{\mu} M \rightarrow 0$$

where  $\mu$  is a minimal homomorphism (Definition 2.8), and  $F, K$  are free. We assume that  $\text{depth}(A) = \text{depth}(F) = \text{depth}(K) = n$ . Then, by Lemma 3.3, we have the following:

$$\text{Ext}_A^i(k, K) = 0 = \text{Ext}_A^i(k, F) \quad (0 \leq i < n)$$

$$\text{Ext}_A^n(k, K) \neq 0, \quad \text{Ext}_A^n(k, F) \neq 0.$$

where  $k = A/\mathfrak{m}$ , In the long exact sequence

$$\cdots \rightarrow \text{Ext}_A^i(k, K) \xrightarrow{\nu^*} \text{Ext}_A^i(k, F) \rightarrow \text{Ext}_A^i(k, M) \rightarrow \text{Ext}_A^{i+1}(k, K) \xrightarrow{\nu^*} \cdots$$

we see  $\nu^* = 0$  by (iii) of Proposition 2.9. Therefore

$$\text{Ext}_A^i(k, M) = 0 \quad (i < n-1), \quad \text{Ext}_A^{n-1}(k, M) \neq 0$$

Hence, by Lemma 3.3, we have  $\text{depth}(M) = n-1$ .

Therefore our formula holds.

Case 2.  $\text{Proj. dim}(M) > 1$ .

Assume that our formula holds for all finite  $A$ -module  $M (\neq 0)$  with  $\text{Proj. dim}(M) = r < n$ . Let  $M$  be a finite  $A$ -module with  $\text{Proj. dim}(M) = r+1$  and consider a projective resolution

$$0 \rightarrow X_{r+1} \rightarrow X_r \rightarrow \cdots \rightarrow X_1 \xrightarrow{d_1} X_0 \rightarrow M \rightarrow 0$$

of  $M$ . We may regard the exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow X_{r+1} \rightarrow X_r \rightarrow \cdots \rightarrow X_1 \rightarrow \text{Im } d_1 \rightarrow 0$$

as a shortest projective resolution of  $\text{Im } d_1$ , that is,  $\text{Proj. dim}(\text{Im } d_1) = r$ . By our inductive hypothesis  $\text{depth}(\text{Im } d_1) = n-r$ ,

Therefore, by Lemma 3.3 we have

$$\text{Ext}_A^i(k, \text{Im } d_1) = 0 \quad (i \leq n-r-1), \quad \text{Ext}_A^{n-r}(k, \text{Im } d_1) \neq 0$$

Again, we consider the short exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow \text{Im } d_1 \rightarrow X_0 \rightarrow M \rightarrow 0$$

We get

$$\cdots \rightarrow \text{Ext}_A^i(k, \text{Im } d_1) \rightarrow \text{Ext}_A^i(k, X_0) \rightarrow \text{Ext}_A^i(k, M) \rightarrow \text{Ext}_A^{i+1}(k, \text{Im } d_1) \rightarrow \cdots$$

Since  $\text{Ext}_A^i(k, X_0) = 0$  for  $i < n$  we have

$$\text{Ext}_A^{n-r-1}(k, M) \neq 0, \quad \text{Ext}_A^n(k, M) = 0 \quad (i < n-r-1).$$

By Lemma 3.3, we have  $\text{depth}(M) = n - r - 1$ .

Hence our formula holds for  $M$ .

Now our Proposition holds.

**Theorem 5.2.**

Let  $(A, \mathfrak{m})$  be a Cohen-Macaulay ring and let  $M (\neq 0)$  be a Cohen-Macaulay  $A$ -module. Then for every  $p \in \text{Ass}(M)$ , we have

$$\text{ht}(p) = \text{Proj. dim}(M).$$

**Proof.** By Lemma 4.3 we have

$$\text{ht}(p) + \dim(A/p) = \dim(A)$$

By (i) of Lemma 4.2 we have  $\dim(A/p) = \text{depth}(M)$ .

Since

$$\text{Proj. dim}(M) + \text{depth}(M) = \text{depth}(A)$$

by Proposition 4.4, and  $\dim(A) = \text{depth}(A)$  by our hypothesis, we have the following

$$\text{ht}(p) + \text{depth}(M) = \text{Proj. dim}(M) + \text{depth}(M).$$

Therefore, we have

$$\text{ht}(p) = \text{Proj. dim}(M).$$

## REFERENCES

1. M. F. Atiyah and I. G. Macdonald, *Introduction to Commutative Algebra*, Addison Wesley, (1969).
2. M. Auslander and D. Buchbaum, *Codimension and Multiplicity*, Ann. of Math. 68, (1958), 625~657.
3. J. E. Carrig, *The homological dimensions of symmetric algebras*, Trans. of A. M. S, 236, (1978), 275~285.
4. P. Eakin, *On Arnolds formula for the dimension of a polynomial ring*, Proc. of A. M. S, 54, (1976), 11~15.
5. S. Goto and K. Watanabe, *On Graded rings 1*, J. of Math. Soc. Japan, 30, (1978), 179~213.
6. C. Huneke, *Powers of ideal generated by Weak  $d$ -sequences*, J. of Alg, 68, (1981), 471~509.
7. S. Mac Lane, *Homology*, Springer-Verlag, (1975).
8. H. Matsumura, *Commutative Algebra*, W. A. Benjamin. Inc, (1980).
9. K. McDowell, *A codimension theorem for Pseudo-Noetherian rings*, Trans. of A. M. S, 214, (1975), 179~185.
10. M. Nagata, *Local rings*, Interscience Pub., (1962).
11. J. J. Rotman, *An introduction to Homological Algebra*, Academic Press Inc., (1979).
12. P. Samuel and O. Zariski, *Commutative Algebra Vol. 1 and 2*, Van Nostrand Co. Inc., (1958).
13. A. Simis and W. V. Vasconcelos, *The Syzygies of the conormal module*, Amer. J. Math, 103, (1981), 203~224.
14. S. Raghavan Balwant Singh R. Sridharan, *Homological methods in Commutative Algebra*, Oxford University Press, (1975).
15. K. Yoshid, *On flat over-rings of a Krull domain*, J. of Math. Soc. Japan, 54, (1976), 11~15.

Department of Mathematics, Graduate School  
Jeonbug National University Jeonju, Korea