

ON THE VANISHING OF Ext

MARK RAMRAS¹

ABSTRACT. In this paper we exhibit certain modules A over a commutative noetherian local ring (R, \mathfrak{M}) which test projective dimension of finitely generated modules in the following sense: if $\text{Ext}^j(M, A) = 0$ for all $j \geq i$, then $\text{pd } M < i$.

We also show that the module \mathfrak{M} tests in a stronger way: if $\text{Ext}^i(M, \mathfrak{M}) = 0$, then $\text{pd } M < i$.

In conclusion we show that if (R, \mathfrak{M}) is artin, then R is self-injective if and only if $\text{Ext}^1(R/\mathfrak{M}^n, R) = 0$, where the index of nilpotence of \mathfrak{M} is $n+1$.

Let (R, \mathfrak{M}) be a commutative, noetherian, local ring with maximal ideal \mathfrak{M} . It is well known that for any finitely generated R -module M , if $\text{Ext}^i(M, R/\mathfrak{M}) = 0$, then the projective dimension of M ($\text{pd } M$) is less than i . We shall say that R/\mathfrak{M} is a strong test module. In this paper we exhibit another strong test module, namely \mathfrak{M} .

We define a weak test module as a module A such that for any finitely generated module M , if $\text{Ext}^j(M, A) = 0$ for all $j \geq 1$, then $\text{pd } M < i$. The following theorem is proved: Let $e_0 = 1$ and, for $i \geq 1$, let $e_i = [\mathfrak{M}^i/\mathfrak{M}^{i+1}: R/\mathfrak{M}]$ (vector space dimension). If $e_n > \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} e_i$ then R/\mathfrak{M}^{n+1} is a weak test module. As a corollary we show that if R is regular local of dimension k and $S = R/\mathfrak{M}^{n+1}$, $n+1 \leq k$, then S is a weak test module as an S -module.

We conclude with the observation that if R is artin then R is self-injective if and only if $\text{Ext}^1(R/\mathfrak{M}^n, R) = 0$ where the index of nilpotence of \mathfrak{M} is $n+1$.

Notation and conventions. Throughout this paper (R, \mathfrak{M}) will denote a commutative, noetherian, local ring with maximal ideal \mathfrak{M} and with a unit element. All modules are unital and finitely generated. By $\text{pd } M$ we mean the projective dimension of M . For an R/\mathfrak{M} -module E , $[E: R/\mathfrak{M}]$ will denote the vector space dimension of E . We shall denote the direct sum of q copies of M by $\bigoplus_q M$.

Received by the editors January 6, 1970.

AMS 1970 subject classifications. Primary 13C10, 13D05; Secondary 13H10.

Key words and phrases. Projective dimension, Ext, commutative noetherian local ring, length of a module, artin local ring, socle.

¹ This research was partially supported by the U. S. Army Research Office (Durham).

Copyright © 1971, American Mathematical Society

1. Strong test modules. We begin with the following

DEFINITION. An R -module A is a *strong test module* if for all R -modules M and for all $i > 0$, $\text{Ext}^i(M, A) = 0$ implies that $\text{pd } M < i$.

By taking a minimal resolution of M it is easy to see that $\text{Ext}^i(M, R/\mathfrak{M}) = X_i/\mathfrak{M}X_i$, where X_i is the i th module in the resolution. Nakayama's Lemma shows that $\text{Ext}^i(M, R/\mathfrak{M}) = 0$ if and only if $X_i = 0$. Since the resolution was minimal, this happens if and only if $\text{pd } M < i$. Hence R/\mathfrak{M} is a strong test module.

LEMMA 1.1. A is a strong test module \Leftrightarrow for all modules M , $\text{Ext}^1(M, A) = 0$ implies that M is projective.

PROOF. (\Rightarrow) Obvious.

(\Leftarrow) By induction on i . We have the case $i = 1$ by assumption. Let $0 \rightarrow K \rightarrow F \rightarrow M \rightarrow 0$ be exact with F free. Then $\text{Ext}^i(K, A) \cong \text{Ext}^{i+1}(M, A)$. Suppose the theorem is true for i and $\text{Ext}^{i+1}(M, A) = 0$. Then $\text{Ext}^i(K, A) = 0$, so $\text{pd } K < i$, and therefore $\text{pd } M < i + 1$. ■

LEMMA 1.2. If $M \neq 0$ and $\text{Ext}^1(M, \mathfrak{M}) = 0$ then R is a direct summand of M .

PROOF. Apply the functor $\text{Hom}(M, _)$ to the exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow \mathfrak{M} \rightarrow R \rightarrow R/\mathfrak{M} \rightarrow 0.$$

Then $0 \rightarrow \text{Hom}(M, \mathfrak{M}) \rightarrow \text{Hom}(M, R) \rightarrow \text{Hom}(M, R/\mathfrak{M}) \rightarrow 0$ is exact. Let $f \in \text{Hom}(M, R)$. If $f(M) = R$ then the sequence $0 \rightarrow \text{Ker } f \rightarrow M \rightarrow R \rightarrow 0$ splits, since R is projective, and we have the desired result. So assume that for all $f \in \text{Hom}(M, R)$, $f(M) \neq R$. Then $f(M) \subsetneq R$. Hence the map $\text{Hom}(M, R) \rightarrow \text{Hom}(M, R/\mathfrak{M})$ is the zero map. But it is also onto, so $\text{Hom}(M, R/\mathfrak{M}) = 0$. From the epimorphism $M \rightarrow M/\mathfrak{M}M \rightarrow 0$ we have the injection $0 \rightarrow \text{Hom}(M/\mathfrak{M}M, R/\mathfrak{M}) \rightarrow \text{Hom}(M, R/\mathfrak{M})$. Thus $\text{Hom}(M/\mathfrak{M}M, R/\mathfrak{M}) = 0$, which, since $M/\mathfrak{M}M$ is a vector space over R/\mathfrak{M} , implies that $M/\mathfrak{M}M = 0$. Nakayama's Lemma says that $M = 0$, which is a contradiction. ■

THEOREM 1.3. If $M \neq 0$ and $\text{Ext}^1(M, \mathfrak{M}) = 0$ then M is R -free. Consequently \mathfrak{M} is a strong test module.

PROOF. By Lemma 1.2, $M \cong M_1 \oplus R$. Since Ext commutes with direct sums, $\text{Ext}^1(M_1, \mathfrak{M}) = 0$. By the same lemma, if $M_1 \neq 0$ then $M_1 \cong M_2 \oplus R$. Thus $M \cong M_2 \oplus R \oplus R$. We may keep repeating this process, except that M is finitely generated, so at some point $M_{i+1} = 0$ and $M_i = R$. Hence $M \cong \bigoplus \sum R$ and so it is R -free.

The second statement follows from Lemma 1.1. ■

PROPOSITION 1.4. *If A is a strong test module and $x \in \mathfrak{M}$ is A -regular (i.e. x is not a zero divisor on A), then A/xA is a strong test module.*

PROOF. Suppose $\text{Ext}^1(M, A/xA) = 0$ for some module M . From the exact sequence $0 \rightarrow A \xrightarrow{z} A \rightarrow A/xA \rightarrow 0$ we have that $\text{Ext}^1(M, A) \xrightarrow{z} \text{Ext}^1(M, A) \rightarrow 0$ is exact. But $\text{Ext}^1(M, A)$ is finitely generated since M and A are, so by Nakayama's Lemma $\text{Ext}^1(M, A) = 0$. Hence M is R -free. ■

The next proposition shows that the class of strong test modules is rather limited.

PROPOSITION 1.5. *If A is a strong test module then $\text{depth}_R A \leq 1$.*

PROOF. $\text{depth}_R A$ = the length of the longest A -regular sequence contained in \mathfrak{M} = the least integer $i \geq 0$ such that $\text{Ext}^i(R/\mathfrak{M}, A) \neq 0$. Thus if $\text{depth}_R A > 1$ then $\text{Ext}^1(R/\mathfrak{M}, A) = 0$ and hence R/\mathfrak{M} is R -free. This means that $\mathfrak{M} = 0$, which implies that $\text{depth}_R A = 0$, contrary to our assumption. So $\text{depth}_R A \leq 1$. ■

2. Weak test modules.

DEFINITION. A is a weak test module if for all modules M and for all $i > 0$, if $\text{Ext}^j(M, A) = 0$ for all $j \geq 1$ then M is R -free.

The following lemma is the analogue of Lemma 1.1; its proof is nearly identical to that of Lemma 1.1 and we omit it.

LEMMA 2.1. A is a weak test module \Leftrightarrow for all modules M , if $\text{Ext}^j(M, A) = 0$ for all $j \geq 1$ then M is R -free.

NOTATION. Let $e_0 = 1$ and, for $i > 0$, let $e_i = [\mathfrak{M}^i/\mathfrak{M}^{i+1} : R/\mathfrak{M}]$.

THEOREM 2.2. *Suppose $e_n > \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} e_i$, for some $n \geq 1$. If*

$$\text{Ext}^i(M, R/\mathfrak{M}^{n+1}) = 0 \quad \text{for all } i > 0$$

then M is R -free. In other words, R/\mathfrak{M}^{n+1} is a weak test module.

PROOF. The following sequences are all exact:

- (1) $0 \rightarrow \mathfrak{M}^n/\mathfrak{M}^{n+1} \rightarrow R/\mathfrak{M}^{n+1} \rightarrow R/\mathfrak{M}^n \rightarrow 0,$
- (2) $0 \rightarrow \mathfrak{M}^{n-1}/\mathfrak{M}^n \rightarrow R/\mathfrak{M}^n \rightarrow R/\mathfrak{M}^{n-1} \rightarrow 0,$
- ⋮
- (n) $0 \rightarrow \mathfrak{M}/\mathfrak{M}^2 \rightarrow R/\mathfrak{M}^2 \rightarrow R/\mathfrak{M} \rightarrow 0.$

If we apply the functor $\text{Hom}(M, \)$ to each of these sequences, we obtain long exact sequences from which we extract the following, for all $i > 0$:

$$\begin{aligned}
(1') \quad & \text{Ext}^i(M, R/\mathfrak{M}^n) \cong \text{Ext}^{i+1}(M, \mathfrak{M}^n/\mathfrak{M}^{n+1}), \\
(2') \quad & \text{Ext}^i(M, \mathfrak{M}^{n-1}/\mathfrak{M}^n) \rightarrow \text{Ext}^i(M, R/\mathfrak{M}^n) \rightarrow \text{Ext}^i(M, R/\mathfrak{M}^{n-1}), \\
& \vdots \qquad \qquad \qquad \vdots \qquad \qquad \qquad \vdots \\
(n') \quad & \text{Ext}^i(M, \mathfrak{M}/\mathfrak{M}^2) \rightarrow \text{Ext}^i(M, R/\mathfrak{M}^2) \rightarrow \text{Ext}^i(M, R/\mathfrak{M}).
\end{aligned}$$

Each of these Ext modules has finite length since M is finitely generated and all the modules appearing in the second variable have finite length. We now compute these lengths.

First we note that if $X \rightarrow Y \rightarrow Z$ is a short exact sequence of modules of finite length then

$$\text{length}(Y) \leq \text{length}(X) + \text{length}(Z).$$

Now let $d_i = [\text{Ext}^i(M, R/\mathfrak{M}) : R/\mathfrak{M}]$. Since $\mathfrak{M}^k/\mathfrak{M}^{k+1} \cong \bigoplus \sum_{e_k} R/\mathfrak{M}$ and Ext commutes with direct sums in either variable,

$$\text{Ext}^i(M, \mathfrak{M}^k/\mathfrak{M}^{k+1}) \cong \bigoplus_{e_k} \sum \text{Ext}^i(M, R/\mathfrak{M}).$$

Hence

$$\text{length}(\text{Ext}^i(M, \mathfrak{M}^k/\mathfrak{M}^{k+1})) = e_k d_i.$$

Thus:

$$\begin{aligned}
(1'') \quad & \text{length}(\text{Ext}^i(M, R/\mathfrak{M}^n)) = e_n d_{i+1}, \\
(2'') \quad & \text{length}(\text{Ext}^i(M, R/\mathfrak{M}^n)) \leq e_{n-1} d_i + \text{length}(\text{Ext}^i(M, R/\mathfrak{M}^{n-1})), \\
(3'') \quad & \text{length}(\text{Ext}^i(M, R/\mathfrak{M}^{n-1})) \leq e_{n-2} d_i + \text{length}(\text{Ext}^i(M, R/\mathfrak{M}^{n-2})), \\
& \vdots \qquad \qquad \qquad \vdots \qquad \qquad \qquad \vdots \\
(n'') \quad & \text{length}(\text{Ext}^i(M, R/\mathfrak{M}^2)) \leq e_1 d_i + e_0 d_i \quad (e_0 = 1).
\end{aligned}$$

Putting these inequalities together: $e_n d_{i+1} \leq d_i \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} e_k$. Hence $d_{i+1} \leq (\sum_{k=0}^{n-1} e_k/e_n) d_i = r \cdot d_i$, and by hypothesis, $r < 1$. We have, then, $d_2 \leq r \cdot d_1$, $d_3 \leq r \cdot d_2$, \dots , $d_{i+1} \leq r \cdot d_i$. Hence for all $i \geq 1$, $d_{i+1} \leq r^i d_1$. Since $r < 1$, for large enough i , $r^i d_1 < 1$. But d_{i+1} is a nonnegative integer, so $d_{i+1} = 0$. Hence $\text{Ext}^{i+1}(M, R/\mathfrak{M}) = 0$. R/\mathfrak{M} is a strong test module, so $\text{pd } M = j < i + 1$. Thus for any module N , $\text{Ext}^j(M, N) \neq 0$ [2, Proposition 4.10]. In particular, then, $\text{Ext}^j(M, R/\mathfrak{M}^{n+1}) \neq 0$. By our hypothesis j must be 0, i.e. $\text{pd } M = 0$, and since R is local, M is R -free. ■

COROLLARY 2.3. *Let (R, \mathfrak{M}) be a local ring with $\mathfrak{M}^{n+1} = 0$. If $e_n > \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} e_i$ then R is a weak test module.*

Now suppose (R, \mathfrak{M}) is a regular local ring of dimension k . Let

$\{x_1, \dots, x_k\}$ be a minimal set of generators for \mathfrak{M} . Then the monomials of degree r in x_1, \dots, x_k form a minimal generating set for \mathfrak{M}^r , for any $r \geq 1$. There are $\binom{k+r-1}{r}$ such monomials, so $e_r = \binom{k+r-1}{r}$. To improve the notation, let us replace e_r with $e_{k,r}$, to indicate explicitly the dependence on k . So $e_{k,0} = 1$ and for $r \geq 1$, $e_{k,r} = \binom{k+r-1}{r}$. Now using induction it is easy to verify that for $r \geq 1$, $e(k, r) / \sum_{i=0}^{r-1} e(k, i) = k/r$. Hence if $r < k$, $e(k, r) > \sum_{i=0}^{r-1} e(k, i)$. Together with Corollary 2.3 this implies:

COROLLARY 2.4. *Let (R, \mathfrak{M}) be a regular local ring of dimension k . Let $S = R/\mathfrak{M}^{n+1}$, $n+1 \leq k$. If M is an S -module such that for all $i > 0$, $\text{Ext}_S^i(M, S) = 0$, then M is S -free. In other words, S , as an S -module, is a weak test module.*

It should be pointed out that if a local ring S , as an S -module, is a weak test module, then every S -module whose Gorenstein dimension (G-dim) is zero is S -free. (Following [1], G-dim $M = 0$ if M is reflexive and for all $i > 0$, $\text{Ext}_S^i(M, S) = \text{Ext}_S^i(M^*, S) = 0$.) If a local ring S is self-injective, then it is easy to see that every S -module has G-dim zero, so if S is not a field there are nonfree modules M with G-dim $M = 0$. However, it is not hard to construct artin local rings which are *not* self-injective and which have nonfree modules whose G-dim is zero.

For example, let (R, \mathfrak{M}) be a local Cohen-Macaulay ring of dimension one with $\text{inj dim}_R R = \infty$. Let $x \in \mathfrak{M}$ be R -regular and let $S = R/(x^2)$. Then $\text{inj dim}_S S = \infty$, [4, Theorem 2.10], and $\dim S = 0$, so S is artin. Let \bar{x} = the image of x in S . Then $\text{ann}_S(\bar{x}) = S\bar{x}$. Hence the sequence $0 \rightarrow S\bar{x} \rightarrow S \rightarrow S/\bar{x} \rightarrow 0$ is exact. Then $(S\bar{x})^* = \text{Hom}_S(S\bar{x}, S) \approx \text{Hom}_S(S/S\bar{x}, S) \approx \text{ann}_S(S\bar{x}) = S\bar{x}$. So $S\bar{x}$ is its own dual (and therefore is reflexive). Thus the above sequence is its own dual and so $\text{Ext}_S^1(S\bar{x}, S) = 0$. But $\text{Ext}_S^i(S\bar{x}, S) \approx \text{Ext}_S^{i+1}(S\bar{x}, S)$ for all $i > 0$. Hence $\text{Ext}_S^i(S\bar{x}, S) = 0$ for all $i > 0$. Since $S\bar{x} \approx (S\bar{x})^*$, $\text{Ext}_S^i(S\bar{x}^*, S) = 0$ for all $i > 0$. So G-dim $S\bar{x} = 0$, and $S\bar{x}$ is not free since $\text{ann}_S(S\bar{x}) = S\bar{x} \neq 0$.

We conclude this paper with an observation that the self-injectivity of an artin local ring depends upon the vanishing of a single particular Ext.

PROPOSITION 2.5. *Suppose (R, \mathfrak{M}) is an artin local ring with $n+1$ = index of nilpotence of \mathfrak{M} . Then R is self-injective $\Leftrightarrow \text{Ext}^1(R/\mathfrak{M}^n, R) = 0$.*

PROOF. (\Rightarrow) Obvious.

(\Leftarrow) Dualizing the exact sequence $0 \rightarrow \mathfrak{M}^n \rightarrow R \rightarrow R/\mathfrak{M}^n \rightarrow 0$ we have that

$$0 \rightarrow \text{Hom}(R/\mathfrak{M}^n, R) \rightarrow R \rightarrow \text{Hom}(\mathfrak{M}^n, R) \rightarrow 0$$

is exact. $\text{Hom}(R/\mathfrak{M}^n, R) \approx \text{ann}(\mathfrak{M}^n) = \mathfrak{M}$ (since $\mathfrak{M}^{n+1} = 0$ and $\mathfrak{M}^n \neq 0$). Hence $\text{Hom}(\mathfrak{M}^n, R) \approx R/\mathfrak{M}$. But \mathfrak{M}^n is an R/\mathfrak{M} -module and thus a direct sum of copies of R/\mathfrak{M} . Therefore $\text{Hom}(\mathfrak{M}^n, R)$ is a direct sum of copies of $\text{Hom}(R/\mathfrak{M}, R)$. Since, on the other hand, it is a simple module, we conclude that $R/\mathfrak{M} \approx \text{Hom}(\mathfrak{M}^n, R) \approx \text{Hom}(R/\mathfrak{M}, R)$. Now $\text{Hom}(R/\mathfrak{M}, R)$ is the socle of R , and it is well known (see, for example, [3, Corollary 2.8]) that R is self-injective if and only if $\text{length}(\text{socle of } R) = 1$, so we are done. ■

REFERENCES

1. M. Auslander and M. Bridger, *Stable module theory*, Mem. Amer. Math. Soc. No. 94 (1969).
2. M. Auslander and O. Goldman, *Maximal orders*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 97 (1960), 1–24. MR 22 #8034.
3. H. Bass, *On the ubiquity of Gorenstein rings*, Math. Z. 82 (1963), 8–28. MR 27 #3669.
4. M. Ramras, *Maximal orders over regular local rings of dimension two*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 142 (1969), 457–479. MR 39 #6878.

HARVARD UNIVERSITY, CAMBRIDGE, MASSACHUSETTS 02138