

JOURNAL OF ALGEBRA **88**, 395–404 (1984)

## On the Picard Group of Polynomial Rings

FRIEDRICH ISCHEBECK

*Mathematisches Institut der Universität Münster,  
Einsteinstraße 62, D-4400 Münster, West Germany**Communicated by Richard G. Swan*

Received November 29, 1982

IN MEMORIAM FRIEDRICH BACHMANN

Sei  $A \subset B$  eine Erweiterung reduzierter Ringe,  ${}^+_B A$  der seminormale Abschluß von  $A$  in  $B$  und  $p$  eine Primzahl oder  $p = \infty$ . Die Gruppe  $\ker[N_r \text{ Pic } A \rightarrow N_r \text{ Pic } B]$  besitzt genau dann ein Element der Ordnung  $p$ , wenn dies für die (additive) Gruppe  ${}^+_B A/A$  gilt.

For a commutative ring  $A$ —and all rings we consider here are supposed to be commutative—one has a natural splitting  $\text{Pic}(A[X_1, \dots, X_r]) \simeq \text{Pic } A \oplus N_r \text{ Pic } A$ .

Our results on  $N_r \text{ Pic}$  depend heavily on Swan's paper [2], where he defines the notion of  $p$ -seminormality and proves that (for  $r \geq 1$ )  $N_r \text{ Pic } A$  has no  $p$ -torsion iff  $A_{\text{red}}$  is  $p$ -seminormal. In the case  $p = 0$  this means that  $N_r \text{ Pic } A = 0$  iff  $A_{\text{red}}$  is seminormal. Here we give a relative version, showing that  $G := \ker[N_r \text{ Pic } A \rightarrow N_r \text{ Pic } B]$  has no  $p$ -torsion iff  $A \subset B$  is an extension of rings, such that  $A_{\text{red}} \subset B_{\text{red}}$  is  $p$ -seminormal.

This solves a problem stated at the end of [2, 6].

Further we characterize the  $p$ -seminormality of an extension  $A \subset B$  by the fact that the quotient of additive groups  ${}^+_B A/A$  has no  $p$ -torsion. Here  ${}^+_B A$  is the seminormal closure of  $A$  in  $B$ .

On the other hand we show that (for reduced  $A, B$ )  $G$  is a torsion group, iff  ${}^+_B A/A$  is so.

Therefore we may state summarily: Let  $A \subset B$  be an extension of reduced rings and  $p$  a prime number or  $p = \infty$ . Then  $G$  has an element of order  $p$  iff  ${}^+_B A/A$  has one.

We show how to derive the absolute case from the relative one, which seems to be a bit delicate if the ring has infinitely many minimal prime ideals.

In the Appendix we say something on divisibility of  $G$ .

An idea of C. A. Weibel is used in parts (e) and (k) of the proof.

1. Following [2] for a natural number  $p$  an extension  $A \subset B$  of commutative rings is called  $p$ -seminormal if  $x \in B$ ,  $x^2, x^3, px \in A$  imply  $x \in A$ . Here the case  $p = 0$  is included and "0-seminormal" means the same as "seminormal."

The smallest ring  $C$  between  $A$  and  $B$ , such that  $C \subset B$  is  $p$ -seminormal (and such a ring exists), is called the  $p$ -seminormal closure of  $A$  in  $B$  and is denoted by  ${}_B^{+p}A$ . Instead of  ${}_B^{+0}A$  one writes  ${}_B^+A$ .

Look in [2, 4] for these notions.

Before we give another characterization of  $p$ -seminormality, let us remark that one immediately verifies the following fact: If  $C/A$  is the  $S$ -torsion part of the additive group  $B/A$ , then  $C$  is a subring of  $B$ . Here  $S$  denotes any multiplicative subset of  $\mathbb{Z} - \{0\}$ .

2. PROPOSITION. *An extension  $A \subset B$  is  $p$ -seminormal iff the additive group  ${}_B^+A/A$  has no  $p$ -torsion. The group  ${}_B^{+p}A/A$  is the  $p$ -torsion part of  ${}_B^+A/A$ . (Here and further as in [2] by the 0-torsion part of an abelian group  $G$  we mean  $G$  itself. "G has no 0-torsion" means " $G = 0$ .")*

*Proof.* The two sentences are clearly equivalent. Let us prove the first. If  $x \in B$ ,  $x^2, x^3 \in A$ , then  $x \in {}_B^+A$ . So the implication from the right to the left is trivial.

Now assume that  $A \subset B$  is  $p$ -seminormal. Let  $C$  be the ring between  $A$  and  ${}_B^+A$  such that  $C/A$  is the  $p$ -torsion part of  ${}_B^+A/A$ . Since  ${}_C^+A = C$ , we must prove only that  ${}_C^+A = A$ , i.e.,  $A \subset C$  is seminormal. So let  $x \in C$ ,  $x^2, x^3 \in A$  and  $n$  be minimal with  $p^n x \in A$ . If  $n = 0$ , we are through. But otherwise we would have  $(p^{n-1}x)^2, (p^{n-1}x)^3, p(p^{n-1}x) \in A$  and hence by  $p$ -seminormality  $p^{n-1}x \in A$ . This contradicts the minimality of  $n$ .

3. COROLLARY. *Let  $A \subset B$  be  $p$ -seminormal and  $x \in B$  be an element for which there is an  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , such that  $x^{n+i} \in A$  for all  $i \in \mathbb{N}$ . If further  $p^r x \in A$  for some  $r \in \mathbb{N}$ , then  $x \in A$ .*

*Proof.* By induction on  $n$  one easily shows that an  $x \in B$ , which fulfills the first condition, belongs to  ${}_B^+A$ . The rest follows from the proposition above.

4. DEFINITION. Let  $B$  be a ring and  $a$  a subgroup of its additive group. Then  $\mathcal{O}_B(a) := \{x \in B \mid xa \subset a\}$ .

*Remark.*  $\mathcal{O}_B(a)$  is a subring of  $B$ .

If—as usual— $a$  is an ideal in a subring  $A$  of  $B$ , then  $\mathcal{O}_B(a) \supset A$  and  $a$  is a common ideal of  $A$  and  $\mathcal{O}_B(a)$ .

5. LEMMA. *Let  $A \subset B$  be a nontrivial extension with  $A$  noetherian, and  $a$*

an ideal of  $A$  with  $aB \subset A$ . Then there is a prime ideal  $\mathfrak{p} \supset a$  of  $A$ , such that  $\mathcal{O}_B(\mathfrak{p}) \neq A$ . Consequently if  $c$  is maximal in the set of all conductors of extensions  $A \subset C$ , with  $C \subset B$  and  $A \neq C$ , then  $c$  is prime in  $A$ .

*Proof.* Let  $\mathfrak{c}$  be the conductor of  $A \subset B$  and  $\mathfrak{p} \in \text{Ass}(A/\mathfrak{c})$ . Then  $\mathfrak{c} \supset a$ , hence  $\mathfrak{p} \supset a$ . Now by the definition of "Ass" there is an  $a \in A - \mathfrak{c}$  with  $a\mathfrak{p} \subset \mathfrak{c}$ . To that  $a$  we find a  $b \in B$  with  $ba \notin A$ , since  $a \notin \mathfrak{c}$ . But then  $ba\mathfrak{p} \subset b\mathfrak{c} \subset \mathfrak{c} \subset \mathfrak{p}$ , so that  $ba \in \mathcal{O}_B(\mathfrak{p}) - A$ .

6. LEMMA. Let  $A \subset B \subset C$  be two extensions, where  $A \subset B$  is  $p$ -seminormal, and  $a$  a radical ideal of  $A$  (i.e.,  $a = \sqrt{a}$ ) such that  $aC \subset B$ . Then  $\mathcal{O}_C(a) \subset C$  is also  $p$ -seminormal.

(This is shown in the proof of Theorem 6.1 in [2] in the case  $B = C$ . We need here the more general formulation.)

*Proof.* Let  $x \in C$  be an element with  $x^2, x^3, px \in \mathcal{O}_C(a)$ . We have to show  $x \in \mathcal{O}_C(a)$ , i.e.,  $xa \in a$  for every  $a \in a$ . Now  $x^2a, x^3a, (px)a \in a$  implies  $(xa)^2, (xa)^3, p(xa) \in a$ . By hypothesis we also have  $xa \in B$ . So by  $p$ -seminormality we get  $xa \in A$ , hence  $xa \in a$ , since  $(xa)^2 \in a$  and  $a = \sqrt{a}$ .

7. LEMMA [3]. Let  $A \subset B$  be an extension of reduced rings, and  $A$  noetherian. Then  ${}^+_B pA \subset \bar{A}$ , where  $\bar{A}$  is the integral closure of  $A$  in  $Q(A)$ , its full ring of fractions.

*Proof.*  ${}^+_B pA \subset {}^+_B A$  and according to the classical definition of seminormality in [4]  ${}^+_B A$  is the biggest ring between  $A$  and  $B$ , which is integral over  $A$  and has the "same" spectrum and the "same" residue fields (in every point of the spectrum) as  $A$ . Apply this to the minimal prime ideals of  $A$ .

8. In order to achieve finer results, we introduce here the notion  $N^r \text{ Pic}$ . Generally if  $F$  is a functor from the category of rings to that of abelian group, one has the natural splitting  $F(A[X]) \simeq FA \oplus NFA$ . Set  $N^0F := F$ ,  $N^rF := N(N^{r-1}F)$ . Then one easily sees [1, XI, Section 7] that in a natural way  $F(A[X_1, \dots, X_r]) = \bigoplus_{i \geq 0} N^iF(A)^{(i)}$ . So

$$N_rF(A) = \ker[F(A[X_1, \dots, X_r]) \rightarrow FA] = \bigoplus_{i \geq 1} N^iF(A)^{(i)}.$$

9. THEOREM. Let  $r \geq 1$  be a natural number and  $A \subset B$  be an extension of reduced rings. Then the following properties are equivalent:

- (i)  $A \subset B$  is  $p$ -seminormal;
- (ii)  $\ker[N^r \text{ Pic } A \rightarrow N^r \text{ Pic } B]$  has no  $p$ -torsion;
- (iii)  $\ker[N_r \text{ Pic } A \rightarrow N_r \text{ Pic } B]$  has no  $p$ -torsion.

*Remarks.* (a) In the case  $p = 0$  this means:  $A \subset B$  is seminormal iff  $N^r \text{Pic } A \rightarrow N^r \text{Pic } B$  (resp.  $N_r \text{Pic } A \rightarrow N_r \text{Pic } B$ ) is injective.

(b) We do not suppose that  $B$  is integral over  $A$ . So as a special case of the theorem we have: Let  $A$  be integrally closed in  $B$ , then  $N^r \text{Pic } A \rightarrow N^r \text{Pic } B$  is injective. I do not know, whether this has been proved before.

*Proof of the Theorem.* (a) As it is already remarked at the end of 6 in [2], the implication (ii)  $\Rightarrow$  (i) can be shown in the same manner as in the proof of Theorem 6.1 [2].

Since  $N^r \text{Pic } A \subset N_r \text{Pic } A$  canonically, (iii)  $\Rightarrow$  (ii) is trivial.

(b) To prove that (i)  $\Rightarrow$  (iii), we first reduce to the case that  $A, B$  are universally japanese. Remember that  $\text{Pic}$  and therefore  $N_r \text{Pic}$  commutes with filtered direct limits. Therefore, and since  $A \subset C$  is  $p$ -seminormal for any  $C$  between  $A$  and  $B$ , we may assume  $B = A[b_1, \dots, b_n]$ . Now  $A$  is the filtered union of finitely generated  $\mathbb{Z}$ -algebras  $A_\alpha$ . Set  $A'_\alpha := {}^{+p}A_\alpha$ , where  $B_\alpha = A_\alpha[b_1, \dots, b_n]$ . Of course  $A$  is also the filtered union of the  $A'_\alpha$ . So it remains to show that  $A'_\alpha$  is finitely generated over  $\mathbb{Z}$ . Since  $A_\alpha$  is noetherian and japanese, this follows from Lemma 7.

(c) Further we may assume that  $A$  is local (of depth 1). Namely, any nontrivial  $p$ -torsion element  $\xi \in \ker[N^r \text{Pic } A \rightarrow N^r \text{Pic } B]$  survives in  $N^r \text{Pic } A_\#$  for some prime ideal  $\#$  (such that  $\text{depth } A_\# = 1$ ); cf. Lemma 6.4 in [2] or Lemma 3.2 in [4]. One easily checks that  $A_\# \subset B_\#$  remains  $p$ -seminormal.

Also we use induction on  $\dim A$ .

(d) Let  $\mathfrak{m}$  be the maximal ideal of  $A$ . (We may assume  $\mathfrak{m} \neq 0$ , hence  $\text{Ann}_A(\mathfrak{m}) = 0$ .) Define  $\mathfrak{b} = \text{Ann}_B(\mathfrak{m})$ ,  $C = \mathcal{C}_B(\mathfrak{m})$ . Then  $\mathfrak{b}$  is a common ideal of  $C$  and  $B$ . Further  $C \subset B$  is  $p$ -seminormal by Lemma 6 and  $\mathfrak{b} = \sqrt[p]{\mathfrak{b}}$ . Namely, if  $b^2\mathfrak{m} = 0$  for all  $m \in \mathfrak{m}$ , then  $(b\mathfrak{m})^2 = 0$ , so  $b\mathfrak{m} = 0$ , since  $B$  is reduced. Remark that  $C$  may not be noetherian; but  $C/\mathfrak{b}$  is so, as we shall see later.

(e) Let  $\xi \in \ker[N_r \text{Pic } A \rightarrow N_r \text{Pic } B]$  be a non-zero  $p$ -torsion element. Then its image  $\xi' \in \ker[N_r \text{Pic } C \rightarrow N_r \text{Pic } B]$  is non-zero. Namely, since  $\mathfrak{m}$  is a common ideal of  $A$  and  $C$ , we have an exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow N_r U(C/\mathfrak{m}) \rightarrow N_r \text{Pic } A \rightarrow N_r \text{Pic } C.$$

(Notice that  $N_r U(A/\mathfrak{m}) = N_r U(C) = N_r \text{Pic}(A/\mathfrak{m}) = 0$ .) Now, if  $p = 0$ ,  $A$  is seminormal in  $B$  and so in  $C$ . Therefore  $C/\mathfrak{m}$  is easily seen to be reduced, i.e.,  $N_r U(C/\mathfrak{m}) = 0$ . If  $p > 0$ , one derives from the  $p$ -seminormality of  $A \subset C$  that  $C/\mathfrak{m}$  is reduced or  $\text{char}(A/\mathfrak{m}) \nmid p$ . But in the latter case  $N_r U(C/\mathfrak{m})$  is a  $\mathbb{Z}[1/p]$ -module by [2, Corollary 8.2] and therefore has no  $p$ -torsion element.

(f) Define  $C' := C/\mathfrak{k}$ ,  $B' := B/\mathfrak{k}$ . Then  $C' \subset B'$  is  $p$ -seminormal and  $N_r U(B') = 0$ , since  $\sqrt[p]{\mathfrak{k}} = \mathfrak{k}$ . We get an exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow N_r \text{ Pic } C \rightarrow N_r \text{ Pic } B \oplus N_r \text{ Pic } C' \rightarrow N_r \text{ Pic } B'.$$

The element  $\xi' \in \ker[N_r \text{ Pic } C \rightarrow N_r \text{ Pic } B]$  goes to an element of the form  $(0, \xi'')$  with a non-zero  $\xi'' \in \ker[N_r \text{ Pic } C' \rightarrow N_r \text{ Pic } B']$ . So it is enough to prove the theorem for  $C' \subset B'$ .

(g) We have  $A \subset C' \subset B'$  (since  $\text{Ann}_A(m) = 0$ ) with  $\text{Ann}_{B'}(m) = 0$ . Therefore  $m \not\subset \mathfrak{p}$  for any  $\mathfrak{p} \in \text{Ass } B'$ . And so there is an  $s \in m$ , which is a non-zero divisor of  $B'$ . Since  $C' \subset \mathcal{O}_{B'}(m)$ , we have  $sC' \subset m$ . Therefore  $C' \subset A_s (=A[1/s])$ , and  $C'$  as an  $A$ -module, being isomorphic to  $sC'$ , is finitely generated. Let  $\bar{A}, \bar{B}'$  be the integral closures of  $A, B'$  in  $A_s, B'_s$ . They are finite modules over  $A$ , resp.  $B'$ , since  $A$  and  $B'$  are japanese. Therefore—by double noetherian induction—we find a maximal  $p$ -seminormal extension  $A'' \subset B''$  with  $C' \subset A'' \subset \bar{A}, B' \subset B'' \subset \bar{B}'$ , such that a non-zero  $p$ -torsion element  $\eta \in \ker[N_r \text{ Pic } A'' \rightarrow N_r \text{ Pic } B'']$  exists. That means if there is a  $p$ -seminormal extension  $A^* \rightarrow B^*$  with

$$\begin{array}{c} A'' \subset A^* \subset \bar{A} \\ \cap \quad \cap \quad \cap \\ B'' \subset B^* \subset \bar{B}' \end{array}$$

and  $A'' \neq A^*$  or  $B'' \neq B^*$ , then  $\eta$  goes to 0 in  $N_r \text{ Pic } A^*$ .

(h) Now again as in (c) there is a  $\mathfrak{p} \in \text{Spec } A''$  such that  $\eta$  survives in  $N_r \text{ Pic } A''_{\mathfrak{p}}$  and  $\text{depth } A''_{\mathfrak{p}} = 1$ . Since  $\dim A'' = \dim A$ , this is impossible—by induction on  $\dim A$ —if  $\mathfrak{p}$  is not maximal. Hence we have  $\mathfrak{p} \cap A = m$ , so  $s \in \mathfrak{p}$  and  $s$  is a non-zero divisor of  $B''_{\mathfrak{p}}$ . We prove now that  $A''_{\mathfrak{p}} \subset B''_{\mathfrak{p}}$  fulfills, for the given  $\eta$ , an analogous maximality condition to that of  $A'' \subset B''$ . Assume there is a  $p$ -seminormal extension  $R \subset S$  between  $A''_{\mathfrak{p}} \subset B''_{\mathfrak{p}}$  and their integral closures in  $(A''_{\mathfrak{p}})_s, (B''_{\mathfrak{p}})_s$ , strictly bigger than  $A''_{\mathfrak{p}} \subset B''_{\mathfrak{p}}$ . Set  $A^* := \{x \in \bar{A} \mid x/1 \in R\}$ ,  $B^* = \{x \in \bar{B}' \mid x/1 \in S\}$ . Then  $R = A^*_{\mathfrak{p}}$ ,  $S = B^*_{\mathfrak{p}}$ , and  $A^* \subset B^*$  is strictly bigger than  $A'' \subset B''$ . The  $p$ -seminormality of  $A^* \subset B^*$  can easily be proved if one uses the fact that  $\bar{A} \subset \bar{B}'$  is  $p$ -seminormal. But this is so, since  $A_s \subset B'_s$  is  $p$ -seminormal because  $A_s = C'_s$ . So our  $\eta$  goes to zero already in  $N_r \text{ Pic } A^*$ , hence in  $N_r \text{ Pic } R$ .

(i) Now, writing  $A \subset B$  instead of  $A''_{\mathfrak{p}} \subset B''_{\mathfrak{p}}$ , we have: (1)  $A$  is local of depth 1; (2) there is a non-zero divisor  $s$  of  $B$  in  $m$ , the maximal ideal of  $A$ ; (3) there is a non-zero  $p$ -torsion element  $\xi \in \ker(N_r \text{ Pic } A \rightarrow N_r \text{ Pic } B)$ , which goes to 0 in  $N_r \text{ Pic } A^*$ , if  $A^* \subset B^*$  is a strictly bigger  $p$ -seminormal extension, contained in  $\bar{A} \subset \bar{B}$ , where  $\bar{A}, \bar{B}$  are the integral closures of  $A, B$  in  $A_s, B_s$ . But we shall now construct such an extension  $A^* \subset B^*$ , where  $\xi$  will not be killed in  $N_r \text{ Pic } A^*$ . This contradiction will prove our theorem.

(j) Consider the ring  $\mathcal{C}_{A_s}(m) = \mathcal{C}_A(m)$ . First we see, exactly as in [2, p. 223], that  $\mathcal{C}_A(m)$  is strictly bigger than  $A$ . (Namely, since  $\text{depth } A = 1$ , we have  $m = (s) : a$  with some  $a \in A - (s)$ . Therefore  $(a/s)m \subset A$ . If  $(a/s)m = A$ , then  $m = A(s/a)$ , so  $A$  is a discrete valuation ring and  $N_r \text{ Pic } A = 0$ , which contradicts the existence of our  $\xi$ . Hence  $(a/s)m \subset m$ , so  $a/s \in \mathcal{C}_{A_s}(m)$ , but  $a/s \notin A$ .) We distinguish two cases: 1.  $B \cap \mathcal{C}_A(m) \neq A$ , 2.  $B \cap \mathcal{C}_A(m) = A$ .

(k) In the first case define  $A^* = B \cap \mathcal{C}_A(m)$  and  $B^* = B$ . If  $b \in \mathcal{C}_B(m)$ , we have  $bs \in m$ , so  $b \in A_s$ . This shows  $\mathcal{C}_B(m) = A^*$ . Therefore by Lemma 6 (with  $B = C$ ) the extension  $A^* \subset B^*$  is  $p$ -seminormal.

But on the other hand, replacing  $A \subset A^* \subset B$  by  $A \subset C \subset B$  we are here in the same situation as in (e), where we have shown that  $\xi$  does not become 0 in  $N_r \text{ Pic } C$ .

(l) Concerning the second case we first remark that here  $B \neq B^*$ . Otherwise take an  $x \in \mathcal{C}_A(m) - A$ . Since  $xm \subset m$ , we would have  $x \in xB = xmB \subset mB = B$ . So  $x \in \mathcal{C}_A(m) \cap B = A$ , a contradiction.

Now define  $D := \mathcal{C}_A(m) \cdot B$ . Then  $(mB)D = mD = mB \subset B$ . So by Lemma 5 there is a prime ideal  $\mathfrak{p}$  of  $B$  containing  $mB$ , such that  $B^* := \mathcal{C}_D(\mathfrak{p}) \neq B$ . We set  $A^* := \mathcal{C}_A(m) \cap B^*$ , and consider the canonical morphism between the two ‘‘conductor squares’’:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} A \longrightarrow A^* & & B \longrightarrow B^* \\ \downarrow & \downarrow & \downarrow \quad \downarrow \\ A/m \longrightarrow A^*/m & \longrightarrow & B/\mathfrak{p} \longrightarrow B^*/\mathfrak{p} \end{array}$$

One derives a commutative diagram with exact lines:

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} 0 \longrightarrow & N_r U(A^*/m) & \longrightarrow & N_r \text{ Pic } A & \longrightarrow & N_r \text{ Pic } A^* & \\ & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & \\ 0 \longrightarrow & N_r U(B^*/\mathfrak{p}) & \longrightarrow & N_r \text{ Pic } B & \longrightarrow & \text{Pic } B^* \oplus N_r \text{ Pic}(B/\mathfrak{p}) & \end{array}$$

Now by hypothesis we have  $A^* \cap B = A$ , hence  $\mathfrak{p} \cap A^* = \mathfrak{p} \cap B \cap A^* = \mathfrak{p} \cap A = m$ . Therefore the map  $N_r U(A^*/m) \rightarrow N_r U(B^*/\mathfrak{p})$  is injective. Further the extension  $A^* \subset B^*$  is strictly bigger than  $A \subset B$  and contained in  $\bar{A} \subset \bar{B}$ . Also it is  $p$ -seminormal by Lemma 6. Namely,  $A^* = \mathcal{C}_{B^*}(m)$  and  $mB^* \subset B$ . So the nontrivial  $\xi \in \ker[N_r \text{ Pic } A \rightarrow N_r \text{ Pic } B]$  goes to 0 in  $N_r \text{ Pic } A^*$ . But that contradicts the left-exactness of ‘‘ker.’’

**10. PROPOSITION.** *Let  $S \subset \mathbb{Z} - \{0\}$  be a multiplicative set and  $A \subset B$  any ring-extension. Then  ${}_B^+ A/A$  is an  $S$ -torsion group iff  $x \in B, x^2, x^3 \in A$  implies that  $mx \in A$  for some  $m \in S$ .*

*Proof.* The implication from the left to the right is trivial, since the  $x \in B$  with  $x^2, x^3 \in A$  belong to  ${}^+_B A$ . Concerning the other implication, it is enough to show that for any ring  $C$  between  $A$  and  ${}^+_B A$ , which is finitely generated (hence finite) over  $A$ , the group  $C/A$  is an  $S$ -torsion-group. By Theorem 2.8 of [2] for such  $C$  there is a chain of rings  $A = A_0 \subset A_1 \subset \dots \subset A_n = C$  with  $A_i = A_{i-1}[x_i]$ , and  $x_i^2, x_i^3 \in A_{i-1}$ . By induction we may assume that  $A_{n-1}/A$  is an  $S$ -torsion group. Especially for any  $a \in A_{n-1}$  there is an  $m \in S$ , such that  $m(ax_n)^2, m(ax_n)^3 \in A$ . Therefore  $(max_n)^2, (max_n)^3 \in A$  and by hypothesis we get an  $m' \in S$  with  $m'm(ax_n) \in A$ . So  $C/A = (A_{n-1} + x_n A_{n-1})/A$  is an  $S$ -torsion group.

11. PROPOSITION. For any extension  $A \subset B$  of reduced rings consider the groups  ${}^+_B A/A, \ker[N^r \text{Pic } A \rightarrow N^r \text{Pic } B], \ker[N_r \text{Pic } A \rightarrow N_r \text{Pic } B]$ . If any one of these is  $S$ -torsion, so are the others.

*Proof.* If  ${}^+_B A/A$  is not  $S$ -torsion, there is an  $x \in B - A$ , with  $x^2, x^3 \in A$ , such that  $mx \notin A$  for any  $m \in S$ . By the method of the first part of the proof of Theorem 6.1 in [2], we get an element  $\xi \in \ker[N^r \text{Pic } A \rightarrow N^r \text{Pic } B]$  with  $m\xi \neq 0$  for any  $m \in S$ . So if  $\ker[N^r \text{Pic } A \rightarrow N^r \text{Pic } B]$  is  $S$ -torsion for some  $r$ , so is  ${}^+_B A/A$ . Further  $N^r \text{Pic } A \subset N_r \text{Pic } A$  functorially, and so  $\ker[N^r \text{Pic } A \rightarrow N^r \text{Pic } B] \subset \ker[N_r \text{Pic } A \rightarrow N_r \text{Pic } B]$ .

Let us suppose now that  ${}^+_B A/A$  is an  $S$ -torsion group. By Theorem 9 we know that  $N_r \text{Pic } {}^+_B A \rightarrow N_r \text{Pic } B$  is injective. So we may assume  ${}^+_B A = B$ . Now we have a commutative square,

$$\begin{CD} S^{-1}N_r \text{Pic } A @>>> S^{-1}N_r \text{Pic } B \\ @VVV @VVV \\ N_r \text{Pic}(S^{-1}A) @>>> N_r \text{Pic}(S^{-1}B), \end{CD}$$

where the vertical arrows are isomorphisms by [2, Theorem 8.1] and the bottom arrow is so by hypothesis. Therefore  $S^{-1}(\ker[N_r \text{Pic } A \rightarrow N_r \text{Pic } B]) = 0$ . (This also holds for the cokernel.)

*Remark.* Of course it would have been enough to consider only the case  $S = \mathbb{Z} - (0)$  in the last proposition. Then Theorem 9 gives us the rest.

As a summary of Theorem 9 and Proposition 11 we have:

12. THEOREM. Let  $p$  be a prime number or  $p = \infty$ , and  $A \subset B$  be an extension of reduced rings. Consider the groups  ${}^+_B A/A, \ker[N^r \text{Pic } A \rightarrow N^r \text{Pic } B], \ker[N_r \text{Pic } A \rightarrow N_r \text{Pic } B]$  for all  $r \geq 1$ . If in any one of these groups there is an element of order  $p$ , then such an element exists in every one of the others.

13. I want to give another formulation: Let  $A \subset B$  be a subintegral extension of reduced rings (" $A \subset B$  is subintegral" means " $B = {}_B^+ A$ "; cf. [2]). For any ring  $C$  between  $A$  and  $B$  define:  $\varphi(C) = \ker[N^r \text{Pic } A \rightarrow N^r \text{Pic } C]$ , which is a subgroup of  $G := \ker[N^r \text{Pic } A \rightarrow N^r \text{Pic } B]$ . Then  $\varphi(A) = \{0\}$ ,  $\varphi(B) = G$ , and  $\varphi$  maps the ring  $C$ , such that  $C/A$  is the  $S$ -torsion part of  $B/A$  to the  $S$ -torsion part of  $G$ . Further  $\varphi$  is injective on the set of these rings. (Question: Is it injective on the whole?)

14. PROPOSITION. *Let  $A \subset B$  be a subintegral extension of reduced rings, such that  $B/A$  is a torsion group. If  $S$  is a multiplicative subset of  $\mathbb{Z} - \{0\}$  and  $C$  the ring between  $A$  and  $B$  such that  $C/A$  is the  $S$ -torsion part of  $B/A$ , then the canonical map*

$$\alpha: \ker[N^r \text{Pic } A \rightarrow N^r \text{Pic } B] \rightarrow \ker[N^r \text{Pic } C \rightarrow N^r \text{Pic } B]$$

*is surjective.*

*Proof.* By the method of the proof of Proposition 11 we see that  $\text{coker}[N^r \text{Pic } A \rightarrow N^r \text{Pic } C]$  is an  $S$ -torsion group. By the lemma of the serpent or even an easier diagram lemma this also yields that  $\text{coker } \alpha$  is an  $S$ -torsion group.

On the other hand  $\ker[N^r \text{Pic } C \rightarrow N^r \text{Pic } B]$  and its factor groups are  $S'$ -torsion groups by Proposition 11, where  $S'$  denotes the multiplicative subset of  $\mathbb{Z}$ , generated by those primes  $p$ , which do not divide any  $m \in S$ . Therefore  $\text{coker } \alpha = 0$ .

Question: Is the above proposition true if  $B/A$  is not supposed to be torsion?

15. Finally, I want to show how the absolute case, which is handled in [2], can be reduced to the relative case I have treated here. We must only prove that  $N_r \text{Pic } A = 0$  for a seminormal ring  $A$ . Let  $P$  be the set of minimal prime ideals of  $A$  (which may be infinite) and  $K_{\mathfrak{p}}$  be an algebraic closure of  $Q(A/\mathfrak{p})$  for every  $\mathfrak{p} \in P$ . Then one easily sees that  $A = {}_B^+ A$ , where  $B = \prod_{\mathfrak{p} \in P} K_{\mathfrak{p}}$ . So by Theorem 9 we only have to show that  $N_r \text{Pic } B = 0$ . But since this is classically true for any noetherian  $B$ , which is normal, i.e., reduced and integrally closed in its full ring of fractions, we need only show the following.

LEMMA. *Let  $B = \prod_{i \in I} K_i$  be a product of algebraically closed fields, then  $B$  is the filtered union of normal noetherian subrings.*

*Proof.*  $B$  is the filtered union of subrings  $B_\alpha$  which are finitely generated  $\mathbb{Z}$ -algebras. Now the maps  $B_\alpha \rightarrow K_i$  (induced by the projections) can be extended to homomorphisms  $\bar{B}_\alpha \rightarrow K_i$ , where  $\bar{B}_\alpha$  is the normalization of  $B_\alpha$ . Here we use the hypothesis that the  $K_i$  are algebraically closed. We get a



map  $\bar{B}_\alpha \rightarrow B$ , whose kernel is a radical ideal  $a$  with  $a \cap B_\alpha = \{0\}$ . If  $a = q_1 \cap \dots \cap q_r$ , where the  $q_i$  are prime ideals, then  $(q_1 \cap B_\alpha) \cap \dots \cap (q_r \cap B_\alpha) = \{0\}$ , so all minimal prime ideals of  $B_\alpha$  are among the  $q_i \cap B_\alpha$ . So all minimal prime ideals of  $\bar{B}_\alpha$  are among the  $q_i$ , hence  $a = \{0\}$ . Therefore we have a subring  $B'_\alpha$  of  $B$ , which is isomorphic to  $\bar{B}_\alpha$ . The  $B'_\alpha$  form a cofinal subset of the set of all  $B_\alpha$ . So the lemma is proved.

*Remark.* It is not to hard to show directly that  $\text{Pic } B[X_1, \dots, X_r] = \{0\}$  for any direct product  $B$  of fields. This would suffice as well.

APPENDIX

1. We need a fact which certainly is well known.

**LEMMA.** *Let  $A$  be a ring,  $M$  a finitely generated  $A$ -module, and  $s \in A$  an element whose homothesy on  $M$  is surjective (i.e.,  $M$  is  $s$ -divisible). Then the residue class of  $s$  in  $A/\text{Ann } M$  is a unit.*

*Proof.* Let  $\mathfrak{m}$  be a maximal ideal of  $A$  containing  $\text{Ann } M$ . We have to show that  $s \notin \mathfrak{m}$ . But since  $M$  is finitely generated and  $\mathfrak{m} \supset \text{Ann } M$ , we have  $\mathfrak{m} \in \text{Supp } M$ , i.e.,  $M_\mathfrak{m} \neq 0$ . Since  $s/1: M_\mathfrak{m} \rightarrow M_\mathfrak{m}$  is surjective, by Nakayama  $s/1$  is a unit in  $A_\mathfrak{m}$ .

**2. PROPOSITION.** *Let  $s > 1$  be a natural number and  $A \subset B$  be an extension of reduced rings, such that  ${}_B^+ A/A$  is a finitely generated  $s$ -divisible  $A$ -module. Then  $\ker[N^r \text{Pic } A \rightarrow N^r \text{Pic } B]$  is a  $\mathbb{Z}[1/s]$ -module. (This is also the case for  $\ker[N_r \text{Pic } A \rightarrow N_r \text{Pic } B]$ , since  $N_r \text{Pic } A \simeq \bigoplus_{1 \leq s \leq r} N^s \text{Pic } A^{(s)}$ .)*

*Proof.* We may assume  $B = {}_B^+ A$ , since  $N^r \text{Pic } {}_B^+ A \rightarrow N^r \text{Pic } B$  is injective. Let  $c$  be the conductor of  $A \subset B$ , i.e.,  $c = \text{Ann}(B/A)$ . Then we have the conductor sequence

$$N^r U(A/c) \rightarrow N^r U(B/c) \rightarrow N^r \text{Pic } A \rightarrow N^r \text{Pic } B \oplus N^r \text{Pic}(A/c) \rightarrow N^r \text{Pic}(B/c).$$

We derive the exact sequence

$$\begin{aligned} N^r U(A/c) \rightarrow N^r U(B/c) \rightarrow \ker[N^r \text{Pic } A \rightarrow N^r \text{Pic } B] \\ \rightarrow N^r \text{Pic}(A/c) \rightarrow N^r \text{Pic}(B/c). \end{aligned}$$

By the lemma  $s$  is a unit in  $A/c$  and  $B/c$ . So by [2, Corollary 8.2] the first two and the last two groups in the sequence above are  $\mathbb{Z}[1/s]$ -modules. Therefore this holds for the third one.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENT

This paper would not have been written without the hearty help of R. G. Swan. He prevented me from publishing a completely false proof of the main theorem and encouraged me to find a correct one. Also my second attempt, which was influenced by an example of his, was not perfect. I did not realize that an inclusion of reduced rings does not induce an inclusion of their integral closures. The idea of how to surmount this difficulty is due to him.

## REFERENCES

1. H. BASS, "Algebraic  $K$ -Theory," Benjamin, New York/Amsterdam.
2. R. G. SWAN, On seminormality, *J. Algebra* **67** (1980), 210–229.
3. R. G. SWAN, Letters from June 7 and December 16, 1982.
4. C. TRAVERSO, Seminormality and Picard group, *Ann. Scuola Norm. Sup. Pisa Sci. Fis. Mat. III Ser.* **24** (1970), 585–595.