

THE $t\#$ -PROPERTY FOR INTEGRAL DOMAINS

STEFANIA GABELLI, EVAN HOUSTON, AND THOMAS G. LUCAS

INTRODUCTION

Let R denote an integral domain with quotient field K . Then R is said to be a $\#$ -domain or to satisfy the $\#$ -condition if $\bigcap_{M \in \mathcal{M}_1} R_M \neq \bigcap_{M \in \mathcal{M}_2} R_M$ whenever \mathcal{M}_1 and \mathcal{M}_2 are distinct subsets of the set of maximal ideals of R . Prüfer domains satisfying the $\#$ -condition were first studied in [9] and [10]. Domains each of whose overrings satisfy the $\#$ -condition were also studied in [10] (in the Prüfer case); these domains have come to be called $\#\#$ -domains.

Although the papers mentioned above contain very interesting results, those results are essentially restricted to the class of Prüfer domains. This paper represents an effort to extend, by a modification of the definitions, results about the $\#$ - and $\#\#$ -conditions to a much wider class of domains. In the first section, we introduce the $t\#$ -condition: A domain R satisfies the $t\#$ -condition if $\bigcap_{M \in \mathcal{M}_1} R_M \neq \bigcap_{M \in \mathcal{M}_2} R_M$ for any two distinct subsets $\mathcal{M}_1, \mathcal{M}_2$ of the set of maximal t -ideals of R . We discuss the extent to which the properties shown in [10] to be equivalent to the $\#$ -property carry over to our setting. For example, [10, Theorem 1 (a) \Leftrightarrow (b)] states that the domain R has the $\#$ -property if and only if each maximal ideal M of R contains a finitely generated ideal which is contained in no other maximal ideal of R ; we show that this result has a natural counterpart in the class of v -coherent domains (which includes all Noetherian domains). (All relevant definitions are given below.) In addition, we show that for *any* domain R , R has the $t\#$ -property if and only if each maximal t -ideal M of R contains a *divisorial* ideal contained in no other maximal t -ideal of R . We also give examples to show that “divisorial” cannot be replaced by “finitely generated” in general.

In Section 2, we attempt to generalize the $\#\#$ -property. In the case of Prüfer domains, the definition of the $\#\#$ -property is reasonable since the overrings have nice properties (e.g., they are flat). To obtain a useful definition of the $t\#\#$ -property for more general classes of rings, however, one must decide which overrings should be required to have the $t\#$ -property. For example, we could say that R has the $t\#\#$ -property if each t -linked overring of R has the $t\#$ -property. Another possibility is to require that the overrings of R which are generalized rings of quotients of R should have the $t\#$ -property. In the end we avoid making a definition at all. Instead, we explore several classes of overrings, primarily in the context of v -coherent domains, and we obtain quite satisfactory results for Prüfer v -multiplication domains.

Section 3 is devoted to a study of the $t\#$ -property for polynomial rings. We show that if R has the $t\#$ -property, then so does $R[\{X_\alpha\}]$ and that the converse is true if $R[\{X_\alpha\}]$ is assumed to be v -coherent. We also consider the $t\#$ -property in two commonly studied localizations of $R[\{X_\alpha\}]$.

All three authors acknowledge support from the Cultural Co-operation Agreement between Università degli Studi Roma Tre and The University of North Carolina at Charlotte.

1. THE $t\#$ -PROPERTY

For a nonzero fractional ideal I of a domain R with quotient field K , we set $I^{-1} = (R :_K I) = \{x \in K \mid xI \subseteq R\}$, $I_v = (I^{-1})^{-1}$, and $I_t = \bigcup J_v$, where the union is taken over all nonzero finitely generated subideals J of I . The reader is referred to [8] for properties of these (and other) star operations. We also recall that I is said to be *divisorial* if $I = I_v$ and to be a *t -ideal* if $I = I_t$. Finally, we denote the set of maximal t -ideals of R by $t\text{-Max}(R)$.

We begin by repeating the definition of the $t\#$ -property.

Definition 1.1. A domain R has the $t\#$ -property (or is a $t\#$ -domain) if $\bigcap_{M \in \mathcal{M}_1} R_M \neq \bigcap_{M \in \mathcal{M}_2} R_M$ for any two distinct subsets \mathcal{M}_1 and \mathcal{M}_2 of $t\text{-Max}(R)$.

Theorem 1.2. *The following statements are equivalent for a domain R .*

- (1) R is a $t\#$ -domain.
- (2) For each $N \in t\text{-Max}(R)$, we have $\bigcap_{M \in t\text{-Max}(R) \setminus \{N\}} R_M \not\subseteq R_N$.
- (3) For each $N \in t\text{-Max}(R)$, we have $R \neq \bigcap_{M \in t\text{-Max}(R) \setminus \{N\}} R_M$.
- (4) $\bigcap_{M \in \mathcal{M}_1} R_M$ and $\bigcap_{M \in \mathcal{M}_2} R_M$ are incomparable for each pair of disjoint subsets \mathcal{M}_1 and \mathcal{M}_2 of $t\text{-Max}(R)$.
- (5) For each maximal t -ideal M of R , there is a divisorial ideal of R which is contained in M and no other maximal t -ideal of R .
- (6) For each maximal t -ideal M of R , there is an element $u \in K \setminus R$ such that M is the only maximal t -ideal containing $(R :_R u)$.

Proof. By [11, Proposition 4] we have $R = \bigcap_{M \in t\text{-Max}(R)} R_M$. Using this and the definitions, the following implications are straightforward: (1) \Leftrightarrow (2), (2) \Leftrightarrow (4); (2) \Leftrightarrow (3); and (6) \Rightarrow (5).

To prove (2) \Leftrightarrow (6), observe that an element $u \in K$ satisfies $u \in \bigcap_{M \in t\text{-Max}(R) \setminus \{N\}} R_M \setminus R_N$ if and only if $(R :_R u)$ is contained in N and no other maximal t -ideal of R .

Now assume (5). Let $N \in t\text{-Max}(R)$, and pick a divisorial ideal I with $I \subseteq N$ and $I \not\subseteq M$ for each $M \in t\text{-Max}(R) \setminus \{N\}$. Then $I^{-1} \subseteq \bigcap_{M \in t\text{-Max}(R) \setminus \{N\}} R_M$ (since for each M , we have $(R :_R I^{-1}) = I \not\subseteq M$), but $I^{-1} \not\subseteq R$. Hence (5) \Rightarrow (3), and the proof is complete. \square

Corollary 1.3. *If R is a domain with the property that each maximal t -ideal is divisorial, then R is a $t\#$ -domain.*

Proof. This is clear from the equivalence of conditions (1) and (5) of Theorem 1.2. \square

Recall that a *Mori domain* is a domain satisfying the ascending chain condition on (integral) divisorial ideals. Equivalently, a domain R is a Mori domain if for each ideal I of R there is a finitely generated ideal $J \subseteq I$ with $I_v = J_v$. In particular, the v - and t -operations on a Mori domain are the same. Hence Corollary 1.3 implies that Mori domains are $t\#$ -domains.

Remark 1.4. We have stated Theorem 1.2 for the t -operation, since our primary interest is in that particular star operation. However, suppose that for a finite-type star operation $*$, we call a domain R a $*\#$ -domain if for each pair of nonempty subsets \mathcal{M}_1 and \mathcal{M}_2 of $*\text{-Max}(R)$ with $\mathcal{M}_1 \neq \mathcal{M}_2$, we have $\bigcap_{M \in \mathcal{M}_1} R_M \neq \bigcap_{M \in \mathcal{M}_2} R_M$. Then Theorem 1.2 remains true with t replaced everywhere (including the proof) by $*$. This is of some interest even in

the case where $*$ is the trivial star operation ($I^* = I$ for each ideal I ; this is often referred to as the d -operation). For the trivial star operation, Olberding has proved the equivalence of statements (1) and (5) in [20, Proposition 2.2].

Theorem 1.2 (1) \Leftrightarrow (6) generalizes [10, Theorem 1 (a) \Leftrightarrow (b)], which states that a Prüfer domain R is a $\#$ -domain if and only if each maximal ideal of R contains a finitely generated ideal which is contained in no other maximal ideal of R . This follows upon recalling that for R Prüfer (i) each ideal is a t -ideal (so that $t\text{-Max}(R) = \text{Max}(R)$) and (ii) for each $u \in K$, $(R :_R u)$ is finitely generated (in fact, two generated). In general, one cannot hope to show that each maximal t -ideal of a $t\#$ -domain contains a finitely generated ideal which is contained in no other maximal t -ideal, as the following example shows. (Example 1.7 below is another such example. However, that example has (Krull) dimension two, and we think it might be of some interest to have a one-dimensional example.)

Example 1.5. Let T be an almost Dedekind domain with exactly one noninvertible maximal ideal M . (One such example is constructed in [8, Example 42.6].) By [9, Theorem 3], T is not a $\#$ -domain. For our purposes, it does no harm to assume that T/M has a proper subfield. This follows from the fact that $T(X) = T[X]_S$, where S is the multiplicatively closed subset of $T[X]$ consisting of those polynomials g having unit content (the ideal generated by the coefficients of g), is also an almost Dedekind domain with exactly one noninvertible maximal ideal, namely $MT(X)$, whose residue field $T(X)/MT(X) \approx (T/M)(X)$ has infinitely many proper subfields [8, Proposition 36.7]. Let F be such a proper subfield of T/M , and let R be defined by the following pullback diagram of canonical homomorphisms:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} R & \longrightarrow & F \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ T & \longrightarrow & k = T/M. \end{array}$$

We claim that R is a $t\#$ -domain. (In fact, since R is one dimensional, it is a $\#$ -domain.) We show that R satisfies condition (5) of Theorem 1.2. For this it suffices to observe that each maximal ideal of R is divisorial. This is clear for M , and if P is a maximal ideal of R with $P \neq M$, then by [7, Theorem 2.35] P is actually invertible. Hence R is a $(t)\#$ -domain. Since T is a non- $t\#$ -Prüfer domain with offending maximal ideal M , however, there is no finitely generated ideal of T contained in M but no other maximal ideal of T ; clearly, a similar statement applies to R .

If we restrict our attention to domains in which conductors are required to be finitely generated, i.e., to *finite conductor domains*, then the $t\#$ -property becomes equivalent to the property that each maximal t -ideal contain a finitely generated ideal contained in no other maximal t -ideal. In fact, we can obtain such a result by requiring a little less than finite generation of conductors. Recall that a domain R is said to be *v -coherent* if for each finitely generated ideal I of R , I^{-1} has finite type (i.e., there is a finitely generated ideal J with $I^{-1} = J_v$). This condition was first studied (under a different name) by Nour el Abidine [19]. It is easy to see that a finite conductor domain is v -coherent. We have the following result.

Theorem 1.6. *For a v -coherent domain, the conditions of Theorem 1.2 are each equivalent to: Each maximal t -ideal of R contains a finitely generated ideal which is contained in no other maximal t -ideal of R .*

Proof. The stated condition clearly implies condition (5) of Theorem 1.2. On the other hand, condition (6), in the presence of v -coherence, implies the stated condition. \square

Now [10, Theorem 1] contains a third equivalence, namely that R is uniquely representable as an intersection of a family $\{V_\alpha\}$ of valuation overrings such that there are no containment relations among the V_α . Since each valuation overring of a Prüfer domain is a localization, this suggests exploring the possibility that the $t\#$ -property on a domain R is equivalent to the condition that R contain a unique set of incomparable t -primes $\{P_\alpha\}$ such that $R = \bigcap R_{P_\alpha}$. One implication is easy. If we assume the existence of a unique set of t -primes $\{P_\alpha\}$ such that $R = \bigcap R_{P_\alpha}$, then that set must be $t\text{-Max}(R)$, and so R is a $t\#$ -domain. In Theorem 1.8, we provide a converse in two cases. First, we give an example showing that the converse does not hold in general. Recall that a domain R is a *Prüfer v -multiplication domain* (PVMD) if R_M is a valuation domain for each maximal t -ideal M of R .

Example 1.7. In [13] Heinzer and Ohm give an example of an essential domain D which is not a PVMD. In their example k is a field, and y, z, x_1, x_2, \dots are independent indeterminants over k ; $R = k(x_1, x_2, \dots)[y, z]_{(y, z)}$; for each i , V_i is a rank one discrete valuation ring containing $k(\{x_j\}_{j \neq i})$ such that y, z , and x_i all have value 1; and $D = R \cap (\bigcap_i V_i)$. Then D is a 2-dimensional domain, and in [18] it is shown that the maximal ideals of D are M, P_1, P_2, \dots , where M is the contraction of the maximal ideal of $R = D_M$, and P_i is the contraction of the maximal ideal of $V_i = D_{P_i}$. Note that each P_i has height one and is therefore a t -ideal. We observe that each element of R is also in V_i for all but finitely many i ; this is the case since an element of R involves only finitely many of the x_j , and x_i is a unit of V_j for all $j \neq i$. Similarly, each element of the maximal ideal of R is in the maximal ideal of V_i for all but finitely many i . It follows that if I is a finitely generated ideal of D contained in M , then I , and hence also I_t , is contained in all but finitely many of the P_i . Suppose that for such an I we have $I_t \not\subseteq M$. Write $1 = x + m$ with $x \in I_t$ and $m \in M$. By the observations stated above, x and m must be simultaneously in all but finitely many of the P_i , a contradiction. Thus M is a t -ideal.¹ We show that R has the $t\#$ -property by showing that M and the P_i satisfy condition (5) of Theorem 1.2. For each i , the divisorial ideal $x_i D \subseteq P_i$, while $x_i \notin M$ and $x_i \notin P_j$ for $j \neq i$. As for M , note that $y/z \in \bigcap D_{P_i} \setminus D_M$. Hence $(D :_D y/z) \subseteq M$, but $(D :_D y/z) \not\subseteq P_i$ for $i = 1, 2, \dots$. Finally, denoting the height-one primes contained in M by $\{Q_\alpha\}$, we observe that $D = (\bigcap_\alpha D_{Q_\alpha}) \cap (\bigcap_i D_{P_i})$ for the set of incomparable t -primes $\{Q_\alpha\} \cup \{P_i\} \neq t\text{-Max}(R)$.

In our next result, we use the fact that a PVMD is v -coherent [19].

Theorem 1.8. *Let R be either a PVMD or a Mori domain. Then the conditions of Theorem 1.2 are each equivalent to: There is a unique set $\{P_\alpha\}$ of incomparable t -primes such that $R = \bigcap R_{P_\alpha}$. In particular, a Mori domain has this property.*

¹We observe that since $D_M = R$ is not a valuation domain, this yields an easy way to see that D is not a PVMD.

Proof. One implication was discussed above. Assume that R is a $t\#$ -domain, and suppose that $R = \bigcap R_{P_\alpha}$ for some set $\{P_\alpha\}$ of incomparable t -primes. Observe that the hypotheses guarantee that R is v -coherent. It suffices to show that each P_α is a maximal t -ideal. By way of contradiction, suppose that $P_\beta \subsetneq M$, where M is a maximal t -ideal. If R is a PVMD, then (since the P_α are incomparable and R_M is a valuation domain), $P_\alpha \not\subseteq M$ for each $\alpha \neq \beta$. By Theorem 1.6, M contains a finitely generated ideal I which is contained in M and no other maximal t -ideal. In particular, $I \not\subseteq P_\alpha$ for $\alpha \neq \beta$. Pick $a \in M \setminus P_\beta$. Then (I, a) is a finitely generated ideal contained in no P_α whatsoever. It follows that $(I, a)^{-1} \subseteq \bigcap R_{P_\alpha} = R$, whence $(I, a)_v = R$. However, since M is a t -ideal, we have $(I, a)_v \subseteq M$, a contradiction in this case. If R is Mori, then M itself is divisorial, and, since M is contained in no P_α , we obtain the contradiction that $M^{-1} \subseteq \bigcap R_{P_\alpha}$. \square

Remark 1.9. We have not been able to determine whether weakening the hypothesis of Theorem 1.8 to v -coherent is sufficient. It does suffice if we make the following subtle change to the condition: there is a unique set $\{P_\alpha\}$ of t -primes such that both $R = \bigcap R_{P_\alpha}$ and the intersection is irredundant (no R_{P_α} can be deleted). To see this, suppose that R is a $t\#$ -domain, and let $\{P_\alpha\}$ be as indicated. Pick a P_β ; we wish to show that it is a maximal t -ideal. The irredundancy hypothesis allows us to choose $u \in R_{P_\beta} \setminus \bigcap_{\alpha \neq \beta} R_{P_\alpha}$. We have $(R :_R u) \not\subseteq P_\beta$ and $(R :_R u) \subseteq P_\alpha$ for each $\alpha \neq \beta$. Since R is v -coherent, there is a finitely generated ideal I with $(R :_R u) = I_v$. Pick a maximal t -ideal $M \supseteq P_\beta$. If there is an element $a \in M \setminus P_\beta$, then, as in the proof of Theorem 1.8, the ideal (I, a) will furnish a contradiction.

2. OVERRINGS OF $t\#$ -DOMAINS

In [10] Gilmer and Heinzer also studied Prüfer domains with the property that each overring is a $\#$ -domain; these domains have come to be called $\#\#$ -domains. Our goal in this section is to obtain t -analogues of results on $\#\#$ -domains.

Most of the characterizations of Prüfer $\#\#$ -domains in [10] can be extended to PVMDs with the property that each t -linked overring is $t\#$. However, if we want to consider a larger class of domains, e.g., v -coherent domains, the question arises as to which overrings should be considered. Put another way, it is not clear exactly how one should define the $t\#\#$ -property (and we shall not do so).

In what follows, it will be convenient to employ the language of localizing systems. We recall the requisite definitions. A nonempty set \mathcal{F} of nonzero ideals of R is said to be a *multiplicative system of ideals* if $IJ \in \mathcal{F}$ for each $I, J \in \mathcal{F}$. The ring $R_{\mathcal{F}} = \{x \in K \mid xI \subseteq R \text{ for some } I \in \mathcal{F}\}$ is called a *generalized ring of quotients* of R . For each ideal J of R we set $J_{\mathcal{F}} = \{x \in K \mid xI \subseteq J \text{ for some } I \in \mathcal{F}\}$; $J_{\mathcal{F}}$ is an ideal of $R_{\mathcal{F}}$ containing $JR_{\mathcal{F}}$.

A particular type of multiplicative system is a *localizing system*: this is a set \mathcal{F} of ideals of R such that (1) if $I \in \mathcal{F}$ and J is an ideal of R with $I \subseteq J$, then $J \in \mathcal{F}$ and (2) if $I \in \mathcal{F}$ and J is an ideal of R such that $(J :_R a) \in \mathcal{F}$ for every $a \in I$, then $J \in \mathcal{F}$. If Λ is a subset of $\text{Spec } R$, then $\mathcal{F}(\Lambda) = \{I \mid I \text{ is an ideal of } R \text{ such that } I \not\subseteq P \text{ for each } P \in \Lambda\}$ is a localizing system; moreover, $R_{\mathcal{F}(\Lambda)} = \bigcap_{P \in \Lambda} R_P$. A localizing system \mathcal{F} is said to be *spectral* if $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{F}(\Lambda)$ for some set of primes Λ . Finally, an *irredundant spectral localizing system* is a localizing system of ideals $\mathcal{F}(\Lambda)$, where Λ is a set of pairwise incomparable primes.

These notions have t -analogues. A set of t -ideals is a t -multiplicative system if it is closed under t -multiplication; a t -multiplicative system Φ is a t -localizing system if it satisfies the closure operations (1) and (2) above.

The localizing system \mathcal{F} is said to be of *finite type* if for each $I \in \mathcal{F}$ there is a finitely generated ideal $J \in \mathcal{F}$ with $J \subseteq I$. Also, \mathcal{F} is said to be v -finite if each t -ideal of \mathcal{F} contains a v -finite ideal which is also in \mathcal{F} .

Denoting the set of t -ideals of R by $t(R)$, it is easy to see that if \mathcal{F} is a localizing system, then $\Phi = \mathcal{F} \cap t(R)$ is a t -localizing system, $R_{\mathcal{F}} = R_{\Phi}$, and \mathcal{F} is v -finite if and only if Φ is v -finite. Conversely, if Φ is a t -localizing system of t -ideals, then $\overline{\Phi} = \{I \mid I_t \in \Phi\}$ is a localizing system of ideals with $\Phi = \overline{\Phi} \cap t(R)$.

Let Λ be a set of pairwise incomparable t -primes. With $\mathcal{F}(\Lambda)$ as above and $\Phi(\Lambda) = \mathcal{F}(\Lambda) \cap t(R) (= \{I \mid I \text{ is a } t\text{-ideal and } I \not\subseteq P \text{ for all } P \in \Lambda\})$, we have that $I \in \mathcal{F}(\Lambda)$ if and only if $I_t \in \Phi(\Lambda)$. Hence $\overline{\Phi(\Lambda)} = \mathcal{F}(\Lambda)$.

An overring T of R is a t -subintersection of R if it has the form $\bigcap R_P$, where the intersection is taken over some set of t -primes P of R , i.e., if $T = R_{\Phi(\Lambda)}$ for some spectral t -localizing system $\Phi(\Lambda)$ of R , where Λ is a set of t -primes. We say that T is t -flat over R if $T_M = R_{M \cap R}$ for each maximal t -ideal M of T [17]. Finally, recall that T is t -linked over R if for each finitely generated ideal I of R with $(R : I) = R$ we have $(T : IT) = T$ [1].

The following implications are easily verified: T is t -flat over $R \Rightarrow T$ is a t -subintersection of $R \Rightarrow T$ is a generalized ring of quotients of $R \Rightarrow T$ is t -linked over R .

All these conditions are equivalent for PVMDs [17, Proposition 2.10], but we believe that in general none of the arrows can be reversed if R is merely assumed to be v -coherent. Also, if R is a PVMD, then every t -linked overring of R is a PVMD [16, Theorem 3.8 and Corollary 3.9], but if R is just v -coherent, we know only that generalized rings of quotients of R are v -coherent [6, Proposition 3.1].

We shall begin by considering t -flat overrings of v -coherent domains. Recall that, for any domain R , an overring T of R is t -flat over R if and only if T is a generalized ring of quotients with respect to a v -finite t -localizing system of ideals [2, Theorem 2.6].

On the other hand, we know that if R is Prüfer then every overring is flat, and we also know that R is a $\#\#$ -domain iff each irredundant spectral localizing system is finitely generated [5]. We shall show that for v -coherent domains the property that each irredundant spectral t -localizing system is v -finite is equivalent to the property that each t -subintersection of R is t -flat and $t\#$.

Lemma 2.1. *Let R be a v -coherent domain and Φ a t -localizing system of t -ideals. Then the following statements are equivalent.*

- (1) Φ is v -finite.
- (2) The set Λ of maximal elements of $t\text{-Spec}(R) \setminus \Phi$ is not empty, and $M \in t\text{-Max}(R_{\Phi})$ if and only if $M = P_{\Phi}$ for some $P \in \Lambda$.

Under these conditions, $\Phi = \Phi(\Lambda)$. In particular, if Λ is a set of pairwise incomparable t -primes of R , then $\Phi = \Phi(\Lambda)$ is v -finite if and only if $t\text{-Max}(R_{\Phi}) = \{P_{\Phi} \mid P \in \Lambda\}$.

Proof. Set $\mathcal{F} = \overline{\Phi} = \{I \mid I_t \in \Phi\}$ and use (i) \Leftrightarrow (vi) of [6, Theorem 3.3]. □

Proposition 2.2. *Let R be a v -coherent domain. If Λ and Λ' are two sets of pairwise incomparable t -primes such that $\Phi(\Lambda)$ and $\Phi(\Lambda')$ are v -finite and $R_{\Phi(\Lambda)} = R_{\Phi(\Lambda')}$, then $\Lambda = \Lambda'$.*

Proof. By Lemma 2.1, we have $t\text{-Max}(T) = \{P_\Phi \mid P \in \Lambda\} = \{Q_{\Phi'} \mid Q \in \Lambda'\}$ and, upon contracting to R , we obtain $\Lambda = \Lambda'$. \square

Recalling that an overring T of a domain R is t -flat over R if and only if $T = R_\Phi$ for some v -finite t -localizing system Φ , the preceding two results immediately imply:

Corollary 2.3. *Let R be a v -coherent domain and let T be a t -flat overring of R . Then there exists a uniquely determined set Λ of pairwise incomparable t -primes for which $T = R_{\Phi(\Lambda)}$ and $\Phi(\Lambda)$ is v -finite. The set Λ is given by $\Lambda = \{M \cap R \mid M \in t\text{-Max}(T)\}$.*

Proposition 2.4. *Let R be a v -coherent domain. Then the following statements are equivalent.*

- (1) *For each set Λ of pairwise incomparable t -primes of R , $\Phi(\Lambda)$ is v -finite.*
- (2) *If Λ and Λ' are two sets of pairwise incomparable t -primes of R such that $R_{\Phi(\Lambda)} = R_{\Phi(\Lambda')}$, then $\Lambda = \Lambda'$.*
- (3) *If T is a t -subintersection of R and is represented as $T = \bigcap_{P \in \Lambda} R_P$ for some set Λ of pairwise incomparable t -primes, then that representation is irredundant.*
- (4) *For each t -prime P and each set Λ of pairwise incomparable t -primes of R not containing P , there exists an element $u \in K$ such that $(R :_R u) \subseteq P$ and $(R :_R u) \not\subseteq Q$, for each $Q \in \Lambda$.*
- (5) *For each t -prime P and each set Λ of pairwise incomparable t -primes of R not containing P , there exists a finitely generated ideal J of R such that $J \subseteq P$ and $J \not\subseteq Q$ for each $Q \in \Lambda$.*
- (6) *For each t -prime P and each set Λ of pairwise incomparable t -primes of R not containing P , $R_P \not\subseteq R_{\Phi(\Lambda)}$.*
- (7) *For each set Λ of pairwise incomparable t -primes of R , $R_{\Phi(\Lambda)}$ is t -flat over R and has the $t\#$ -property.*

Proof. (1) \Rightarrow (2) by Proposition 2.2.

(2) \Rightarrow (3) is clear.

(3) \Rightarrow (1): Given a set Λ of incomparable primes, consider the t -subintersection $T = R_{\Phi(\Lambda)}$ of R . Since T is v -coherent [6, Proposition 3.1] and the intersection is irredundant, we obtain $t\text{-Max}(T) = \{P_{\Phi(\Lambda)} \mid P \in \Lambda\}$ as in Remark 1.9. It follows that $\Phi(\Lambda)$ is v -finite (Lemma 2.1).

(1) \Rightarrow (7): Let Λ be a set of pairwise incomparable t -primes of R and $T = R_{\Phi(\Lambda)}$. Since $\Phi(\Lambda)$ is v -finite, then T is t -flat over R , and $\Lambda = \{M \cap R \mid M \in t\text{-Max}(R)\}$ is uniquely determined by Corollary 2.3. Hence we cannot delete any $P \in \Lambda$, and so the intersection is irredundant. In addition, by t -flatness, $T_M = R_{M \cap R}$; hence T is a $t\#$ -domain.

(7) \Rightarrow (3): If the t -subintersection $T = R_{\Phi(\Lambda)}$ of R is t -flat, then $\Lambda = \{M \cap R \mid M \in t\text{-Max}(R)\}$ by Corollary 2.3. If T is also a $t\#$ -domain, then $T = \bigcap T_M = \bigcap R_{M \cap R}$ is an irredundant t -subintersection.

(2) \Rightarrow (4): Given Λ and P as specified, set $\Lambda' = (\Lambda \setminus \{Q \in \Lambda \mid Q \subseteq P\}) \cup \{P\}$. Then $\Lambda \neq \Lambda'$, so that $R_{\Phi(\Lambda)} \neq R_{\Phi(\Lambda')}$ by (2). Since we clearly have $R_{\Phi(\Lambda')} \subseteq R_{\Phi(\Lambda)}$, there is an

element $u \in R_{\Phi(\Lambda)} \setminus R_{\Phi(\Lambda')}$, and for this u we have $(R :_R u) \subseteq P$ and $(R :_R u) \not\subseteq Q$ for each $Q \in \Lambda$.

(4) \Rightarrow (5): Since R is v -coherent, then the ideal $(R :_R u)$ contains a finitely generated subideal J with $J_v = (R :_R u)$; this J does what is required.

(5) \Rightarrow (6): Given J as indicated, one shows easily that $(R : J) \subseteq R_{\Phi(\Lambda)}$ but $(R : J) \not\subseteq R_P$, whence $R_P \not\subseteq R_{\Phi(\Lambda)}$.

(6) \Rightarrow (2): Suppose that Λ and Λ' are two sets of pairwise incomparable primes for which $R_{\Phi(\Lambda)} = R_{\Phi(\Lambda')}$ but $\Lambda \neq \Lambda'$. We may then assume that there is a prime $P \in \Lambda \setminus \Lambda'$. If $P \not\subseteq Q$ for all $Q \in \Lambda'$, then (6) yields $R_P \not\subseteq R_{\Phi(\Lambda')} = R_{\Phi(\Lambda)}$, a contradiction. We then denote by Λ'' the maximal elements in the set $(\Lambda \cup \{Q \in \Lambda' \mid P \subseteq Q\}) \setminus \{P\}$. (Choosing the maximal elements is possible since both Λ and Λ' contain pairwise incomparable elements.) Pick $Q_0 \in \Lambda'$ with $P \subseteq Q_0$. Then $Q_0 \in \Lambda''$, and we have $R_P \supseteq R_{Q_0} \supseteq R_{\Phi(\Lambda'')}$, which contradicts (6). □

Remark 2.5. The equivalent conditions of Proposition 2.4 hold automatically for a Mori domain, since in such a domain each t -ideal is v -finite.

Proposition 2.6. *Let R be a v -coherent domain such that each t -subintersection of R is t -flat over R . Then the following statements are equivalent.*

- (1) *Each t -flat overring of R is a $t\#$ -domain.*
- (2) *Each t -subintersection of R is a $t\#$ -domain.*
- (3) *For each set Λ of pairwise incomparable t -primes of R , $\Phi(\Lambda)$ is v -finite.*
- (4) *If T is a t -subintersection of R , there exists a unique set of pairwise incomparable t -primes Λ of R such that $T = R_{\Phi(\Lambda)}$; moreover, $\Lambda = \{M \cap R \mid M \in t\text{-Max}(T)\}$.*
- (5) *If T is a t -flat overring of R and $T = \bigcap_{Q \in \Lambda} T_Q$ for some set Λ of pairwise incomparable t -primes of T , then $\Lambda = t\text{-Max}(T)$.*

Proof. (1) \Leftrightarrow (2) and (5) \Rightarrow (1) are clear.

(2) \Leftrightarrow (3) by Proposition 2.4.

(3) \Rightarrow (4) by Corollary 2.3.

(4) \Rightarrow (5): Assume that T is a t -flat overring of R and that we have $T = \bigcap_{Q \in \Lambda} T_Q$, where Λ is a set of pairwise incomparable t -primes of T . By t -flatness, $T_Q = R_{Q \cap R}$ for each $Q \in \Lambda$. Hence $T = R_{\Phi(\Gamma)}$, where $\Gamma = \{Q \cap R \mid Q \in \Lambda\}$. We then have $\Lambda = t\text{-Max}(T)$ by (4) (and t -flatness). □

If R is a Mori domain, then, as mentioned in Remark 2.5, the equivalent conditions of Proposition 2.4 hold. It then follows from [2, Theorem 2.6] that each t -subintersection of R is t -flat; hence the equivalent conditions of Proposition 2.6 hold also.

For a PVMD, t -subintersections are automatically t -flat; in fact, t -linked overrings are t -flat by [17, Proposition 2.10]. Thus the hypotheses of Proposition 2.6 hold for PVMDs. Our next proposition adds several more equivalences for PVMDs. We need the following lemma.

Lemma 2.7. *Let R be a PVMD and let P be a t -prime of R which is not t -invertible. Then $(P : P) = (R : P) = R_P \cap S$, where $S = \bigcap_{M \in t\text{-Max}(R), M \not\subseteq P} R_M$.*

Proof. By [14, Proposition 2.3 and Lemma 1.2], $(R : P) = (P : P)$. The result now follows from [15, Theorem 4.5]. \square

Proposition 2.8. *For a PVMD R , the conditions of Proposition 2.6 are also equivalent to each of the following.*

- (6) *If $\Lambda \subseteq t\text{-Max}(R)$, then $\Phi(\Lambda)$ is v -finite.*
- (7) *Each t -prime ideal P of R contains a finitely generated ideal which is not contained in any maximal t -ideal of R not containing P .*
- (8) *For each t -prime P of R , there exists an element $u \in K$ such that $(R :_R u) \subseteq P$ and $(R :_R u) \not\subseteq M$, for each maximal t -ideal M not containing P .*
- (9) *For each t -prime ideal P of R , $R_P \not\supseteq \bigcap R_M$, where M ranges over the set of maximal t -ideals not containing P .*
- (10) *Each t -linked overring of R is a $t\#$ -domain.*
- (11) *$(P : P)$ is a $t\#$ -domain for each t -prime P of R .*

Proof. (3) \Rightarrow (6) is clear.

(6) \Rightarrow (7): If Λ is the set of maximal t -ideals not containing P , then $P \in \Phi(\Lambda)$ and $\Phi(\Lambda)$ is v -finite.

(7) \Rightarrow (1): Let T be a t -subintersection of R . Then T is t -flat over R , and we have $T = \bigcap_{M \in t\text{-Max}(T)} R_{M \cap R}$. Fix $N \in t\text{-Max}(T)$ and let J be a finitely generated ideal of R contained in $P = N \cap R$ and not contained in the maximal t -ideals of R not containing P . Since in a PVMD two incomparable t -primes are t -comaximal, then J is not contained in $M \cap R$ for each maximal t -ideal $M \neq N$ of T . It follows that JT is a finitely generated ideal contained in N and not contained in M for $M \neq N$. We conclude by applying Theorem 1.6.

(3) \Rightarrow (8) by Proposition 2.4.

(8) \Rightarrow (7) by v -coherence.

(8) \Leftrightarrow (9) because, for each prime P and $u \in K$, $(R :_R u) \subseteq P$ iff $u \notin R_P$.

(1) \Leftrightarrow (10) because each t -linked overring of a PVMD is t -flat [17, Proposition 2.10].

(11) \Rightarrow (9): Let $T = (P : P)$. If P is t -invertible then $R = T$. Otherwise, $T = (R : P) = R_P \cap (\bigcap R_{M_\alpha})$, where M_α ranges over the set of maximal t -ideals of R not containing P (Lemma 2.7). In either case, setting $\Lambda = \{P\} \cup \{M_\alpha\}$, we have that $T = R_{\Phi(\Lambda)}$. Since R is v -coherent, the set of ideals $\{Q_{\Phi(\Lambda)} = QR_Q \cap T; Q \in \Lambda\}$ is a set of incomparable t -primes of T [6, Proposition 3.2]. For each $Q \in \Lambda$, we have $R_Q = T_{Q_{\Phi(\Lambda)}}$ and by hypothesis T is a $t\#$ -domain. Hence by Theorem 1.6 $R_{\Phi(\Lambda)}$ is an irredundant intersection. It follows that $R_P \not\supseteq \bigcap R_{M_\alpha}$.

(10) \Rightarrow (11): According to [1, Proposition 2.2 (5)], $(A_v : A_v)$ is t -linked over R for each ideal A of R . In fact, it is easy to see that replacing “ v ” by “ t ” in the proof of that result shows that $(A_t : A_t)$ is t -linked. In particular, if P is a t -prime of R , then $(P : P)$ is t -linked. \square

Comparing conditions (3) and (6) of Propositions 2.6 and 2.8, we observe that for PVMDs one has to consider only subsets of $t\text{-Max}(R)$ rather than all sets of incomparable t -primes.

The equivalence of conditions (7) and (8) above is also proved in [3, Lemma 3.6]. The equivalence of conditions (10) and (11) for Prüfer domains is [20, Proposition 2.5].

When R is Prüfer, Proposition 2.8 recovers [5, Theorem 2.4]. In [5, Theorem 2.5] it is also proved that for Prüfer domains the $\#\#$ -condition is equivalent to the $\#_P$ -condition introduced by N. Popescu in [21]. We recall that R is a $\#_P$ -domain if, given two sets of prime ideals $\Lambda_1 \neq \Lambda_2$ with the property that $P + Q = R$ for each pair of distinct ideals $P \in \Lambda_1$ and $Q \in \Lambda_2$, we have $R_{\Phi(\Lambda_1)} \neq R_{\Phi(\Lambda_2)}$.

We can define the $t\#_P$ -property analogously: R is a $t\#_P$ -domain if, given two sets of prime t -ideals $\Lambda_1 \neq \Lambda_2$ with the property that $(P + Q)_t = R$ for each pair of distinct ideals $P \in \Lambda_1$ and $Q \in \Lambda_2$, we have $R_{\Phi(\Lambda_1)} \neq R_{\Phi(\Lambda_2)}$.

We will show that, with this definition, [5, Theorem 2.5] can be extended to PVMDs. Recall that, if R is a PVMD, then for any two incomparable prime t -ideals P and Q we have $(P + Q)_t = R$ (since R_M is a valuation domain for each maximal t -ideal M of R).

Proposition 2.9. *Let R be a v -coherent domain, and assume that the equivalent conditions of Proposition 2.4 are satisfied. Then R is a $t\#_P$ -domain.*

Proof. Let $\Lambda_1 \neq \Lambda_2$ be two sets of prime t -ideals of R with the property that $(P + Q)_t = R$ for each pair of distinct ideals $P \in \Lambda_1$ and $Q \in \Lambda_2$, and let $P \in \Lambda_1 \setminus \Lambda_2$. Since $(P + Q)_t = R$ for $Q \in \Lambda_2$, we have $(P + M)_t = R$ for each M in the set $\Gamma = \{N \in t\text{-Max}(R) \mid Q \subseteq N \text{ for some } Q \in \Lambda_2\}$. Since Γ is a set of incomparable t -primes not containing P , we may apply Proposition 2.4 (4) to obtain an element $u \in K$ such that $(R :_R u) \subseteq P$ but $(R :_R u) \not\subseteq M$ for each $M \in \Gamma$. It is then easy to see that $u \in R_{\Phi(\Lambda_2)} \setminus R_{\Phi(\Lambda_1)}$. \square

Our next result shows that for PVMDs the $t\#_P$ -condition is equivalent to the conditions of Propositions 2.6 and 2.8.

Proposition 2.10. *Let R be a PVMD. Then R is a $t\#_P$ -domain if and only if each t -linked overring of R is a $t\#$ -domain.*

Proof. In a PVMD any two incomparable t -primes are t -comaximal. Hence if R is a $t\#_P$ -domain, then R must satisfy condition (3) of Proposition 2.4. The fact that conditions (4) of Proposition 2.6 and (10) of Proposition 2.8 are equivalent then shows that each t -linked overring of R is a $t\#$ -domain. The converse follows from Proposition 2.9. \square

The next result generalizes [5, Theorem 2.6].

Proposition 2.11. *The following statements are equivalent for a v -coherent domain R .*

- (1) *For each set Λ of t -primes of R , $\Phi(\Lambda)$ is v -finite.*
- (2) *R satisfies the ascending chain conditions on t -primes, and R satisfies the equivalent conditions of Proposition 2.4.*

Proof. (1) \Rightarrow (2): Let Λ be a nonempty set of t -primes of R . Since $\Phi(\Lambda)$ is v -finite, Lemma 2.1 implies that Λ has maximal elements. Hence R satisfies the acc on t -primes. Condition (1) of Proposition 2.4 holds by hypothesis.

(2) \Rightarrow (1): Let Λ be a nonempty set of t -primes. Then acc on t -primes implies that each element of Λ is contained in a maximal element. Hence if Λ_0 is the set of maximal elements of Λ , then $\Phi(\Lambda) = \Phi(\Lambda_0)$ is v -finite by Proposition 2.4. \square

The preceding result can be improved for PVMD's in a way which generalizes [10, Theorem 4]. We first recall some results from [2] and prove a variation on [10, Lemma 4].

Lemma 2.12. *Let R be any domain. Then R satisfies the ascending chain condition on radical t -ideals if and only if each prime t -ideal is the radical of a v -finite t -ideal.*

If R does satisfy the acc on radical t -ideals, then every t -ideal has only finitely many minimal (t -)primes.

Proof. [2, Lemmas 3.7 and 3.8]. □

Lemma 2.13 (cf. [10, Lemma 4]). *Let $I = (a_1, \dots, a_n)$ be a finitely generated ideal of a PVMD R . Then each minimal prime ideal of I_v is minimal over some (a_i) . Moreover, if I_v has only finitely many minimal primes, then each minimal prime of I_v is the radical of a v -finite divisorial ideal.*

Proof. Let P be minimal over I_v . Then P is a t -prime, and, since primes contained in P are also t -primes, P is also minimal over I . The proof of the first statement now proceeds as in the proof of the corresponding part of [10, Lemma 4]. Now assume that I_v has only finitely many minimal primes P_1, \dots, P_k , $k \geq 2$. Since there are no containment relations among the P_i (and since the t -spectrum of a PVMD is treed), we have $(P_1 + P_2 \cdots P_k)_t = R$. Hence there are finitely generated ideals $A \subseteq P_1$ and $B \subseteq P_2 \cdots P_k$ with $(A + B)_v = R$. We claim that P_1 is the radical of $(I + A)_v$. To see this, suppose that Q is a prime which is minimal over $(I + A)_v$. Then Q is a t -prime and must contain a prime minimal over I_v ; that is, Q must contain one of the P_i . However, Q cannot contain P_i for $i \geq 2$, since then Q would contain B (and $(A + B)_v = R$). Hence Q contains, and is therefore equal to, P_1 . □

Proposition 2.14. *Let R be PVMD. Then the statements in Proposition 2.11 are equivalent to each of the following.*

- (3) *R satisfies the ascending chain condition on radical t -ideals.*
- (4) *R satisfies the ascending chain condition on t -primes, and, for each finitely generated ideal I , the set of minimal primes of I_v is a finite set.*
- (5) *Each t -prime of R is branched and each t -linked overring of R is a $t\#$ -domain.*
- (6) *R satisfies the ascending chain condition on t -primes and each t -linked overring of R is a $t\#$ -domain.*

Proof. (2) \Rightarrow (4): By (3) \Leftrightarrow (5) of Proposition 2.4, for each t -prime P of R , we have that $R_P \not\supseteq \bigcap R_M$, where the intersection is taken over those maximal t -ideals of R which do not contain P . Hence each principal ideal has only finitely many minimal (t -)primes by [3, Lemma 3.9]. Thus if $I = (a_1, \dots, a_n)$ is finitely generated, then I_v can have only finitely many minimal primes, since Lemma 2.13 implies that each such minimal prime must be minimal over one of the a_i .

(4) \Rightarrow (3): Let P be a t -prime of R . By Lemma 2.12, it suffices to show that P is the radical of a v -finite t -ideal. By the ascending chain condition on t -primes, the set of t -primes properly contained in P has a maximal element Q . Thus, for $x \in P \setminus Q$, P is minimal over the principal ideal xR . By assumption, xR has only finitely many minimal primes. Hence Lemma 2.13 yields that P is the radical of a v -finite t -ideal, as desired.

(3) \Rightarrow (2): Clearly, R satisfies the ascending chain condition on t -primes. Let P be a t -prime of R . By Lemma 2.12 P is the radical of J_v for some finitely generated ideal J of R . Since any t -prime containing J also contains P , it is clear that condition (5) of Proposition 2.4 holds.

(2) \Leftrightarrow (6) because each t -linked overring of a PVMD is a t -flat t -subintersection ([16, Theorem 3.8] and [17, Proposition 2.10]).

(5) \Leftrightarrow (6): Since each localization of a PVMD at a t -prime is a valuation domain, each t -prime of R is branched if and only if R satisfies the ascending chain condition on t -primes. \square

The PVMD's with the property that each t -localizing system of ideals is v -finite have been studied in [2] and [3]. They are called Generalized Krull domains. By [2, Theorem 3.9], R is a Generalized Krull domain if and only if each principal ideal has only finitely many minimal primes and $P \neq (P^2)_t$ for each t -prime P . On the other hand, the first condition is satisfied under the equivalent conditions of Proposition 2.8 [3, Lemma 3.9]. Hence we obtain the following result.

Corollary 2.15. *A PVMD R is a Generalized Krull domain if and only if each t -linked overring of R is a $t\#$ -domain and $P \neq (P^2)_t$ for each t -prime P .*

3. POLYNOMIAL RINGS

In this section, we denote by $\{X_\alpha\}$ a set of independent indeterminates over R . Let us call a prime ideal Q of $R[\{X_\alpha\}]$ an *upper to zero* if $Q \cap R = 0$. For f in the quotient field of $R[\{X_\alpha\}]$, the *content of f* , written $c(f)$ is the fractional R -ideal generated by the coefficients of f ; we also write $c(I)$ for the fractional ideal generated by the coefficients of all the polynomials in the fractional $R[\{X_\alpha\}]$ -ideal I .

Lemma 3.1. *Let Q be an upper to zero in $R[\{X_\alpha\}]$. Then the following statements are equivalent.*

- (1) $Q = fK[\{X_\alpha\}] \cap R[\{X_\alpha\}]$ for some irreducible polynomial $f \in K[\{X_\alpha\}]$. (Note that we may take $f \in R[\{X_\alpha\}]$.)
- (2) $\text{ht } Q = 1$.
- (3) $R[\{X_\alpha\}]_Q$ is a DVR.

Proof. A localization argument establishes (1) \Leftrightarrow (2), and (3) \Rightarrow (2) is trivial. Assume (2). If $\{X_\alpha\}$ is finite, then (3) follows from a standard induction argument. If $\{X_\alpha\}$ is infinite, then we may pick $X_1, \dots, X_n \in \{X_\alpha\}$ with $Q \cap R[X_1, \dots, X_n] \neq 0$. Then $V = R[X_1, \dots, X_n]_{Q \cap R[X_1, \dots, X_n]}$ is a DVR with maximal ideal $M = (Q \cap R[X_1, \dots, X_n])V$, and, since $\text{ht } Q = 1$, we must have Q extended from $Q \cap R[X_1, \dots, X_n]$. It is then easy to see that $R[\{X_\alpha\}]_Q = V[\{X_\alpha\}]_{M[\{X_\alpha\}]}$ is a DVR. \square

Lemma 3.2. *Let Q be an upper to zero in $R[\{X_\alpha\}]$ which is also a maximal t -ideal. Then $\text{ht } Q = 1$.*

Proof. First suppose $\{X_\alpha\} = \{X_1, \dots, X_n\}$. The result clearly holds if $n = 1$ (even if Q is not a maximal t -ideal!). Suppose $n > 1$, and let $q = Q \cap R[X_1, \dots, X_{n-1}]$. If $q = 0$, then $\text{ht } Q = 1$ by the case $n = 1$. If $q \neq 0$, then by [14, Theorem 1.4], q is a maximal t -ideal of $R[X_1, \dots, X_{n-1}]$, and $Q = q[X_n]$. By induction $\text{ht } q = 1$, and $V = R[X_1, \dots, X_{n-1}]_q$ is a DVR by Lemma 3.1. Hence $R[X_1, \dots, X_n]_Q = V[X_n]_Q$ is also a DVR, and $\text{ht } Q = 1$.

For the general case, we may pick $X_1, \dots, X_n \in \{X_\alpha\}$ with $q = Q \cap R[X_1, \dots, X_n] \neq 0$. By [4, Proposition 2.2], q is a maximal t -ideal of $R[X_1, \dots, X_n]$, and Q is extended from q . The argument now proceeds as in the induction step above. \square

The following extends [14, Theorem 1.4 and Corollary 1.5] to the case of infinitely many indeterminates.

Theorem 3.3. *Let Q be an upper to zero in $R[\{X_\alpha\}]$. Then following statements are equivalent.*

- (1) Q is a maximal t -ideal.
- (2) Q is t -invertible.
- (3) $c(Q)_t = R$, and $\text{ht } Q = 1$. (In this case, a standard argument shows that Q contains an element g with $c(g)_v = R$.)

In case these equivalent statements hold, then $Q = fK[\{X_\alpha\}] \cap R[\{X_\alpha\}]$ for some $f \in R[\{X_\alpha\}]$ such that f is irreducible in $K[\{X_\alpha\}]$; moreover, we have $Q = (f, g)_v$.

Proof. (3) \Rightarrow (1): Since $\text{ht } Q = 1$, Q is a t -ideal. Hence Q is contained in a maximal t -ideal, say N . Since $c(Q)_t = R$, we cannot have N extended from $N \cap R$, whence N is an upper to zero by [4, Proposition 2.2]. By Lemma 3.2, $\text{ht } N = 1$, whence $Q = N$, and Q is a maximal t -ideal.

The proofs of (1) \Rightarrow (3) and (2) \Rightarrow (1) are as in [14, Theorem 1.4].

(1) \Rightarrow (2): This also goes through essentially as in the proof of [14, Theorem 1.4]. That proof contains a reference to [12, Proposition 1.8], which is stated for the case of one indeterminate. However, the proof of this latter result extends to the case of an arbitrary set of indeterminates. (The content formula [8, Corollary 28.3] is needed.)

To prove the last statement, note that $Q = fK[\{X_\alpha\}] \cap R[\{X_\alpha\}]$ by Lemmas 3.1 and 3.2. The fact $Q = (f, g)_v$ may be proved as in [14, Corollary 1.5]. \square

Theorem 3.4. *If R is a $t\#$ -domain, then so is $R[\{X_\alpha\}]$.*

Proof. We wish to show that condition (5) of Theorem 1.2 is satisfied. Thus let N be a maximal t -ideal of $R[\{X_\alpha\}]$. By [4, Proposition 2.2], either $N \cap R = 0$ or $N = (N \cap R)R[\{X_\alpha\}]$. In the former case N is divisorial (being a t -invertible t -ideal), and N is certainly not contained in any other maximal t -ideal of $R[\{X_\alpha\}]$. In the latter case, $N \cap R$ contains a divisorial ideal I which is contained in no other maximal t -ideal of R , and it follows that $IR[\{X_\alpha\}]$ is a divisorial ideal of $R[\{X_\alpha\}]$ which is contained in N and no other maximal t -ideal of $R[\{X_\alpha\}]$. \square

We have been unable to prove the converse of Theorem 3.4. (Indeed, we doubt that the converse is true.) However, we can prove that several standard localizations of $R[\{X_\alpha\}]$ are simultaneously $t\#$. We denote by $R(\{X_\alpha\})$ the ring of fractions of $R[\{X_\alpha\}]$ with respect to the multiplicatively closed subset of $R[\{X_\alpha\}]$ consisting of the polynomials of unit content. Finally, if $S = \{f \in R[\{X_\alpha\}] \mid c(f)_v = R\}$, we denote by $R\langle\{X_\alpha\}\rangle$ the ring $R[\{X_\alpha\}]_S$. We then have the following description of the maximal t -ideals in these rings.

Lemma 3.5. *Denote by \mathcal{U}_1 the set of uppers to zero which are also maximal t -ideals in $R[\{X_\alpha\}]$ and by \mathcal{U}_2 the set of those elements $P \in \mathcal{U}_1$ which satisfy $c(P) \neq R$. Then:*

- (1) $t\text{-Max}(R[\{X_\alpha\}]) = \{MR[\{X_\alpha\}] \mid M \in t\text{-Max}(R)\} \cup \mathcal{U}_1$;
- (2) $t\text{-Max}(R(\{X_\alpha\})) = \{MR(\{X_\alpha\}) \mid M \in t\text{-Max}(R)\} \cup \{PR(\{X_\alpha\}) \mid P \in \mathcal{U}_2\}$;
- (3) $t\text{-Max}(R\langle\{X_\alpha\}\rangle) = \{MR\langle\{X_\alpha\}\rangle \mid M \in t\text{-Max}(R)\}$.

Proof. (1) Each maximal t -ideal of $R[\{X_\alpha\}]$ must have the form indicated by [4, Proposition 2.2]. The reverse inclusion follows from [4, Lemma 2.1].

(2) By [16, Corollary 2.3], $MR(\{X_\alpha\})$ is a t -ideal of $R(\{X_\alpha\})$ for each $M \in t\text{-Max}(R)$. Suppose that for some $N \in t\text{-Max}(R(\{X_\alpha\}))$ we have $N \supseteq MR(\{X_\alpha\})$. Then since $R(\{X_\alpha\})$ is a ring of fractions of $R[\{X_\alpha\}]$, N is extended from a maximal t -ideal of $R[\{X_\alpha\}]$, which in turn must be extended from a maximal t -ideal of R . It follows that $N = MR(\{X_\alpha\})$. Hence $MR(\{X_\alpha\}) \in t\text{-Max}R(\{X_\alpha\})$. If $P \in \mathcal{U}_2$, then, since $c(P) \neq R$, $PR(\{X_\alpha\}) \neq R(\{X_\alpha\})$. Moreover, since $\text{ht } P = 1$ by Theorem 3.3, $\text{ht } PR(\{X_\alpha\}) = 1$ also, and $PR(\{X_\alpha\})$ is a t -prime of $R(\{X_\alpha\})$. Any maximal t -ideal of $R(\{X_\alpha\})$ containing $PR(\{X_\alpha\})$ must be extended from a t -prime of $R[\{X_\alpha\}]$ containing P . Therefore, since $P \in t\text{-Max}(R[\{X_\alpha\}])$, $PR(\{X_\alpha\}) \in t\text{-Max}(R(\{X_\alpha\}))$. That each maximal t -ideal of $R(\{X_\alpha\})$ must be of the form indicated follows from (1) (and the fact that $R(\{X_\alpha\})$ is a ring of fractions of $R[\{X_\alpha\}]$).

(3) This follows from the facts that $R\langle\{X_\alpha\}\rangle$ is a localization of $R(\{X_\alpha\})$ and that each $P \in \mathcal{U}_1$ satisfies $c(P)_t = R[\{X_\alpha\}]$ by Theorem 3.3 so that $PR\langle\{X_\alpha\}\rangle = R\langle\{X_\alpha\}\rangle$. \square

In the proof of the following result, we often invoke Lemma 3.5 without explicit reference.

Theorem 3.6. *The following statements are equivalent for a domain R .*

- (1) $R[\{X_\alpha\}]$ is a $t\#$ -domain.
- (2) $R(\{X_\alpha\})$ is a $t\#$ -domain.
- (3) $R\langle\{X_\alpha\}\rangle$ is a $t\#$ -domain.

If, in addition, $R[\{X_\alpha\}]$ is v -coherent, then these conditions are equivalent to: R is a $t\#$ -domain.

Proof. (1) \Rightarrow (2): If $M \in t\text{-Max}(R)$, then by Theorem 1.2, M contains a divisorial ideal I which is contained in no other maximal t -ideal of R . It follows that $IR(\{X_\alpha\})$ is a divisorial ideal of $R(\{X_\alpha\})$ [16, Corollary 2.3], and it is clear that $IR(\{X_\alpha\})$ is contained in $MR(\{X_\alpha\})$ but in no other maximal t -ideal of $R(\{X_\alpha\})$. Hence each maximal t -ideal of $R(\{X_\alpha\})$ of the form $MR(\{X_\alpha\})$ contains a divisorial ideal contained in no other maximal t -ideal of $R(\{X_\alpha\})$. On the other hand, if $PR(\{X_\alpha\})$ is a maximal t -ideal of $R(\{X_\alpha\})$ with $P \in \mathcal{U}_2$, then P is divisorial, from which it follows $PR(\{X_\alpha\})$ is also divisorial (and is clearly not contained in any other maximal t -ideal of $R(\{X_\alpha\})$). By Theorem 1.2, $R(\{X_\alpha\})$ is a $t\#$ -domain.

(2) \Rightarrow (3): Similar (but easier).

(3) \Rightarrow (1): Let M be a maximal t -ideal of R . By hypothesis and Theorem 1.2 ((1) \Leftrightarrow (6)), there is an element $u \in K(\{X_\alpha\})$ such that $(R\langle\{X_\alpha\}\rangle :_{R\langle\{X_\alpha\}\rangle} u)$ is contained in $MR\langle\{X_\alpha\}\rangle$ and no other maximal t -ideal of $R\langle\{X_\alpha\}\rangle$. Let $I = (R[\{X_\alpha\}] :_{R[\{X_\alpha\}]} u)$. Then I is divisorial in $R[\{X_\alpha\}]$, and $IR\langle\{X_\alpha\}\rangle = (R\langle\{X_\alpha\}\rangle :_{R\langle\{X_\alpha\}\rangle} u)$. Clearly, $I \subseteq MR[\{X_\alpha\}]$ and $I \not\subseteq NR[\{X_\alpha\}]$ for each maximal t -ideal N of R with $N \neq M$. Moreover, I is contained in at most finitely many maximal t -ideals P with $P \cap R = 0$. We shall show how to enlarge I so as to avoid each such P . By Theorem 3.3, we have that $PR\langle\{X_\alpha\}\rangle = R\langle\{X_\alpha\}\rangle$, and P is v -finite. Therefore, since $R[\{X_\alpha\}]_P$ is a DVR, we may pick $h \in R[\{X_\alpha\}] \setminus P$ with $hP^n \subseteq I$. Hence $hR\langle\{X_\alpha\}\rangle = hP^n R\langle\{X_\alpha\}\rangle \subseteq IR\langle\{X_\alpha\}\rangle$, and there is an element $g \in R[\{X_\alpha\}]$ with

$c(g)_v = R$ and $gh \in I$. In particular, $g \notin MR[\{X_\alpha\}]$, so that the divisorial ideal $(I :_{R[\{X_\alpha\}]} g)$ is contained in $MR[\{X_\alpha\}]$. Moreover, $h \in (I :_{R[\{X_\alpha\}]} g) \setminus P$. Hence $(I :_{R[\{X_\alpha\}]} g)$ is a divisorial ideal contained in $MR[\{X_\alpha\}] \setminus P$. This process may be continued finitely many times to produce a divisorial ideal which is contained in $MR[\{X_\alpha\}]$ but in no other maximal t -ideal of $R[\{X_\alpha\}]$. Thus $R[\{X_\alpha\}]$ is a $t\#$ -domain.

To prove the final statement, assume that $R[\{X_\alpha\}]$ is a $t\#$ -domain. Let $M \in t\text{-Max}(R)$. By Theorem 1.6, there is a finitely generated ideal I of $R[\{X_\alpha\}]$ such that $I \subseteq MR[\{X_\alpha\}]$ and I is contained in no other maximal t -ideal of $R[\{X_\alpha\}]$. Clearly, $c(I) \subseteq M$ and $c(I)$ is contained in no other maximal t -ideal of R . Another application of Theorem 1.6 completes the proof. \square

It is well known that a domain R is a PVMD if and only if $R[\{X_\alpha\}]$ is a PVMD. Thus for a PVMD R the conditions of Theorem 3.6 are each equivalent to R being a $t\#$ -domain. It follows that if R is a Prüfer domain, then R is a $\#$ -domain if and only if $R[\{X_\alpha\}]$ is a $t\#$ -domain.

Now recall that it is possible for a polynomial ring over a Mori domain to fail to be Mori [22]. In view of the fact that a Mori domain is automatically a $t\#$ -domain (Corollary 1.3), we see by Theorem 3.4 that if R is a Mori domain, then $R[\{X_\alpha\}]$ is a $t\#$ -domain even though $R[\{X_\alpha\}]$ may not be a Mori domain.

It is an open question whether R v -coherent implies that $R[\{X_\alpha\}]$ is v -coherent. We are therefore unable to determine whether the last statement of Theorem 3.6 remains true if we assume only that R is v -coherent. It is true, however, that v -coherence of $R[\{X_\alpha\}]$ implies that of R , as the following result shows.

Proposition 3.7. *If $R[\{X_\alpha\}]$ is v -coherent, then R is v -coherent.*

Proof. Let I be a finitely generated ideal of R . We have $(I[\{X_\alpha\}])^{-1} = I^{-1}[\{X_\alpha\}]$; by hypothesis, this produces a finitely generated fractional ideal J of $R[\{X_\alpha\}]$ with $I^{-1}[\{X_\alpha\}] = J_v$. We may assume $1 \in J$. Moreover, since $R[\{X_\alpha\}] \subseteq I^{-1}[\{X_\alpha\}] \subseteq K[\{X_\alpha\}]$, we have $R[\{X_\alpha\}] \subseteq J \subseteq K[\{X_\alpha\}]$. Hence $c(J)$ is a finitely generated ideal of R with $1 \in c(J)$. We claim that $c(J)_v = I^{-1}$. Note that $J \subseteq c(J)[\{X_\alpha\}] \subseteq I^{-1}[\{X_\alpha\}]$. Hence

$$J_v \subseteq (c(J))[\{X_\alpha\}]_v = c(J)_v[\{X_\alpha\}] \subseteq I^{-1}[\{X_\alpha\}] = J_v,$$

and the claim follows. \square

REFERENCES

- [1] D. Dobbs, E. Houston, T. Lucas, M. Zafrullah, *t-linked overrings and Prüfer v -multiplication domains*, Comm. Algebra **17** (1989), 2835-2852.
- [2] S. El Baghdadi, *On a class of Prüfer v -multiplication domains*, Comm. Algebra **30** (2002), 3723-3742.
- [3] S. El Baghdadi, *Factorization of divisorial ideals in a generalized Krull domain*, manuscript.
- [4] M. Fontana, S. Gabelli, and E. Houston, *UMT-domains and domains with Prüfer integral closure*, Comm. Algebra **26** (1998), 1017-1039.
- [5] S. Gabelli, *Prüfer ($\#\#$)-domains and localizing systems of ideals*, in *Advances in Commutative Ring Theory*, Lecture Notes in Pure and Applied Mathematics, vol. 205, D. Dobbs, M. Fontana, and S. Kabbaj, eds., pp. 391-409, Dekker, New York, 1999.

- [6] S. Gabelli, *On Nagata's Theorem for the class group, II*, in *Commutative algebra and algebraic geometry*, Lecture Notes in Pure Appl. Math., vol. 206, F. Van Oystaeyen, ed., pp. 117-142, Dekker, New York, 1999.
- [7] S. Gabelli and E. Houston, *Ideal theory in pullbacks*, in *Non-Noetherian commutative ring theory*, Mathematics and its Applications, vol. 520, S. Chapman and S. Glaz eds., pp. 199-227, Kluwer, Dordrecht, 2000.
- [8] R. Gilmer, *Multiplicative ideal theory*, Dekker, New York, 1972.
- [9] R. Gilmer, *Overrings of Prüfer domains*, J. Algebra **4** (1966), 331-340.
- [10] R. Gilmer and W. Heinzer, *Overrings of Prüfer domains. II*, J. Algebra **7** (1967), 281-302.
- [11] M. Griffin, *Some results on Prüfer v -multiplication rings*, Canad. J. Math. **19** (1967), 710-722.
- [12] E. Hamann, E. Houston, and J. Johnson, *Properties of uppers to zero in $R[x]$* , Pac. J. Math. **135** (1988), 65-79.
- [13] W. Heinzer and J. Ohm, *An essential ring which is not a v -multiplication ring*, Canad. J. Math. **25** (1973), 856-861.
- [14] E. Houston and M. Zafrullah, *On t -invertibility II*, Comm. Algebra **17** (1989), 1955-1969.
- [15] E. Houston, S. Kabbaj, T. Lucas and A. Mimouni, *When is the dual of an ideal a ring?*, J. Algebra **225** (2000), 429-450.
- [16] B.G. Kang, *Prüfer v -multiplication domains and the ring $R[X]_{N_v}$* , J. Algebra **123** (1989), 151-170.
- [17] D.J. Kwak and Y.S. Park, *On t -flat overrings*, Ch. J. Math. **23** (1995), 17-24.
- [18] J. Mott and M. Zafrullah, *On Prüfer v -multiplication domains*, Manuscripta Math. **35** (1981), 1-26.
- [19] D. Nour el Abidine, *Groupe des classes de certain anneaux intègres et idéaux transformés*, Thèse de Doctorat, Lyon, 1992.
- [20] B. Olberding, *Globalizing local properties of Prüfer domains*, J. Algebra **205** (1998), 480-504.
- [21] N. Popescu, *On a class of Prüfer domains*, Rev. Roumaine Math. Pures Appl. **29** (1984), 777-786.
- [22] M. Roitman, *On polynomial extensions of Mori domains over countable fields*, J. Pure Appl. Algebra **64** (1990), 315-328.

DIPARTIMENTO DI MATEMATICA, UNIVERSITÀ DEGLI STUDI ROMA TRE, LARGO SAN L. MURIALDO, 1, 00146 ROMA, ITALY

E-mail address: gabelli@mat.uniroma3.it

(Evan Houston and Thomas G. Lucas) DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA AT CHARLOTTE, CHARLOTTE, NC 28223 U.S.A.

E-mail address, Evan Houston: eghousto@email.uncc.edu

E-mail address, Thomas G. Lucas: tglucas@email.uncc.edu