TSUKUBA J. MATH.
Vol. 8 No. 2 (1984). 333—338

SOME RESULTS ON PSEUDO-VALUATION DOMAINS

By

Akira OKABE

Introduction. In [7], Hedstrom and Houston defined a pseudo-valuation domain (for short, a PVD) to be an integral domain in which every prime ideal P has the property that whenever x and y are elements of the quotient field with $xy\in P$, then either $x\in P$ or $y\in P$. As the terminology suggests, these domains are closely related to valuation domains. In [7, Prop. 1.1], they showed that every valuation domain is a pseudo-valuation domain. They also showed, in [7, Theorem 2.10], that a PVD which is not a valuation domain is characterized as a quasilocal domain (D, M) with the property that $M^{-1}=D:_{K}M$ is a valuation overring with maximal ideal M, where K is the quotient field of D.

If I is an ideal of an integral domain R with quotient field K, then $I:_{K}I=\{x\in K|xI\subseteqq I\}$ is an overring of R. We shall call $I:_{K}I$ the "*conductor overring*" of R with respect to I. In [12], we investigated conductor overrings of a valuation domain. In that paper, we introduced the notion of "*recurrent closure*": If I is an ideal of an integral domain R with quotient field K, then the ideal $R:_{R}(I:_{K}I)$ is called the "*recurrent closure*" of I and is denoted by I_{r}. In [12, Theorem 13], we proved that if I is an ideal of a valuation domain V with quotient field K such that $I:_{K}I\neq V$, then I_{r} is a prime ideal of V and $I:_{K}I=V_{I_{r}}$. An ideal I of an integral domain R is said to be "*recurrent*" in case $I=I_{r}$. We also showed, in [12, Theorem 13], that every nonmaximal prime ideal P of a valuation domain V is recurrent. The main purpose of this paper is to study conductor overrings of a pseudo-valuation domain and to extend some results obtained in [12] to a pseudo-valuation domain.

Throughout this paper, D will be a pseudo-valuation domain with maximal ideal M, and K will denote its quotient field. Any unexplained terminology is standard, as in [5] and [10].

Let R be an integral domain with quotient field K and let $P\subset I$ be ideals of R with P prime. Then we cannot in general expect that P is also prime in $I:_{K}I$, as showed in [12, Example 15]. But we showed in [12, Corollary 16]

Received December 7, 1983.

that if $P\subset I$ are ideals of a valuation domain V with P prime, then P is also prime in $I:_K I$, where K is the quotient field of V. We show here that this result is also valid for a PVD.

THEOREM 1. *Let $P\subset I$ be ideals of D. If P is prime in D, then P is also prime in $I:_K I$.*

PROOF. By [11, Corollary 1.5], it suffices to prove that $P=P:_K I$. Since $P\subseteqq P:_K I$ is clear, we need only show that $P:_K I\subseteqq P$. To see this, let $x\in P:_K I$. If we choose an element $t\in I\backslash P$, then we have $xt\in P$. Then, since P is strongly prime (cf. [7, Definition, p. 138]), $xt\in P$ and $t\notin P$ implies that $x\in P$, which shows that $P:_K I\subseteqq P$.

COROLLARY 2. *Let I be an ideal of D and let P be a prime ideal of $I:_K I$. If $P\cap D\subset I$, then P is also a prime ideal of D.*

PROOF. If we set $Q=P\cap D$, then, by hypothesis, Q is properly contained in I and so, by [11, Proposition 1.3 (3)], we have $P=Q:_K I$. But then, by Theorem 1, $Q=Q:_K I$ and consequently $P=Q$, which implies that P is also a prime ideal of D as required.

In [7, Theorem 2.10], Hedstrom and Houston showed that $M^{-1}=D:_K M$ is a valuation overring with maximal ideal M. Since $M^{-1}=M:_K M$ by [9, Proposition 2.3], it then follows that M is the unique maximal ideal of $M:_K M$. In this paper it will be shown that if P is a prime ideal of D, then P is the unique maximal ideal of $P:_K P$.

We first establish the following lemma.

LEMMA 3. *Let P be a prime ideal of D. Then*

(1) *P is also a prime ideal of $P:_K P$.*

(2) *Any proper ideal I of $P:_K P$ is also an ideal of D.*

PROOF. (1) First, it is well known that P is an ideal of $P:_K P$. Then it is easily seen that P is also a prime ideal of $P:_K P$, since P is strongly prime.

(2) Let I be any proper ideal of $P:_K P$. It then suffices to show that $I\subseteqq D$. Assume the converse and choose an element $x\in I\backslash D$. Then, by [7, Proposition 1.2], $x^{-1}\in P:_K P$. Hence $1=xx^{-1}\in I(P:_K P)=I$, which implies that $I=P:_K P$. But this contradicts our assumption, and consequently $I\subseteqq D$ as we wanted.

THEOREM 4. *If P is a prime ideal of D, then P is the unique maximal ideal of $P:_K P$.*

PROOF. Let I be any proper ideal of $P:_K P$. Then it is sufficient to show that I is contained in P. First, by Lemma 3, I is contained in D. Suppose that $I \subsetneqq P$ and choose an element $s \in I \setminus P$. Then $s/p \in K \setminus D$ for each nonzero $p \in P$. Therefore, by [7, Proposition 1.2], $p/s \in P:_K P$. Then, since P is strongly prime, $s(p/s) \in P$ and $s \notin P$ implies $p/s \in P$ and therefore $p \in sP$. Thus we have $P \subseteqq sP \subseteqq P$, and consequently $P = sP$. But then, by [12, Lemma 18], s is a unit of $P:_K P$ and so $I = P:_K P$, a contradiction. This completes the proof.

In [12, Theorem 13], we showed that every nonmaximal prime ideal P of a valuation domain V is a recurrent ideal, as stated in Introduction. We can now prove, as an easy consequence of Theorem 4, that this result is also valid for any nonmaximal prime ideal of a *PVD*.

COROLLARY 5. *If P is a nonmaximal prime ideal of D, then P is a recurrent ideal.*

PROOF. First, by [11, Lemma 1.1], $P_r = D:_D(P:_K P)$ is an ideal of $P:_K P$. Then, by Theorem 4, P_r is contained in P. But, by definition, the converse inclusion $P \subseteqq P_r$ is always valid and thus $P = P_r$ as we wanted.

In [12, Theorem 1], we showed that if P is a proper prime ideal of a valuation domain V, then $P:_K P = V_P$ where K is the quotient field of V. We shall next show that this fact is also true for any nonmaximal prime ideal P of a *PVD*.

We begin by proving the following lemma.

LEMMA 6. *Let R be an integral domain with quotient field K. If P is a prime ideal of R such that R_P is a valuation domain and $PR_P = P$, then we have $P:_K P = R_P$.*

PROOF. First, if we take any element $x \in R \setminus P$, then $p/x \in PR_P = P$ for any $p \in P$, and consequently $p \in xP$. Thus $P \subseteqq xP \subseteqq P$, and therefore $P = xP$. Then, by [12, Lemma 18], x is a unit of $P:_K P$. Hence $x^{-1} \in P:_K P$ for any $x \in R \setminus P$. Now take any element r/s of R_P with $r \in R$ and $s \in R \setminus P$. Then, by the result shown above, $s^{-1} \in P:_K P$ and accordingly $r/s \in P:_K P$. Therefore we have $R_P \subseteqq P:_K P$. Next, we shall show that $P:_K P \subseteqq R_P$. Suppose not. Then we can choose an element $t \in P:_K P \setminus R_P$. Since R_P is a valuation domain, $t \notin R_P$ implies that $t^{-1} \in PR_P = P$. Then we get $1 = tt^{-1} \in (P:_K P)P \subseteqq P$, a contradiction, whence we must have $P:_K P \subseteqq R_P$. Thus our proof is complete.

THEOREM 7. *If P is a nonmaximal prime ideal of D, then $P:_K P = D_P$.*

PROOF. By [7, Proposition 2.6], D_P is a valuation domain. Next, any *PVD* is a divided ring, as noted in [3, p. 560], and consequently $PD_P=P$. Thus any nonmaximal prime ideal P of D satisfies the two conditions descrived in Lemma 6, and therefore our assertion follows from Lemma 6.

REMARK 8. Following [6], a prime ideal P of an integral domain R is called an "*F-ideal*" if R_P is a valuation domain and $PR_P=P$. Using this terminology, Lemma 6 says that if P is an F-ideal of an integral domain R with quotient field K, then $P:_K P=R_P$. Furthermore, the proof of Theorem 7 is based on the fact that any nonmaximal prime ideal P of a *PVD* is an F-ideal.

In [11, Corollary 2.5], we showed that if P is a prime ideal of an integral domain R with quotient field K, then $\dim(P:_K P)\geqq \operatorname{rank} P$. The following corollary is an immediate consequence of Theorem 7.

COROLLARY 9. *If P is a nonmaximal prime ideal of D, then we have* $\dim(P:_K P)=\operatorname{rank} P$.

It is well known that if I is an ideal of a valuation domain V, then $\bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} I^n$ is a prime ideal of V (cf. [5, Theorem (17.1) (3)]) and furthermore if P is a prime ideal of V properly contained in I, then $P\subseteqq \bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} I^n$ (cf. [5, Theorem (17.1) (4)]). In [7, Proposition 2.4], Hedstrom and Houston showed that if I is an ideal of a *PVD*, then $\bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} I^n$ is a prime ideal. By virtue of [7, Theorem 1.4], it is easily proved that [5, Theorem (17.1) (4)] is also valid for a *PVD*.

PROPOSITION 10. *Let I be a proper ideal of D. If a prime ideal P of D is properly contained in I, then* $P\subseteqq \bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} I^n$.

PROOF. If not, then $P\nsubseteq I^m$ for some integer $m>0$. Then, by [7, Theorem 1.4], $MI^m\subseteqq P$. Now, since $P\subset I\subseteqq M$, there is an element $t\in M\backslash P$. Then $tI^m\subseteqq P$ and $t\notin P$ implies that $I^m\subseteqq P$, and accordingly $I\subseteqq P$, a contradiction. This completes our proof.

In [11, Lemma 1.1 (5)], we showed that if I is an ideal of an integral domain R and R' is a proper overring of R, then $I:_R R'$ is an ideal of R and is contained in I. It is natural to ask that if P is a prime ideal of R, does this imply that $P:_R R'$ is a prime ideal of R? In general, $P:_R R'$ need not be a prime ideal of R (Example 12), but in the case R is a *PVD*, the answer is yes.

THEOREM 11. *Let D' be a proper overring of D and let P be a prime ideal* *of D. Then*

(1) $P:_D D'$ *is also a prime ideal of* D *and is contained in* P.

(2) *If* $D'\subseteqq P:_K P$, *then we have* $P:_D D'=P$.

(3) *If* $P:_K P$ *is properly contained in* D', *then* $P:_D D'$ *is properly contained in* P. *Moreover,* $D'\to P:_D D'$ *gives a one-one correspondence between the set of all prime ideals* P' *properly contained in* P *and the set of all overrings* D' *of* D *properly containing* $P:_K P$.

PROOF. (1) By [11, Lemma 1.1 (5)], $P:_D D'$ is an ideal of D and is contained in P. Hence we need only show that $P:_D D'$ is a prime ideal of D. Suppose that $rs\in P:_D D'$, $s\notin P:_D D'$ with $r, s\in D$. Since $s\notin P:_D D'$, $st\notin P$ for some $t\in D'$. But then, we have $(rs)(tD')\subseteqq rsD'\subseteqq P$, since $tD'\subseteqq D'$. Then $(st)(rD')\subseteqq P$ and $st\notin P$ implies that $rD'\subseteqq P$, whence $r\in P:_D D'$. Thus $P:_D D'$ is a prime ideal of D, and our proof is over.

(2) By [11, Lemma 1.1 (6)], we always have $P=P:_D(P:_K P)$. Hence, if $D'\subseteqq P:_K P$, then $P=P:_D(P:_K P)\subseteqq P:_D D'\subseteqq P$, whence $P=P:_D D'$.

(3) If $P:_K P\subset D'$, then there exists an element $x\in D'\backslash P:_K P$. Since $x\notin P:_K P$, we can find an element $p\in P$ such that $xp\notin P$. Then $xp\notin P$ and $x\in D'$ implies that $p\notin P:_D D'$, whence $p\in P\backslash P:_D D'$. Thus $P:_D D'\neq P$ as we wanted. Next, we shall show that if D' is any overring of D properly containing $P:_K P$, then D' is of the form $P':_K P'$ with some prime ideal P' properly contained in P. First, we note that $P:_K P$ is a valuation domain by [7, Proposition 1.2]. Moreover, by Theorem 7, we have $P:_K P=D_P$. Hence, we get $D'=(D_P)_{P'D_P}=D_{P'}$ with some prime ideal P' properly contained in P. Using Theorem 7 again, we have $D'=D_{P'}=P':_K P'$, as we required. Next, we shall show that if $D'=P':_K P'$ with $P'\subset P$, then $P:_D D'=P'$. By [11, Lemma 1.1 (6)], $P'=P':_D(P':_K P')$ and moreover, by Corollary 5, $D:_D(P':_K P')=P'$. Hence it follows that $P'=P':_D(P':_K P')=P':_D D'\subseteqq P:_D D'\subseteqq D:_D(P':_K P')=P'$, whence $P:_D D'=P'$. Conversely, if P' is a prime ideal of D properly contained in P, then, by Theorem 7, $P':_K P'=D_{P'}$ is an overring of D properly containing $P:_K P=D_P$, and furthermore we have $P'=P:_D(P':_K P')$, as shown above. This completes our proof.

EXAMPLE 12. Let $R=k[X^3, X^4]\subset R'=k[X^2, X^3]$, where k is a field and X is an indeterminate over k. Then the quotient field of R is the field $k(X)$ and so R' is an overring of R. Set $P=RX^3+RX^4$, and note that P is a prime ideal of R since $R/P=k$. We claim that $P:_R R'$ is not a prime ideal of R. To see this, first observe that $X^3\notin P:_R R'$. In fact, $X^3X^2=X^5\notin P$. But $X^6\in P:_R R'$ since $X^6X^2=(X^4)^2\in P$ and $X^6X^3=(X^3)^3\in P$. Thus we have $X^3\notin P:_R R'$ and $(X^3)^2\in$

$P:_{R}R'$, and our claim is established.

References

[1] Akiba, T., A note on AV-domains, Bulletin of Kyoto Univ. of Education, Ser. B., **31** (1967), 1-3.
[2] Dobbs, D. E., Divided rings and going-down, Pac. J. Math., **67** (1976), 353-363.
[3] ———, Coherence, ascent of going-down and pseudo-valuation domains, Houston J. Math., **4** (1978), 551-567.
[4] ———, On the weak global dimension of pseudo-valuation domains, Canad. Math. Bull., **21** (1978), 159-164.
[5] Gilmer, R., Multiplicative Ideal Theory, Marcel Dekker, New York, 1972.
[6] Greenberg, B. V., Global dimension of Cartesian squares, J. Algebra, **32** (1974), 31-43.
[7] Hedstrom, J. R. and Houston, E. G., Pseudo-valuation domains, Pacific J. Math., **75** (1978), 137-147.
[8] ——— and ———, Pseudo-valuation domains (II), Houston J. Math., **4** (1978), 199-207.
[9] Huckaba, J. A. and Papick, I. J., When the dual of an ideal is a ring, Manus. Math., **37** (1982), 67-85.
[10] Kaplansky, I., Commutative Rings, Allyn and Bacon, Boston, 1970.
[11] Okabe, A., On conductor overrings of an integral domain, Tsukuba J. Math., to appear.
[12] ———, On conductor overrings of a valuation domain, Tsukuba J. Math., to appear.

Gunma Technical College
Toriba, Maebashi, Gunma, 371
Japan