

ON THE EXTENSION OF DERIVATIONS TO SOME CLOSURES

SILVIA MOLINELLI AND GRAZIA TAMONE

Introduction. Let A be a noetherian ring with integral closure \bar{A} in its total quotient ring $k(A)$. When A is an integral domain, it is well known that any differentiation $\underline{D} = (1, D_1, \dots, D_i, \dots)$ of A extends to \bar{A} [3, Section 2], but, generally, \underline{D} doesn't extend to a ring lying between A and \bar{A} (see [4 ex. 1.1 or ex. 2.6]). Now let $A \subset B$ be noetherian integral domains. In Section 1, we consider some *closures* of A in B with respect to a given property. We prove that a differentiation \underline{D} of A which extends to B also extends to the *u-closure* and to the *F-closure* of A in B ; moreover, \underline{D} extends to the *t-closure* of A in B whenever B is finite as an A -module. As regards *(n-root)-closure*, we show \underline{D} can be extended under particular assumptions but not as a general rule (Section 1, Remark 1.9); we note that the *(2,3)-closure* has been already studied in [5].

The above problem can be considered from another point of view. If A is any noetherian ring, each ring between A and \bar{A} can be seen as a suitable *closure* of A in $k(A)$ called Δ -*closure* and denoted with A^Δ (where Δ is a set of ideals of A , according to [7]). Since generally neither a differentiation of A nor an integrable derivation extends to A^Δ , we wonder when a derivation of A can be extended to A^Δ (Section 2). For any A^Δ , we give a sufficient (but not necessary) condition in order that a derivation D of A can be extended to A^Δ (Proposition 2.5), whereas, under suitable assumptions, we show that the extension of D to A^Δ can be characterized by certain properties of the conductor β of A in A^Δ . In particular, we prove the following. If A has (S_1) -property, D extends to \bar{A} if and only if β is D -differential (Corollary 2.8).

Finally, in Section 3 we consider some classes of Δ -closures A^Δ and of derivations D of A satisfying the sufficient condition of Proposition 2.5, so that $D(A^\Delta) \subset A^\Delta$.

Received by the editors on August 7, 1990.

Copyright ©1992 Rocky Mountain Mathematics Consortium

In this paper, all rings are assumed to be commutative with a unit element.

Section 1. Let A, B be noetherian rings such that $A \subset B$. The ring A is called **-closed in B* if each $b \in B$ satisfying a property $(*; A)$ belongs to A . The smallest subring of B containing A that is **-closed* is called the **-closure* of A in B ; we shall denote it generically with ${}^*{}_B A$.

In this section we are concerned with the following question: if \underline{D} (respectively, D) is a differentiation (respectively, an integrable derivation) of A which extends to B , then does \underline{D} (respectively, D) extend to ${}^*{}_B A$? In particular, **-closure* will mean, respectively, *t-closure*, *u-closure*, *F-closure* and *(n-root)-closure* (as regards (2,3)-*closure*, see [5]).

First, we recall the basic definitions; generally, they concern integral domains, so that in this section we shall consider noetherian integral domains.

Definition 1.1. Let A, B be noetherian integral domains such that $A \subset B$. If $b \in B$, then:

- 1) b satisfies $(u; A)$ if: $b^2 - b \in A, b^3 - b^2 \in A$;
- 2) b satisfies $(t; A)$ if: $b^2 - rb \in A, b^3 - rb^2 \in A$ for some $r \in A$;
- 3) b satisfies $(F; A)$ if: $b^2, b^3, nb \in A$ for some positive integer n ;
- 4) b satisfies $(n\text{-root}; A)$ if: $b^n \in A$ for some positive integer n .

(See, e.g., [9, 10]). If $*$ means one of the properties 1) through 4), we denote ${}^*{}_B A$ respectively with: ${}^u{}_B A, {}^t{}_B A, {}^F{}_B A, {}^{n\text{-root}}{}_B A$.

Remark 1.2. a) Each property $(*; A)$ in Definition 1.1 is expressed by conditions like $P_i^*(b) \in A$, where, for each i , $P_i^*(b)$ belongs to $A[b]$.

b) If b satisfies one of the properties 1) through 4) of Definition 1.1, then b is integral over A .

c) If $*$ is one of the properties 1) through 4) of Definition 1.1 and b satisfies $(*; A)$, then b satisfies also $(*; C)$ for each ring C such that $A \subset C \subset B$.

Proposition 1.3. *Let A, B be as in Definition 1.1. For each $b \in {}^*B A$, one has $b \in A[x_1, \dots, x_k] \subset B$, where x_j satisfies $(*; A[x_1, \dots, x_{j-1}])$ for $j = 1, \dots, k$.*

Proof. We call $*$ -finite extension of A in B a ring like $A_k = A[x_1, \dots, x_k] \subset B$ where x_j satisfies $(*; A[x_1, \dots, x_{j-1}])$ for $j = 1, \dots, k$. Then put $X = \{A_k | A_k \text{ is } * \text{-finite extension of } A \text{ in } B\}$ and

$$(1) \quad C = \bigcup_k A_k, \text{ where } A_k \in X.$$

First we note the union (1) is filtered, according to Remark 1.2c). Then we prove ${}^*B A = C$. It is obvious that $C \subset {}^*B A$; so, let us prove the opposite inclusion. If ${}^*B A \not\subset C$, then $C \neq {}^*B C$ (otherwise, $C = {}^*B C \supset {}^*B A$, since $A \subset C \subset B$), so that we can find $b \in B \setminus C$ such that b satisfies $(*; C)$. Then, according to Remark 1.2a), there are some polynomials $P_i^*(b)$ in $C[b]$ such that $P_i^*(b) \in C$. Therefore, since the union (1) is filtered, and according to the definition of C , one can find a suitable $A_k \in X$ such that, for each i , $P_i^*(b)$ and its coefficients belong to A_k . The above statement implies b satisfies $(*; A_k)$, then $A_k[b]$ is a $*$ -finite extension of A in B , i.e., $A_k[b] = A_h$ for some $A_h \in X$. So, $b \in C$, a contradiction. Then ${}^*B A = C$. \square

In many cases, the $*$ -closures with respect to the properties $*$ considered in Definition 1.1 are stable under passage to formal series, as we recall.

Proposition 1.4. *Let A, B be noetherian integral domains such that $A \subset B$. Then:*

- 1) *If A is u -closed in B , so is $A[[X]]$ in $B[[X]]$.*
- 2) *If A is t -closed in B and B is finite as an A -module, then $A[[X]]$ is t -closed in $B[[X]]$.*
- 3) *If A is F -closed in B , so is $A[[X]]$ in $B[[X]]$.*

4) If $\text{char}(A) = p$ and A is $(p\text{-root})$ -closed in B , then $A[[X]]$ is $(p\text{-root})$ -closed in $B[[X]]$.

Proof. 1) See [6, n. 4, Proposition 7].

2) See [6, n. 4., Proposition 8, (8.2)].

3) Let us suppose $A = {}^F_B A$, and let $f(X) = \sum a_i X^i \in B[[X]]$ be such that $f(X)$ satisfies $(F; A[[X]])$. One immediately has $a_0 \in A$; so, in order to prove $f(X) \in A[[X]]$, it is enough to show that $(f(X) - a_0)^2$, $(f(X) - a_0)^3$, $n(f(X) - a_0)$ belong to $A[[X]]$ for some positive integer n (for, then we replace $f(X)$ by $f(X) - a_0 = X(a_1 + a_2 X + \dots)$ and iterate the procedure with respect to $a_1 + a_2 X + \dots$). Now, expanding out, and according to the assumptions over A , it is enough to show that $a_0 f(X) \in A[[X]]$, i.e., $a_0 a_i \in A$ for each $i \geq 0$. It can be shown as in [1, Theorem (1), page 283].

4) Let us suppose that $A = {}^{p\text{-root}}_B A$, and let $f(X) = \sum a_i X^i \in B[[X]]$ be such that $[f(X)]^p \in A[[X]]$. Since $\text{char}(A) = p$, one has $[f(X)]^p = \sum a_i^p X^{ip}$, so that $a_i^p \in A$ for each i ; then $a_i \in A$, according to the assumptions on A . \square

Now let $\underline{D} = (1, D_1, \dots, D_i, \dots)$ be a differentiation (of Hasse-Schmidt) of A , i.e., a sequence of additive endomorphisms $D_i : A \rightarrow A$ such that $D_n(ab) = \sum_{i+j=n} (D_i(a) \cdot D_j(b))$ (where $i+j=n$) for all $a, b \in A$ (so that D_1 is a derivation of A). A derivation D of A is called *integrable* if there exists a differentiation $\underline{D} = (1, D_1, \dots, D_i, \dots)$ of A such that $D_1 = D$. We denote with $HS(A)$ the group of the differentiations of A , and with $\text{Der}(A)$ (respectively with $\text{IDer}(A)$) the A -module of all the derivations of A (respectively of the integrable derivations of A).

It is known that, if A is a ring, to each $\underline{D} = (1, D_1, \dots, D_i, \dots) \in HS(A)$ one can associate a ring homomorphism $E : A \rightarrow A[[X]]$ defined by $E(a) = \sum D_i(a) X^i$ for each $a \in A$ (see [3, Section 1]). Then, according to Proposition 1.4, we wonder when a $\underline{D} \in HS(A)$, such that \underline{D} extends to B , can extend to ${}^*B A$. We can prove:

Theorem 1.5. *Let A, B be as in Proposition 1.4, and let $\underline{D} = (1, D_1, \dots, D_i, \dots)$ in $HS(A)$ be such that \underline{D} extends to B . Then:*

- 1) \underline{D} extends to ${}^u_B A$.
- 2) If B is finite as an A -module, then \underline{D} extends to ${}^t_B A$.
- 3) \underline{D} extends to ${}^F_B A$.
- 4) If $\text{char}(A) = p$, \underline{D} extends to ${}^{p\text{-root}}_B A$.

Proof. Let $E : A \rightarrow A[[X]]$ be the ring homomorphism associated to \underline{D} ; let us denote with E also the ring homomorphism of B in $B[[X]]$ associated to the extension of \underline{D} to B . So, for each closure ${}^*_B A$ considered in 1) through 4), we have to prove: $E({}^*_B A) \subset ({}^*_B A)[[X]]$. Now, according to Proposition 1.3, it is enough to show that $E(A[x_1, \dots, x_k]) \subset ({}^*_B A)[[X]]$ for each $A[x_1, \dots, x_k]$ contained in B such that x_j satisfies $(*; A[x_1, \dots, x_{j-1}])$ for $j = 1, \dots, k$; then we have to prove that $E(x_j) \in ({}^*_B A)[[X]]$ for each x_j as above, $1 \leq j \leq k$. We show it by induction on k . Since x_1 satisfies $(*; A)$, there is a finite set of polynomials $\{P_i^*(x_1)\}$ such that, for each i , $P_i^*(x_1) \in A[x_1]$, say $P_i^*(x_1) = \sum_h (a_{ih} x_1^h)$ (see Definition 1.1 and Remark 1.2a)). Then, for each i , in $B[[X]]$, one has $E(P_i^*(x_1)) = \sum_h E(a_{ih})[E(x_1)]^h$, so that $E(x_1)$ satisfies $(*; A[[X]])$, i.e., $E(x_1) \in {}^*_{B[[X]]} A[[X]]$. Then $E(x_1) \in ({}^*_B A)[[X]]$, according to Proposition 1.4. Now let us suppose that $E(x_1), \dots, E(x_{j-1}) \in ({}^*_B A)[[X]]$. The same argument as before shows that $E(x_j)$ satisfies $(*; ({}^*_B A)[[X]])$, so $E(x_j) \in ({}^*_B A)[[X]]$, according to Proposition 1.4. \square

Corollary 1.6. *Let A be a noetherian integral domain, \bar{A} its integral closure, *A be the $*$ -closure of A in \bar{A} , $\underline{D} \in HS(A)$. Then:*

- a) \underline{D} extends to ${}^u A, {}^F A$,
- b) if \bar{A} is finite as an A -module, \underline{D} extends to ${}^t A$,
- c) if $\text{char}(A) = p$, \underline{D} extends to ${}^{p\text{-root}} A$.

Proof. Since \underline{D} extends to \bar{A} (see [3, Theorem 3]), it follows immediately from Theorem 1.5. \square

Corollary 1.7. *The results of Theorem 1.5 and Corollary 1.6 hold by considering $D \in \text{IDer}(A)$ instead of $\underline{D} \in HS(A)$.*

Corollary 1.8. *Let R be an integral domain such that $\text{char}(R) = 0$, $k(R)$ be the quotient field of R , and $A = R[[X]]$, $B = (k(R))[[X]]$. If \underline{D} is the differentiation of $HS(B)$ defined by $\underline{D} = (1, D = \partial/\partial X, \dots, D_i = D^{(i)}/i!, \dots)$, then:*

- a) $\underline{D} \in HS(A)$
- b) \underline{D} extends to ${}^u_B A, {}^F_B A$.

Proof. a) We have $D_j(x^i) = 0$ if $i < j$, and, if $i \geq j$, $D_j(X^i) = \binom{i}{j} X^{i-j} \in A$. Then $D_j(A) \subset A$.

- b) It follows immediately from a) and Theorem 1.5, 1, 3). \square

Remark 1.9. If A, B, D are as in Theorem 1.5, generally \underline{D} doesn't extend to ${}^{n\text{-root}}_B A$, as the following example shows. Let $A = \mathbf{Z}[[X]]$, $B = \mathbf{Q}[[X]]$, $\underline{D} = (1, D = \partial/\partial X, \dots, D_i = D^{(i)}/i!, \dots) \in HS(A) \cap HS(B)$ (Corollary 1.8 a)). Let $f(X) = 1 + (1/2)X - (1/8)X^2 + (1/16)X^3 - (5/128)X^4 + \dots \in B$, considered in [10, Example 1]. As proved in [10], one has $[f(X)]^2 \in \mathbf{Z}[[X]] = A$, so that $f(X) \in {}^{2\text{-root}}_B A$. On the other hand, $D(f(X)) = (1/2) - (1/4)X + (3/16)X^2 + \dots$, so $[D(f(X))]^2 = (1/4) - (1/4)X + \dots$. Then, $D(f(X)) \notin {}^{2\text{-root}}_B A$. In fact, according to Proposition 1.3, a series $g(X) = \sum g_i X^i \in B$ belonging to ${}^{2\text{-root}}_B A$ is such that $g(X) \in A[x_1, \dots, x_k]$, where, for $j = 1, \dots, k$, $x_j = \sum_i (h_{ij} X^i) \in B = \mathbf{Q}[[X]]$ and $x_j^2 \in A[x_1, \dots, x_{j-1}]$; then, $h_{0j}^2 \in \mathbf{Z}$, i.e., $h_{0j} \in \mathbf{Z}$ (for $j = 1, \dots, k$, as one can easily see), which implies that $g_0 \in \mathbf{Z}$. So, D (then, even more so, D), doesn't extend to ${}^{2\text{-root}}_B A$.

Section 2. Let A be a noetherian ring, $k(A)$ be the total quotient ring of A and \bar{A} be the integral closure of A in $k(A)$. Each ring B such that $A \subset B \subset \bar{A}$ can be seen as a suitable *closure* of A in $k(A)$, as we now recall. We refer to [7]. If Δ is a multiplicatively closed set of nonzero ideals of A , for each ideal I of A we denote with I_Δ the set $\bigcup \{IK : K|I \in \Delta\}$. Now, a Δ -extension of A

in $k(A)$ is a subring B of $k(A)$ containing A such that $aB \cap A \subset (aA)_\Delta$ for all regular nonunits a in A . We call Δ -closure of A in $k(A)$ the largest Δ -extension of A that is contained in $k(A)$, and we denote it with A^Δ (see [7, 2.1, 6.1] and following remark). We recall some basic properties of A^Δ .

Proposition 2.1. *Let A be a noetherian ring, $k(A)$ the total quotient ring of A , and Δ a multiplicatively closed set of nonzero ideals of A . Then $A^\Delta = A[S] = S$, where:*

$$S = \{b/a \in k(A) \mid a \text{ is a regular nonunit in } A \text{ and } b \in (aA)_\Delta\}.$$

(See [7, Theorem (6.2)].)

Further, we have

Proposition 2.2. *Let A , $k(A)$, and Δ be as in Proposition 2.1, and let B be a ring such that $A \subset B \subset \overline{A}$. Then $B = A^\Delta$, where:*

$$\Delta = \{\text{finite products of the ideals } aB \cap A \mid a \text{ is a regular nonunit in } A\}.$$

In particular, $\overline{A} = A^\Delta$ where Δ is the set of nonzero ideals of A that are not contained in any minimal prime ideal.

(See [7, (8.1) and the following remarks, and (6.3)].)

So, according to Proposition 2.2, any subring of \overline{A} containing A can be seen as a suitable Δ -closure of A in $k(A)$.

If $D \in \text{IDer}(A)$, generally D doesn't extend to A^Δ (see [4, ex. 1.1 or ex. 2.6]). So, in this section we wonder when a derivation $D \in \text{Der}(A)$ can be extended to A^Δ . We recall that an ideal I of A is called D -differential if $D(I) \subset I$. According to Proposition 2.1, each element of A^Δ looks like $s = b/a$, where:

- (2) a is a regular nonunit in A
- (3) $b \in (aA)_\Delta$, i.e., $bK \subset aK$ for some ideal $K \in \Delta$.

We have

Proposition 2.3. *Let A, Δ be as in Proposition 2.1, $s = b/a \in A^\Delta$, K be an ideal of Δ satisfying (3), and $D \in \text{Der}(A)$. If K is D -differential, then $D(s) \in A^\Delta$.*

Proof. Since $D \in \text{Der}(A)$, one has $D(s) = [D(b)a - bD(a)]/a^2$ in $k(A)$, where a^2 is a regular nonunit in A , since a satisfies (2). So, according to Proposition 2.1, it is enough to show that $[D(b)a - bD(a)] \in (a^2A)_\Delta$, i.e., there is an ideal $K' \in \Delta$ such that:

$$(4) \quad [D(b)a - bD(a)]K' \subset a^2K'.$$

Since K satisfies (3), for each $k \in K$ there exists $k' \in K$ such that $bk = ak'$, so in $k(A)$ one has $k' = (bk/a)$, and by applying D one obtains $bD(k) + kD(b) = D(a)k' + aD(k') = D(a)(bk/a) + aD(k')$ in $k(A)$. So, in A one has $abD(k) + akD(b) = D(a)bk + a^2D(k')$, i.e., $k[aD(b) - bD(a)] = -abD(k) + a^2D(k')$. Now $D(k') \in K$ and $D(k) \in K$, since K is D -differential; so $a^2D(k') \in a^2K$, and $abD(k) \in abK$, so that $abD(k) \in a^2K$ since b and K satisfy (3). Then $k[aD(b) - bD(a)] \in a^2K$ for each $k \in K$, so that

$$(5) \quad [aD(b) - bD(a)]K \subset a^2K.$$

If we put $K' = K$, we obtain (4). \square

Remark 2.4. The converse of Proposition 2.3 is not true, generally. Indeed, we exhibit $A, A^\Delta, s \in A^\Delta$ such that $D(s) \in A^\Delta$, but there is no $K \in \Delta$ such that K is D -differential and satisfies (3).

Let $A = \mathbf{Z}_p[x, y]$ where p is prime, $p \neq 2$ and $y^p = x^p(x+1)$. According to [8, n. 5], we have: A is an integral domain, y/x is integral over A , and $\overline{A} = A[y/x]$. Let $A^\Delta = \overline{A}$, $D \in \text{Der}(A)$ be defined by $D(x) = 0$, $D(y) = 1$ (see [8, n. 5]). Take $s = (y^2/2x) \in \overline{A}$. Then

$$(6) \quad y^2K \subset (2x)K \quad \text{for an ideal } K \in \Delta,$$

according to (3).

Now we show that each K satisfying (6) cannot be D -differential. In fact, if there is $K \in \Delta$, K D -differential and satisfying (6), then, according to the proof of Proposition 2.3, one obtains (5) for $a = 2x$,

$b = y^2$, i.e., $[2xD(y^2) - y^2D(2x)]K \subset (4x^2)K$, so $yK \subset xK$ (since A is a domain). This means that $y/x \in A^\Delta$ (Proposition 2.1 and (3)), and K satisfies the assumptions of Proposition 2.3 for $s = y/x$. Then, according to the result of Proposition 2.3, one has $D(y/x) \in A^\Delta$, a contradiction, since $D(y/x) = (1/x) \notin \overline{A} = A^\Delta$ (see [8, n.5]).

If A^Δ is finitely generated over A , it is possible to find a particular $K \in \Delta$ such that K is an ideal of A^Δ . In fact, if $A^\Delta = A[x_1, \dots, x_n]$, the above K can be obtained as follows (see [7, proof of Theorem (6.4)]): for $i = 1, \dots, n$, let $x_i = b_i/a_i$ and $K_i \in \Delta$ be such that $b_iK_i \subset a_iK_i$ (see (3)); then, $K = \Pi K_i$ has the requested property. This ideal K satisfies the assumptions of the following

Proposition 2.5. *Let A, Δ, A^Δ, D be as usual; moreover, let $K \in \Delta$ be an ideal of A^Δ . Then:*

if K is D -differential, then $D(A^\Delta) \subset A^\Delta$.

Proof. Let $s = (b/a) \in A^\Delta$. Since K is an ideal of A^Δ , one has $sK \subset K$, i.e., $bK \subset aK$. Then K satisfies the assumptions of Proposition 2.3; since K is D -differential, Proposition 2.3 shows $D(s) \in A^\Delta$. \square

Remark 2.6. Generally the converse of Proposition 2.5 is not true, as the following examples show.

1) Let $A = k[t^5, t^6]$ where k is a field of characteristic $p = 5$, $A^\Delta = A[t^8] \subset \overline{A}$. If $K = (t^{16}, t^{24})A$, then $K = (t^{16})A^\Delta$; so $K \in \Delta$ according to Proposition 2.2. Further, K satisfies the assumption of Proposition 2.5. Let $D = t^{10}(\partial/\partial t) \in \text{Der}(A)$. One has $D(A^\Delta) \subset A^\Delta$, since $D(t^8) = 8 \cdot t^{17} \in A$. Nevertheless, $D(K) \not\subset K$; in fact, $D(t^{16}) = 16 \cdot t^{25} \notin K$.

2) Let $A = k[t^3, t^7, t^8]$, where k is a field of characteristic zero, and $A^\Delta = A[t^4] \subset \overline{A}$. According to Proposition 2.2, it can be seen that $K = (t^8, t^{12})A$ belongs to Δ and is an ideal of A^Δ . If $D = t^6(\partial/\partial t) \in \text{Der}(A)$, one has

$$\begin{aligned} -D(A^\Delta) \subset A^\Delta, & \quad \text{since } D(t^4) = 4 \cdot t^9 \in A, \\ -D(K) \not\subset K, & \quad \text{since } D(t^8) = 8 \cdot t^{13} \notin K. \end{aligned}$$

We note that Examples 1), 2) of Remark 2.6 can be seen as particular cases of a larger class of examples we shall consider in Section 3.

Corollary 2.7. *Let β be the conductor of A in A^Δ , $D \in \text{Der}(A)$. If $\beta \in \Delta$, the following conditions are equivalent:*

- 1) $D(A^\Delta) \subset A^\Delta$;
- 2) β is D -differential.

Proof. 1) \Rightarrow 2). For each $s \in A^\Delta$, $x \in \beta$, one has $sx \in A$ so that $D(sx) \in A$, i.e., $xD(s) + sD(x) \in A$. Now $xD(s) \in A$ since $D(s) \in A^\Delta$ and $x \in \beta$; then, $sD(x) \in A$ (for each $s \in A^\Delta$), so $D(x) \in \beta$.

2) \Rightarrow 1). Let $s = (b/a) \in A^\Delta$. Since β is an ideal of A^Δ , the result follows from Proposition 2.5. \square

When A satisfies the (S_1) -property and $A^\Delta = \overline{A}$, under suitable assumptions one has $\beta \in \Delta$ (Corollary 2.8). We recall a ring A satisfies the (S_1) -property if and only if A has no embedded prime ideals associated with (0) .

Corollary 2.8. *Let β be the conductor of A in \overline{A} , $D \in \text{Der}(A)$. If \overline{A} is a finitely generated A -module and if A satisfies the (S_1) -property, the following conditions are equivalent:*

- 1) $D(\overline{A}) \subset \overline{A}$;
- 2) β is D -differential.

Proof. Since A satisfies (S_1) , each $P \in \text{Ass}(A/\beta)$ has height ≥ 1 since it is associated to an ideal I generated by a regular element (see [2, Proposition 5.21] where only the assumption (S_1) is needed). Then $ht(\beta) \geq 1$, so $\beta \in \Delta$, according to Proposition 2.2. Now the result follows from Corollary 2.7.

Remark 2.9. 1) In Corollary 2.7 the assumption $\beta \in \Delta$ is needed only as regards 2) \Rightarrow 1).

2) Under the assumptions of Corollary 2.8, the condition $\beta \in \Delta$ of Corollary 2.7 is satisfied. Generally, for a Δ -closure A^Δ , it is

not true that $\beta \in \Delta$. Consider, for example, $A = k[X^2, XY, Y^3]$, $A^\Delta = A[X + Y] \subset \overline{A}$, $D = X(\partial/\partial X) + XY^2(\partial/\partial Y)$. In [4, ex. 2.6], it is proved that $D(A^\Delta) \not\subset A^\Delta$ and β is D -differential; according to Corollary 2.7, we have necessarily that $\beta \notin \Delta$.

Section 3. In this section we show some classes of Δ -closures A^Δ and of ideals $K \in \Delta$ satisfying the assumptions of Proposition 2.5, such that K is D -differential with respect to some $D \in \text{Der}(A)$. In this case, according to Proposition 2.5, one has $D(A^\Delta) \subset A^\Delta$. First, we show the following

Lemma 3.1. *Let A be a noetherian ring, $A^\Delta = A[x] \subset \overline{A}$, where x^2 and x^3 belong to A , $K = (x^2, x^3)A$. Then $k \in \Delta$ and K is an ideal of A^Δ contained in A .*

Proof. If $a = x^2$, then $aA^\Delta = K$. In fact, $(x^2, x^3) \subset (x^2)A^\Delta$ obviously; on the other hand, for each $y \in (x^2)A^\Delta$ one has $y = x^2(a_0 + a_1x)$, where $a_0, a_1 \in A$, so that $y = a_0x^2 + a_1x^3 \in K$. So $K = aA^\Delta \cap A$, then we have also $k \in \Delta$, according to Proposition 2.2. \square

So, in Lemma 3.1, we construct an ideal $K \in \Delta$ that satisfies the assumptions of Proposition 2.5 and also generalizes the examples of Remark 2.6. Now we refer to rings of the particular type $A = k[t^{\alpha_1}, \dots, t^{\alpha_m}]$, in order to show ideals K as above and certain $D \in \text{Der}(A)$ such that K is D -differential. So let $A = k[t^{\alpha_1}, \dots, t^{\alpha_m}]$, where k is a field of characteristic zero.

In this section we denote with S the semigroup $\langle \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_m \rangle$ and suppose that $(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_m) = 1$, i.e., that there exists $s \in S$ such that $s + n \in S$ for each $n \in \mathbf{N}$; the least of these integers, s , is called the *conductor* of S . Now, according to Lemma 3.1, take $x = t^a \in \overline{A}$ such that $t^a \notin A$, but $t^{2a}, t^{3a} \in A$, and let $A^\Delta = A[x] = A[t^a]$, $K = (t^{2a}, t^{3a})$. Further, take $D = t^\alpha(\partial/\partial t)$ with $\alpha \geq 0$ ($D \in \text{Der}(\overline{A})$). Then the conditions we are interested in are the following:

- i) $D \in \text{Der}(A)$
- ii) $D(K) \subset K$,

that are respectively equivalent to

I) $\alpha_i - 1 + \alpha \in S$ for $i = 1, \dots, m$

II) $2a - 1 + \alpha \in S$ (since ii holds if and only if $D(x^2) \in K$).

Now, in order to have II, the following condition is sufficient

III) $a - 1 + \alpha = s + ka$, for some $s \in S$ and $k \geq 1$.

In fact, if III holds, one has: $2a - 1 + \alpha = s + (k + 1)a$, with $s \in S$ and $k + 1 \geq 2$, so that $2a - 1 + \alpha \in S$. Nevertheless, II doesn't imply III. Take, for example, $\alpha_1 = 3$, $\alpha_2 = 7$, $\alpha_3 = 8$, $a = 8$, $\alpha = 6$; conditions I and II are satisfied, but $a - 1 + \alpha = 13$ and $13 \neq 8k + s$ for each $s \in S$, $k \geq 1$.

Now we show that conditions I and III are satisfied for a particular choice of the integers $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_m$.

Proposition 3.2. *Let $A = k[t^2, t^{2n+1}]$ with k field of characteristic zero, $n \geq 1$, $t^a \in \overline{A} \setminus A$ be such that $t^{2a}, t^{3a} \in A$. Moreover, let $A^\Delta = A[t^a]$, $K = (t^{2a}, t^{3a})$. If $D = t^\alpha(\partial/\partial t) \in \text{Der}(A)$, then $D(K) \subset K$.*

Proof. Let $D = t^\alpha(\partial/\partial t) \in \text{Der}(A)$. According to the above notations and remarks, it is enough to show that III holds. In this case, the assumption over D means:

$$(I) \quad 1 + \alpha \in S, \quad 2n + \alpha \in S.$$

Moreover, $S = \{0, 2, \dots, 2n + 1, \dots\}$ and, since $t^a \notin A$, one has that a is odd and $a < 2n + 1$.

If α is even, then I is satisfied if and only if $\alpha \geq 2n$. Then, $a - 1 + \alpha \geq a - 1 + 2n > a - 1 + a - 1$ (since $a < 2n + 1$) $= 2(a - 1)$. So, $a - 1 + \alpha$ is even and greater than $2(a - 1)$, so that $a - 1 + \alpha = 2(a - 1) + 2h$ for some $h \geq 1$, i.e., $a - 1 + \alpha = 2a + 2(h - 1)$ where $h - 1 \geq 0$. Then III holds since $2(h - 1) \in S$.

If α is odd, then I is trivially satisfied for each $\alpha \geq 1$. Further, $a - 1 + \alpha = a + (-1 + \alpha)$, where $-1 + \alpha$ belongs to S since it is even; then III holds.

Remark 3.3. Let $A = k[t^{\alpha_1}, \dots, t^{\alpha_m}]$, A^Δ , K , be as before. If c is the conductor of $S = \langle \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_m \rangle$, then each $D = t^\alpha (\partial/\partial t)$ with $\alpha \geq c+1$ is such that $D \in \text{Der}(A)$ and $D(K) \subset K$. In fact, if $\alpha \geq c+1$, one has for $i = 1, \dots, m$, $\alpha_i - 1 + \alpha \geq \alpha_i + c \in S$; $a - 1 + \alpha \geq a + c$, so that $a - 1 + \alpha = a + s$, for some $s \in S$. Then I and III hold so that the result follows. \square

REFERENCES

1. J.W. Brewer, *Seminormality in power series rings*, J. Algebra **82** (1983), 282–284.
2. S. Greco, *Normal varieties*, Inst. Math. **IV**, Academic Press (1978).
3. H. Matsumura, *Integrable derivations*, Nagoya Math. J. **87** (1982), 227–245.
4. S. Molinelli, *On differentiations and birational integral extensions*, Comm. Algebra **16** (8) (1988), 1663–1671.
5. S. Molinelli and G. Tamone, *On some invariant ideals and on extension of differentiations to seminormalization*, J. Pure Appl. Algebra, to appear.
6. N. Onoda, T. Sugatani and K. Yoshida, *Local quasinormality and closedness type criteria*, Houston J. Math. **11** (1985), 247–256.
7. L.J. Ratliff, Jr., *Δ -closures on ideals and rings*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **313** (1989), 221–247.
8. A. Seidenberg, *Derivations and integral closure*, Pacific J. Math. **16** (1966), 167–173.
9. T. Sugatani and K. Yoshida, *On t -closures*, C.R. Math. Rep. Acad. Sci. Canada **VI** (1984), 55–57.
10. J.J. Watkins, *Root and integral closure for $R[[X]]$* , J. Algebra **75** (1982), 43–58.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF GENOVA, VIA L.B. ALBERTI 4,
16132, GENOVA, ITALY.