

## Some remarks on Euclid rings

By

Masayoshi NAGATA

(Received March 30, 1984)

In the present note, we show that the notion of a Euclid ring may be defined as below, and then it is quite easy to prove that the direct sum of a finite number of Euclid rings is again a Euclid ring.

**Definition 1.** A commutative ring  $R$  with identity is called a Euclid ring if there is a mapping  $\varphi$  of  $R - \{0\}$  into some ordered set  $M$  with minimum condition satisfying the condition:

If  $a, b \in R$  and if  $a \neq 0$ , then there are  $q, r \in R$  such that  $b = aq + r$  with either  $r = 0$  or  $\varphi r < \varphi a$ .

In the circumstances, we say that  $(R, M, \varphi)$  is a Euclid ring.

**Definition 2.**  $r$  as above is called a right residue at the division of  $b$  by  $a$ ; for the case where  $a = 0$ , we say  $b$  is the right residue at the division of  $b$  by  $0$ .

We show in this note also that if  $R$  is a Euclid ring, then we can choose a well-ordered set  $W$  and a mapping  $\psi$  of  $R - \{0\}$  into  $W$  so that  $(R, W, \psi)$  is a Euclid ring in the sense of Nagata [1]. This means that, by defining  $\psi(0)$  to be smaller than any element of  $W$ , our Euclid ring becomes a Euclid ring in the sense of Samuel [2].

**Proposition 1.** *If  $(R, M, \varphi)$  is Euclid ring, then  $R$  is a principal ideal ring.*

*Proof.* Let  $I$  be a non-zero ideal in  $R$ . Take a minimal element  $\varphi a (a \in I)$  among  $\{\varphi x \mid x \in I, x \neq 0\}$ . For an arbitrary  $b$  in  $I$ , let  $r$  be a right residue at the division of  $b$  by  $a$ . By the minimality of  $\varphi a$ , we have  $r = a$ . This means that  $b$  is divisible by  $a$ . Thus  $I = aR$ . Q. E. D.

Assume now that  $(R, M, \varphi)$  and  $(S, N, \psi)$  are Euclid rings. Let  $M' = M \cup \{t\}$ ,  $N' = N \cup \{u\}$  with  $t$  and  $u$  bigger than any element of  $M$  and  $N$ , respectively. We extend  $\varphi$  and  $\psi$  so that  $\varphi 0 = t$  and  $\psi 0 = u$ . Let  $M' \times N'$  be an ordered set by defining that  $(m', n') \geq (m, n)$  if and only if  $m' \geq m$  and  $n' \geq n$ . Then  $M' \times N'$  satisfies the minimum condition. A mapping  $(\varphi, \psi)$  of the direct sum  $R + S$  into  $M' \times N'$  is naturally defined by  $(a, b) \rightarrow (\varphi a, \psi b)$ . Then we have

**Theorem 2.** *The direct sum  $(R + S, M' \times N', (\varphi, \psi))$  is a Euclid ring.*

*Proof.* Let  $(a, b)$  and  $(c, d)$  be elements of  $R+S$  with  $(a, b) \neq (0, 0)$ . Let  $r, s$  be right residues at the division of  $c, d$  by  $a, b$ , respectively. Then we have one of the following cases:

- |                                    |  |
|------------------------------------|--|
| (1) $(r, s) = (a, b)$              | (2) $r = a, \phi s < \phi b$                 |
| (3) $\varphi r < \varphi a, s = c$ | (4) $\varphi r < \varphi a, \phi s < \phi b$ |
| (5) $a = 0, b \neq 0, r = c$       | (6) $a \neq 0, b = 0, s = d$                 |

It is obvious that the cases (1)-(4) are good. As for the case (5), if  $c \neq 0$ , then  $\varphi c < \varphi 0$  (by definition) and  $\phi s \leq \phi b$ , and this is a good case. If  $c = 0$ , then either  $s = b$  or  $\phi s < \phi b$ , and this is also a good case. The case (6) is similar.

Q. E. D.

**Theorem 3.** *If  $R$  is a Euclid ring, then there is a mapping  $\rho$  of  $R - \{0\}$  into a suitable well-ordered set  $W$  so that  $(R, W, \rho)$  is a Euclid ring.*

For the proof of this, it suffices to prove the following:

**Proposition 4.** *If  $M$  is an ordered set with minimum condition, then there is a mapping  $f$  of  $M$  into a suitable well-ordered set  $W$  so that if  $a, b \in M$  and if  $a > b$ , then  $fa > fb$ .*

*Proof.* Take a well-ordered set  $W$  which is big enough (if we need later, we are allowed to enlarge  $W$  by adding new elements which are bigger than any element of the original  $W$ ). We define  $f$  inductively. Namely, consider an element  $w$  of  $W$ , and assume that for all  $y < w$ ,  $f^{-1}(y)$  are defined. Let  $M_w$  be the complement of  $T_w = \bigcup_{y < w} f^{-1}(y)$  with respect to  $M$ . Then we define  $f^{-1}(w)$  to be the set of minimal elements in  $M_w$ . Thus we defined  $f$  on the union of all of  $f^{-1}(w)$ . If the union is not  $M$ , then we can go on further, because of the minimum condition. Therefore  $f$  is a mapping of  $M$  into  $W$ . If  $a > b$  ( $a, b \in M$ ), and if  $fb = w$ , then  $a$  is in  $M_y$  for  $y \leq w$  ( $y \in W$ ) because  $a > b \in M_y$  and  $a$  is not a minimal element in any such  $M_y$ . Therefore, we have  $fa > fb$ .

Q. E. D.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS  
KYOTO UNIVERSITY

### References

- [1] M. Nagata, On Euclid algorithm, C.P. Ramanujam A Tribute, Stud. Math. 8, Tata Inst. Fund. Res., (1978), 175-186.
- [2] P. Samuel, About Euclidean rings, J. of Alg., 19 (1971), 282-301.