

**Math 711: Lecture of October 22, 2007**

By the *singular locus*  $\text{Sing}(R)$  in a Noetherian ring  $R$  we mean the set

$$\{P \in \text{Spec}(R) : R_P \text{ is not regular}\}.$$

We know that if  $R$  is excellent, then  $\text{Sing}(R)$  is a Zariski closed set, i.e., it has the form  $\mathcal{V}(I)$  for some ideal  $I$  of  $R$ . We say that  $I$  *defines* the singular locus in  $R$ . Such an ideal  $I$  is not unique, but its radical is unique. It follows easily that  $c \in \text{Rad}(I)$  if and only if  $R_c$  is regular.

We next want to prove:

**Theorem.** *Let  $K$  be a field of characteristic  $p$  with  $p$ -base  $\Lambda$ . Let  $B$  be a complete local ring with coefficient field  $K$ . Let  $R$  be a ring essentially of finite type over  $B$ , and for  $\Gamma$  cofinite in  $\Lambda$  let  $R^\Gamma = B^\Gamma \otimes_B R$ .*

- (a) *If  $R$  is regular, then  $R^\Gamma$  is regular for all  $\Gamma \ll \Lambda$ .*
- (b) *If  $c \in R$  is such that  $R_c$  is regular, then  $(R_c)^\Gamma \cong (R^\Gamma)_c$  is regular for all  $\Gamma \ll \Lambda$ .*
- (c) *If  $I$  defines the singular locus of  $R$ , then for all  $\Gamma \ll \Lambda$ ,  $IR^\Gamma$  defines the singular locus in  $R^\Gamma$ .*

*Proof.* For every  $\Gamma$  cofinite in  $\Lambda$ ,  $R \rightarrow R^\Gamma$  is purely inseparable, and so we have a homeomorphism  $\text{Spec}(R^\Gamma)\text{Spec}(R) = X$ , given by contraction of primes. The unique prime ideal of  $R^\Gamma$  lying over  $P$  in  $R$  is  $\text{Rad}(PR^\Gamma)$ . See the Proposition on p. 2 of the Lecture Notes from October 1. We identify the spectrum of every  $R^\Gamma$  with  $X$ . Let  $Z_\Gamma$  denote the singular locus in  $R^\Gamma$ , and  $Z$  the singular locus in  $R$ . Since all of these rings are excellent, every singular locus is closed in the Zariski topology. If  $R \rightarrow S$  is faithfully flat and  $S$  is regular then  $R$  is regular, by the Theorem on p. 2 of the Lecture Notes of September 19. Thus, a prime  $Q$  such that  $S_Q$  is regular lies over a prime  $P$  in  $R$  such that  $R_P$  is regular. For  $\Gamma \subseteq \Gamma'$  we have maps  $R \rightarrow R^\Gamma \rightarrow R^{\Gamma'}$ : both maps are faithfully flat. It follows that  $Z \subseteq Z_\Gamma \subseteq Z_{\Gamma'}$  for all  $\Gamma \subseteq \Gamma'$ .

The closed sets in  $X$  have DCC, since ideals of  $R$  have ACC. It follows that we can choose  $\Gamma$  cofinite in  $\Lambda$  such that  $Z_\Gamma$  is minimal. Since the sets cofinite in  $\Lambda$  are directed under  $\supseteq$ , it follows that  $Z_\Gamma$  is minimum, not just minimal. We have  $Z \subseteq Z_\Gamma$ . We want to prove that they are equal. If not, we can choose  $Q$  prime in  $R^\Gamma$  lying over  $P$  in  $R$  such that  $R_Q^\Gamma$  is not regular but  $R_P$  is regular. By part (a) of the Theorem at the bottom of p. 4 of the Lecture Notes from October 17, we can choose  $\Gamma_0 \subseteq \Gamma$  cofinite in  $\Lambda$  such that  $PR^{\Gamma_0}$  is prime. This prime will be the contraction  $Q_0$  of  $Q$  to  $R^{\Gamma_0}$ . Let  $R_P$  have Krull dimension  $d$ . In  $R_P$ ,  $P$  has  $d$  generators. Hence,  $Q_0R_P^{\Gamma_0} = PR_P^{\Gamma_0}$  also has  $d$  generators, and it follows that  $Q_0$  itself has  $d$  generators. Consequently, we have that  $R_{Q_0}^{\Gamma_0}$  is regular, and this means that  $Z_{\Gamma_0}$  is *strictly* smaller than  $Z_\Gamma$ : the point corresponding to  $P$  is not

in  $Z_{\Gamma_0}$ . This contradiction shows that for all  $\Gamma \ll \Lambda$ ,  $Z_\Gamma = Z$ . It is immediate that for such a choice of  $\Gamma$ , a prime  $Q$  of  $R^\Gamma$  is such that  $R_Q^\Gamma$  is not regular if and only if  $R_{Q \cap R}$  is not regular. But this holds if and only if  $Q \cap R$  contains  $I$ , i.e., if and only if  $Q \supseteq I$ , which is equivalent to  $Q \supseteq IR^\Gamma$ . This proves (c).

Part (a) is simply the case where  $Z$  is empty. Note that for any  $c \in R$ ,

$$(R_c)^\Gamma = B^\Gamma \otimes_B R_c \cong B^\Gamma \otimes_B (R \otimes_R R_c) \cong (B^\Gamma \otimes_B R) \otimes_R R_c \cong (R^\Gamma)_c.$$

Thus, (b) follows from (a) applied to  $R_c$ .  $\square$

We are now in a position to fill in the details of the proof of the Theorem on the existence of completely stable big test elements stated on p. 2 of the Lecture Notes from October 12. The proof was sketched earlier to motivate our development of the gamma construction.

We need one small preliminary result.

**Lemma.** *If  $R$  is essentially of finite type over  $B$  and  $B \rightarrow C$  is geometrically regular, then  $C \otimes_B R$  is geometrically regular over  $R$ .*

*Proof.* This is a base change, so the map is evidently flat. Let  $P$  be a prime ideal of  $R$  lying over  $\mathfrak{p}$  in  $B$ . Then

$$\kappa_P \otimes_R (R \otimes_B C) \cong \kappa_P \otimes_B C \cong \kappa_P \otimes_{\kappa_{\mathfrak{p}}} (\kappa_{\mathfrak{p}} \otimes_B C).$$

Let  $T = \kappa_{\mathfrak{p}} \otimes_B C$ , which is a geometrically regular  $\kappa_{\mathfrak{p}}$ -algebra by the hypothesis on the fibers. Then all we need is that every finite algebraic purely inseparable extension field  $\mathcal{L}$  of  $\kappa_P$ , the ring  $\mathcal{L} \otimes_{\kappa_{\mathfrak{p}}} T$  is regular. We may replace  $\mathcal{L}$  by a larger field finitely generated over  $\kappa_{\mathfrak{p}}$ . By the Lemma at the top of p. 5 of the Lecture Notes of October 19, we may assume this larger field is a finite separable algebraic extension of  $\mathcal{K}(y_1, \dots, y_h)$ , where  $\mathcal{K}$  is a finite algebraic purely inseparable extension of  $\kappa_{\mathfrak{p}}$  and  $y_1, \dots, y_h$  are indeterminates. Then  $\mathcal{K} \otimes_{\kappa_{\mathfrak{p}}} T$  is regular by the hypothesis of geometric regularity of the fiber  $T$  over  $\kappa_{\mathfrak{p}}$ . Therefore,  $\mathcal{K}(y_1, \dots, y_h) \otimes_{\kappa_{\mathfrak{p}}} T$  is regular because it is a localization of the polynomial ring  $(\mathcal{K} \otimes_{\kappa_{\mathfrak{p}}} T)[y_1, \dots, y_h]$ . Since  $\mathcal{L}$  is finite separable algebraic over  $\mathcal{K}(y_1, \dots, y_h)$ , the result now follows from the second Corollary on p. 4 of the Lecture Notes from September 19.  $\square$

We now restate the result that we want to prove.

**Theorem.** *Let  $R$  be a Noetherian ring of prime characteristic  $p > 0$ . Suppose that  $R$  is reduced and essentially of finite type over an excellent semilocal ring  $B$ . Then there are elements  $c \in R^\circ$  such that  $R_c$  is regular, and every such element  $c$  has a power that is a completely stable big test element.*

*Proof.* By the Lemma above,  $\widehat{B} \otimes_B R$  is geometrically regular over  $R$ . Moreover, the localization at  $c$  may be viewed as has a regular base  $R_c$ , and the fibers of  $R_c \rightarrow \widehat{B} \otimes_R R_c$

are still regular: they are a subset of the original fibers, corresponding to primes of  $R$  that do not contain  $c$ . By the first Corollary at the top of p. 4 of the Lecture Notes of September 19,  $(\widehat{B} \otimes_B R)_c$  is regular. Since  $R$  is reduced and  $c \in R^\circ$ ,  $c$  is not a zerodivisor in  $R$ , i.e.,  $R \subseteq R_c$ . It follows that  $\widehat{B} \otimes_B R \subseteq \widehat{B} \otimes_B R_c$ , and so  $\widehat{B} \otimes_B R$  is reduced. Since  $R \rightarrow \widehat{B} \otimes_B R$  is faithfully flat, it suffices to prove the result for  $\widehat{B} \otimes_B R$ , by part (b) of the Proposition at the bottom of p. 8 of the Lecture Notes from September 17.

Thus, we may replace  $B$  by its completion. Henceforth, we assume that  $B$  is complete.  $B$  is now a product of local rings.  $R$  is a product in a corresponding way, and every  $R$ -module is a product of  $R$ -modules over the factors. The hypotheses are preserved on each factor ring, and all of the issues under consideration reduce to consideration of the factors separately. Therefore we need only consider the case where  $B$  is a complete local ring.

Choose a coefficient field  $K$  for  $B$ , and a  $p$ -base  $\Lambda$  for  $K$ , so that we may use the gamma construction on  $B$ . For all  $\Gamma \ll \Lambda$ , we have that  $R^\Gamma = B^\Gamma \otimes_B R$  is reduced, and that

$$B^\Gamma \otimes_B R_c \cong R_c^\Gamma$$

is regular. Since  $R^\Gamma$  is faithfully flat over  $R$ , it suffices to consider  $R^\Gamma$  instead of  $R$ . Since  $R^\Gamma$  is F-finite, the result is now immediate from the Theorem at the bottom of p. 4 of the Lecture Notes of October 1.  $\square$

We want to improve the result above: it will turn out that it suffices to assume that  $R_c$  is Gorenstein and weakly F-regular. We will need some further results about weak F-regularity in the Gorenstein case. In particular, we want to prove that when the ring is F-finite, weak F-regularity implies strong F-regularity.

We first note the following fact:

**Proposition.** *Let  $R$  be a Noetherian ring of prime characteristic  $p > 0$ . Then the following conditions are equivalent:*

- (a) *If  $N \subseteq M$  are arbitrary modules (with no finiteness condition), then  $N$  is tightly closed in  $M$ .*
- (b) *For every maximal ideal  $m$  of  $R$ ,  $0$  is tightly closed (over  $R$ ) in  $E_R(R/m)$ .*
- (c) *For every maximal ideal  $m$  of  $R$ , if  $u$  generates the socle in  $E(R/m)$ , then  $u$  is not in the tight closure (over  $R$ ) of  $0$  in  $E_R(R/m)$ .*

*Proof.* Evidently (a)  $\Rightarrow$  (b)  $\Rightarrow$  (c). But (c)  $\Rightarrow$  (b) is clear, because if the tight closure of  $0$  is not  $0$ , it must contain the socle:  $R/m \hookrightarrow E_R(R/m)$  is essential, and every nonzero submodule of  $E_R(R/m)$  therefore contains  $u$ .

Now suppose that  $N \subseteq M$  and  $u \in M$  is such that  $u \in N_M^* - N$ . We may replace  $N$  by a submodule of  $M$  maximal with respect to containing  $N$  and not containing  $u$ , by Zorn's Lemma. Then we may replace  $u$  and  $N \subseteq M$  by the image of  $u$  in  $M/N$  and  $0 \subseteq M/N$ . Hence, we may assume that  $u \in 0_M^* - \{0\}$  and that  $u$  is in every nonzero

submodule of  $M$ . We may now apply the Lemma on p. 1 of the Lecture Notes from September 17 to conclude that for every finitely generated nonzero submodule of  $M$ , there is only one associated prime,  $m$ , which is maximal, and that the socle is one-dimensional and generated by  $u$ . But then the same conclusion applies to  $M$  itself, and so  $M$  is an essential extension of  $Ru \cong Ku$ , where  $K = R/m$ . Hence,  $M$  embeds in  $E_R(R/m) = E$  so that  $u$  generates the socle in  $E$ , and  $u \in 0_M^*$  implies that  $u \in 0_E^*$ .  $\square$

We next want to prove the following:

**Theorem.** *Let  $(R, m, K)$  be a Gorenstein local ring of prime characteristic  $p > 0$ . Then the conditions of the preceding Proposition hold if and only if  $R$  is weakly  $F$ -regular.*

*Moreover, if  $R$  is weakly  $F$ -regular and  $F$ -finite, then  $R$  is strongly  $F$ -regular.*

It will be a while before we can give a complete proof of this result. Our proof of the Theorem requires understanding  $E_R(K)$  when  $R$  is a Gorenstein local ring.

### Calculation of the injective hull of a Gorenstein local ring

**Theorem.** *Let  $(R, m, K)$  be a Gorenstein local ring with system of parameters  $x_1, \dots, x_n$ . For every integer  $t \geq 1$ , let  $I_t = (x_1^t, \dots, x_n^t)R$ . Let  $y = x_1 \cdots x_n$ . Then*

$$E_R(K) \cong \varinjlim_t R/I_t,$$

where the map  $R/I_t \rightarrow R/I_{t+1}$  is induced by multiplication by  $y$  on the numerators.

Moreover, if  $u \in R$  represents a socle generator in  $R/(x_1, \dots, x_n)R$ , then for every  $t$ ,  $y^{t-1}u \in R/I_t$  represents the socle generator in  $R/I_t$  and in  $E_R(K)$ .

*Proof.* Let  $E = E_K(R)$  be a choice of injective hull for  $K$ . Then  $E_t = \text{Ann}_E I_t$  is an injective hull for  $K$  over  $R/I_t$ , and so is isomorphic to  $R/I_t$ . Since every element of  $E$  is killed by a power of  $m$ , each element of  $E$  is in some  $E_t$ . Then

$$E = \bigcup_t E_t$$

shows that there is some choice of injective maps

$$\theta_t : R/I_t \rightarrow R/I_{t+1}$$

such that

$$E = \varinjlim_t E_t,$$

using the maps  $\theta_t$ . One injection of  $R/I_t$  into  $R/I_{t+1}$  is given by the map  $\eta_t$  induced by multiplication by  $y$  on the numerators: see the Theorem at the bottom of p. 5 of the

Lecture Notes from October 8, applied to  $x_1, \dots, x_n$  and  $x_1^t, \dots, x_n^t$ , with the matrix  $A = \text{diag}(x_1^{t-1}, \dots, x_n^{t-1})$ . (See also the last statement of the Proposition near the top of p. 8 in the same lecture, which will prove the final statement of the Theorem.) Since the modules have finite lengths, an injection of  $E_t$  into  $E_{t+1}$  must have image  $E_t = \text{Ann}_E I_t$ , since the image is clearly contained in  $E_t$ , and so there must be an automorphism  $\alpha_t$  of  $E_t$  such that  $\theta_t = \alpha_t \circ \eta_t$ . In fact,  $\alpha_t \in \text{Hom}_{R/I_t}(E_t, E_t) \cong R_t$  must be multiplication by a unit of  $R_t$ . Thus, every  $\alpha_t$  lifts to a unit  $a_t \in R$ . Let  $b_1 = 1$ , and let  $b_t = a_1 \cdots a_{t-1}$ .

We can now construct a commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{cccccccc}
 E_1 & \xrightarrow{\eta_1} & E_2 & \xrightarrow{\eta_2} & \cdots & \xrightarrow{\eta_{t-1}} & E_t & \xrightarrow{\eta_t} & E_{t+1} & \xrightarrow{\eta_{t+1}} & \cdots \\
 b_1 \downarrow & & b_2 \downarrow & & & & b_t \downarrow & & b_{t+1} \downarrow & & \\
 E_1 & \xrightarrow{\theta_1} & E_2 & \xrightarrow{\theta_2} & \cdots & \xrightarrow{\theta_{t-1}} & E_t & \xrightarrow{\theta_t} & E_{t+1} & \xrightarrow{\theta_{t+1}} & \cdots
 \end{array}$$

Commutativity follows from the fact that on  $E_t$ ,  $b_{t+1}\eta_t$  is induced by multiplication by  $b_{t+1}y = a_t b_t y = (a_t y)b_t$ , and  $\theta_t$  is induced by multiplication by  $a_t y$  on  $E_t$ . Since the vertical arrows are isomorphisms, the direct limits are isomorphic. The direct limit of the top row is the module that we are trying to show is isomorphic to  $E$ , while the direct limit of the bottom row is  $E$ .  $\square$