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Introduction. In this paper a ring means a commutative ring with a unit element. An integral domain $R$ is said to be a PF domain if any finite projective $R$-module is free.
J. P. Serre raised in [6] the following question:
(S) Is the polynomial ring $K\left[X_{1}, X_{2}, \cdots, X_{n}\right]$ with a finite number of variables $X_{1}, X_{2}, \cdots, X_{n}$ over a field $K$ a PF domain?

It is well-known (cf. [3]) that any principal ideal domain is a PF domain. Therefore, when $n=1$, the answer to ( S ) is affirmative. Also, when $n=2$, C. S. Seshadri gave in [9] an affirmative answer to (S). He proved in [9], more generally, that the polynomial ring $R[X]$ with a variable $X$ over a principal ideal domain $R$ is a PF domain. This was further generalized by Seshadri [10], Serre [8] and Bass [1] to the following form: If $R^{\prime}=R[X]$ is the polynomial ring with a variable $X$ over a Dedekind domain $R$, then every finite projective $R^{\prime}$-module $P^{\prime}$ is expressible as $P^{\prime} \cong R_{R}^{\prime} \otimes_{R} P$ for some finite projective $R$-module $P$.

For $n \geqq 3$ the question ( S ) is still open. D. Lissner gave in [4] some results suggesting a negative answer to (S) in case $n \geqq 3$. Recently H. Bass and S. Schanuel showed in [2] that, for the polynomial ring $R^{\prime}=R\left[X_{1}, X_{2}\right.$, $\left.\cdots, X_{n}\right]$ with a finite number of variables $X_{1}, X_{2}, \cdots, X_{n}$ over a semi-local principal ideal domain $R$, any projective $R^{\prime}$-module of rank $>n$ is free.

Our main results in this paper are Theorems 4.7 and 5.4. In Theorem 4.7 we give a necessary and sufficient condition for a Noetherian integral domain $R$ of dimension 1 , whose derived normal ring (cf. [5]) is a finite $R$-module, to the effect that, for the polynomial ring $R^{\prime}=R[X]$ with a variable $X$ over $R$, every finite projective $R^{\prime}$-module $P^{\prime}$ is expressible as $P^{\prime} \cong R^{\prime} \otimes_{R} P$ for some finite projective $R$-module $P$. This is a generalization of all the above-mentioned result in [1], [8], [9] and [10]. In Theorem 5.4, we give a necessary and sufficient condition for a semi-local integral domain $R$ of dimension 1 to the effect that the polynomial ring $R[X, Y]$ with two variables $X, Y$ over $R$ is a PF domain. This is related with the above-mentioned result in [2].

In both cases, the conditions are expressed in the form that the ring $R$ should be "weakly normal". Thus the concept of weakly normal rings will
play an important part throughout this paper. This concept will be introduced in §1. Another fundamental tool of this paper is the Proposition 2.2 in §2, which seems to be the most general result proved by the method used by Seshadri, Serre and Bass.

Our notations and terminologies are the same as those in [5] for the ringtheoretical facts with some exceptions. The "dimension" of a ring means the "altitude" of it in [5]. An ideal $\mathfrak{a}$ of a ring $R$ is said to be "unmixed" in it if, for any prime divisor $\mathfrak{p}$ of $\mathfrak{a}$ in $R$, we have $\operatorname{height}_{R} \mathfrak{p}=$ height $_{R} \mathfrak{a}$. A " multiplicative system" of a ring means a multiplicatively closed subset of it which does not contain 0 . Let $R$ be a ring, $S$ be a multiplicative system of $R$ and $M$ be an $R$-module. Then we denote by $R_{S}$ and $M_{S}$ the quotient ring and the quotient module of $R$ and $M$ with respect to $S$, respectively. Especially, if $S$ is the complementary set of a prime ideal $\mathfrak{p}$ in $R$, we use $R_{\mathfrak{p}}$ and $M_{p}$ instead of $R_{S}$ and $M_{S}$, respectively. A projective $R$-module $P$ is said to be of "rank $n$ " in $R$ if, for any maximal ideal $\mathfrak{m}$ of $R, P_{\mathrm{m}}$ has an $R_{\mathrm{m}}$-free base consisting of $n$ elements. A projective $R$-module is called "quasi-free" if it is expressible as a direct sum of $R$-modules, each of which is isomorphic to an ideal generated by an idempotent of $R$. Let $R^{\prime}=R\left[X_{1}, X_{2}, \cdots, X_{n}\right]$ be the polynomial ring with a finite number of variables $X_{1}, X_{2}, \cdots, X_{n}$ over a ring $R$. Then a finite $R^{\prime}$-module $M^{\prime}$ is said to be "extended" if there exists a finite $R$-module $M$ such that $M^{\prime} \cong R^{\prime} \otimes_{R} M$.

## § 1. Preliminaries.

First we refer to some well-known facts, which will be freely used throughout this paper.

Lemma 1.1 (cf. [3]). Let $R$ be an integral domain and $M$ be a finite $R$ module. Then $M$ is $R$-projective if and only if, for any maximal ideal $m$ of $R$, $M_{\mathrm{m}}$ is $R_{\mathrm{m}}$-free.

Lemma 1.2 (cf. [7]). A semi-local integral domain is a PF domain.
Lemma 1.3 (cf. [5]). Let $R$ be an integral domain and $\bar{R}$ be an integral extension of $R$. Then, for any prime ideal $\mathfrak{p}$ of $R$, there is a prime ideal $\bar{p}$ of $\bar{R}$ such that $\mathfrak{p}=\overline{\mathfrak{p}} \cap R$. Furthermore, $\bar{p}$ has height 1 in $\bar{R}$ if $\mathfrak{p}$ has height 1 in $R$, and $\mathfrak{p}$ is maximal in $R$ if and only if $\bar{p}$ is maximal in $\bar{R}$.

Lemma 1.4 (cf. [5]). Let $R$ be a Noetherian integral domain of dimension 1 and $\bar{R}$ be an almost finite integral extension of $R$. Then $\bar{R}$ is also a Noetherian integral domain of dimension 1 , and, if $\bar{R}$ is a normal ring, it is a Dedekind domain. Especially, if $R$ is semi-local, then $\bar{R}$ is also semi-local, and, in case $\bar{R}$ is normal, it is a principal ideal domain.

Lemma 1.5 (cf. [5]). Let $R$ be a Noetherian ring and $R^{\prime}=R\left[X_{1}, X_{2}, \cdots, X_{n}\right]$
be the polynomial ring with a finite number of variables $X_{1}, X_{2}, \cdots, X_{n}$ over $R$. Then there exists a maximal ideal $\mathfrak{m}^{\prime}$ in $R^{\prime}$ such that $\mathfrak{m}^{\prime} \cap R$ is not maximal in $R$ if and only if there is a prime ideal $\mathfrak{p}$ in $R$ such that $R / \mathfrak{p}$ is a semi-local integral domain of dimension 1. If $\mathfrak{m}^{\prime} \cap R$ is not maximal in $R, R / \mathfrak{m}^{\prime} \cap R$ becomes, in fact, a semi-local integral domain of dimension 1.

We now introduce a notion of weakly normal rings.
Definition. Let $R$ be a local integral domain of dimension 1 with a maximal ideal $\mathfrak{m}$. Let $\bar{R}$ be the derived normal ring of $R$ and $\overline{\mathfrak{n}}$ be the Jacobson radical of $\bar{R}$. Then $R$ is said to be a weak (discrete) valuation ring if we have $\mathfrak{m}=\overline{\mathfrak{n}}$ in the set-theoretical sense.

In general, a Noetherian integral domain $R$ is said to be a weakly normal ring if $R$ satisfies the following two conditions:

1) For any prime ideal $\mathfrak{p}$ of height 1 in $R, R_{\mathfrak{p}}$ is a weak valuation ring.
2) Any principal ideal $(\neq 0)$ in $R$ is unmixed, i. e., any prime divisor of it has height 1 in $R$.

Now we prove
Proposition 1.6. A Noetherian normal ring is a weakly normal ring. However, a weakly normal ring is not always a normal ring.

Proof. The first part of our proposition is obvious by our definition (cf. [5]). Hence we have only to give an example of a weak valuation ring which is not a valuation ring. Let $Q$ be the field of all rational numbers and $Q[[X, Y]]$ be the formal power-series ring with two variables $X, Y$ over $Q$. If we put $\mathfrak{p}=\left(X^{2}+Y^{2}\right) Q[[X, Y]]$, then $\mathfrak{p}$ is a prime ideal of $Q[[X, Y]]$. Furthermore put $R_{0}=Q[[X, Y]] / \mathfrak{p}$ and denote by $a, b$ the residues of $X, Y$ in $R_{0}$, respectively. Then $R_{0}$ is a local integral domain of dimension 1 with a maximal ideal $\mathfrak{m}_{0}=a R_{0}+b R_{0}$. Let $\bar{R}$ be the derived normal ring of $R_{0}$. As $R_{0}$ is complete, $\bar{R}$ is a valuation ring with a maximal ideal $\bar{m}$ (cf. [5]). Let $R$ be an integral domain generated by $\overline{\mathfrak{m}}$ over $R_{0}$. Then $R$ is obviously a weak valuation ring. If we put $\alpha=b / a$, then we have $\alpha^{2}+1=0$, hence $\alpha, \alpha^{-1} \in \bar{R}$, and so $\alpha \notin \overline{\mathfrak{m}}$. If we suppose $\alpha \in R$, then we have $\alpha=u+\beta$ for a unit $u$ of $R_{0}$ and an element $\beta$ of $\overline{\mathrm{m}}$. From $\alpha^{2}+1=0$, we obtain $\beta(\beta+2 u)+u^{2}$ $+1=0$. As $\beta \in \overline{\mathfrak{m}}$, we have $u^{2}+1 \in \overline{\mathfrak{m}} \cap R_{0}=\mathfrak{m}_{0}$. Let $f(X, Y)$ be a representative of $u$ in $Q[[X, Y]]$. Then we have $(f(X, Y))^{2}+1 \in X Q[[X, Y]]+Y Q[[X$, $Y$ ]. If we denoted by $q$ the constant term of $f(X, Y)$, then we obtain $q^{2}+1=0$. As $q \in Q$, this is obviously a contradiction. Thus $\alpha \in R$. This shows $R \neq \bar{R}$. Consequently $R$ is a weak valuation ring which is not a valuation ring.

Here we show some basic properties of weakly normal rings.
Lemma 1.7. Let $R$ be a weakly normal ring and $S$ be a multiplicative system of $R$. Then $R_{S}$ is also a weakly normal ring.

Lemma 1.8. Let $R$ be a Noetherian integral domain of dimension 1. Then $R$ is a weakly normal ring if and only if, for any prime ideal $\mathfrak{p}$ of $R, R_{p}$ is a weak valuation ring. Especially, if $R$ is semi-local, and $\mathfrak{n}$ is the Jacobson radicat of $R$, then $R$ is a weakly normal ring if and only if we have $\mathfrak{n}=\overline{\mathfrak{n}}$ for the Jacobson radical $\bar{n}$ of the derived normal ring of $R$.

These two results follow immediately from our definition.
Lemma 1.9. Let $R$ be a weakly normal ring. Then the polynomial ring $R^{\prime}=R\left[X_{1}, X_{2}, \cdots, X_{n}\right]$ with a finite number of variables $X_{1}, X_{2}, \cdots, X_{n}$ over $R$ is also a weakly normal ring.

Proof. Let us show our lemma for $n=1$, i. e., $R^{\prime}=R[X]$ with a variable $X$. The general case follows easily by induction on $n$. First we prove that, for any prime ideal $\mathfrak{p}^{\prime}$ of height 1 in $R^{\prime}, R_{p^{\prime}}^{\prime}$ is a weak valuation ring. If $\mathfrak{p}^{\prime} \cap R=0$, then we have $R_{\mathfrak{p}^{\prime}}^{\prime}=(K[X])_{p^{\prime} K[X]}$ where $K$ is the quotient field of $R$, and so $R_{p^{\prime}}^{\prime}$ is a discrete valuation ring. On the other hand, if $\mathfrak{p}^{\prime} \cap R=\mathfrak{p} \neq 0$, then we have $\mathfrak{p}^{\prime}=\mathfrak{p} R^{\prime}$, hence $R_{p^{\prime}}^{\prime}=\left(R_{p}[X]\right)_{p R p[X]}$. Therefore we may suppose that $R$ is a weak valuation ring and $\mathfrak{p}$ is a maximal ideal of it. Let $\bar{R}$ be the derived normal ring of $R$ and $\bar{n}$ be the Jacobson radical of $\bar{R}$. Then we have $\mathfrak{p}=\bar{n}$. Since $\bar{R}[X]$ is the derived normal ring of $R[X]$, putting $S^{\prime}=R[X]-\mathfrak{p} R[X],(\bar{R}[X])_{S^{\prime}}$ is also the derived normal ring of $(R[X])_{\mathfrak{p} R[X]}$. From $\mathfrak{p}=\bar{n}$ we see easily $\mathfrak{p}(R[X])_{p R[X]}=\bar{n}(\bar{R}[X])_{S^{\prime}}$. As $\bar{n}(\bar{R}[X])_{S^{\prime}}$ coincides with the Jacobson radical of $(\bar{R}[X])_{S^{\prime}}$, this shows that $(R[X])_{p R[X]}$ is a weak valuation ring. Thus, in every case, $R_{p^{\prime}}^{\prime}$ is a weak valuation ring.

Let $\mathfrak{a}^{\prime}$ be a non-zero principal ideal of $R^{\prime}$ and $\mathfrak{p}^{\prime}$ be a prime divisor of it. Suppose height ${R^{\prime}}^{\prime} \mathfrak{p}^{\prime} \geqq 2$. Then we have $\mathfrak{p}^{\prime} \cap R \neq 0$. Hence there exists a non-zero element $\alpha$ of $R$ in $\mathfrak{p}^{\prime}$. Then $\mathfrak{p}^{\prime}$ is a prime divisor of $\alpha R^{\prime}$ (cf. [5], 12.6). However, as $R$ is weakly normal, $a R$ is unmixed in $R$, and so $a R^{\prime}$ is unmixed in $R^{\prime}$. This is a contradiction. Thus $\mathfrak{p}^{\prime}$ must be of height 1 in $R^{\prime}$, i. e., $\mathfrak{a}^{\prime}$ must be unmixed in $R^{\prime}$. This completes our proof.

## §2. Fundamental proposition.

We first prove a proposition, which gives in the most general form a reasoning which played essential parts in the proofs of the Seshadri-SerreBass's results.

Lemma 2.1. Let $R$ be an integral domain and $\mathfrak{p}$ be a prime ideal of $R$ such that $R / \mathfrak{p}$ is Euclidean. Let $P$ be a finite projective $R$-module and $L$ be a finite projective $R$-submodule of $P$ such that $L=L_{1} \oplus L_{2} \oplus \cdots \oplus L_{n}$ with each $L_{i} a$ finite projective $R$-module of rank 1. Then there exists an automorphism $\varphi$ of $L$ and an integer $r, 0 \leqq r \leqq n$, such that $\varphi\left(L_{1} \oplus L_{2} \oplus \cdots \oplus L_{r}\right) \subset \mathfrak{p} P$ and $\varphi\left(L_{r+1}\right.$ $\left.\oplus L_{r+2} \oplus \cdots \oplus L_{n}\right) \cap \mathfrak{p} P=\mathfrak{p} \cdot \varphi\left(L_{r+1} \oplus L_{r+2} \oplus \cdots \oplus L_{n}\right)$.

The proof is omitted, because it runs in the same line as in [1], 2.2.

Proposition 2.2. Let $R$ be a Noetherian integral domain and $S$ be a multiplicative system of $R$ consisting of elements $\left\{a_{i}\right\}$ such that $a_{i} R$ is expressible as the product of invertible prime ideals $\mathfrak{p}_{1}, \mathfrak{p}_{2}, \cdots, \mathfrak{p}_{s}$ in $R$, for any $\mathfrak{p}_{i}$ of which $R / \mathfrak{p}_{i}$ is Euclidean. Let $P$ be a finite projective $R$-module. If $P_{S}$ is $R_{S^{-}}$ free, then $P$ is expressible as a direct sum of projective $R$-modules of rank 1. Especially, if $S$ is a multiplicative system of $R$ generated by prime elements $\left\{p_{i}\right\}$ such that each $R / p_{i} R$ is Euclidean, and if $P_{S}$ is $R_{S}$-free, then $P$ is $R$-free.

Proof (cf. [1], [8], [9] or [10]). As $P_{S}$ is $R_{S}$-free, we can choose a free base $u_{1}, u_{2}, \cdots, u_{t}$ for $P_{S}$ in $P$. If we put $L=u_{1} R+u_{2} R+\cdots+u_{t} R$, then we have $L \subset P$ and $s P \subset L$ for some $s \in S$. By our assumption on $S$ we have
 are Euclidean. Hence we established the existence of an $R$-submodule $L$ of $P$ satisfying the following conditions:

1) $L=L_{1} \oplus L_{2} \oplus \cdots \oplus L_{n}$ with each $L_{i}$ a projective $R$-module of rank 1 .
 $R / \mathfrak{p}_{i}$ is Euclidean.

Since $R$ is Noetherian, we may choose $L$ maximal satisfying 1). Now we shall prove $P=L$. Suppose $L \subseteq P$. If we put $\mathfrak{p}=\mathfrak{p}_{1}$ and $\mathfrak{a}=p_{1}^{l_{1}^{1-1}} p_{2}^{l_{2}^{2}} \cdots \mathfrak{p}_{k}^{l_{k}}\left(l_{1} \geqq 1\right)$,
 diction. Therefore $\mathfrak{p a P} \subset \mathfrak{p} L$, however $\mathfrak{p a P \subset p} P \cap L$. This shows that $\mathfrak{p} L \subseteq \mathfrak{p} P \cap L$. By (2.1) we have an automorphism $\varphi$ of $L$ for which $\varphi\left(L_{1} \oplus L_{2} \oplus \cdots \oplus L_{r}\right) \subset \mathfrak{p} P$ and $\mathfrak{p} P \cap \varphi\left(L_{r+1} \oplus L_{r+2} \oplus \cdots \oplus L_{n}\right)=\mathfrak{p} \cdot \varphi\left(L_{r+1} \oplus L_{r+2} \oplus \cdots \oplus L_{n}\right)$. As $\mathfrak{p} P \cap L \neq \mathfrak{p} L$, we have $r>0$. Hence, if we put $H=\mathfrak{p}^{-1} \cdot \varphi\left(L_{1} \oplus L_{2} \oplus \cdots \oplus L_{r}\right) \oplus \varphi\left(L_{r+1} \oplus L_{r+2} \oplus\right.$ $\cdots \oplus L_{n}$ ), then $H$ contradicts the maximality of $L$. Thus we obtain $P=L$. This completes the proof of the first part of our proposition. The second part is obvious from the above proof of the first part.

Corollary 2.3. Let $R$ be a Noetherian integral domain and $S$ be a multiplicative system of $R$ consisting of elements $\left\{a_{i}\right\}$ such that each $a_{i} R$ is expressible as the product of maximal invertible ideals in $R$. Let $R^{\prime}=R[X]$ be the polynomial ring with a variable $X$ over $R$ and $P^{\prime}$ be a finite projective $R^{\prime}$-module. If $P_{S}^{\prime}$ is $R_{S}^{\prime}$-free, then $P^{\prime}$ is expressible as a direct sum of projective $R^{\prime}$-modules of rank 1. Especially, if $S$ is a multiplicative system of $R$ generated by prime elements $\left\{p_{i}\right\}$ such that all $p_{i} R$ 's are maximal in $R$ and if $P_{S}^{\prime}$ is $R_{S}^{\prime}$-free, then $P^{\prime}$ is also $R^{\prime}$-free.

Lemma 2.4. Let $R$ be a ring and $P$ be a finite quasi-free $R$-module. If $P$ has its rank, then $P$ is a free $R$-module.

Proof. Put $n=\operatorname{rank}_{R} P$. When $n=0$, this is obvious. Hence we may assume $n \geqq 1$. We put $P=e_{1} R \oplus e_{2} R \oplus \cdots \oplus e_{t} R$ for idempotents, $e_{1}, e_{2}, \cdots, e_{t}$ $(\mathrm{t} \geqq n)$ in $R$. If we put $e_{2}^{\prime}=\left(1-e_{1}\right) e_{2}, e_{3}^{\prime}=\left(1-e_{1}\right)\left(1-e_{2}\right) e_{3}, \cdots, e_{t}^{\prime}=\left(1-e_{1}\right)\left(1-e_{2}\right)$ $\cdots\left(1-e_{t-1}\right) e_{t}$ and $e_{2}^{\prime \prime}=e_{2}-e_{2}^{\prime}, \cdots, e_{t}^{\prime \prime}=e_{t}-e_{t}^{\prime}$, then we have $P \cong e_{1} R \oplus e_{2}^{\prime} R \oplus \cdots$
$\oplus e_{t}^{\prime} R \oplus e_{2}^{\prime \prime} R \oplus e_{3}^{\prime \prime} R \oplus \cdots \oplus e_{t}^{\prime \prime} R$. We see easily that $R \cong e_{1} R \oplus e_{2}^{\prime} R \oplus \cdots \oplus e_{t}^{\prime} R$. Putting $P^{\prime}=e_{2}^{\prime \prime} R \oplus e_{3}^{\prime \prime} R \oplus \cdots \oplus e_{t}^{\prime \prime} R$, then $P^{\prime}$ is a quasi-free $R$-module of rank $n-1$ and we have $P \cong R \oplus P^{\prime}$. By repeating this procedure to $P^{\prime}$, we conclude that $P$ is a free $R$-module of rank $n$.

Proposition 2.5. Let $R$ be an integral domain, $\mathfrak{n}$ be an ideal contained in the Jacobson radical of $R$ and $P$ be a finite projective $R$-module. If $P / n P$ is a quasi-free $R / \mathrm{n}$-module, then $P$ is $R$-free.

Proof. As $R$ is an integral domain, $P$ has its rank. If we put $n=\operatorname{rank}_{R} P, P_{\mathrm{m}}$ is a free $R_{\mathrm{m}}$-module of rank $n$, for any maximal ideal m of $R$. Since $\mathfrak{n} \subset \mathfrak{m},(P / \mathfrak{n} P)_{\mathfrak{m} / \mathfrak{n}}$ is also a free $(R / \mathfrak{n})_{\mathfrak{m} / n}$-module of rank $n$. Therefore we have $\operatorname{rank}_{R / \mathfrak{n}} P / \mathfrak{n} P=n$. As $P / \mathfrak{n} P$ is $R / \mathfrak{n}$-quasi-free, $P / \mathfrak{n} P$ is $R / \mathfrak{n}$-free by (2.4). Let $\left\{\bar{u}_{1}, \bar{u}_{2}, \cdots, \bar{u}_{n}\right\}$ be a free base of $P / \mathfrak{n} P$ over $R / \mathfrak{n} R$, and $u_{1}, u_{2}, \cdots, u_{n}$ be the representatives of $\bar{u}_{1}, \bar{u}_{2}, \cdots, \bar{u}_{n}$ in $P$, respectively. If we put $M=u_{1} R+u_{2} R+$ $\cdots+u_{n} R$, we have $P=M+\mathfrak{n} P$. Then, by the Krull-Azumaya's lemma, we obtain $P=M$, i. e., $P$ has a base $\left\{u_{1}, u_{2}, \cdots, u_{n}\right\}$ over $R$. As $P_{\mathrm{m}}$ is of rank $n$, $\left\{u_{1}, u_{2}, \cdots, u_{n}\right\}$ is a free base of $P_{\mathrm{m}}$ over $R_{\mathfrak{m}}$ for any maximal ideal $\mathfrak{m}$ of $R$. From this it follows that $\left\{u_{1}, u_{2}, \cdots, u_{n}\right\}$ is a free base of $P$ over $R$. Thus $P$ is $R$-free.

## § 3. Polynomial rings over semi-local integral domains of dimension 1, I.

Here we give
Proposition 3.1. Let $R$ be a semi-local integral domain of dimension 1 with the Jacobson radical $\mathfrak{n}$ and $R^{\prime}=R\left[X_{1}, X_{2}, \cdots, X_{n}\right]$ be the polynomial ring with a finite number of variables $X_{1}, X_{2}, \cdots, X_{n}$ over $R$. Then the following conditions are equivalent:

1) $R$ is a weakly normal ring.
2) Any prime ideal $\mathfrak{p}^{\prime}$ of height 1 in $R^{\prime}$ such that $\mathfrak{p}^{\prime}+\mathfrak{n} R^{\prime}=R^{\prime}$ is principal in $R^{\prime}$.

Proof. Let $\bar{R}$ be the derived normal ring of $R$ and $\bar{n}$ be the Jacobson radical of $\bar{R}$. Denote by $K$ the quotient field of $R$ and put $\bar{R}^{\prime}=\bar{R}\left[X_{1}, X_{2}, \cdots, X_{n}\right]$.

The implication 1) $\rightarrow 2$ ): Suppose that $R$ is weakly normal. Then, by (1.8), we have $\mathfrak{n}=\bar{n}$, hence $\mathfrak{n} R^{\prime}=\bar{n} \bar{R}^{\prime}$. Let $\mathfrak{p}^{\prime}$ be a prime ideal of height 1 in $R^{\prime}$ such that $\mathfrak{p}^{\prime}+\mathfrak{n} R^{\prime}=R^{\prime}$. As $\bar{R}^{\prime}$ is integral over $R^{\prime}$, there exists a prime ideal $\bar{p}^{\prime}$ of height 1 in $\bar{R}^{\prime}$ such that $\mathfrak{p}^{\prime}=\bar{p}^{\prime} \cap R^{\prime}$ by (1.3). Since $\bar{R}$ is a semilocal principal ideal domain by (1.4), $\bar{R}^{\prime}$ is a unique factorization domain, as is well-known, hence $\bar{p}^{\prime}$ is principal in $\bar{R}^{\prime}$ (cf. [5], 13.1). As $\bar{p}^{\prime}+\bar{n} \overline{R^{\prime}}=\bar{R}^{\prime}$, we have $\bar{p}^{\prime}=(f+1) \bar{R}^{\prime}$ for some $f \in \overline{\mathfrak{n}} \bar{R}^{\prime}=\mathfrak{n} R^{\prime}$. From $\mathfrak{p}^{\prime}=\bar{p}^{\prime} \cap R^{\prime}$, we obtain $f+1 \in \mathfrak{p}^{\prime}$. Hence we have also $\mathfrak{p}^{\prime} K\left[X_{1}, X_{2}, \cdots, X_{n}\right]=(f+1) K\left[X_{1}, X_{2}, \cdots, X_{n}\right]=\bar{p}^{\prime} K\left[X_{1}, X_{2}\right.$, $\left.\cdots, X_{n}\right]$. If $\mathfrak{m}^{\prime}$ is a maximal ideal of $R^{\prime}$ containing $f+1$, then we have $\mathfrak{m}^{\prime} \cap R=0$
and so we have $R_{m^{\prime}}^{\prime}=\left(K\left[X_{1}, X_{2}, \cdots, X_{n}\right]\right)_{m^{\prime} K\left[X_{1}, \cdots, X_{n}\right]}$. Therefore we have $\mathfrak{p}^{\prime} R_{\mathfrak{m}^{\prime}}^{\prime}=(f+1) R_{\mathfrak{m}^{\prime}}^{\prime}$. Thus we must have $\mathfrak{p}^{\prime}=(f+1) R^{\prime}$. This proves that $\mathfrak{p}^{\prime}$ is principal in $R^{\prime}$.

The implication 2$) \rightarrow 1$ ): Suppose that $R$ is not weakly normal. Then, again by (1.8), we have a) $\mathfrak{n} \bar{R} \neq \mathfrak{n}$ or b) $\mathfrak{n} \bar{R}=\mathfrak{n} \neq \overline{\mathfrak{n}}$. In order to prove 2) $\rightarrow 1$ ) it suffices to show that there exists a non-principal prime ideal $\mathfrak{p}^{\prime}$ of height 1 in $R^{\prime}$ such that $\mathfrak{p}^{\prime}+\mathfrak{n} R^{\prime}=R^{\prime}$, in case a), b).

Case a): When $\mathfrak{n} \bar{R} \neq \mathfrak{n}$, we see easily $\mathfrak{n} \bar{R} ₫ R$. Therefore we find an element $b / a$ of $\bar{R}, a, b \in R$ such that $b c / a \notin R$ for a suitable element $c$ of $\mathfrak{n}$. As $b / a \oplus R$ but $b / a \in \bar{R}, b / a$ is the root of an equation:

$$
T^{k}+r_{1} T^{k-1}+\cdots+r_{k-1} T+r_{k}=0, \quad r_{1}, r_{2}, \cdots, r_{k} \in R, \quad k \geqq 2 .
$$

Hence $b c / a$ is also the root of an eqation:

$$
T^{k}+c r_{1} T^{k-1}+\cdots+c^{k-1} r_{k-1} T+c^{k} r_{k}=0 .
$$

If we put $d_{i}=c^{i} r_{i}, 1 \leqq i \leqq k$, then all $d_{i}$ 's are contained in $\mathfrak{n}$. Hence $a / b c$ is the root of the following equation:

$$
d_{k} T^{k}+d_{k-1} T^{k-1}+\cdots d_{1} T+1=0
$$

On the other hand, as is easily seen, $a / b c$ is also the root of an equation $b c T-a=0$. Put $\mathfrak{p}^{\prime}=\left(b c X_{1}-a\right) R^{\prime}+\left(d_{k} X_{1}^{k}+d_{k-1} X_{1}^{k-1}+\cdots+d_{1} X_{1}+1\right) R^{\prime}$. We shall now prove that $\mathfrak{p}^{\prime}$ is as required. Let $\mathfrak{m}^{\prime}$ be a maximal ideal of $R^{\prime}$. If $\mathfrak{m}^{\prime} \supset \mathfrak{p}^{\prime}$, we have $\mathfrak{m}^{\prime} \cap R=0$, as $d_{1}, d_{2}, \cdots, d_{k} \in \mathfrak{n}$, hence we obtain $R_{\mathfrak{m}^{\prime}}^{\prime}=\left(K\left[X_{1}\right.\right.$, $\left.\left.X_{2}, \cdots, X_{n}\right]\right)_{m^{\prime} K\left[X_{1}, \cdots, X_{n}\right]}$. Therefore we have $\mathfrak{p}^{\prime} R_{m^{\prime}}^{\prime}=\left(X_{1}-a / b c\right) R_{m^{\prime}}^{\prime}$ 。 If $\mathfrak{m}^{\prime} \not \mathfrak{p}^{\prime}$, we have $\mathfrak{p}^{\prime} R_{m^{\prime}}^{\prime}=R_{\mathfrak{m}^{\prime}}^{\prime}$. This shows that $\mathfrak{p}^{\prime}$ is an invertible prime ideal of height 1 in $R^{\prime}$. However, as $b c \notin a R, \mathfrak{p}^{\prime}$ is not principal in $R^{\prime}$, and, as $d_{1}, d_{2}, \cdots, d_{k} \in \mathfrak{n}$, we have $\mathfrak{p}^{\prime}+\mathfrak{n} R^{\prime}=R^{\prime}$. This shows that $\mathfrak{p}^{\prime}$ is as required.

Case b): As $\mathfrak{n} \bar{R}=\mathfrak{n} \neq \overline{\mathfrak{n}}$, we find a positive integer $k \geqq 2$ such that $\overline{\mathfrak{n}}^{k} \subset \mathfrak{n}$. Then there exists an element $b / a$ of $\overline{\mathfrak{n}}$ such that $b / a \notin \mathfrak{n}$ but $(b / a)^{k}=c \in \mathfrak{n}$. Hence $a / b$ is the root of equations $c T^{k}-1=0$ and $b T-a=0$. If we put $\mathfrak{p}^{\prime}=\left(b X_{1}-a\right) R^{\prime}+\left(c X_{1}^{k}-1\right) R^{\prime}$, we can prove, as in case a), that $\mathfrak{p}^{\prime}$ is as required. This completes our proof.

Corollary 3.2. Let $R$ be a semi-local integral domain of dimension 1 and $R^{\prime}=R\left[X_{1}, X_{2}, \cdots, X_{n}\right]$ be the polynomial ring with a finite number of variables $X_{1}, X_{2}, \cdots, X_{n}$ over $R$. If $R$ is not weakly normal, then there exists an invertible ideal in $R^{\prime}$ which is not principal.

Proof. It is obvious from the proof of 2$) \rightarrow 1$ ) in (3.1).
Proposition 3.3. Let $R$ be a semi-local integral domain of dimension 1 and let $R^{\prime}=R[X]$ be the polynomial ring with a variable $X$ over $R$. Then the following conditions are equivalent:

1) $R$ is a weakly normal ring.
2) $R^{\prime}$ is a PF domain.

Proof. The implication 2 ) $\rightarrow 1$ ) was already proved by (3.2). Hence we have only to show the implication 1$) \rightarrow 2$ ). Suppose that $R$ is weakly normal. Let $\mathfrak{n}$ be the Jacobson radical of $R$, and $\mathfrak{m}^{\prime}$ be a maximal ideal of height 1 in $R^{\prime}$. Then we have $\mathfrak{m}^{\prime}+\mathfrak{n} R^{\prime}=R^{\prime}$ by (1.5). Therefore, by (3.1), $\mathfrak{m}^{\prime}$ is principal in $R^{\prime}$. Let $S^{\prime}$ be the multiplicative system of $R^{\prime}$ generated by all prime generators of maximal ideals of height 1 in $R^{\prime}$. Then, for any maximal ideal $\mathfrak{m}^{\prime}$ of height 2 in $R^{\prime}$, we have $\mathfrak{m}^{\prime} \cap S^{\prime}=\phi$. Accordingly, if we put $R^{\prime \prime}=R_{S^{\prime}}^{\prime}$, $\mathfrak{m}^{\prime} R^{\prime \prime}$ is also maximal in $R^{\prime \prime}$. Conversely, for any maximal ideal $\mathfrak{m}^{\prime \prime}$ of $R^{\prime \prime}$, $\mathfrak{m}^{\prime \prime} \cap R^{\prime}$ is a maximal ideal of height 2 in $R^{\prime}$. As any maximal ideal of height 2 in $R^{\prime}$ contains $n R^{\prime}$, any maximal ideal of $R^{\prime \prime}$ contains $n R^{\prime \prime}$ and so $n R^{\prime \prime}$ is contained in the Jacobson radical of $R^{\prime \prime}$. Now we have $R^{\prime \prime} / \mathfrak{n} R^{\prime \prime}$ $\cong(R / \mathfrak{n})[X] \cong\left(R / \mathfrak{m}_{1}\right)[X] \oplus \cdots \oplus\left(R / \mathfrak{m}_{t}\right)[X]$, where $\mathfrak{m}_{1}, \mathfrak{m}_{2}, \cdots, \mathfrak{m}_{t}$ are all maximal ideals of $R$. Since any $\left(R / m_{i}\right)[X]$ is a PF domain, any projective $R^{\prime \prime} / \mathfrak{n} R^{\prime \prime}$ module is quasi-free. Hence, by (2.5), $R^{\prime \prime}$ is a PF domain. By applying (2.2) to $S^{\prime}$, we see that $R^{\prime}$ is also a PF domain.

## § 4. Polynomial rings over Noetherian integral domains of dimension 1.

First we give two lemmas.
Lemma 4.1. Let $R$ be an integral domain and $R^{\prime}=R[X]$ be the polynomial ring with a variable $X$ over $R$. Then any finite projective $R^{\prime}$-module of rank 1 is isomorphic to an invertible ideal of $R^{\prime}$ containing a non-zero element of $R$.

Proof. Let $P^{\prime}$ be a finite projective $R^{\prime}$-module of rank 1 . If we denote by $K$ the quotient field of $R$, we have $P^{\prime} \subset K \underset{R}{\bigotimes} P^{\prime}$. As $K \underset{R}{\bigotimes} P^{\prime}$ is a free $K[X]$-module of rank 1 , we may choose a generator $\alpha$ of $K \bigotimes_{R} P^{\prime}$ such that $P^{\prime} \subset \alpha R^{\prime}$. If we consider $\alpha R^{\prime}$ as $R^{\prime}$, we can also consider $P^{\prime}$ as an invertible ideal $\mathfrak{a}^{\prime}$ of $R^{\prime}$. Since, for some $a \neq 0$ in $R$, we have $a \alpha \in P^{\prime}$, we have clearly $\mathfrak{a}^{\prime} \cap R \neq 0$.

Lemma 4.2. Let $R$ be a PF domain and $R^{\prime}=R[X]$ be the polynomial ring with a variable $X$ over $R$. Let $P^{\prime}$ be a finite projective $R^{\prime}$-module of rank 1 . If $P^{\prime}$ is extended, then $P^{\prime}$ is isomorphic to $R^{\prime}$.

Proof. As this is easy, we omit it (cf. [3], X, Ex. 1).
Now we prove
Theorem 4.3. Let $R$ be a Noetherian integral domain such that any principal ideal in it is unmixed, and $R^{\prime}=R\left[X_{1}, X_{2}, \cdots, X_{n}\right]$ be the polynomial ring with a finite number of variables $X_{1}, X_{2}, \cdots, X_{n}$ over $R$. Then the following conditions are equivalent:

1) $R$ is a weakly normal ring.
2) Any finite projective $R^{\prime}$-module of rank 1 is extended.

Proof. It suffices to prove our theorem in case $n=1$, i. e., $R^{\prime}=R[X]$ with a variable $X$, by the last part of the proof of (1.9) and by (1.9).

The implication 1) $\rightarrow 2$ ): Suppose that $R$ is weakly normal. According to (4.1), it suffices to show that, for an invertible ideal $\mathfrak{a}^{\prime}$ of $R^{\prime}$ such that $\mathfrak{a}^{\prime} \cap R$ $=\mathfrak{a} \neq 0$, we have $\mathfrak{a}^{\prime}=\mathfrak{a} R^{\prime}$. As, for any maximal ideal $\mathfrak{m}^{\prime}$ of $R^{\prime}, \mathfrak{a}^{\prime} R_{\mathfrak{m}^{\prime}}^{\prime}$, is principal in $R_{m^{\prime}}^{\prime}, \mathfrak{a}^{\prime} R_{\mathrm{m}}^{\prime}$, is unmixed in $R_{\mathrm{m}}^{\prime}$, by (1.7) and (1.9). So $\mathfrak{a}^{\prime}$ must be unmixed in $R^{\prime}$. Let $\mathfrak{p}_{1}^{\prime}, p_{2}^{\prime}, \cdots, \mathfrak{p}_{t}^{\prime}$ be all prime divisors of $\mathfrak{a}^{\prime}$ in $R^{\prime}$. As all $p_{i}^{\prime \prime}$ s contain $\mathfrak{a}$, we have $\mathfrak{p}_{i}^{\prime} \cap R=\mathfrak{p}_{i} \neq 0$ for any $i$. As $\operatorname{height}_{R^{\prime}, \mathfrak{h}_{i}^{\prime}=1}$ we have $\mathfrak{p}_{i}^{\prime}=\mathfrak{p}_{i} R^{\prime}$ for any $i$. Now let $\mathfrak{a}^{\prime}=\mathfrak{q}_{1}^{\prime} \cap \mathfrak{q}_{2}^{\prime} \cap \cdots \cap \mathfrak{q}_{t}^{\prime}$ be a primary decomposition of $\mathfrak{a}^{\prime}$ in $R^{\prime}$ where each $\mathfrak{q}_{i}^{\prime}$ is a primary ideal belonging to $\mathfrak{p}_{i} R^{\prime}$. Then we have also $\mathfrak{q}_{i}^{\prime} \cap R=\mathfrak{q}_{i} \neq 0$, for any $i$. Now we shall prove $\mathfrak{q}_{i} R^{\prime}=q_{i}^{\prime}$ for any $i$. Since $R_{p_{i}}$ is a weak valuation ring, $R_{p_{i}}[X]$ is a PF domain by (3.3). As we have $\mathfrak{a}^{\prime} R_{\mathfrak{p}_{i}}[X]=q_{i}^{\prime} R_{\mathfrak{p}_{i}}[X]$, and $\mathfrak{a}^{\prime} R_{p_{i}}[X]$ is invertible in $R_{p_{i}}[X], q_{i}^{\prime} R_{p_{i}}[X]$ is principal in $R_{p_{i}}[X]$. From $\mathfrak{q}_{i} \neq 0 \mathfrak{q}_{i}^{\prime} R_{p_{i}}[X]$ has a generator $q_{i}$ in $R_{p_{i}}$. If we put $q_{i}^{*}=q_{i} R_{p_{i}}$, we have $q_{i}^{*} R_{p_{i}}[X]=q_{i}^{\prime} R_{p_{i}}[X]$ and $\varsigma_{i}^{\prime} R_{p_{i}}[X] \cap R_{p_{i}}=q_{i}^{*}$. Therefore $\mathfrak{q}_{i}^{*}$ is a primary ideal belonging to $\mathfrak{p}_{i} R_{\mathfrak{p}_{i}}$. Since $\mathfrak{q}_{i}=\mathfrak{q}_{i}^{*} \cap R$, we have $\mathfrak{q}_{i} R_{p_{i}}=\mathfrak{q}_{i}^{*}$, and so $\mathfrak{q}_{i}$ is also a primary ideal belonging to $\mathfrak{p}_{i}$. As $\mathfrak{q}_{i} R_{p_{i}}[X]$ $=\mathfrak{q}_{i}^{\prime} R_{\mathfrak{p}_{i}}[X]$, we have $\mathfrak{q}_{i} R^{\prime}=\mathfrak{q}_{i}^{\prime}$. From this we easily see $\mathfrak{a}=\mathfrak{q}_{1} \cap \mathfrak{q}_{2} \cap \cdots \cap \mathfrak{q}_{t}$ and $\mathfrak{a}^{\prime}=\mathfrak{a} R^{\prime}$. This proves 1$) \rightarrow 2$ ).

The implication 2) $\rightarrow 1$ ): Suppose that $R$ is not weakly normal. Then, for some prime ideal $\mathfrak{p}$ of height 1 in $R, R_{\mathfrak{p}}$ is not a weak valuation ring. Let $\bar{R}$ be the derived normal ring of $R$, and put $S=R-p$. Then $\bar{R}_{S}$ is the derived normal ring of $R_{p}$. As $R_{p}$ is not a weak valuation ring, $\mathfrak{p} R_{p}$ does not coincide with the Jacobson radical $\overline{\mathfrak{n}}$ of $\bar{R}_{S}$ in the set-theoretical sense. Hence we have a) $\mathfrak{p} \bar{R}_{S} \neq \mathfrak{p} R_{\mathfrak{p}}$ or b) $\mathfrak{p} \bar{R}_{S}=\mathfrak{p} R_{\mathfrak{p}} \neq \overline{\mathfrak{n}}$. It suffices to show that there is an invertible ideal in $R^{\prime}$ which is not extended, in each case a), b).

Case a): There exists an element $\beta$ of $\bar{R}_{S}$ such that $c \beta \notin R_{\mathfrak{p}}$ for some $c \in \mathfrak{p} R_{\mathfrak{p}}$. By multiplying $\beta, c$ by a suitable element of $S$, we may assume $\beta \in \bar{R}$ such that $c \beta \in R_{\mathfrak{p}}$ for some $c \in \mathfrak{p}$. Put $\beta=b / a, a, b \in R$. Then there exist only a finite number of prime divisors $\mathfrak{p}_{1}(=\mathfrak{p}), \mathfrak{p}_{2}, \cdots, \mathfrak{p}_{t}$ of $a R$, each of which is of height 1 in $R$. If we put $U=\bigcap_{i=1}^{t}\left(R-\mathfrak{p}_{i}\right), R_{U}$ is a semi-local integral domain of dimension 1 with maximal ideals $\mathfrak{p}_{1} R_{U}, \mathfrak{p}_{2} R_{U}, \cdots, \mathfrak{p}_{t} R_{U}$, which is not weakly normal. Again, by multiplying $c$ by a suitable element of $\bigcap_{i=2}^{t} p_{i}$ which is not contained in $\mathfrak{p}$, we may assume that $\beta$ is an element of $\bar{R}$ such that $c \beta \notin R_{U}$ for some $c \in \bigcap_{i=1}^{t} \mathfrak{p}_{i}$. If we put $\alpha=c \beta$, then, as in (3.3), $\alpha^{-1}$ is a root of an equation $c f(T)+1=0, f(T) \in R[T]$. Furthermore put $\mathfrak{p}^{\prime}=(b c X$ $-a) R^{\prime}+(c f(X)+1) R^{\prime}$. Let $\mathfrak{m}^{\prime}$ be a maximal ideal of $R^{\prime}$. If we put $q=\mathfrak{m}^{\prime} \cap R$,
$\mathfrak{q}$ is a prime ideal of $R$. If $c \in \mathfrak{q}$, then $c f(X)+1 \notin \mathfrak{m}^{\prime}$, hence we have $\mathfrak{p}^{\prime} R_{\mathfrak{m}^{\prime}}^{\prime}=R_{\mathfrak{m}^{\prime}}^{\prime}$ 。 If $c \notin \mathfrak{q}$, then $\mathfrak{p}_{1}, \mathfrak{p}_{2}, \cdots, \mathfrak{p}_{t} \nsubseteq \mathfrak{q}$, and so $a \notin \mathfrak{q}$, i. e., $a \notin \mathfrak{m}^{\prime}$. Therefore we have $\mathfrak{p}^{\prime} R_{m^{\prime}}^{\prime}=(\alpha X-1) R_{\mathrm{m}}^{\prime}$. This shows that $\mathfrak{p}^{\prime}$ is an invertible prime ideal of $R^{\prime}$. However, $\mathfrak{p}^{\prime} R_{U}[X]$ is not principal in $R_{U}[X]$ as in the proof of Case a) in (3.3). By (4.2), then, $\mathfrak{p}^{\prime} R_{U}[X]$ is not extended in $R_{U}[X]$. Consequently $\mathfrak{p}^{\prime}$ is not extended in $R^{\prime}$. Thus $\mathfrak{p}^{\prime}$ is as required.

Case b): There exists an element $\alpha$ of $\bar{R}_{S}$ such that $\alpha \notin R_{p}$ but $\alpha^{k} \in \mathfrak{p} R_{p}$ for some $k \geqq 2$. As in a) we may assume $\alpha \in \bar{R}$ such that $\alpha \notin R_{p}$ but $\alpha^{k} \in \mathfrak{p} R_{p}$. Put $\alpha=b / a, a, b \in R$. There exist a finite number of prime divisors $\mathfrak{p}_{1}(=\mathfrak{p}), \mathfrak{p}_{2}, \cdots, \mathfrak{p}_{t}$ of $a R$. If we put $U=\bigcap_{i=1}^{t}\left(R-\mathfrak{p}_{i}\right)$, then we may assume also that $\alpha$ is an element of $\bar{R}$ such that $\alpha \in R_{U}$ and $\alpha^{k} \in \bigcap_{i=1}^{t} \mathfrak{p}_{i}$. If we put $c=\alpha^{k}$ and $\mathfrak{p}^{\prime}=(b X-a) R^{\prime}+\left(c X^{k}-1\right) R^{\prime}$, then, as in a), we can show that $\mathfrak{p}^{\prime}$ is as required. This completes our proof.

Corollary 4.4. Let $R$ be a Noetherian integral domain of dimension 1 and $R^{\prime}=R\left[X_{1}, X_{2}, \cdots, X_{n}\right]$ be the polynomial ring with a finite number of variables $X_{1}, X_{2}, \cdots, X_{n}$ over $R$. Then the following conditions are equivalent:

1) $R$ is a weakly normal ring.
2) Any finite projective $R$-module of rank 1 is extended.

Corollary 4.5 (cf. [1]). Let $R$ be a Noetherian normal ring and $R^{\prime}$ $=R\left[X_{1}, X_{2}, \cdots, X_{n}\right]$ be the polynomial ring with a finite number of variables $X_{1}, X_{2}, \cdots, X_{n}$ over $R$. Then any finite projective $R^{\prime}$-module of rank 1 is extended.

Lemma 4.6. Let $R$ be a Noetherian integral domain, whose derived normal ring, $\bar{R}$, is a finite $R$-module. Then there exist only a finite number of prime ideals $\mathfrak{p}_{1}, \mathfrak{p}_{2}, \cdots, \mathfrak{p}_{t}$ of height 1 in $R$ such that $R_{\mathfrak{p}_{i}}$ 's are not discrete valuation rings.

Proof. Let $\mathfrak{a}$ be the conductor of $\bar{R}$ to $R$, i. e., $\mathfrak{a}=\{a ; a \bar{R} \subset R, a \in R\}$. By our assumption a is a non-zero ideal of $R$. There exist only a finite number of prime ideals $\mathfrak{p}_{1}, \mathfrak{p}_{2}, \cdots, \mathfrak{p}_{t}$ of height 1 in $R$ containing $\mathfrak{a}$. If $\mathfrak{p}$ is a prime ideal of height 1 in $R$ which does not coincide with any of $\mathfrak{p}_{i}$ 's, we have $\bar{R} \subset R_{p}$, as $\mathfrak{a} \bar{R} \subset R$. Putting $S=R-p$, we have $R_{p}=\bar{R}_{S}$. This shows that $R_{p}$ is a discrete valuation ring.

Our main result is given in the following:
Theorem 4.7. Let $R$ be a Noetherian integral domain of dimension 1, whose derived normal ring, $\bar{R}$, is a finite $R$-module and let $R^{\prime}=R[X]$ be the polynomial ring with a variable $X$ over $R$. Then the following conditions are equivalent:

1) $R$ is a weakly normal ring.
2) Any finite projective $R^{\prime}$-module is extended.

Proof. The implication 2) $\rightarrow 1$ ) was proved in (4.3). Hence we have only to show the implication 1$) \rightarrow 2$ ). As $R$ is one-dimensional, any prime ideal $\mathfrak{p}(\neq 0)$ of $R$ is of height 1 in $R$. According to (4.6), there exists only a finite number of prime ideals $\mathfrak{p}_{1}, \mathfrak{p}_{2}, \cdots, \mathfrak{p}_{t}$ in $R$ such tnat $R_{p_{i}}$ 's are not discrete valuation rings. Let $\mathfrak{p}$ be a prime ideal of $R$ different from $\mathfrak{p}_{1}, \mathfrak{p}_{2}, \cdots, \mathfrak{p}_{t}$. Then $R_{\mathfrak{p}}$ is a discrete valuation ring and so $\mathfrak{p}$ is invertible in $R$. Now put $S=\bigcap_{i=1}^{t}\left(R-\mathfrak{p}_{i}\right)$. Then, for any element $s$ of $S$, we have $s \notin \mathfrak{p}_{1}, \mathfrak{p}_{2}, \cdots, \mathfrak{p}_{t}$, hence $s R$ is expressible as the product of invertible prime ideals of $R$. Therefore $S$ satisfies the condition in (2.3). Suppose that $R$ is a weakly normal ring. Then $R_{S}$ is also weakly normal. Hence, by (3.3), $R_{S}^{\prime}=R_{S}[X]$ is a PF domain. So, by (2.3), any finite projective $R^{\prime}$-module is expressible as a direct sum of projective $R^{\prime}$-modules of rank 1 . On the other hand, by (4.4), any finite projective $R^{\prime}$-module of rank 1 is extended. Thus our proof is completed.

Corollary 4.8. Let $R$ be a Noetherian PF integral domain of dimension 1, whose derived normal ring, $\bar{R}$, is a finite $R$-module, and let $R^{\prime}=R[X]$ be the polynomial ring with a variable $X$ over $R$. Then the following conditions are equivalent:

1) $R$ is a weakly normal ring.
2) $R^{\prime}$ is a PF domain.
§ 5. Polynomial rings over semi-local integral domains of dimension 1, II.
We begin with
Lemma 5.1. Let $R$ be a unique factorization domain and $R^{\prime}=R\left[X_{1}, X_{2}, \cdots, X_{n}\right]$ be the polynomial ring with a finite number of variables $X_{1}, X_{2}, \cdots, X_{n}$ over $R$. Let $\mathfrak{a}^{\prime}$ be an ideal of $R^{\prime}$ generated by $a_{1} X_{1}+b_{1}, a_{2} X_{2}+b_{2}, \cdots, a_{n} X_{n}+b_{n}$ such that, for any $i, a_{i}, b_{i}$ are relatively prime non-zero elements of $R$. Then there exist relatively prime non-zero elements $a_{i}, b_{i}$ of $R$ and positive integers $l_{2}, \cdots, l_{n}$ such that $a\left(X_{1}+X_{2}^{t_{2}}+\cdots+X_{n}^{L_{n}}\right)+b \in \mathfrak{a}^{\prime}$ and $a \in \bigcap_{i=1}^{n} a_{i} R$.

Proof. This is obvious in case $n=1$. First we suppose $n=2$. If $a_{1}, a_{2}$ are relatively prime, $a_{1} a_{2}$ and $a_{2} b_{1}+a_{1} b_{2}$ are also relatively prime. We have now $a_{1}\left(a_{2} X_{2}+b_{2}\right)+a_{2}\left(a_{1} X_{1}+b_{1}\right)=a_{1} a_{2}\left(X_{1}+X_{2}\right)+a_{2} b_{1}+a_{1} b_{2} \in \mathfrak{a}^{\prime}$. Hence, if we put $a=a_{1} a_{2}, b=a_{1} b_{2}+a_{2} b_{1}$ and $l_{2}=1$, then our conclusion holds. If $a_{1}, a_{2}$ are not relatively prime, then there exist common prime divisors $p_{1}, p_{2}, \cdots, p_{t}$ of $a_{1}, a_{2}$ and we may write $a_{1}=p_{1}^{r_{1}} p_{2}^{r_{2}} \cdots p_{t}^{r} t a_{1}^{\prime}$ and $a_{2}=p_{1}^{s_{1}} p_{2}^{s} \cdots p_{t}^{s t} a_{2}^{\prime}$ for relatively prime elements $a_{1}^{\prime}$, $a_{2}^{\prime}$ of $R$ such that $a_{1}^{\prime}, a_{2}^{\prime} \oplus p_{i} R, 1 \leqq i \leqq t$ and positive integers $r_{i}, s_{i}$. Now, for a suitably large integer $l$, we have $l s_{i}>r_{i}$ for any $i$ and $a_{2}^{l} X_{2}^{l}+b_{2}^{l} \in \mathfrak{a}^{\prime}$. Then we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
& p_{1}^{s_{1}-r_{1}} p_{2}^{s_{2}-r_{2}} \cdots p_{t}^{s_{t}-r_{t}} a_{2}^{\prime}\left(a_{1} X_{1}+b_{1}\right)+a_{1}^{\prime}\left(a_{2}^{l} X_{2}^{l}+b_{2}^{l}\right) \\
= & l_{1}^{s_{1}} p_{2}^{s_{2}} \cdots \cdots p_{t}^{l_{t} t} a_{1}^{\prime} a_{2}^{\prime l}\left(X_{1}+X_{2}^{l}\right)+p_{1}^{s_{1}-r_{1}} p_{2}^{s_{2}^{2}-r_{2}} \cdots p_{t}^{s_{t}-r_{t} t_{2}^{\prime \prime}} b_{1}+a_{1}^{\prime} b_{2}^{l} \in \mathfrak{a}^{\prime} .
\end{aligned}
$$

If we put $a=p_{1}^{l s_{1}} p_{2}^{l s_{2}} \cdots p_{t}^{l s_{t}}$ and $b=p_{1}^{l s_{1}-r_{1}} p_{2}^{l s_{2}-r_{2}} \cdots p_{t}^{l s_{t}-r_{t}} a_{2}^{l} b_{1}+a_{1}^{\prime} b_{2}^{l}$, then $a, b$ are relatively prime non-zero elements of $R$. Accordingly, for $a, b, l_{2}=l$, our conclusion holds.

In general case, we use the induction on $n$. Suppose that the conclusion holds for $n=k(\geqq 2)$. Let $\mathfrak{a}_{k+1}^{\prime}$ be an ideal of $R\left[X_{1}, X_{2}, \cdots, X_{k}, X_{k+1}\right]$ generated by $a_{1} X_{1}+b_{1}, a_{2} X_{2}+b_{2}, \cdots, a_{k} X_{k}+b_{k}, a_{k+1} X_{k+1}+b_{k+1}$ such that for any $i, a_{i}, b_{i}$, are relatively prime non-zero elements of $R$. If we put $\mathfrak{a}_{k}^{\prime}=\left(a_{1} X_{1}+b_{1}\right) R\left[X_{1}, X_{2}\right.$, $\left.\cdots, X_{k}\right]+\cdots+\left(a_{k} X_{k}+b_{k}\right) R\left[X_{1}, X_{2}, \cdots, X_{k}\right]$, then $\mathfrak{a}_{k}^{\prime}$ is also an ideal of $R\left[X_{1}, X_{2}\right.$, $\left.\cdots, X_{k}\right]$ satisfying the condition in our lemma for $n=k$. By the assumption of induction, there is an element $a^{\prime}\left(X_{1}+X_{2}^{l_{2}^{2}}+\cdots+X_{k}^{l_{k}}\right)+b^{\prime}$ in $\mathfrak{a}_{k}^{\prime}$ such that $a^{\prime} \in \bigcap_{i=1}^{k} a_{i} R$ and $a^{\prime} R+b^{\prime} R=R, a^{\prime}, b^{\prime} \neq 0$. As $\mathfrak{a}_{k}^{\prime} \subset \mathfrak{a}_{k+1}^{\prime}, a^{\prime}\left(X_{1}+X_{2}^{l_{2}}+\cdots+X_{k}^{l} k\right)+b^{\prime}$ $\in \mathfrak{a}_{k+1}^{\prime}$. Put $Y=X_{1}+X_{2}^{l_{2}}+\cdots+X_{k}^{l_{k}}$ and let $a^{\prime \prime}$ be an ideal of $R\left[Y, X_{k+1}\right]$ generated by $a^{\prime} Y+b^{\prime}, a_{k+1} X_{k+1}+b_{k+1}$. If we apply the proof for $n=2$ to $a^{\prime} Y+b^{\prime}, a_{k+1} X_{k+1}+b_{k+1}$, we can find relatively prime elements $a$, $b$ of $R$ such that $a\left(Y+X_{k+1}^{t_{k+1}}\right)+b \in \mathfrak{a}^{\prime \prime}$ and $a \in a^{\prime} R \cap a_{k+1} R$. As $\mathfrak{a}^{\prime \prime} \subset \mathfrak{a}_{k+1}^{\prime}$, we have $a\left(Y+X_{k+1}^{l_{k+1}}\right)+b=a\left(X_{1}+X_{2}^{l_{2}}+\cdots+X_{k+1}^{l_{k+1}}\right)+b \in \mathfrak{a}_{k+1}^{\prime}$. Obviously we also have $a \in \bigcap_{i=1}^{k+1} a_{i} R$. This shows that our conclusion holds for $n=k+1$. Thus our proof is completed.

Proposition 5.2. Let $R$ be a semi-local integral domain of dimension 1 and $R^{\prime}=R\left[X_{1}, X_{2}, \cdots, X_{n}\right]$ be the polynomial ring with a finite number of variables $X_{1}, X_{2}, \cdots, X_{n}$ over $R$. Then any maximal ideal $\mathfrak{m}^{\prime}$ of height $n$ in $R^{\prime}$ contains a prime ideal $\mathfrak{p}^{\prime}$ of height 1 in $R^{\prime}$ such that $R^{\prime} / \mathfrak{p}^{\prime}$ is isomorphic to the polynomial ring with $n-1$ variables over a field.

Proof. If $n=1$, this is trivial. Hence we may suppose $n \geqq 2$. As $\mathfrak{m}^{\prime}$ has height $n$ in $R^{\prime}$, at least one of $X_{i}^{\prime}$ 's is not contained in $\mathfrak{m}^{\prime}$. Suppose that $X_{i_{1}}, X_{i_{2}}, \cdots, X_{i_{k}} \notin \mathfrak{m}^{\prime}$ and $X_{j_{1}}, X_{j_{2}}, \cdots, X_{j_{n-k}} \in \mathfrak{m}^{\prime}$, for some $k \geqq 1$. Then we have $\mathfrak{m}^{\prime}=\mathfrak{m}^{\prime \prime} R^{\prime}+X_{j_{1}} R^{\prime}+X_{j_{2}} R^{\prime}+\cdots+X_{j_{n-k}} R^{\prime}$ for a maximal ideal $\mathfrak{m}^{\prime \prime}$ of height $k$ in $R\left[X_{i_{1}}, X_{i_{2}}, \cdots, X_{i_{k}}\right]$.

If we use $\mathfrak{m}^{\prime \prime}$ instead of $\mathfrak{m}^{\prime}$, we may assume $X_{1}, X_{2}, \cdots, X_{n} \notin \mathfrak{m}^{\prime}$. If we put $\mathfrak{p}_{i}=\mathfrak{m}^{\prime} \cap R\left[X_{i}\right]$ for any $i$, then $\mathfrak{p}_{i}$ is a prime ideal of height 1 in $R\left[X_{i}\right]$ and we have $\mathfrak{p}_{i} \cap R=0$. If at least one $\mathfrak{p}_{i_{0}}$ of $\mathfrak{p}_{i}$ 's is maximal in $R\left[X_{i_{0}}\right]$, then we have $R^{\prime} / p_{i_{0}} R^{\prime}=\left(R\left[X_{i_{0}}\right] / p_{i_{0}}\right)\left[X_{1}, X_{2}, \cdots, X_{i_{0}-1}, X_{i_{0}+1}, \cdots, X_{n}\right]$, and therefore our assertion is true. Hence we assume that any $\mathfrak{p}_{i}$ is not maximal in $R\left[X_{i}\right]$. Let $K$ be the quotient field of $R$. Then $\mathfrak{p}_{i} K\left[X_{i}\right]$ is a prime ideal of $K\left[X_{i}\right]$, and so it is generated by an irreducible polynomial $f_{i}\left(X_{i}\right)$ in $K\left[X_{i}\right]$. As is easily seen, we can suppose $f_{i}\left(X_{i}\right) \in \mathfrak{p}_{i}$. Let $\alpha_{1}^{(i)}, \alpha_{2}^{(i)}, \cdots, \alpha_{t_{i}}^{(i)}$ be all the roots of the algebraic equation $f_{i}(T)=0$ over $K$ for any $i$, and put $\bar{K}=K\left[\alpha_{1}^{(1)}, \alpha_{2}^{(1)}\right.$, $\left.\cdots, \alpha_{t_{1}}^{(1)}, \alpha_{1}^{(2)}, \cdots, \alpha_{1}^{(n)}, \cdots, \alpha_{t_{n}}^{(n)}\right]$. Let $\bar{R}$ be the integral closure of $R$ in $\bar{K}$. Then, by (1.4), $\bar{R}$ is a semi-local principal ideal domain. If we put $\bar{R}^{\prime}=\bar{R}\left[X_{1}, X_{2}\right.$,
$\left.\cdots, X_{n}\right]$, then $\bar{R}^{\prime}$ is a unique factorization domain integral over $R^{\prime}$. There exists a maximal ideal $\overline{\mathfrak{m}}^{\prime}$ of $\bar{R}^{\prime}$ such that $\mathfrak{m}^{\prime}=\overline{\mathfrak{m}}^{\prime} \cap R^{\prime}$ by (1.3). Similarly, by (1.3), we have height $\bar{R}^{\prime} \bar{m}^{\prime}=n$. Since any $f_{i}\left(X_{i}\right)$ is expressible as the product of linear polynomials in $\bar{R}\left[X_{i}\right]$, and any $X_{i}$ is not contained in $\overline{\mathfrak{m}}^{\prime}$, we have

$$
\overline{\mathfrak{m}}^{\prime}=\left(\bar{a}_{1} X_{1}+\bar{b}_{1}\right) \bar{R}^{\prime}+\left(\bar{a}_{2} X_{2}+\bar{b}_{2}\right) \bar{R}^{\prime}+\cdots+\left(\bar{a}_{n} X_{n}+\bar{b}_{n}\right) \bar{R}^{\prime}
$$

for non-zero relatively prime elements $\bar{a}_{i}, \bar{b}_{i}$ of $\bar{R}$ for any $i$. Then, by (5.1), there is an element $\bar{a}\left(X_{1}+X_{2}^{l_{2}}+\cdots+X_{n}^{l_{n}}\right)+\bar{b}$ in $\overline{\mathfrak{m}}^{\prime}$ such that $\bar{a} \bar{R}+\bar{b} \bar{R}=\bar{R}$ and $\bar{a} \in \bigcap_{i=1}^{n} \bar{a}_{i} \bar{R}$. As $\bar{m}^{\prime}$ is maximal in $\bar{R}^{\prime}$, it is easily seen that $\prod_{i=1}^{n} \bar{a}_{i}$ is contained in the Jacobson radical $\overline{\mathfrak{n}}$ of $\bar{R}$. Hence $\bar{a}$ is also contained in $\overline{\mathfrak{n}}$. Since $\bar{a} \bar{R}+\bar{b} \bar{R}=\bar{R}, \bar{b}$ must be a unit of $\bar{R}$, and so we may suppose $\bar{b}=1$. If we put $U=X_{1}+X_{2}^{l_{2}}+\cdots+X_{n}^{L_{n}}$, then we have $R^{\prime}=R\left[U, X_{2}, \cdots, X_{n}\right]$ and $\bar{R}^{\prime}=\bar{R}\left[U, X_{2}\right.$, $\left.\cdots, X_{n}\right]$. Also we have $\overline{\mathfrak{m}}^{\prime} \cap \bar{R}[U]=(\bar{a} U+1) \bar{R}[U]$. As $\bar{a} \in \bar{n},(\bar{a} U+1) \bar{R}[U]$ is a maximal ideal of height 1 in $\bar{R}[U]$. If we put $\mathfrak{p}_{U}=(\bar{a} U+1) \bar{R}[U] \cap R[U]$, then $\mathfrak{p}_{U}$ is a prime ideal of height 1 in $R[U]$. Since $\bar{R}[U]$ is integral over $R[U], \mathfrak{p}_{U}$ is also maximal in $R[U]$ by (1.3). If we put $\mathfrak{p}^{\prime}=\mathfrak{p}_{U} R^{\prime}$, then we have

$$
R^{\prime} / \mathfrak{p}^{\prime} \cong\left(R[U] / \mathfrak{p}_{U}\right)\left[X_{2}, X_{3}, \cdots, X_{n}\right]
$$

Obviously we have $\mathfrak{p}^{\prime} \subset \mathfrak{m}^{\prime}$. This completes our proof.
Corollary 5.3. Let $R$ be a semi-local principal ideal domain and $R^{\prime}$ $=R\left[X_{1}, X_{2}, \cdots, X_{n}\right]$ be the polynomial ring with a finite number of variables $X_{1}, X_{2}, \cdots, X_{n}$ over $R$. Then any maximal ideal $\mathfrak{m}^{\prime}$ of $R^{\prime}$ is generated by elements in numbers equal to its height.

Now we give
Theorem 5.4. Let $R$ be a semi-local integral domain of dimension 1 and let $R^{\prime}=R[X, Y]$ be the polynomial ring with two variables $X, Y$ over $R$. Then the following conditions are equivalent:

1) $R$ is a weakly normal ring.
2) $R^{\prime}$ is a PF domain.

Proof. As the implication 2 ) $\rightarrow 1$ ) was proved in (3.2), we have only to show the implication 1$) \rightarrow 2$ ). Suppose that $R$ is weakly normal. Let $\mathfrak{m}^{\prime}$ be a maximal ideal of height 2 in $R^{\prime}$. Then, by (5.2), there exists a prime ideal $\mathfrak{p}^{\prime}$ of height 1 in $R^{\prime}$ contained in $\mathfrak{m}^{\prime}$ such that $R^{\prime} / \mathfrak{p}^{\prime}$ is isomorphic to the polynomial ring with a variable over a field, i. e., to a Euclidean ring. If we denote by $\mathfrak{n}$ the Jacobson radical of $R$, we see easily $\mathfrak{p}^{\prime}+\mathfrak{n} R^{\prime}=R^{\prime}$. Hence, by (3.1), $\mathfrak{p}^{\prime}$ is principal in $R^{\prime}$ and so we can put $\mathfrak{p}^{\prime}=p^{\prime} R^{\prime}$ for a prime element $p^{\prime}$ of $R^{\prime}$. Let $S^{\prime}$ be the multiplicative system of $R^{\prime}$ generated by all prime elements $\left\{p_{i}^{\prime}\right\}$ in $R^{\prime}$ such that any $R^{\prime} / p_{i}^{\prime} R^{\prime}$ is Euclidean. If a maximal ideal $\mathfrak{m}^{\prime}$ of $R^{\prime}$ has height 2 in $R^{\prime}$, then we have $\mathfrak{m}^{\prime} \cap S^{\prime} \neq \phi$ by the preceding argu-
ment, and if $\mathfrak{m}^{\prime}$ has height 3 in $R^{\prime}$, then we have $\mathfrak{m}^{\prime} \cap S^{\prime}=\phi$, as is easily seen. If we put $R^{\prime \prime}=R_{S^{\prime}}^{\prime}$, there is no maximal ideal of height 2 in $R^{\prime \prime}$. Let $\mathfrak{m}^{\prime \prime}$ be a maximal ideal of height 1 in $R^{\prime \prime}$. If we put $\mathfrak{p}^{\prime}=\mathfrak{m}^{\prime \prime} \cap R^{\prime}$, then $\mathfrak{p}^{\prime}$ is a prime ideal of height 1 in $R^{\prime}$ such that $\mathfrak{p}^{\prime}+\mathfrak{n} R^{\prime}=R^{\prime}$. Again, by (3.1), $\mathfrak{p}^{\prime}$ is principal in $R^{\prime}$. As $\mathfrak{m}^{\prime \prime}=\mathfrak{p}^{\prime} R^{\prime \prime}, \mathfrak{m}^{\prime \prime}$ is also principal in $R^{\prime \prime}$. Let $S^{\prime \prime}$ be the multiplicative system of $R^{\prime \prime}$ generated by all prime elements $\left\{p_{i}^{\prime \prime}\right\}$ in $R^{\prime \prime}$ such that any $R^{\prime \prime} / p_{i}^{\prime \prime} R^{\prime \prime}$ is a field. Then, for a maximal ideal $\mathfrak{m}^{\prime \prime}$ of height 1 in $R^{\prime \prime}$, we have $\mathrm{m}^{\prime \prime} \cap S^{\prime \prime} \neq \phi$ by the preceding argument, and while, for a maximal ideal $\mathfrak{m}^{\prime \prime}$ of height 3 in $R^{\prime \prime}$, we have $\mathfrak{m}^{\prime \prime} \cap S^{\prime \prime}=\phi$. If we put $R^{*}=R_{S^{\prime \prime}}^{\prime \prime}$, then any maximal ideal $\mathfrak{m}^{*}$ of $R^{*}$ has height 3 in $R^{*}$ and is generated by a maximal ideal $\mathfrak{m}^{\prime}$ of height 3 in $R^{\prime}$. So we have $\mathfrak{m}^{*} \supset \mathfrak{n} R^{*}$. This shows that $\mathfrak{n} R^{*}$ is contained in the Jacobson radical of $R^{*}$. According to (2.2), if $R^{*}$ is a PF domain, then $R^{\prime \prime}$ is so and if $R^{\prime \prime}$ is a PF domain, then $R^{\prime}$ is so. Furthermore, if any finite projective $R^{*} / \mathrm{n} R^{*}$-module is quasi-free, then, by (2.5), $R^{*}$ is a PF domain. Therefore it suffices to prove that $R^{*} / \mathfrak{n} R^{*}$ is a direct sum of PF domains. In fact, if we denote by $\mathfrak{m}_{1}, \mathfrak{m}_{2}, \cdots, \mathfrak{m}_{t}$ all maximal ideals of $R$, we have

$$
R^{*} / \mathfrak{n} R^{*} \cong(R / \mathfrak{n})[X, Y] \cong\left(R / \mathfrak{m}_{1}\right)[X, Y] \oplus \cdots \oplus\left(R / \mathfrak{m}_{t}\right)[X, Y] .
$$

As any $R / \mathfrak{m}_{i}$ is a field, any $\left(R / \mathfrak{m}_{i}\right)[X]$ is a principal ideal domain. Then, by (4.8), any $\left(R / \mathfrak{m}_{i}\right)[X, Y]$ is a PF domain. This completes our proof.
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