ORE EXTENSIONS OVER NEAR PSEUDO-VALUATION RINGS AND NOETHERIAN RINGS

V. K. BHAT

Abstract. We recall that a ring $R$ is called near pseudo-valuation ring if every minimal prime ideal is a strongly prime ideal.

Let $R$ be a commutative ring, $\sigma$ an automorphism of $R$ and $\delta$ a $\sigma$-derivation of $R$. We recall that a prime ideal $P$ of $R$ is $\delta$-divided if it is comparable (under inclusion) to every $\sigma$-invariant and $\delta$-invariant ideal $I$ (i.e. $\sigma(I) \subseteq I$ and $\delta(I) \subseteq I$) of $R$. A ring $R$ is called a $\delta$-divided ring if every prime ideal of $R$ is $\delta$-divided. A ring $R$ is said to be almost $\delta$-divided ring if every minimal prime ideal of $R$ is $\delta$-divided.

Recall that an endomorphism $\sigma$ of a ring $R$ is called Min.Spec-type if $\sigma(U) \subseteq U$ for all minimal prime ideals $U$ of $R$ and $R$ is a Min.Spec-type ring (if there exists a Min.Spec-type endomorphism of $R$). With this we prove the following.

Let $R$ be a commutative Noetherian $Q$-algebra ($Q$ is the field of rational numbers), $\sigma$ a Min.Spec-type automorphism of $R$ and $\delta$ a $\sigma$-derivation of $R$ such that $\sigma(\delta(a)) = \delta(\sigma(a))$ for all $a \in R$. Further let any strongly prime ideal $U$ of $R$ with $\sigma(U) \subseteq U$ and $\delta(U) \subseteq U$ implies that $U[x;\sigma,\delta]$ is a strongly prime ideal of $R[x;\sigma,\delta]$. Then

1) $R$ is a near pseudo valuation ring implies that $R[x;\sigma,\delta]$ is a near pseudo valuation ring
2) $R$ is an almost $\delta$-divided ring if and only if $R[x;\sigma,\delta]$ is an almost $\delta$-divided ring.

1. Introduction

We follow the notation as in Bhat [14]. All rings are associative with identity. Throughout this paper $R$ denotes a commutative ring with identity $1 \neq 0$. The set of prime ideals of $R$ is denoted by $\text{Spec}(R)$, the set of minimal prime ideals of $R$ is denoted by $\text{Min. Spec}(R)$, and the set of strongly prime ideals is denoted
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by S. Spec(R). The fields of rational numbers and real numbers are denoted by \( \mathbb{Q} \) and \( \mathbb{R} \) respectively unless otherwise stated.

We recall that as in Hedstrom and Houston [16], an integral domain \( R \) with quotient field \( F \), is called a pseudo-valuation domain (PVD) if each prime ideal \( P \) of \( R \) is strongly prime \((ab \in P, a \in F, b \in F \) implies that either \( a \in P \) or \( b \in P \)). For a survey article on pseudo-valuation domains, the reader is referred to Badawi [6].

In Badawi, Anderson and Dobbs [8], the study of pseudo-valuation domains was generalized to arbitrary rings in the following way. A prime ideal \( P \) of \( R \) is said to be strongly prime if \( R \) is strongly prime if \( aP \subseteq bR \) or \( bR \subseteq aP \) for all \( a, b \in R \). A ring \( R \) is said to be a pseudo-valuation ring (PVR) if each prime ideal \( P \) of \( R \) is strongly prime. For more details on pseudo-valuation rings, the reader is referred to Badawi [7].

The concept of pseudo-valuation domain is generalized to the context of rings with zero divisors as in [8, 1, 3, 4, 5].

This article concerns the study of skew polynomial rings over PVDs. Let \( R \) be a ring, \( \sigma \) an endomorphism of \( R \) and \( \delta \) a \( \sigma \)-derivation of \( R \) \((\delta: R \to R \) is an additive map with \( \delta(ab) = \delta(a)\sigma(b) + a\delta(b) \), for all \( a, b \in R \)). In case \( \sigma \) is identity, \( \delta \) is just called a derivation. For example let \( R = F[x], F \) a field. Then \( \delta: R \to R \) defined by \( \delta(f(x)) = f(0) \) is an endomorphism of \( R \). Also let \( K = \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R} \). Then \( g: K \to K \) by \( g(a, b) = (b, a) \) is an automorphism of \( K \).

Let \( \sigma \) be an automorphism of a ring \( R \) and \( \delta: R \to R \) any map. Let \( \phi: R \to M_2(R) \) be a map defined by

\[
\phi(r) = \begin{pmatrix} \sigma(r) & 0 \\ \delta(r) & r \end{pmatrix}, \text{ for all } r \in R.
\]

Then \( \delta \) is a \( \sigma \)-derivation of \( R \) if and only if \( \phi \) is a homomorphism.

Also let \( R = F[x], F \) a field. Then the usual differential operator \( \frac{d}{dx} \) is a derivation of \( R \).

We denote the Ore extension \( R[x; \sigma, \delta] \) by \( O(R) \). If \( I \) is an ideal of \( R \) such that \( I \) is \( \sigma \)-invariant; i.e. \( \sigma(I) \subseteq I \) and \( I \) is \( \delta \)-invariant; i.e. \( \delta(I) \subseteq I \), then we denote \( I[x; \sigma, \delta] \) by \( O(I) \). We would like to mention that \( R[x; \sigma, \delta] \) is the usual set of polynomials with coefficients in \( R \), i.e. \( \{\sum_{i=0}^n x^i a_i, \ a_i \in R \} \) in which multiplication is subject to the relation \( ax = x\sigma(a) + \delta(a) \) for all \( a \in R \).

In case \( \delta \) is the zero map, we denote the skew polynomial ring \( R[x; \sigma] \) by \( S(R) \) and for any ideal \( I \) of \( R \) with \( \sigma(I) \subseteq I \), we denote \( I[x; \sigma] \) by \( S(I) \). In case \( \sigma \) is the identity map, we denote the differential operator ring \( R[x; \delta] \) by \( D(R) \) and for any ideal \( J \) of \( R \) with \( \delta(J) \subseteq J \), we denote \( J[x; \delta] \) by \( D(J) \).

Ore-extensions (skew-polynomial rings and differential operator rings) have been of interest to many authors. For example see [10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15].

**Near Pseudo-valuation rings.** Recall that a ring \( R \) is called a near pseudo-valuation ring (NPVR) if each minimal prime ideal \( P \) of \( R \) is strongly prime (Bhat [13]). For example a reduced ring is NPVR. Here the term near may not
be interpreted as near ring (Bell and Mason [9]). We note that a near pseudo-valuation ring (NPVR) is a pseudo-valuation ring (PVR), but the converse is not true. For example a reduced ring is a NPVR, but need not be a PVR.

**Divided rings.** We recall that a prime ideal $P$ of $R$ is said to be divided if it is comparable (under inclusion) to every ideal of $R$. A ring $R$ is called a divided ring if every prime ideal of $R$ is divided (Badawi [2]). It is known (Lemma (1) of Badawi, Anderson and Dobbs [8]) that a pseudo-valuation ring is a divided ring. Recall that a ring $R$ is called an almost divided ring if every minimal prime ideal of $R$ is divided (Bhat [13]).

**$\delta$-divided rings.** A prime ideal $P$ of $R$ is said to be $\delta$-divided (where $\delta$ is a $\sigma$-derivation of $R$) if it is comparable (under inclusion) to every $\sigma$-invariant and $\delta$-invariant ideal $I$ of $R$. A ring $R$ is called a $\delta$-divided ring if every prime ideal of $R$ is $\delta$-divided (Bhat [11]). A ring $R$ is said to be almost $\delta$-divided ring if every minimal prime ideal of $R$ is $\delta$-divided (Bhat [13]). For more details on near pseudo-valuation rings, $\delta$-divided rings and almost $\delta$-divided rings the reader is referred to [11, 13, 14].

The author of this paper has proved the following in [14] concerning strongly prime ideals of Ore extensions.

**Theorem B** (Bhat [14]). Let $R$ be a Noetherian ring, which is also an algebra over $\mathbb{Q}$. Let $\delta$ be a derivation of $R$. Further let any $U \in S\cdot \text{Spec}(R)$ with $\delta(U) \subseteq U$ implies that $O(U) \in S\cdot \text{Spec}(O(R))$. Then

1. $R$ is a near pseudo-valuation ring implies that $D(R)$ is a near pseudo-valuation ring
2. $R$ is an almost $\delta$-divided ring if and only if $D(R)$ is an almost $\delta$-divided ring.

**Theorem BB** (Bhat [14]). Let $R$ be a Noetherian ring. Let $\sigma$ be a Min.Spec-type automorphism of $R$. Further let any $U \in S\cdot \text{Spec}(R)$ with $\sigma(U) = U$ implies that $O(U) \in S\cdot \text{Spec}(O(R))$. Then

1. $R$ is a near pseudo-valuation ring implies that $S(R)$ is a near pseudo-valuation ring
2. $R$ is an almost $\sigma$-divided ring if and only if $S(R)$ is an almost $\sigma$-divided ring.

In this paper we generalize the above results of [14] and answer the problem posed in [14].

**Theorem A.** Let $R$ be a commutative Noetherian $\mathbb{Q}$-algebra, $\sigma$ a Min.Spec-type automorphism of $R$ and $\delta$ a $\sigma$-derivation of $R$ such that $\sigma(\delta(a)) = \delta(\sigma(a))$ for all $a \in R$. Further let any $U \in S\cdot \text{Spec}(R)$ with $\sigma(U) \subseteq U$ and $\delta(U) \subseteq U$ implies that $O(U) \in S\cdot \text{Spec}(O(R))$. Then

1. $R$ is a near pseudo valuation ring implies that $R[x; \sigma, \delta]$ is a near pseudo valuation ring
2. $R$ is an almost $\delta$-divided ring if and only if $R[x; \sigma, \delta]$ is an almost $\delta$-divided ring.
This is proved in Theorem (2.5), but before that, we have the following definition.

**Definition 1.1** (see [14]). Let \( R \) be a ring. We say that an endomorphism \( \sigma \) of \( R \) is Min.Spec-type if \( \sigma(U) \subseteq U \) for all minimal prime ideals \( U \) of \( R \). We say that a ring \( R \) is Min.Spec-type ring if there exists a Min.Spec-type endomorphism of \( R \).

**Example 1.2** (see [14]). Let \( R = \begin{pmatrix} F & F \\ 0 & F \end{pmatrix} \), where \( F \) is a field. Let \( \sigma : R \to R \) be defined by \( \sigma \left( \begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ 0 & c \end{pmatrix} \right) = \begin{pmatrix} a & 0 \\ 0 & c \end{pmatrix} \). Then it can be seen that \( \sigma \) is a Min.Spec-type endomorphism of \( R \), and therefore, \( R \) is a Min.Spec-type ring.

2. **Proof of Main Theorem**

**Theorem 2.1.** Let \( R \) be a right Noetherian ring which is also an algebra over \( \mathbb{Q} \). Let \( \sigma \) be a Min.Spec-type automorphism of \( R \) and \( \delta \) a \( \sigma \)-derivation of \( R \). Then \( \delta(U) \subseteq U \) for all \( U \in \text{Min.Spec}(R) \).

**Proof.** Let \( U \in \text{Min.Spec}(R) \). We have \( \sigma(U) \subseteq U \). Consider the set
\[
T = \{ a \in U \mid \text{ such that } \delta^k(a) \in U \text{ for all integers } k \geq 1 \}.
\]
First of all, we will show that \( T \) is an ideal of \( R \). Let \( a, b \in T \). Then \( \delta^k(a) \in U \) and \( \delta^k(b) \in U \) for all integers \( k \geq 1 \). Now \( \delta^k(a - b) = \delta^k(a) - \delta^k(b) \in U \) for all \( k \geq 1 \). Therefore \( a - b \in T \). Therefore \( T \) is a \( \delta \)-invariant ideal of \( R \).

We will now show that \( T \in \text{Spec}(R) \). Suppose \( T \notin \text{Spec}(R) \). Let \( a \notin T \), \( b \notin T \) be such that \( aRb \subseteq T \). Let \( t, s \) be least such that \( \delta^t(a) \notin U \) and \( \delta^s(b) \notin U \). Now there exists \( c \in R \) such that \( \delta^t(a)\sigma^t(\delta^s(b)) \notin U \). Let \( d = \sigma^{-t}(c) \). Now \( \delta^{t+s}(abd) \in U \) as \( aRb \subseteq T \). This implies on simplification that
\[
\delta^t(a)\sigma^t(d)\sigma^s(\delta^s(b)) + u \in U,
\]
where \( u \) is sum of terms involving \( \delta^l(a) \) or \( \delta^m(b) \), where \( l < t \) and \( m < s \). Therefore by assumption \( u \in U \) which implies that \( \delta^t(a)\sigma^t(d)\sigma^s(\delta^s(b)) \in U \). This is a contradiction. Therefore, our supposition must be wrong. Hence \( T \in \text{Spec}(R) \). Now \( T \subseteq U \), so \( T = U \) as \( U \in \text{Min.Spec}(R) \). Hence, \( \delta(U) \subseteq U \). \( \Box \)

**Lemma 2.2.** Let \( R \) be a right Noetherian ring which is also an algebra over \( \mathbb{Q} \). Let \( \sigma \) be a Min.Spec-type automorphism of \( R \) and \( \delta \) a \( \sigma \)-derivation of \( R \). Then

1. if \( U \) is a minimal prime ideal of \( R \), then \( O(U) \) is a minimal prime ideal of \( O(R) \) and \( O(U) \cap R = U \)
2. if \( P \) is a minimal prime ideal of \( O(R) \), then \( P \cap R \) is a minimal prime ideal of \( R \).

**Proof.** (1) Let \( U \) be a minimal prime ideal of \( R \). Now \( \sigma(U) \subseteq U \) and by Theorem (2.1) \( \delta(U) \subseteq U \). Now, on the same lines as in Theorem (2.22) of
Goodearl and Warfield [15] we have \( O(U) \in \text{Spec}(O(R)) \). Suppose \( L \subset O(U) \) be a minimal prime ideal of \( O(R) \). Then \( L \cap R \subseteq U \) is a prime ideal of \( R \), a contradiction. Therefore \( O(U) \in \text{Min.Spec}(O(R)) \). Now it is easy to see that \( O(U) \cap R = U \).

(2) We note that \( x \notin P \) for any prime ideal \( P \) of \( O(R) \) as it is not a zero divisor. Now, the proof follows on the same lines as in Theorem (2.22) of Goodearl and Warfield [15] using Lemma (2.1) and Lemma (2.2) of Bhat [11] and Theorem (2.1).

**Theorem 2.3.** Let \( R \) be a right/left Noetherian ring. Let \( \sigma \) and \( \delta \) be as usual. Then the ore extension \( O(R) = R[x; \sigma, \delta] \) is right/left Noetherian.

**Proof.** See Theorem (1.12) of Goodearl and Warfield [15].

**Remark 2.4.** Let \( \sigma \) be an endomorphism of a ring \( R \) and \( \delta \) a \( \sigma \)-derivation of \( R \) such that \( \sigma(\delta(a)) = \delta(\sigma(a)) \) for all \( a \in R \). Then \( \sigma \) can be extended to an endomorphism (say \( \bar{\sigma} \)) of \( R[x; \sigma, \delta] \) by \( \bar{\sigma}(\sum_{i=0}^{m} x^i a_i) = \sum_{i=0}^{m} x^i \sigma(a_i) \). Also \( \delta \) can be extended to a \( \bar{\sigma} \)-derivation (say \( \bar{\delta} \)) of \( R[x; \sigma, \delta] \) by \( \bar{\delta}(\sum_{i=0}^{m} x^i a_i) = \sum_{i=0}^{m} x^i \delta(a_i) \).

We note that if \( \sigma(\delta(a)) \neq \delta(\sigma(a)) \) for all \( a \in R \), then the above does not hold. For example let \( f(x) = xa \) and \( g(x) = xb, a, b \in R \). Then

\[
\bar{\delta}(f(x)g(x)) = x^2\{\sigma(\delta(a))\sigma(b) + \sigma(a)\delta(b)\} + x\{\delta^2(a)\sigma(b) + \delta(a)\sigma(b)\},
\]

but

\[
\bar{\delta}(f(x))\bar{\sigma}(g(x)) + f(x)\bar{\delta}(g(x)) = x^2\{\sigma(\delta(a))\sigma(b) + \sigma(a)\delta(b)\} + x\{\delta^2(a)\sigma(b) + \delta(a)\sigma(b)\}.
\]

We are now in a position to prove Theorem A as follows.

**Theorem 2.5.** Let \( R \) be a commutative Noetherian \( \mathbb{Q} \)-algebra, \( \sigma \) a Min.Spec-type automorphism of \( R \) and \( \delta \) a \( \sigma \)-derivation of \( R \) such that \( \sigma(\delta(a)) = \delta(\sigma(a)) \) for all \( a \in R \). Further let any \( U \in S.\text{Spec}(R) \) with \( \sigma(U) \subseteq U \) and \( \delta(U) \subseteq U \) implies that \( O(U) \in S.\text{Spec}(O(R)) \). Then

(1) \( R \) is a near pseudo valuation ring implies that \( R[x; \sigma, \delta] \) is a near pseudo valuation ring

(2) \( R \) is an almost \( \delta \)-divided ring if and only if \( R[x; \sigma, \delta] \) is an almost \( \delta \)-divided ring.

**Proof.** (1) Let \( R \) be a near pseudo-valuation ring which is also an algebra over \( \mathbb{Q} \). Now \( O(R) \) is Noetherian by Theorem (2.3). Let \( J \in \text{Min.Spec}(O(R)) \). Then by Lemma (2.2) \( J \cap R \subseteq \text{Min.Spec}(R) \). Now \( R \) is a near pseudo-valuation \( \mathbb{Q} \)-algebra, therefore \( J \cap R \in S.\text{Spec}(R) \). Also \( \delta(J \cap R) \subseteq J \cap R \) by Theorem (2.1). Now Lemma (2.2) implies that \( O(J \cap R) = J \), and by hypothesis \( O(J \cap R) \in S.\text{Spec}(O(R)) \). Therefore, \( J \in S.\text{Spec}(O(R)) \). Hence \( O(R) \) is a near pseudo-valuation ring.

(2) Let \( R \) be an almost \( \delta \)-divided which is also an algebra over \( \mathbb{Q} \). Now \( O(R) \) is Noetherian by Theorem (2.3). Let \( J \in \text{Min.Spec}(O(R)) \) and \( K \) be an ideal
of $O(R)$ such that $\sigma(K) \subseteq K$ and $\delta(K) \subseteq K$. Note that $\sigma$ can be extended to an automorphism of $O(R)$ and $\delta$ can be extended to a $\sigma$-derivation of $O(R)$ by Remark (2.4). Now by Lemma (2.2) $J \cap R \in \text{Min}. \text{Spec}(R)$. Now $R$ is an almost $\delta$-divided commutative Noetherian $\mathbb{Q}$-algebra, therefore $J \cap R$ and $K \cap R$ are comparable (under inclusion), say $J \cap R \subseteq K \cap R$. Now $\delta(K \cap R) \subseteq K \cap R$. Therefore, $O(K \cap R)$ is an ideal of $O(R)$ and so $O(J \cap R) \subseteq O(K \cap R)$. This implies that $J \subseteq K$. Hence $O(R)$ is an almost $\delta$-divided ring.

Conversely suppose that $O(R)$ is almost $\delta$-divided. Let $U \in \text{Min}. \text{Spec}(R)$ and $V$ be an ideal of $R$ such that $\sigma(U) \subseteq U$ and $\delta(U) \subseteq U$. Now by Theorem (2.1) $\delta(U) \subseteq U$, and Lemma (2.2) implies that $O(U) \in \text{Min}. \text{Spec}(O(R))$. Now $O(R)$ is an almost $\delta$-divided ring, therefore $O(U)$ and $O(V)$ are comparable (under inclusion), say $O(U) \subseteq O(V)$. Therefore, $O(U) \cap R \subseteq O(V) \cap R$; i.e. $U \subseteq V$. Hence $R$ is an almost $\delta$-divided ring. \qed

We note that in above Theorem the hypothesis that any $U \in S.\text{Spec}(R)$ with $\delta(U) \subseteq U$ implies that $O(U) \in S.\text{Spec}(O(R))$ can not be deleted as extension of a strongly prime ideal of $R$ need not be a strongly prime ideal of $O(R)$.

Example 2.6 (see [14]). $R = \mathbb{Z}_{(p)}$. This is in fact a discrete valuation domain, and therefore, its maximal ideal $P = pR$ is strongly prime. But, $pR[x]$ is not strongly prime in $R[x]$ because it is not comparable with $xR[x]$ (so the condition of being strongly prime in $R[x]$ fails for $a = 1$ and $b = x$).

Question 2.7. Let $R$ be a NPVR. Let $\sigma$ be an automorphism of $R$ and $\delta$ a $\sigma$-derivation of $R$. Is $O(R) = R[x; \sigma, \delta]$ a NPVR?
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