

Anurag K. Singh

Dec. 4, '02

"Direct Summands of module finite extension"

Def. (Ma, 1988) An integral domain R is

a splinter if for every module

finite extension ring S , the inclusion

$R \hookrightarrow S$ splits via an R -bim. map.

Rmk. $R \subseteq S$ module-finite ring extension

① if $R \subseteq S$ splits, then $IS \cap R = I$

\forall ideals $I \subseteq R$.

② if R is excellent, then $R \subseteq S$ splits

\Leftrightarrow for all ideals $I \subseteq R$ we have $IS \cap R = I$

splinters = "ideally integrally closed"

\hookrightarrow Hochster, 1973 (Nagoya)

Assume rings are excellent, images of

regular rings...

(3) splinter \Rightarrow normal

PF. if $\frac{a}{b}$ is integral over R , then

$R \subseteq R[\frac{a}{b}]$ splits.

$$a = b(\frac{a}{b}) \in b R[\frac{a}{b}] \cap R = bR \quad \checkmark$$

(4) if $\mathbb{Q} \subseteq R$, then R is a splinter \Leftrightarrow

R is normal.

PF. if $R \subseteq S$ is module-finite domain extension, then

$$\frac{1}{[Q(S):Q(R)]} \cdot \text{Trace}_{Q(S)/Q(R)} : S \rightarrow R$$

gives a splitting.

(5) Direct summand conjecture: "Every RLR is a splinter."

open for rings of mixed char., $\dim \geq 4$.

(6) if $R = \mathbb{Z}_p[x, y, z] / (x^3 + y^3 + z^3)$, $p \neq 3$

This is normal.

$$p=2 \quad z^2 \notin (x, y)R$$

$$z^4 = z x^3 + z y^3$$

$$\text{so } z^2 = x\sqrt{zx} + y\sqrt{zy} \in (x, y)R^{1/2}$$

$\Rightarrow R$ is not a splitter.

More generally, if $p \equiv 2 \pmod{3}$, it is

easy to check that $z^{2p} \in (x^p, y^p)R$

$$\text{so } z^2 \in (x, y)R^{1/p}.$$

For $p \equiv 2 \pmod{3}$, $R \subseteq R^{1/p}$ doesn't split

(supersingular elliptic curve)

If $p \equiv 1 \pmod{3}$, then $R \subseteq R^{1/p}$ splits

(ordinary elliptic curve). However

\exists separable extensions for which $R \subseteq S$

does not split.

R is not a splitter for every prime char. $p > 0$.

Let R be a domain of char $p > 0$,
and S a module finite extension.

$$\exists \text{ R-hm. } \varphi: S \rightarrow R$$
$$1 \mapsto c \neq 0$$

Suppose $z \in IS \cap R$, $I \subseteq R$ ideal

then \exists equation $z = \sum_{i=1}^n s_i x_i$ $s_i \in S$
 $x_i \in I$

$\forall q = p^e$ we have $z^q = \sum_i s_i^q x_i^q$

Apply φ : $c z^q = \sum \varphi(s_i^q) x_i^q$

i.e. $c z^q \in (x_1^q, \dots, x_n^q)$ $\forall q = p^e$

i.e. $z \in I^*$.

Prop. $R \subseteq S$ module-finite, char $p > 0$.

For all ideals $I \subseteq R$ we have

$$I \subseteq IS \cap R \subseteq I^*$$

If every ideal is tightly closed (such rings are called weakly F -reg.)

then R is a splitter. (using excellency!)

examples of weakly F -reg. rings

(hence of splinters)

- ① Regular rings
- ② Determinantal rings
- ③ Plücker embedded Grassmannians
- ④ normal affine semigroup rings.

Let R^+ denote the integral closure of R in an alg. closure of its fraction field.

Thm. (Hochster-Muncke 1992) If R is a local domain of char $p > 0$, then R^+ is a big CM algebra for R .

If R is graded, R^{+gr} is a big CM algebra.

(L., 1999) R^{+sep} is a big CM algebra for R

$R^{+gr.sep}$ is not a big CM algebra.

related: R is a splitter \Leftrightarrow

R splits from separable module-finite extensions

Define $I^+ = I R^+ \cap R$. Then $I^+ \subseteq I^*$

Question: Is it true that $I^+ = I^*$?

- Yes, Smith (1994) if I is gen. by part of

a system of parameters.

Question If a ring R has $I^+ = I \vee I$,

is it true that $I^* = I \vee I$?

i.e. does splinter \Rightarrow weakly F -reg. ?

(note: we saw weakly F -reg. \Rightarrow splinter)

	Hochster, Huneke	
splinter	$\xrightarrow{\text{Smith}}$	F -rational, pseudo-rational, C -M, normal

1994, Hochster - Huneke: A Gorenstein splinter is weakly F -reg.

(1998, -) \mathbb{Q} -Gorenstein splinter \Rightarrow weakly F -reg.

R is \mathbb{Q} -Gorenstein if $[w_R] \in \text{Cl}(R)$ has finite order.

Thm. () If the anti-canonical cover of R is Noeth., then R splonds \Rightarrow weakly F -reg.

Let \mathfrak{a} be a divisorial ideal of R with $[\mathfrak{a}] = -[w_R]$ in $Cl(R)$.

The anti-canonical cover is

$$R_S(\mathfrak{a}) = R \oplus \mathfrak{a} \oplus \mathfrak{a}^{(2)} \oplus \dots$$

If R is Gorenstein, $R_S(\mathfrak{a}) \simeq R[T] \Rightarrow$ Noeth.

If R is \mathbb{Q} -Gorenstein, $R_S(\mathfrak{a})$ is Noeth.

Def. R is F -reg. if R_p is weakly F -reg. $\forall p$

Cor. Let R be a weakly F -reg. ring.

If its anti-canonical cover is Noeth. on the punctured spectrum, then R is F -reg.

-9-

example (Max Cramer) If R is \mathcal{A} -Gorenstein
on the punctured spectrum, then

R is weak F -reg. $\implies R$ is F -reg.