

# F-RATIONAL RINGS

ZHAN JIANG

## CONTENTS

1.	Definition	1
1.1.	Definition	1

## 1. DEFINITION

### 1.1. Definition.

**Definition 1.1.** A local ring  $(R, m, K)$  is F-rational if it's a holomorphic image of a Cohen-Macaulay ring and every ideal generated by a system of parameters is tightly closed.

**Theorem 1.2.** *If  $R$  is F-rational, then*

- $R$  is Cohen-Macaulay.
- $R$  is normal.
- Every ideal generated by part of a system of parameters is tightly closed.

*Proof.* Let  $x_1, \dots, x_k$  be part of a system of parameters and let  $I = (x_1, \dots, x_k)$ . Let  $x_1, \dots, x_n$  be a system of parameters for  $R$  and let  $I_t = (x_1, \dots, x_k, x_{k+1}^t, \dots, x_n^t)$ . Then for all  $t, I \subseteq J_t$  and  $J_t$  is tightly closed. So  $I^* \subseteq J_t \Rightarrow I^* \subseteq \bigcap_t J_t = I$ , as required.

We see that (0) and principal ideals generated by nonzerodivisors are tightly closed, so  $R$  is a normal domain.

By colon-capturing, we know  $R$  is C-M. □

**Theorem 1.3.** *Let  $(R, m, K)$  be a local ring and C-M. If one ideal generated by a system of parameters is tightly closed, then  $R$  is F-rational, i.e. every ideal generated by part of any system of parameters is tightly closed.*

*Proof.* Let  $I_t = (x_1^t, \dots, x_n^t)$ . We shall show that all  $I_t$  are tightly closed. Choose any nonzero element  $u \in I_t^*/I_t$ , since  $I_t^*/I_t$  has finite length. There is a nonzero multiple of  $u$  has annihilator  $m$ , i.e. it's in  $\text{soc}(I_t^*/I_t) \subseteq \text{soc}(R/I_t)$ .

Notice that we have an isomorphism  $\text{soc}(R/I) \rightarrow \text{soc}(R/I_t)$  given by multiplication by  $x_1^{t-1} \dots x_n^{t-1}$ . So  $v = x_1^{t-1} \dots x_n^{t-1}w$  for some  $w \in \text{soc}(R/I)$ .

Now since  $v = x_1^{t-1} \dots x_n^{t-1}w \in I_t^*$ , so we have

$$c(x_1^{t-1} \dots x_n^{t-1}w)^q \in I_t^{[q]}$$

for some  $c \in R^\circ$  and all sufficiently large  $q$ . which is

$$(x_1^q \dots x_n^q)^{t-1}(cw^q) \in ((x_1^q)^t, \dots, (x_n^q)^t)R$$

Since  $x_1^q, \dots, x_n^q$  also form a regular sequence, we see that

$$cw^q \in I_t^{[q]}$$

for all sufficiently large  $q$ . Therefore  $w \in I^* = I$ . But we have  $w = 0$  in  $\text{soc}(R/I)$ , a contradiction!

Now for any other system of parameters  $y_1, \dots, y_n$ , there is some  $t$  such that  $(x_1^t, \dots, x_n^t) \subseteq (y_1, \dots, y_n)$ . Hence we have an injection  $R/(y_1, \dots, y_n)R \rightarrow R/(x_1^t, \dots, x_n^t)R$ . Since (0) is tightly closed in the latter one, it is necessarily closed in the former one.  $\square$

Next we show that we don't need the C-M condition:

**Theorem 1.4.** *Let  $(R, m, K)$  be a reduced local ring that is a holomorphic image of a C-M ring and let  $x_1, \dots, x_n$  be a sequence of elements of  $m$  such that*

- $I_k = (x_1, \dots, x_k)$  has height  $k$  modulo every minimal prime of  $R$  for every  $k$ .
- $R$  has a test element.
- $(x_1, \dots, x_n)R$  is tightly closed.

Then  $I_k$  is tightly closed and  $x_1, \dots, x_n$  is a regular sequence in  $R$ .

*Proof.* We show this by reverse induction on  $k$ .  $k = n$  is true by assumption. Now assume that  $I_{k+1}^*$  is tightly closed, let  $u \in I_k^*$  be given. Since  $u \in I_k^* \subseteq I_{k+1}^* = I_{k+1} = I_k + x_{k+1}R$ , we can write

$$u = v + x_{k+1}r$$

where  $v \in I_k$  and  $r \in R$ . Then both  $u$  and  $v$  are in  $I_k^*$  so we have  $r \in (I_k^* : x_{k+1})$ . Since  $R$  has a test element, by the second part of colon capturing we have

$$r \in (I_k^* : x_{k+1}) \subseteq I_k^*$$

so  $u \in I_k + x_{k+1}I_k^*$  and  $u$  is arbitrary, we have  $I_k^* \subseteq I_k + x_{k+1}I_k^*$ . Now passing to modulo  $I_k$  we have  $I_k^* \subseteq x_{k+1}I_k^* \subseteq I_k^*$ , which implies that it's zero by Nakayama's lemma. Hence  $I_k = I_k^*$ .  $\square$

Now following result follows immediately

**Theorem 1.5.** *Let  $(R, m, K)$  be reduced, equidimensional local ring that is a homomorphic image of a C-M ring. Suppose that  $R$  has a test element and one ideal generated by some system of parameters is tightly closed, then  $R$  is F-rational.*

**Proposition 1.6.** *A localization of an F-rational ring at any prime is F-rational.*

*Proof.* TO BE ADDED.  $\square$

F-rational rings behaviour extremely well in the case of Gorenstein rings:

**Theorem 1.7.** *Let  $(R, m, K)$  be a reduced Gorenstein local ring. Let  $x_1, \dots, x_n$  be a system of parameters for  $R$  and let  $u \in R$  be a generator of  $\text{soc}(R/(x_1, \dots, x_n)R)$ . TFAE:*

- (1)  $R$  is weakly F-regular
- (2)  $R$  is F-rational
- (3)  $(x_1, \dots, x_n)R$  is tightly closed
- (4)  $u \notin ((x_1, \dots, x_n)R)^*$

*Proof.* Clearly (1) $\Rightarrow$ (2), while (2) $\Leftrightarrow$ (3) $\Leftrightarrow$ (4) is easy: First of all, (2) $\Rightarrow$ (3) is obvious. Since  $R$  is C-M, we also have that (3) $\Rightarrow$ (2). If (3) holds, then 0 is tightly closed therefore  $u \notin 0^*$  in  $\text{soc}(R/(x_1, \dots, x_n)R)$ . So  $u \notin ((x_1, \dots, x_n)R)^*$ . If (4) holds and  $(x_1, \dots, x_n)R$  is not tightly closed, then the image of its tight closure in  $\text{soc}(R/(x_1, \dots, x_n)R)$  is nonzero submodule, therefore it must contain  $u$ , a contradiction!

Now we want to show (2)&(3)&(4) $\Rightarrow$ (1): Assume  $R$  is F-rational, let  $N \subseteq M$  be two finitely generated  $R$ -modules, we want to show that  $N$  is tightly closed.

Suppose not, choose  $v \in N^* - N$ . We may replace  $N$  by a maximal submodule  $N'$  not containing  $v$ . Then  $v \in N'^* - N'$ . Kill  $N'$  we can assume WLOG that  $M$  is finite length and 0 is not tightly closed, i.e. there is some nonzero element  $v \in 0^*$ .

Since  $M$  is finite length, some power of  $m$  will kill  $M$ . In other words, every  $x_i^t$  kills  $M$ . So  $M$  is actually an  $S = R/(x_1^t, \dots, x_n^t)R$ -module. Now  $S$  is a Gorenstein Artin local ring. Since both  $M$  and  $S$  [See Useful Lemma in F-regularity] has a one-dimensional socle. We have following diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} K & \xrightarrow{\quad} & S \\ \downarrow & \nearrow \text{dotted} & \\ M & & \end{array}$$

The dotted map comes from the injectivity of  $S$  over  $S$ . We claim that this is also an injection: If not,  $v$  is in the kernel. But the socles are isomorphic. So we have an injection  $M \rightarrow S$ . But  $0$  is tightly closed in  $S$ . So  $0$  is tightly closed in  $M$ , a contradiction!  $\square$